

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 13 June 2023

The **SPEAKER (Hon. D.R. Cregan)** took the chair at 11:00.

The SPEAKER: Honourable members, we acknowledge Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples as the traditional owners of this country throughout Australia and their connection to land and community. We pay our respects to them and their cultures and to elders both past and present.

The **SPEAKER** read prayers.

Bills

ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION (OBJECTS OF ACT AND BOARD ATTRIBUTES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 1 June 2023.)

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (11:01): I think I came close to concluding my remarks, but I did touch upon the steel industry in my final comments and the importance of mitigation when it comes to the steel industry. Of course, these changes to the Environment Protection Act are changes to embody some expertise with regard to greenhouse gas mitigation and adaption, to embed some expertise within the body and to the body of the EPA, and to take into account mitigation and adaption in relation to greenhouse gas emissions.

One of the reasons that I have been keen on mitigation is that I do have, if you like, one of the dirtiest industries in the state in my community in Whyalla. It is a major emitter of carbon dioxide in the iron and steelmaking process. It is something that we do need to address. People are probably aware that the steel industry internationally contributes between 7 and 8 per cent—possibly up to 9 per cent—of greenhouse gas emissions globally, so it is important that we get serious about mitigation in that particular sector.

Of course, the only real pathway to serious mitigation in the steel industry is if you are talking about the use of virgin ore as opposed to recycled steel, which can be utilised in an electric arc furnace that can be renewable energy-run. But if you are talking about taking virgin ore and producing metallic iron, you need a reductant that is going to replace coking coal. The only reductant that is going to be able to do that is hydrogen. That is why the Hydrogen Jobs Plan and the selection of Whyalla are incredibly important, because a power plant in Whyalla needs a significant capacity when it comes to electrolyzers. To get electrolyzers in Whyalla is that first step on the road to mitigation.

We have to demonstrate that we can, using renewables, produce hydrogen commercially at scale. If we can do that, that provides a pathway for the steel industry in Whyalla. I have said before, and other people have said before, how interesting it is when you look at Whyalla and the resources available within the Whyalla region. It is one of the few places in the world that has that combination of resources.

A massive amount of magnetite in the Middleback Ranges, 50 kilometres to the west of Whyalla, is serviced by infrastructure that is already in place. There is a JORC reserve of four billion tonnes of magnetite and, if you put that into some sort of context, we use at the moment around 1.3 to 1.4 million tonnes of magnetite a year to produce intermediate and finished steel product at Whyalla, so we are talking about a massive resource in the order of billions of tonnes in the Middleback Ranges.

When you add to that the JORC reserve of magnetite throughout South Australia, it stands at somewhere between 10 and 12 billion tonnes at the moment, so we could produce steel in Whyalla for many years to come, and there will be a very strong interest if this all falls into place in iron briquettes that might well help steel industries internationally to help green up what they do, assuming we are going to use hydrogen.

This is incredibly important for our state. As I said, we have resources within the region, so you have the magnetite with the infrastructure in place, you have a port, you have a steelworks and you have a massive resource when it comes to renewables around Whyalla, Eyre Peninsula and the north of the state. You have a world-class wind resource overlapping a world-class solar resource. Once again, there are not many places in the world that have that combination.

Some of the companies are looking at Whyalla for the hydrogen hub, as opposed to the Hydrogen Jobs Plan, which is the state government initiative around the power plant. With the hydrogen hub itself, the companies that are looking at the region are talking about renewables in the gigawatt scale. We talk about renewables in this state, utility-scale renewables, in the megawatt range.

This is in the gigawatt range, very large projects, none of which are close to fruition, none of which have financial closure—and I think it is always important to put in that qualification because we are in a global competition here, with some countries willing to throw a lot of money at it, such as the United States with its Inflation Reduction Act. The Europeans are going to respond to that. We do not have the financial resources as a relatively small nation to compete on that level, so we have to be incredibly smart and play to our comparative and strategic advantages.

For my community of Whyalla, this is about a long-term future for steelmaking that will better make steel for generations to come. I am proud of the fact that three generations of my family, including me, have worked in the steel industry in Whyalla. I want to see that go on for many years to come, because at the end of the day it is the only integrated steel plant in the nation that produces long product that produces rail. It has significant strategic importance. If we can get it right there, we will be making a contribution to the global shift.

This year, 2023, will be a really interesting one, looking at the International Energy Agency and what it said. It looks like 2023 will be a game changer in terms of the scale of what is now happening internationally. A lot of people were quite pessimistic at one stage, but it is interesting that China, in just three to four months of this year, has built 71 gigawatts of solar capacity; in that very short period of time, they have built more than the whole of the history of the Australian national electricity market. The volume of what is going on in that country and in other nations that are now following is very significant. Some people who were quite pessimistic about reaching our goals now believe 2023 will be a watershed.

Ms THOMPSON (Davenport) (11:09): I also rise to support the Environment Protection (Objects of Act and Board Attributes) Amendment Bill 2023. We have all experienced the early impacts of climate change. It is sobering to realise that the environmental harm caused by climate change will continue to escalate until emissions effectively reach net zero levels, which sets huge challenges to reduce carbon emissions for this generation and those that follow. The risks of not acting are unequivocal and have already started to appear: more extreme weather events more often, real threats to our flora and fauna and devastating social and economic impacts.

This bill will amend the Environment Protection Act 1993 in order to clarify that the objects of the act extend to matters relating to climate change adaptation and also mitigation. The amendments make clear the existing role and function of the EPA to consider climate change when administering the act, particularly when executing its environmental authorisation and development assessment functions. The amendments also provide clarity and transparency while supporting the implementation of the government's climate change and emissions reduction targets and policies.

The objects of the Environment Protection Act are important, as they underpin the regulatory functions of the EPA. As they already do for the existing objects, with these amendments the EPA will need to start considering matters relating to climate change when considering applications for EPA licences and also considering development applications.

The bill also adds to the required attributes of the Environment Protection Authority Board membership. Climate change knowledge and capability attributes will become a requirement of the EPA Board membership to ensure appropriate expertise and guidance. This small but important change means that our EPA can only be guided by those with relevant knowledge and experience, just as it should be and just as I suspect all South Australians expect.

To inform this bill, the EPA met with key stakeholders, including 17 of South Australia's largest greenhouse gas emitters. Feedback regarding the intent to develop a climate change environment protection policy was overwhelmingly supportive. Of course, many of these businesses already have plans in place to achieve net zero by 2050 or are in the process of doing so. This cooperation will be crucial in delivering the environmental outcomes that South Australians want and expect, and I want to place on the record my thanks to all those who came to the table and committed to taking real action.

Key stakeholders were also informed of the intention to develop a climate change environment protection policy to outline and provide more detail on the responsibilities of government, licensees and development proponents in addressing climate change mitigation and adaptation. A climate change environment protection policy was seen as a valuable instrument by some larger emitters, as it would set an equal playing field for industry with respect to climate change expectations and support company officers making a case for decarbonisation to company management boards.

The proposed amendments to the objects of the Environment Protection Act will clarify existing provisions to provide certainty to business and community of the EPA's role with regard to climate change. It is important that our state has a comprehensive regulatory approach to address the causes and consequences of climate change, to assist in achieving our ambition to decarbonise, and build greater preparedness and resilience to the risks of climate change. The EPA has a critical role in protecting our environment from the threats of climate and in delivering actions that will support SA to achieve net zero emissions by 2050.

This amendment assists us to actively regulate greenhouse gas emissions and encourage the many South Australian businesses licensed by the EPA to transition to a net zero emission economy. While the EPA has always had a legal duty to protect the community and the environment from harm, it has never had a legislated direction like this to tackle one of the greatest threats to our health, to our environment and to our future prosperity: climate change.

Increasingly, communities across Australia and the globe are demanding that governments take effective and meaningful climate change action, and our government is committed to strengthening our response. Without substantial action, climate change poses a major threat to humanity. Reducing greenhouse gas emissions and adapting to climate change are important focuses of the South Australian government.

In May 2022, South Australia declared a climate emergency and committed to restoring a safe climate by transforming the economy to net zero emissions. The South Australian government has statewide goals of reducing net greenhouse gas emissions by more than 50 per cent by 2030, achieving net zero emission by 2050, and achieving 100 per cent renewable energy generation by 2030.

The government is delivering a range of actions to progress towards these targets and strengthen South Australia's climate change response. Building upon a strong foundation of existing government action, the South Australia: Responding to Climate Change strategy outlines the priority actions that the South Australian government will be focusing on to build a strong net zero emissions future and adapt to climate change.

The South Australian government is working with industries, businesses, communities, local government and the Australian government to implement these actions and encourage action beyond the role of government and there is no better example of the direct action that this government is taking than its Hydrogen Jobs Plan—a bold policy that will cement South Australia's position as world leader in renewable energy, create regional jobs and generate new export opportunities.

The Premier recently spoke of this government's commitment to implementing new hydrogen and renewable energy legislation, which will slash red tape and streamline processes for businesses wanting to invest in large-scale green energy projects, but these global interest-generating projects need to be appropriately supported and that is what this legislation does. South Australians can rest assured knowing that their EPA and, importantly, appointees to the EPA Board have an obligation to consider matters of climate as it exercises its powers.

Our government has a range of existing policies and programs that contribute to reducing the state's greenhouse gas emissions in areas including energy efficiency, renewable energy sources, transport, waste, waste management and buildings. Earlier this month, the state government progressed its transition to a zero-emission public transport system, with investigations into best technology solutions for bus and train services underway. A feasibility study assessing zero-emissions technologies for railcars on non-electrified lines, being the Belair, Outer Harbor, Port Dock spur and Grange services, will seek to identify appropriate fuel solutions.

Meanwhile, trial and testing of full battery electric buses continues, with five additional battery electric buses on order to support these efforts. This work will play a key role in determining the future of South Australia's public transport network and support the state government's objective of achieving net zero emissions by 2050.

In the housing space, the state government continues to grow its Virtual Power Plant, an initiative that allows lower income families to share in the benefits of South Australia's significant renewable energy generation and output. An additional 3,000 households, including those in the community housing sector, stand to gain from low-cost electricity and the comfort of battery backup. The expansion of this program, which was implemented by the former Labor government, will deliver public and community housing tenants a \$423 yearly saving, meaning we are not just producing more and increasing accessibility to green energy, we are using this energy to support some of our community's most vulnerable.

Businesses have been looking at the looming threat of climate change and at the new opportunities that it presents and are also taking action for themselves. Over the past decade, businesses and the community have been leaders, and I acknowledge and encourage their efforts. That is why it is so important that the government, whoever that may be, support these efforts, meet community expectations and accelerate change wherever and however possible. Right now, it is up to us. Future generations will look back on us all and ask what we did.

Those who stand on the steps of Parliament House or march on our streets will tell us that we are still not doing enough, and they are right: we do need to do more and we will. Government action is what Australians and South Australians now demand. There is no single button that we can press. We need a coherent approach that reduces greenhouse emissions, that deals with climate change that is already happening and that seeks a global solution.

This bill will enable the Environment Protection Authority to implement a range of enhanced regulatory measures. For example, it will consider how climate-related changes, such as sea level rise and more frequent extreme weather events, increase risk to or alter the environmental impacts and proposed developments.

The EPA will work with Green Industries SA and other government agencies on education, engagement and incentives to encourage businesses, schools and the community to implement circular economy opportunities and boost sustainable growth and address resource security. The Environment Protection Authority will assist licensees exposed to climate-related risk by reviewing licence conditions and supporting action to improve arrangements for dealing with more frequent extreme weather events.

This bill will ensure that our environment continues to be protected by the best possible environmental laws. I commend the bill to the house.

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (11:20): I rise to speak on the Environment Protection (Objects of Act and Board Attributes) Amendment Bill 2023. In 2021, our Deputy Premier, the Hon. Susan Close, also our Minister for Climate, Environment and Water, tabled a petition with more than 10,000 signatures from South Australians calling for immediate action on climate change. This

petition came after almost 10 years of inaction on climate change by the federal and state Liberal governments, which left Australia badly exposed to the effects of climate change.

How can we ever forget the former Liberal Prime Minister Scott Morrison bringing a lump of coal into federal parliament or labelling South Australia's world-leading big battery at Jamestown 'a big banana'? This is an example of why elections matter, because since the state and federal elections Labor governments have been getting on with the job of taking action on climate change.

In May 2022, Minister Close introduced the climate emergency motion, reaffirming the urgent need to decarbonise the South Australian economy and shift to renewable sources of energy. This declaration signalled our intention to take action and reaffirmed the state government's commitment to build science-based policies that can prepare South Australia for the realities of extreme weather, climate shifts and increased global warming.

The South Australian government has a statewide goal of reducing net greenhouse gas emissions by more than 50 per cent by 2030, achieving net zero emissions by 2050 and achieving 100 per cent renewable energy generation by 2030. The Malinauskas Labor government has also committed to building a world-first hydrogen power plant near Whyalla in Upper Spencer Gulf by 2024 and accelerating the growth of the state hydrogen economy. The Malinauskas government is also supporting:

- the growth of green minerals and processing industries to support mining for critical minerals with the lowest impact on the environment;
- a circular economy development, where resources are recycled and re-used rather than thrown away;
- the increased use of electric vehicles, which included abolishing the former Liberal government's tax on electric vehicles;
- carbon accounting to support the measuring and monitoring of carbon emissions;
- solar, batteries and smarter homes;
- large-scale renewable energy generation and storage;
- urban greening strategies;
- regional climate partnerships;
- blue carbon;
- carbon farming; and
- coastal protection.

Our government is also leading by example by taking action to reduce emissions from our own state government operations and undertaking several key pieces of work to respond to climate change.

The first piece of work is an amendment to the state's climate change act to enshrine our state emission targets in law and strengthen requirements around government climate change planning and action. Legislating our targets sends a clear signal that South Australia is serious about tackling climate change and is a place to invest in clean, low emissions business.

The second piece of work is to develop a world-leading net zero emissions reduction plan. This work will focus on addressing the gaps in our current effort to reach at least 50 per cent reduction in net emissions by 2030 and net zero by 2050. The net zero emissions reduction plan will also focus on maximising the economic benefits from the transition to net zero.

Each year, the commonwealth government provides an SA greenhouse gas inventory, which includes a dataset dating back to the 1990 financial year. The most recent released data shows that our state currently emits around 21.5 million tonnes of greenhouse emissions each year. This means our emissions have reduced by 42 per cent since 2005. Over the next seven years, we will need a further 8 per cent drop to achieve our state's target of at least 50 per cent reduction in net emissions

by 2030 from 2005 levels. To set us on track to net zero by 2050, we need to act to achieve this target as well as lay the foundations for longer term reductions.

More locally, in my community of Adelaide I have committed to greening our neighbourhood, delivering projects that increase our tree canopy and create more open green space to cool our suburb, increase biodiversity and improve community wellbeing through nature. As a country kid I took for granted the many trees I would climb and the open green spaces I would run and play in, living both on the farm and alongside the Naracoorte Creek. While we might live in a thriving city, I want these same experiences for our kids and grandkids.

I am very proud to have announced two brand-new pocket parks in Prospect on Main North Road and Churchill Road, with work starting just last week at the Main North Road location opposite Scotty's Corner and the famous big Scotsman. This dirt block, which would otherwise have been turned into some large concrete box, will instead transform into open green space to bring much-needed tree canopy to this pocket of our community. A further two pocket parks will also be created at Brompton and Bowden, increasing the benefits of the new Ovingham overpass community area.

Our communities deserve more open green space and more trees because we know there are so many benefits that flow from greening our neighbourhood. From improving community wellbeing and connection to biodiversity and cooling our suburbs, the importance of tree canopy cannot be understated.

Delivering on another election commitment, the Malinauskas Labor government has fully restored Parklands protection to Helen Mayo Park, ensuring the park's trees and open green spaces are saved for current and future generations. We have achieved this by scrapping the former Liberal government's plans to build a \$662 million basketball stadium on the Parklands, which would have destroyed this area of open green space and beautiful trees.

It is worth pointing out that we also opposed the former Liberal government's plans to rezone parts of the Parklands along the Riverbank as entertainment zones as well as their proposed zoning changes, which would have paved the way for high-rise commercial and residential developments along the Riverbank, along our Parklands.

The Malinauskas government will also invest \$1.5 million to revitalise degraded areas of Helen Mayo Park, to be delivered by the Adelaide City Council. By reinstating the Adelaide Parklands zone, Helen Mayo Park once again has full Parklands protection, ensuring no development can occur on the banks of the River Torrens, as was the plan of the former Liberal government.

On Saturday, I was very proud to join the Premier in unveiling the very first designs of a brand-new Adelaide Aquatic Centre to replace the current run-down and decaying facility. The new state-of-the-art centre will be built for purpose, making it greener and more energy efficient. It will provide both indoor and outdoor pools, more family fun activities like splash zones, water slides and a bombing pool, include major improvements to accessibility and inclusivity and provide a dedicated warm-water pool for rehabilitation and a dedicated learn-to-swim pool.

Importantly, we have unveiled a design that will return 1,000 square metres of Parklands back to the community. That is 1,000 square metres of extra open green space over what we currently have at the site today. I am advised by the department that we are also retaining established trees on Barton Terrace West and Jeffcott Street and are looking to replace non-native vegetation with native vegetation where possible.

Understanding the importance of the tree canopy, the Malinauskas government also convened an expert panel in August 2022 to review the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016 and the Planning and Design Code to ensure planning decisions encourage livability, competitiveness and sustainability. This review also included how the code and related instruments manage tree preservation and planting. The Minister for Planning, Nick Champion MP, further directed the expert panel to provide advice and recommendations on proposed amendments to the regulations as they pertain to trees, with the expert panel currently in the process of preparing their final report for the minister's consideration.

The next step in the Malinauskas government's plan to tackle climate change is this bill, the Environment Protection (Objects of Act and Board Attributes) Amendment Bill 2023. This bill amends

the Environment Protection Act 1993 to clarify that the objects of the act extend to matters relating to climate change adaptation and mitigation.

The bill will also add further attributes to the Environment Protection Authority (EPA) Board membership in relation to climate change adaptation and mitigation. The amendments will clarify the existing roles and function of the EPA when considering these matters and administering the act, particularly when executing its environmental authorisation and development assessment functions. As the bill clarifies the existing powers enshrined in the act, these amendments have no regulatory impact. The amendments provide clarity and transparency while supporting the implementation of the government's climate change and emission reduction targets and policies.

The objects of the EP Act underpin the regulatory function of the act. The Environment Protection Authority, when considering applications for EPA licences and development applications under the EP Act and the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016, must consider and further the objects of the EP Act. The objects of the EP Act also inform the environment protection policymaking powers in part 5 of the EP Act in that an environment protection policy may be made for any purpose directed towards securing the objects of the act.

During the consultation and engagement of this bill, the Environment Protection Authority met with key stakeholders to inform them of the proposed amendment bill. During this consultation period, all 17 of South Australia's largest greenhouse gas emitters were contacted. The feedback received from these companies was overwhelmingly in support of our plan to develop the environment protection policy. Meetings were also held with DTI, DEW, DEM, DIIS, Conservation Council SA, the Climate Change Action Steering Group and the Premier's Climate Change Council.

The EPA will also form a government reference group, in consultation, to ensure joined-up decisions and messaging across government in regard to regulation, measurement and reporting. A climate change environment protection policy was seen as being a valuable instrument by some larger emitters, as it would set an equal playing field for industry with respect to climate change expectations and would support company officers making a case for decarbonisation to company management and boards.

The benefit of the proposed bill is provision of clarity and transparency to government, licensees, development proponents and the general community that climate change adaptation and mitigation falls within the scope of the objects of the EP Act. The addition of climate change knowledge and expertise to the membership of the EPA Board will provide necessary expertise and guidance on the EPA Board as the EPA's regulation of climate-related matters evolves.

I am very proud to be a part of the Malinauskas Labor government that is getting on with the job and taking active steps to tackle climate change. I commend this bill to the house.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (11:32): I rise to close debate. I would like to thank all members for their contributions to the second reading of the Environment Protection (Objects of Act and Board Attributes) Amendment Bill 2023. This bill reinforces this government's commitment to stronger action on both climate change adaptation and climate change mitigation in recognition of the climate emergency that we are all facing.

We are delivering a broad range of actions to address climate change to protect the environment and to support jobs and growth at the same time. As I outlined in my introductory speech, this government is committed to statewide goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by more than 50 per cent against 2005 emissions levels by 2030 and then to achieve net zero emissions by 2050.

I think it is since I gave the second reading explanation that we have had the update in the Greenhouse Gas Inventory, as was referred to by the member for Adelaide, and have now seen that we have achieved a 42 per cent reduction on 2005 levels. One should by no means be complacent about the next 8 per cent, nor that the figures would remain stable from year to year, as there are transitory influences on the inventory as well, but it is very pleasing to see how far we have advanced along that pathway.

The Environment Protection Authority, as the state's principal environment regulator, is well positioned to play a pivotal role in assisting the government to deliver priority actions for government leadership and collaboration and to make contributions towards a net zero emissions future. It has had some runs on the board already. Environment Protection Authority regulation has already achieved a 40 per cent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions in the waste management, resource recovery and recycling sector from 1990 to 2019 whilst growing the circular economy, including the employment of 4,800 FTEs across the sector.

The Environment Protection Authority is also leading three actions under the South Australian government climate change actions. The Environment Protection Authority has powers that enable it to regulate a significant proportion of the state's emissions footprint and to assist small to medium businesses to adapt to climate change. The objects of the act underpin the functions of the authority. The amendments contained in this bill will clarify the existing role of the Environment Protection Authority in combatting climate change to ensure that all stakeholders—business, government and the community—are aware of their responsibilities with full transparency.

The Environment Protection Authority must have regard to the objects of the act when considering applications for environmental authorisations under the act and when considering development applications that are referred to it under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016. The objects of the act also inform the environment protection policymaking powers in part 5 of the act, in that an environmental protection policy may be made for any purpose directed towards securing the objects of the act.

Therefore, the proposed amendments will also support future development of a climate change focused environment protection policy under the act. I think it is probably worth emphasising that point in the context of some of the questions that were raised in the opposition's second reading contribution, where it was questioned whether the changes to the act were of sufficient weight and would make much difference.

What is, of course, important is to understand that they assist in then creating the right environment for us to be able to have an environment protection policy that is targeted not only at climate change mitigation but also at climate change adaptation, which will be very necessary as we continue to regulate large emitting businesses.

The addition of climate change knowledge and expertise to the membership of the board of the Environment Protection Authority will provide necessary expertise and guidance on the board as the authority's regulation of climate change related matters evolves over time. The authority has broadly consulted with key stakeholders on the elements of this bill and the future work that this agency intends to do to clarify its role in regulating climate change matters, where the support for progressing this work was unanimous.

These amendments to the EPA 1993 and further policy-related work to come will assist the government to meet its greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets and its circular economy and green industry transition. This bill is just one step towards addressing climate change adaptation and mitigation in South Australia. Other key South Australian legislation will be reviewed to strengthen climate action and will further demonstrate the Malinauskas government's commitment to strong climate change legislation and delivering meaningful action on climate change.

I also respond to the contribution by the opposition in being concerned that at this point we are not progressing with the legislation they are putting forward to add the targets that we have all agreed upon—the 50 per cent by 2030 and net zero by 2050—and that a lack of progress on their bill on that matter means a lack of interest in enshrining those targets in legislation. As I think has been explained in my contribution, and in the contributions of other people on this side, nothing could be further from the truth. We are committed to updating that legislation, but what we want is to do it in a thorough way that picks up all the changes that might be both required and useful for making changes to the way in which government guides the transition to a net zero economy.

We have therefore asked the Premier's Climate Change Council, under the very good leadership of Martin Haese, to review the act as well as prepare a climate change strategy that in fact sees a pathway to those targets, as opposed to the strategy we inherited from the previous government, and we have kept in place for now, that would get us nowhere near achieving those

targets. We think it is important that we now take the process of being able to visualise and plan both the 2030 and the 2050 targets in a far more serious way.

We have also taken the time to have an industry and climate change conference over two days; 900 people attended, all South Australian small businesses and non-government organisations—a remarkable turnout. We are using the information that was received from the participants to assist and guide in both those pieces of work.

We are also supporting the Conservation Council to undertake a 12-month process of having discussions with the community about what the community wants to see in a climate change response. This is so that, when we come to updating both the strategy and legislation, we are not just saying, 'We have had these shared targets on both sides of parliament for some time and we will pop them in,' but we are actually making the changes to the 2007 act that are necessary for us to be up to date with what we understand the technology enables us to do, what our trading partners are requiring us to do, what the pace of change in climate change is requiring of us in terms of speedy action and, of course, in making that very significant economic transition.

I think the previous Labor government made a tremendous contribution to South Australia's economic transition through its efforts in promoting renewable energy. It was a remarkable change, from something like 1 per cent of our electricity being generated by renewable energy in any given year to 77 per cent being generated by intermittent renewable electricity. Because it is intermittent, that is world leading.

Nations and jurisdictions that have a higher proportion of renewable energy do it with hydro, with being able to store in dams. We do not have lots of large dams, we do not have lots of high rainfall, and so we are doing it with intermittent renewables, and that puts us right at the forefront of being able to make the transition even in places that do not have lots of hills and lots of water, which makes what we do important not just for ourselves but in our leadership elsewhere.

That contribution was significant. I make no claim to have had any part in it, but it was significant and important both environmentally and economically in making the transition. It was at that point that we saw that economic growth in South Australia was decoupled from growth in emissions, which was an immensely important transition point.

What we have now is the opportunity to take the next step, because we all now agree, across the world, that we need to get to net zero by 2050. We need to make not just the transition in what has occurred already but another staged leap in being able to dramatically drop our emissions. To do that, we need to get beyond 77 per cent. The investment in the Hydrogen Jobs Plan, in the plant that will be in the Upper Spencer Gulf, is enormously significant in that. It is taking not only a lot of public money but a lot of effort on behalf of this government and the very diligent public servants in preparing for that.

It is making way for further renewable energy expansion because not only will that be required for the hydrogen plant but there is now an interest and appetite from business to work out how hydrogen can be harnessed in various ways, including the production of fertiliser, to be able to assist in the transition. It must not be just the ability to produce hydrogen or even to turn that back into electrons; it must be to make an industrial transformation.

That is why, as the member for Giles was talking about earlier, the transition to green iron and perhaps even green steel is so significant, because if we can export our renewable energy in the form of a product—not just the hydrogen, not just the holder of the energy, but in the form of a product like green iron—then we are really establishing South Australia to be a secure and prosperous place for the demands of the new century.

I pay tribute to the opposition when they were in government in making a great leap forward in getting rid of some single-use plastics and introducing that piece of legislation. That was a significant moment in assisting consumers to be part of the circular economy and to get out of the disposable economy. We are making further changes, as was anticipated in the legislation, this September and the one after, to reduce the amount of single-use plastics that are able to be sold. We are addressing transport, significantly preventing the disincentive to have EVs which was

captured by the previous government's piece of taxation legislation and which has now been repealed.

As was mentioned particularly by the member for Adelaide, we are working on a much more thoughtful approach to ensuring that we are greening not only Adelaide the city but also the regions. There are significant investments in heritage agreements, which are ways in which private landholders are able to look after the biodiversity they have—to protect it, to restore it—but also in the recent Cooler, Greener, Wilder Grants, released by Green Adelaide, and of course support for the national parks system, putting nature at the centre of what the protected areas are about and supporting the Friends of Parks, who are so intent on making sure that parks are properly vegetated both for biodiversity purposes and for resilience to climate change.

There is a significant amount of work that is occurring across government effort, all of which are supported by making sure that every part of government is doing what it can. The EPA has a particular role it can and will play in participating far more actively and with far more clarity through the amendment of this act, and I therefore commend it to the house.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Mr BATTY: The minister spoke of stakeholders being consulted in the preparation of this bill. Can you outline who the EPA consulted in preparing this bill?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: The EPA met with key stakeholders to inform them of the proposed bill, either face to face or virtually, from December 2022 to February 2023. All of South Australia's largest greenhouse gas emitters were contacted: those that are licensed under the EP Act and also report emissions greater than 100,000 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent under the National Greenhouse and Energy Reporting framework.

The large emitters the EPA met with were Santos, Liberty Primary Metals (which is Whyalla Steelworks), AGL, Pelican Point Power, Adelaide Brighton Cement, BHP, OZ Minerals, Aurora Group, Nyrstar, SA Water, Origin Energy, Cleanaway, Kimberly-Clark, and Pacific National Services. The Australian Gas Networks and Osborne Cogeneration Pty Ltd declined the invitation to meet but asked the EPA to inform them of the outcome.

Meetings have also been held with the Department for Trade and Investment; Planning and Land Use Services; the Department for Environment and Water; the Department for Energy and Mining; the Department for Industry, Innovation and Science; Conservation Council South Australia; the Climate Change Action Steering Group; and the Premier's Climate Change Council.

Mr BATTY: I think you indicated in your second reading speech that the vast majority of those consulted were supportive of this bill. Correct me if I am wrong, but you just said, in closing the debate, that there was unanimous support from all those stakeholders. Was it the vast majority that were supportive or was it unanimous support?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: My advice is that everyone was supportive of the bill.

Clause passed.

Clause 2.

Mr BATTY: This is a clause that deals with the commencement of the bill. Can the minister outline what practical effect on climate change we will see from the commencement of this bill?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: As I think the house is now well aware, the EPA is already able to address climate change matters and does so on an ad hoc basis—might be the way to describe it. As soon as the bill commences, the EPA will be in a position to start working on the environment protection policy, which as I mentioned in the close of the second reading speech is the device which is used by the EPA to guide with a greater level of detail what is expected of the entities it regulates.

That policy will reflect what is happening also at the federal level. The safeguards mechanism that is being discussed at present at the federal level would be acknowledged so that there is no double work for emitters—that they are having to deal at both levels. It will be able to consolidate what is expected or at least reflect what we are not doing because it is being managed elsewhere.

Constructing that policy, we will start negotiations or consultation with industry, government and also the Premier's Climate Change Council in order to bring together a policy that is functional and will make a real difference. The other change that will happen as soon as the bill commences is that it will give us an opportunity to select a board member with expertise on climate change, as is required, then, under the act.

Mr BATTY: Is there any reason why the EPA cannot get on with the work of this environment protection policy in the absence of this bill passing today?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: What is important to understand is that while it is true that one could read the objects, and likely in a court case might be required to read the objects, as being inclusive of climate change, it is not explicit. We are dealing with businesses that must make significant investments as they transition themselves. Many of them, indeed, already desire to transition to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions and also prepare for the impacts of the more extreme weather events that are associated with the warming that is occurring.

Given that the investment climate is a matter of seriousness, changing this act means that it becomes beyond question that there will be an environment protection policy, that the EPA regards itself as having rightly a role to play in the management of climate change. It is a way of being fair to business—to all business—to be clear that that is what is happening, and to enable us to, in an orderly way, then sit down with industry alongside government and the Premier's Climate Change Council to develop this policy so that there are no sort of mixed signals, and 'Well, is that just an interpretation of the objects? Do you really need to do it?' It is in the act, we are going to develop a policy, business will be involved, industry will be involved in that policy.

While the opposition—well, anyone—could choose to characterise this as, 'Oh, well, it's already probably there, so it is not making much difference,' in fact the parliament choosing to endorse that it is in this act, and the government then acting and, importantly, the Environment Protection Authority acting in a way that then conscientiously delivers on that, is all part of creating an environment of certainty for industry and clarity about where we as South Australia are going.

Mr BATTY: Perhaps to assist with that clarity then, on commencement of this bill will the EPA have any additional powers or, maybe more importantly, will there be any additional obligations on major polluters? For instance, when the EPA were conducting their consultation on this bill with those major polluters, what did the EPA tell these major polluters they will need to do in terms of adjusting their operations following the commencement of this bill?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I think the question is really directed at what will happen in the environment protection policy and, of course, the fact that there would be one was foreshadowed as part of these discussions about the bill. Just as WA and Northern Territory have done already, the idea of the policy is in essence to establish that emitters are required to say what their emissions will be and what they will be doing to reduce them.

Clause passed.

Clause 3.

Mr BATTY: This is a clause that inserts additional definitions into section 3 of the act; definitions of climate change adaptation, climate change mitigation and greenhouse gas emissions. Already existing in section 3 of the act is a definition of a pollutant. Is a greenhouse gas emission a pollutant?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: We have received advice that greenhouse gases could be considered a pollutant, although I do not believe that that has been tested in a court, but it is likely, given the consequences of their emission, that they could be considered a pollutant.

The advantage of this clause and this bill is that it puts it beyond question and that it is able to use the definitions in the Climate Change and Greenhouse Emissions Reduction Act 2007, so that

then, rather than debating whether this or that particular gas could be regarded as a pollutant, again this is about creating a much more certain environment for industry so that there is not a question, it is clear, and then we are able, of course, to act on that as we know we all need to.

It is also important that the piece of legislation talks about adaptation. We should not ignore the consequences—and the necessity of adapting to climate change.

Mr BATTY: A similar question: already existing in section 3, and ultimately section 5, is a definition of environmental harm. Is climate change environmental harm?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: One of the complexities I think we are dealing with is that unlike many, not all, other environmental harms, climate change is a global effect from the cumulative emissions that occur globally. What I mean by that is that whereas a spill of lead will affect that local environment, and there is a very clear link of environmental harm, emissions of carbon in the same place will not simply warm that place; they are a contributor to what we know to be a global challenge that we must address.

So, while we have had advice that climate change could be considered environmental harm, because by any common understanding of those words of course it is, it is important—given that question of the distance between individual action and the collective and cumulative result and that we need collective and cumulative action to reduce those emissions if we are going to have a global impact—that for the sake of certainty for industry we put that beyond doubt by making these legislative changes.

There is no rational way of dealing with climate change without reducing emissions, and we not only need to do that in order to make our contribution to the decline in emissions collectively but we also need to do it because if we do not, we will be economically left behind. So what we need to do is make sure that we are working in South Australia to have a strong economy in a carbon constrained global economy, one that will increasingly test what products are being sold and how many emissions are associated with them, so we need to use all of the angles we can to assist the economy to make that shift.

Clause passed.

Clause 4.

Mr BATTY: The minister has already conceded that the objects of the act are already sufficiently broad to permit consideration of climate change adaptation and mitigation. This is a clause that effectively peppers the act with those words. Does this bill do anything more than pepper the act with words like 'climate change', in which case why do we need it? At its highest, is this bill just clarifying what powers and obligations already exist?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I feel like I am in some sort of groundhog day where I am being asked versions of exactly the same question and I am not sure if it is because my answers are not sufficiently clear or perhaps the questions are pre-prepared, so we just go on to the next one. What we are dealing with is a very complex environmental impact in the creation of greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to the global harm of climate change and also the need for our industry to be ready in every way it can be for a warming environment that creates more extreme weather events.

Whether by legal definition one could interpret with certainty that these matters are already covered in the general terms of environmental harm and pollutants is a matter that has never been settled before the courts but one can receive legal advice on. What really matters is that, collectively as a parliament, as custodians collectively of the South Australian economy and by virtue of that of South Australian society and prosperity, we provide clarity and certainty so that decisions are not locked up in questions about whether that definition is sufficiently clear to cover this particular emission, but is removed from that world and taken into the real world of what climate change means, what is required of industry and all the instruments that are able to be used collectively to address it.

Whether one wants to get caught up in whether this is a semantic debate on an interpretation of a piece of legislation or whether one wants to understand that this is an important step in treating industry and their need for certainty and security seriously and that we collectively as a parliament

choose to make that statement, that does have weight. It will have even more weight once the environment protection policy is able to be worked through with the stakeholders, but in itself it does have weight because it states beyond doubt that the Environment Protection Authority has a responsibility to contribute to our response to climate change.

That is one of the things that parliament does: it clarifies what is important, it identifies entities that are responsible for contributing to addressing that and it does so in a way that puts it beyond legal doubt or dispute and also, I hope, beyond political doubt or dispute about whether this is something that is important to deal with.

Mr BATTY: The minister mentioned earlier that there was no opposition raised with respect to this bill when consulting with stakeholders. Did any stakeholders raise any other opposition about work connected to this—for example, the environment protection policy that you foreshadowed?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Naturally, while all the businesses were very clearly supportive of the bill itself, there were questions and some concerns about what the environment protection policy will require of them and when. We have explained very clearly that they will be participating in the process for us to draw that up.

We need to pay attention to meeting our obligations for climate change—mitigation in particular—but also do that in the context of understanding what the federal government is requiring of businesses and how quickly businesses can reasonably act. This is custom and practice for the EPA; it works with businesses to make sure that they are successful but are responding to environmental challenges. This will be no different.

Mr TEAGUE: I just take up that line of questioning that the member for Bragg stepped through primarily from clause 3 to clause 4. Perhaps in the context of the minister's answers, I draw particular attention to subclause (5) and the reference there to the requirement that persons engaged in polluting activities 'ensure their facilities and premises are designed or progressively approved and so on'.

I note what the minister has had to say about the purpose of the parliament and what we are doing to refer to climate change and the broad nature of the effect of climate change. Is it not the problem that we are actually here with a responsibility to legislate in a meaningful way and that, as a first step, it is a therefore perfectly reasonable and necessary question, is it not, to determine whether or not the climate change inducing activities—the climate change inducing components—are caught by definitions in the act and in the regulations?

Section 3 of the act defines in, I think, three ways—pollute, pollutant, pollution—and there are references in the act and in the regulations to contamination and contaminating activities and so on. Is it not the case that the act is designed and geared towards the regulation of those polluting activities that are catalogued and then to determining things like pollutant, load-based components and so on, so that—and I see that, in addition to those pollutants that are set out, there is capacity to regulate the addition of other categories of pollutant—it is necessary to determine that with some precision for the purposes including of whether or not a person is engaged in polluting activities?

Without that, are we not then saying that we are going to apply this act, which was designed for a purpose other than to deal with climate change, only to those who are engaged in the more narrow—and, might I say, traditionally defined polluting activities, although 'polluting activities' is not defined; it is used discursively in the bill and by reference to pollution—because, otherwise, we do not know who is actually caught by provisions including that referred to in clause 4(5)?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I will just try to decipher exactly what the question was, so if I am not answering the question please tell me. If the question was, 'Who is affected by the legislation now, once the definition is clear?', that will be determined. If I am understanding, it might be: 'Does a small business that emits a small amount of greenhouse gas get caught up in having to respond or not? Is there a cut-off?' That might have been part of the question in trying to understand who is affected by this clarity in definition. That will largely be captured through the environment protection policy so that we are able to determine which of the regulated industries are particularly needing to pay attention to the terms of that policy.

Mr TEAGUE: I come back to the definition of 'pollutant'. Maybe I have walked through the whole thing in one go. To answer the minister's question, the first point at which the rubber hits the road is clause 4(5), inserting a requirement that persons engaged in polluting activities ensure that their facilities and premises are designed and progressively improved so as to limit the risk of environmental harm from those activities in relation to the impacts of a changing climate. Does it not need to decide who those persons are?

The act as it has been so far applied and directed is defining pollutants and also defining contamination in ways that the minister has described are those more traditional ways that are going to have immediate effects in local areas and hence need to be regulated by the EPA. There is a regime for determining how those more immediate impacts are to be applied.

What we see here, then, as the member for Bragg has adverted to, is a 'peppering', to use his term, and some definitions applied in terms of objects. We are overlaying that broad question of how we might look at climate change mitigation, applying measures so as to improve and limit environmental harm in that broad sense, but we need to identify who is being obliged to do that in the act.

We need to define, and maybe the question more particularly might be, who are those persons engaged in polluting activities. To whatever extent, there is at present uncertainty as to what polluting activities are. How do we know who the persons involved are? I am engaged in a polluting activity at the moment; there is some carbon dioxide being emitted.

Where we have gone from an EPA that is dealing with prescribed pollutants, prescribed contaminants, regimes for determining things like points and approvals and monitoring and all the rest of it, we are now talking climate change in the broad, but we are not possibly—or are we?—bringing that back to, as it were, putting the money where the mouth is and saying, 'Here are the pollutants now that tell us about what activities are to be mitigated,' and therefore making a contribution.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: A bit of graphology, a bit of semantics, a bit of legal—we are ready, I think. Schedule 1, as the member may well be aware, of the Environment Protection Act contains a list of activities that require the EPA to regulate an industry. There is no intention for any business or an industry that is not already being regulated, that already has a licence, to be added to the list of industry that is required to have a licence. So we are already dealing with a known quantity of industry; it is just a question of being able to deal specifically and explicitly with the greenhouse gas emissions. While the member may well be emitting carbon, he is currently not required to get a licence for causing environmental harm, nor will he be required to get a licence for causing environmental harm.

Mr TEAGUE: I am grateful for that indication, but maybe I will give a couple of illustrations. The minister may not necessarily have it to hand, but section 64A of the act talks about the obligation on the minister to take action where a pollutant is released, regularly or irregularly. It does not seem to me to limit itself to those prescribed activities or designated entities that are set out in schedule 1. It just talks about the emission of a pollutant in a way that gives rise to the obligation for the minister to take action about it. That is just one example of a series of provisions in that nature that hinge off the definition of pollutant in the first place.

To perhaps put that into some context, if we get back to the regulations, I will bring up regulation 31, and the minister might like to have a look at that as well. For example—and I mentioned this earlier when talking about pollutant load base components—it sets out for the purposes of the regulation a couple of tables by reference to particular designated air pollutants and those, for the purposes of that regulation, include the familiar ones: sulphur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, particulates, volatile organic compounds, and lead. Further on in the regulation, we see fee units and zone weightings for designated water pollutants, particularly in the context of desalination plants. We see those components are again tabulated, there are fee results, load is determined and so on.

The broad point is that the act is applying itself to what it goes through stepwise to define and then apply regulations towards in terms of specific pollutants, sometimes in relation to emitters of them, sometimes in the broad, as section 64A of the act, I think, exemplifies. The question remains: how can the overlay of an object to, as it were, progressively improve as it is applied to those persons

engaged in polluting activities—so called, in subclause (5)—or the general references to mitigation and adaption have any work to do in the act without there being that legislative focus on what the pollutants or contaminants are?

If it is an attempt here to, as it were, overlay and apply climate change objects to the old act, we have not seen any indication—I am not aware of any indication—that there is the possibility to name all these pollutants by regulation. That could happen subsequently, but there has been no reference to it so far. Are we not talking about a couple of parallel concepts that are not actually connecting to one another in the legislation?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: There are a couple of things to clarify. The earlier clause that we passed talks about greenhouse gas emissions having the same meaning as in the Climate Change and Greenhouse Emissions Reduction Act 2007. That act does list what they are, so if we are concerned about what the gases are we can find them, and we have done that through a definition of referral.

The problem when we are suddenly leaping out of the bill and into the act—although perfectly entitled to do so—means that it is easy to get out of context. Section 64A is not a general requirement to deal with pollution, it refers specifically to auto protection areas, so it is not quite analogous I think to what the member might be seeking to ask.

The reality is that much of the detail that is being sought, many of the ways in which these matters will be addressed, will appear, as happens with many ways in which environmental harm is dealt with, through the environment protection policy so that it is able to be refined and adjusted and also to be consulted with industry, but it creates a much more flexible way of dealing with environmental harm than capturing definitively all the detail in the act.

Mr TEAGUE: I might be done, and I could do it in clause 5, only very briefly, if the Chair would permit.

The CHAIR: I will allow a supplementary.

Mr TEAGUE: It is supplementary. Going back to clause 3 and to the definition of greenhouse gas emissions, why in light of the minister's answer, for example, are greenhouse gas emissions not included specifically in an amended definition of pollutant? I just ask that rhetorically. Against the background of the answers that have been given so far, I cannot see any good reason why it would not have been, but I am just here to ask questions.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Would you like an answer?

Mr TEAGUE: You might feel like you have already answered it.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: My understanding is that 'pollutants' includes the phrase 'gases' and then this gives us the definition of what greenhouse gases are, so I think the member's concerns about a lack of clarity have been answered through that chain.

Clause passed.

Clause 5.

Mr BATTY: This is a clause that amends section 14B, requiring the EPA Board to have a person with knowledge of climate change adaptation and mitigation. The existing section 14B(5) of the act already requires the board membership to have someone with experience relevant to environment protection and also knowledge of industry. Why does this do more? What work is left to be done by this amendment?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I think it is important that we be clear that we want that specific expertise on the board. Simply saying 'environmental harm and industry' is fairly non-specific. This gives greater guidance not just for this government but future governments that climate change adaptation and mitigation is going to be increasingly an important part of what we all are dealing with—every part of government and every part of society. This puts beyond question the need for that practical knowledge and experience and I hope we will attract someone with that expertise to come onto the board to add value to what the board is able to do not only in the regulatory role of the EPA but in terms of looking forward to policy settings that will be required in the future.

Mr BATTY: Does the minister have any concerns about the current experience or qualifications of those on the EPA Board?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Of course not.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (12:36): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE (WOMBAT BURROWS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (12:36): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I would like to thank members in the other place who gave detailed consideration to the important animal welfare issues that this bill considers. I would particularly like to thank the Hon. Tammy Franks for the work she did in bringing the original version of the bill to her chamber and then, of course, for the work done by Emily Bourke, amongst, I am sure, other members of the Legislative Council, in amending the bill to the form in which we have received it.

As an iconic species in South Australia, there is value in increasing the protection of wombats and in clarifying for landholders and the community how wombats and their habitat are to be protected. There are two species of wombat found in South Australia. There is the southern hairy-nosed wombat and the common wombat, sometimes called the bare-nosed wombat. Both of these species are considered by the bill that is before us today.

The latter, although known as a common wombat, is in fact recognised as a rare species in South Australia under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972. Importantly, both species are protected under the National Parks and Wildlife Act, which means that the current existing framework provides that a person must not, first of all, take, which means to kill, injure or capture, a protected animal without a permit and also must not interfere, harass or molest a protected animal or undertake an activity that is or is likely to be detrimental to the welfare of the protected animal, unless they hold a permit to do so or satisfy exemption criteria.

It is also important to note that there are currently provisions relating to the ill-treatment of animals in the Animal Welfare Act 1985. This bill provides specific regulatory protections to wombats, and it inserts a provision preventing the deliberate disturbance, damage or destruction of burrows.

This bill, I think, was inspired by concerns raised by members of the public about the possibility that, by destroying burrows without taking due care and diligence to ensure that animals are not in those burrows, wombats were being suffocated within their homes and that we needed to make sure that, although that is against the law under the Animal Welfare Act, we are providing the right regime to protect those animals and to guide the way in which they are managed or their environment is managed.

The Department for Environment and Water encourages a 'living with wildlife' approach to how people think about and interact with wildlife. Burrow destruction is rarely effective when undertaken as the only means of managing wombat impacts and therefore the department

recommends a range of methods to landholders. Nonlethal methods of management for wombats include electric fencing, fence alterations, wombat gates and marking burrows.

While the department encourages the use of nonlethal methods of wombat management, it may issue a person a Permit to Destroy Wildlife when wombats and, indeed, protected wildlife generally are causing or are likely to cause damage to the environment, crops, stock, property or environmental amenity, including built structures, or are posing a safety risk or hazard to people or industry.

Where destruction is permitted, it must be done in accordance with the relevant code of practice for humane destruction. Destroying burrows with the intent of destroying an animal is not an approved method of destruction and would almost certainly be an offence under the National Parks and Wildlife Act, as well as the Animal Welfare Act.

The legislation before us creates a mechanism to allow the minister to declare an area to be protected from this kind of activity so that the animals are entirely protected and makes sure that the way we interact with these animals is respectful and people can have confidence that cruelty is not occurring.

I would like to thank members for their support in developing the bill in its current format. I commend the bill to the house.

Mr BATTY (Bragg) (12:41): I rise to make a brief contribution to the bill on behalf of the opposition. In doing so, I want to acknowledge the work of the Hon. Tammy Franks in the other place for her ongoing commitment to protecting our native fauna. Like so many in this place, we are all committed to the prevention of cruelty to animals, whether they be domestic or native animals. This bill, of course, concerns wombats and wombat burrows. As the minister has pointed out, there are two species of wombats found in South Australia: the southern hairy-nosed wombat and the common wombat, both of which are already protected under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972.

In circumstances where a landowner or manager may have the need to destroy a wombat burrow—and I note that there are many legitimate circumstances where that need might arise, whether it be for safety reasons or for economic reasons—that landowner or manager is already required under the existing legislative provisions to do so in a manner that will not constitute an offence, an offence under either the National Parks and Wildlife Act or the Animal Welfare Act 1985, which prevent the taking or molesting of protected fauna and which prevent the ill-treatment of an animal.

In contrast to these existing legislative protections, this bill seeks to introduce a specific provision into the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972 which prohibits the destroying, damaging or disturbing of a wombat burrow and also establishes a permit system for doing so. In that sense it is more of a protection of habitat rather than a protection of a species.

The opposition does have some concerns that to require a landowner to obtain a permit prior to the destruction of a wombat burrow might increase the regulatory burden on land managers and landowners, as well as government agencies, without practically improving the protections that are already in place for wombats under both the National Parks and Wildlife Act and the Animal Welfare Act.

These concerns appear to be somewhat consistent with concerns the government might have had on this issue as well. I note that there were amendments moved in the other place that limit the circumstances in which a land manager will require a permit, including an exemption where the burrow is causing or is likely to cause damage to crops, stock, machinery or infrastructure or may pose a safety risk or hazard to people.

However, this limitation only applies if the burrow is outside a wombat burrow protection zone, and the bill lacks any detail about how a wombat burrow protection zone will be determined, except to say it will be declared by notice in the *Gazette*. In these circumstances, the opposition is of the view that this bill will increase the regulatory burden on both land managers and government agencies without necessarily achieving any improvements in the existing protection of wombats under the National Parks and Wildlife Act and the Animal Welfare Act.

Ms CLANCY (Elder) (12:45): I rise today in support of the National Parks and Wildlife (Wombat Burrows) Amendment Bill 2022. In today's climate of 24/7 news coverage, regular opinion polls and 10-second sound bites, I think it is a fair cop that parliaments right across the democratic world can sometimes get caught up trying to get that next vote, but it is imperative that, as representatives, we represent not just those who are the loudest but also those who cannot speak at all. Today, we get to do that in this place and provide a voice to our fluffy, four-legged friends who contribute so much to our communities and our economy without saying anything at all.

This bill is designed to give additional protections to what I would consider one of our cutest four-legged friends—wombats. I would like to start by thanking the Hon. Tammy Franks MLC, who is in the gallery today, for introducing this bill to the other place, and I extend my appreciation to her staff, as well as to community organisations, particularly the Wombat Awareness Organisation, which worked incredibly hard on the bill we find before us today.

As the member for Bragg pointed out, South Australia is home to two species of wombat: the southern hairy-nosed wombat and the common or bare-nosed wombat. Beloved by our state, the hairy-nosed wombat was made South Australia's faunal emblem in 1970. All muscle, these powerful and skilled diggers can grow to be one metre long and weigh as much as 32 kilos—if they were a dog, I reckon with a solid build like that they would be a staffy—and young hairy-nosed wombats will live in their mother's burrow for almost three years.

Its bare-nosed cousin, the common wombat—a term I feel does not give them the credit they deserve; it almost feels as if it is the wombat version of calling someone basic, but I digress—is recognised as a rare species under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972. Both species are protected under the act, meaning that no person can kill, injure or capture a wombat without a permit. Provisions relating to the ill-treatment of animals such as wombats can also be found in the Animal Welfare Act 1985.

Despite these protections, South Australians will be rightfully disgusted to learn that as many as a dozen wombats are believed to be buried alive in our state each and every week. South Australian wombats are being buried alive as a form of eradication. Despite their aforementioned strength, wombats cannot dig themselves out of a destroyed burrow, becoming entombed and suffocating for up to 21 days before eventually passing away.

It has become clear to me, as it has to many in this place and the other, that the existing protections for our beloved wombats are simply not enough. More than 50,000 people have signed the Wombat Awareness Organisation's petition to stop wombats from being buried alive, and today the Malinauskas Labor government sees that call and will legislate to protect wombats and their homes.

I understand that to support this bill in the other place the government introduced further amendments to the bill, which were supported by the mover. The first was to insert a provision that landholders are permitted to destroy a wombat burrow without a permit only where it poses a risk to human safety, stock, farming crops and machinery or infrastructure. This provision would not derogate from the requirement of compliance with the National Parks and Wildlife Act or the Animal Welfare Act.

The other main amendment was to allow the minister to declare a wombat burrow protection zone, a geographical area where a person must not, without a permit granted by the minister, destroy, damage or disturb the burrow of a wombat. These provisions are focused on protecting safety, infrastructure and industry and are not intended to enable unreasonable damage to wombat burrows.

As the Department for Environment and Water suggests, we must continue to encourage a 'living with wildlife' approach to how people think about and interact with wildlife. The fact is that the destruction of wombat burrows is rarely effective when undertaken as the only means of managing their impact on farmers and landowners. A range of nonlethal methods of wombat management is recommended to landowners, including but not limited to fence alterations, wombat gates and marking burrows.

Where burrow destruction is permitted, it must only be done in accordance with the relevant code of practice for humane destruction. Destroying a burrow with the intent to kill an animal is simply

not in line with the values of the overwhelming majority of South Australians and would likely be an offence under the National Parks and Wildlife Act and the Animal Welfare Act. However, by passing this bill, we can make it explicitly clear to farmers and landowners that this behaviour will not be tolerated.

This bill also provides us with an opportunity to increase compliance and education efforts to raise awareness for the nonlethal methods of wombat management and to reduce identified risks and impacts and the inefficiency of destroying wombat burrows in isolation from other management methods to reduce risks and impacts to safety and machinery.

Before I wrap up, I want to take this opportunity to provide some fun facts about wombats. As I am sure many of you know, and I know a number of my colleagues know, their poos are cube shaped and, still focusing on their rear ends, they use their bums to block their burrows to keep predators away. A group of wombats is known as a wisdom, and wombats can run at 40 km/h. If you are looking for more wombat content, I really encourage you to follow the CSIRO on Instagram for their weekly wombat doses, which are on Wombat Wednesday. How good is it that you only have one sleep to wait for the next one!

Once again, I would like to thank the Hon. Tammy Franks MLC for introducing this bill in the other place, and I thank everyone who has taken a stand to protect this South Australian icon. I look forward to seeing the successful passage of this bill under a new, more compassionate state government, and I commend this bill to the house. Go wombats!

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (12:51): Just very briefly, and I will not take the house's time to reflect on my personal love of wombats and so on, but I want to draw attention to the structure of what will be section 68AA(3) and the establishment of a new concept called the wombat burrow protection zone.

In the interest of avoiding a committee on this point, and just from a legislative point of view, it seems to me that the operation of the system of requiring a permit, or not, is inherently now dependent upon, first of all, the existence of a wombat burrow protection zone, so that you can be outside it or not. It begs the question as well, it seems to me, if it is to be something that is declared by the minister in a notice in the *Gazette*, of whether that is then contemplated to be something that would apply in a temporal sense to deal with prevailing circumstances, or is it at once and for all: we know this because of the nature of known habitats and so on?

If that is the case, it would seem to me to be helpful to have that, as it were, known for the purposes of this debate—and it may be that it is not that far off. But, as a threshold point, the concept of the zone seems to require that at least something is established so that you can be outside it or not, otherwise the reality is that the only provisions doing any work here will be those that require a permit and all the relevant permit provisions.

As I have already indicated, there is no clear sense of what such a zone would be reflecting—that is, known habitat on the one hand, or some other particularly temporal intervention in particular circumstances that might prevail depending on other activities that are going on on land from time to time. I just make those observations about that definition in particular and the work that it would do in the act, and that is in the interests of those who would need to be navigating this new provision.

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (12:55): I rise to indicate my support for the National Parks and Wildlife (Wombat Burrows) Amendment Bill 2022, a bill introduced by the Hon. Tammy Franks MLC in the other place. In South Australia, we have two species of this beautiful creature: the southern hairy-nosed wombat and the common wombat, sometimes known as the bare-nosed wombat.

Both of these species are protected under the national parks act, which means that, under sections 51 and 68, the current framework provides that a person must not take a protected animal without a permit—this includes killing, injuring or capturing a wombat—or interfere, harass or molest a protected animal or undertake an activity that is, or is likely to be, detrimental to the welfare of a protected animal unless they hold a permit to do so or satisfy an exemption criteria.

There are also provisions relating to the ill-treatment of animals in the Animal Welfare Act 1985. Despite this, hundreds of wombats are being buried alive through the destruction of their

burrows, and I am pleased to support this bill that provides further protection for wombats—our state fauna emblem, the southern hairy-nosed wombat.

I would also like to thank the Hon. Emily Bourke MLC, who amended the bill to insert a provision that allows the minister to declare a wombat burrow protection zone: a geographical area where a person must not, without a permit granted by the minister, destroy, damage or disturb the burrow of a wombat. These provisions are focused on protecting safety infrastructure and industry and are not intended to enable unreasonable damage to wombat burrows—for example, in a natural environment outside these circumstances. The bill also includes a provision for the protection zone, in which landholders may have a reasonable need to damage burrows from time to time due to human safety and risks of damage to equipment and infrastructure.

The Department for Environment and Water encourages a 'living with wildlife' approach to how people think about and interact with wildlife. Burrow destruction is rarely effective when undertaken as the only means of managing a wombat population. The department recommends other methods to landholders: nonlethal methods of management for wombats, including electric fencing, fence alterations, wombat gates and marking burrows. Destroying burrows with the intent of destroying an animal is not an approved method of destruction and would likely be an offence.

When we think of protecting wombats and their homes, it is also interesting to note, as the member for Elder pointed out, that a group of wombats is called a wisdom. Wombats can live in the wild for up to 26 years. Being a nocturnal animal, they come out to feed in the early evening and during the night. Wombats sometimes emerge from their burrows to sun themselves on sunny days.

In protecting wombat burrows, it is useful to know that wombat burrows can cover a large area and will have many entrances. All wombat species live in burrows, often creating complex networks of burrows, with tunnels and chambers that can extend for up to 150 metres in radius. It would be a sad day if we lost this marsupial mammal that is indigenous to Australia. The name 'wombat' comes from the now nearly extinct Dharug language spoken by the Dharug people who originally inhabited the Sydney area. I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mrs Pearce.

Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.

SUMMARY OFFENCES (OBSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC PLACES) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY (DOMESTIC ABUSE) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

Petitions

UNLEY HIGH SCHOOL

Ms STINSON (Badcoe): Presented a petition signed by 756 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to deliver an all-weather, multisport pitch at Unley High School.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

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 Premier (Hon. P.B. Malinauskas)—

Remuneration Tribunal—Overseas Accommodation and Daily Allowance Australian
Judicial Officers Association Annual Colloquium—
Report and Determination No. 3 of 2023

By the Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science (Hon. S.E. Close)—

University of Adelaide—Annual Report 2022

By the Minister for Energy and Mining (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Mining—Fees Notice—No. 3

By the Treasurer (Hon. S.C. Mullighan)—

Industry Fund Annual Reports 2021-22—
Adelaide Hills Wine
Apiary
Barossa Wine
Cattle
Citrus Growers
Clare Valley Wine
Grain
Grain Industry Research and Development
Langhorne Creek Wine
McLaren Vale Wine
Pig
Riverland Wine
SA Grape Growers
Sheep
Regulation made under the following Act—
Public Corporations—Adelaide Film Festival—Annual Festival

By the Minister for Health and Wellbeing (Hon. C.J. Picton)—

Automated External Defibrillators (Public Access) Act 2022—State Government support for
persons required to install an Automated External Defibrillator—
Report—June 2023

By the Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs (Hon. A. Michaels)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration—Fees Notice—No. 2
Fair Trading—Motor Vehicle Insurers and Repairers—Exemption

*Parliamentary Committees***ABORIGINAL LANDS PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE**

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (14:07): I bring up the report of the committee entitled Inquiry into
Aboriginal Heritage, Final Report.

Report received.

Mr HUGHES: I bring up the report of the committee entitled Annual Report 2022-23.

Report received.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call questions without notice, I acknowledge the presence in the gallery today of the Hon. Adam Marshall, former Minister for Agriculture in New South Wales, a guest of the member for Chaffey.

Question Time

AMBULANCE RAMPING

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:09): My question is to the Premier. When will the Premier fix ramping? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: South Australians have endured the worst ramping in the state's history under the Malinauskas Labor government. Just last month, ambulances spent 2,972 hours ramped, an increase from the previous months and double what it was before the 2022 state election, when Labor promised it would fix ramping.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:09): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question, notwithstanding the fact, I think, that some interpretations of his facts aren't strictly accurate. I am happy to report that as of yesterday we are able to update the people of South Australia with a bit more detail in respect of the performance of the state government in the context of the election commitment that we made. As of last week, 70 per cent of all P1 call-outs for the South Australian Ambulance Service were met on time. Month to date, that figure is 70.6 per cent. The same time last year—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has the call.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —that figure was 45.2 per cent. In respect of P2 call-outs, month to date figures have that operating at 55 per cent in comparison to 34.7 per cent at the same time last year. So, just to put that in some real-world context, we know that at the time of the state election last year a lights and sirens emergency P2 call-out, which requires ideally a response time of 16 minutes—

The Hon. C.J. Picton interjecting:

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: P2 is 16 minutes. We know that under the former government that response rate was operating at around about 33 per cent: so on two out of three occasions when a South Australian picked up the phone and called 000 on behalf of a loved one for a lights and sirens emergency the ambo rolled up late—the ambo rolled up late. Now we have been able to dramatically improve that situation so that the ambulances at increasing rates are starting to rollup on time, and that is also true for the priority 1 rates. We have been able to achieve—

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Schubert!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —this because the government has very deliberately made the necessary policy decisions that have been required—

The Hon. V.A. Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hartley!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —to be able to improve the performance of the hospital system. We still see room for improvement, which is why just this morning the Treasurer and the health minister and I were able to announce yet more funding allocated towards the removal of bed block in the system. Yesterday, we were at the Royal Adelaide Hospital announcing in excess of an additional \$60 million towards more substantial resourcing on weekends to alleviate the fact that

Mondays are perennially the worst day of the week, on the back of the fact that we don't see the same discharge rates on weekends that we see ordinarily.

To put it a bit more specifically, discharge rates from our public hospital system fall to the tune of 40 per cent over the course of the weekend, simply because we don't see the same level of resources operating in the health system on the weekend. So we have made a decision to allocate a substantial pool of funding to address that challenge because it is a priority for the government. But we made clear at the election time and time again, to the extent that it was criticised by those opposite, that we had a plan to fix the ramping crisis to see ambulances rolling up on time. Thankfully—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Colton!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —more and more, week by week, month by month, ambulances are starting to roll up on time in South Australia—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —and fixing what was delivered by those opposite.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: I have no doubt that there are South Australians who are alive today as a result of the measures that we are implementing.

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: But you said you'd fix ramping.

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Morialta!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Elder is warned, the member for Hartley is warned and the member for Schubert is on one warning and also seeking the call.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I turn to her, I note the presence in the gallery today of Alan Sibbons, former member for Mitchell.

Question Time

HEALTH WORKER INCENTIVES

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:13): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Will the government match incentives on offer in other states across Australia to attract and retain health workers and, if not, why not? With your leave, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mrs HURN: In the Victorian state budget handed down just last month, the government invested \$201 million in a range of initiatives, including \$37 million in sign-on bonuses for new nursing graduates to encourage them to enter the public health system.

The Hon. P.B. Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier is called to order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:14): As the Treasurer reminds us, there were some substantial tax increases in the Victorian budget, which perhaps those opposite as advocating as well.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Certainly, when they were in office they were very keen to see increased land tax revenue—

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Florey!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —and that is part of their future plans.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Badcoe! The Premier is called to order. The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: When we came to office we made it very clear, in terms of our plans to increase—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —the health workforce across South Australia, and that involved—

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey! The minister has the call.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Florey is warned. The minister has the call.

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Florey is on two warnings. The minister has the call.

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Morialta!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: That involved 100 extra doctors, 300 extra nurses and 350 extra ambos. The Premier and I were very delighted that we were able in the past couple of weeks to release an update in terms of one year down the track in terms of what our health workforce figures were. We have increased the health workforce in South Australia with not just 100 or 200 but now 550 FTE extra than what was in place when we came to office. We are well on track to meeting those targets, and potentially exceeding some of those targets, particularly when you look at our nurse recruitment so far that we have done already since we came to office.

Of course, we have more to do and we are continuing to invest more. In Thursday's state budget, of course, we are foreshadowing we will have extra investments going into our healthcare system. We have also announced that we are increasing our investment in terms of attraction and retention of staff as well, particularly in terms of attraction to have those payments that can be provided to make sure that we can incentivise people to move to South Australia—either to move here or to move to regional areas across the state where there is demand.

In devising that package, we looked specifically in relation to the payments that were on offer in Victoria and have pegged those in terms of those relocation expenses that we will provide the payment for for people who move to South Australia, and including to the regional areas across the state. We are very confident that that will assist our ability in terms of attracting extra workforce to South Australia. In particular, it is obviously in line with what is in place in Victoria as well.

We have seen the opposition, though, out peddling various figures. They have gone onto Google.com and they have found every single possible payment that could be provided to any possible worker. The shadow minister has stood up with a billboard, which has a scholarship that a nurse could get—and, of course, we offer scholarships as well in South Australia—and a scholarship that a GP could get, and a payment for entrance exams that a GP could get in Victoria. Apparently, this person is doing nursing scholarships and GP scholarships, and moving into particular areas where Victoria have identified demand, such as mental health as well.

The actual fact is we have pegged those incentives in terms of what is in place in Victoria in relation to those relocation expenses. Obviously, since we have come to office we have also put in place a new enterprise bargaining agreement with our nurses across South Australia and also with our paramedics who were denied a pay rise under the previous government for the full four years they were in office: there was no pay rise for our paramedics. So we've got runs on the board in terms of increasing our health workforce and we will continue to do that in the future.

PAEDIATRIC INTENSIVE CARE UNIT

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:18): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Will today's announcement regarding the Paediatric ICU at the current Women's and Children's Hospital guarantee its accreditation? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mrs HURN: It was revealed last year that the PICU at the current Women's and Children's Hospital lost its accreditation to teach young doctors. The government today announced a \$20 million upgrade to the ICU, but it's not clear now whether this now guarantees its accreditation.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:18): As members will know, back in 2018 the College of Intensive Care Medicine sent the previous government a letter warning them that if infrastructure wasn't upgraded at the Paediatric Intensive Care Unit they would lose accreditation, and nothing happened—absolutely nothing happened—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —and then, lo and behold, four years later the college said that accreditation for training—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —would be lost. That is why we are taking action, both in terms of the announcement that has been made today in relation to investments going in to upgrade that unit, the Paediatric Intensive Care Unit—

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: So is that a maybe but we're not sure?

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —but also the previous announcements that we have made in relation to additional doctors that would need to go into that unit, to make sure that we can equal the requirements that have been set for the college.

The Hon. N.F. Cook: That's what you did for four years, hiding the mess. You had the letter.

The SPEAKER: Member for Hurtle Vale!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: So we're not sitting on our hands with that warning that was issued back in 2018, like those opposite. We are getting on with the job. We will continue to work with the College of Intensive Care Medicine to make sure we can get that accreditation back because that is obviously important for training our future health workforce. Of course, that is separate to the safety and quality accreditation, which is done by a different body; this is in relation to the training of doctors in the unit. It is very important because, as we have previously noted, our desire is to continue to

increase our health workforce and obviously we need to make sure that we have that training accreditation to do so.

I thank the Treasurer for his support in relation to having that upgrade funded in Thursday's state budget. We will now get to work on this immediately to get that upgraded as soon as possible. Of course, in the context of what is a very constrained site at the Women's and Children's Hospital—a very old site with a lot of outdated units and facilities—ultimately the full answer is to have the new Women's and Children's Hospital. I am very delighted to inform the house that this is a government that will deliver that as a bigger hospital—not the previous plan, which was just going to be one extra overnight paediatric bed. We are increasing the number of beds at the hospital—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Chaffey! Member for Frome!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —particularly with the increase in demand for birthing in the state, led by the Premier and his wife. We need to make sure that we've got that capacity for the future. Clearly, we need to make sure that that is a hospital that is not going to be full on the day it opens, as would have been in place under the previous plan. That is why we have made the difficult long-term decision in terms of making sure that we've got a new Women's and Children's Hospital that is going to last in the long term.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:21): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Does the government have a plan to sustain the current Women's and Children's Hospital site beyond the next decade? With your leave, sir, and that of house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mrs HURN: The former Liberal government invested \$80 million into the current Women's and Children's Hospital site, based on the new hospital being built much sooner than 2032. The government today announced \$27 million for sustainment works, of which \$20.1 million—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier is called to order.

Mrs HURN: —addresses the paediatric ICU accreditation issues—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Elder!

Mrs HURN: —leaving just \$6.9 million for broader sustainment works at the current Women's and Children's Hospital.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Schubert, you may wish to repeat your explanation. It was not audible.

Mrs HURN: Yes, I think so. There was a bit of a ruckus, sir. The former Liberal government invested \$80 million into the current Women's and Children's Hospital site, based on the fact that the new Women's and Children's Hospital would be delivered much earlier than 2032. The government today announced \$27 million for sustainment works, of which \$20.1 million is to address the paediatric ICU accreditation issues, leaving just \$6.9 million for broader sustainment works at the current Women's and Children's Hospital.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:23): The member references \$80 million of other spending at the hospital. Clearly, that actually goes back—it was started under the Weatherill government originally, continued under the Marshall government, and has been continuing under us as well.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta! Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: So when you add that together with the money that has been announced today, that's obviously more than \$100 million being invested in that hospital. But ultimately we do need the new hospital to address all of the issues at that site, and that is why we are committed to doing so and will be doing that as quickly as we can. But we're not going to do it in a way that means that we end up with a hospital that is too small on the day it opens, but the other critical factor is—and I don't think this has had enough attention—that the other plan to build that hospital on the constrained site next to the Royal Adelaide Hospital stopped the future expansion of the Royal Adelaide Hospital into the future, and we know at some stage that hospital will have to expand as well. So it was not a good outcome for the long term.

So, obviously we are continuing the investment in terms of sustainment works at the hospital. We have announced that today. It builds on the announcements of the previous government, and also the government before that, in terms of sustainment works at the women's and kids' hospital. But we are cracking on in terms of delivery of the new Women's and Children's Hospital—

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni: Sixteen years and no new hospital. No new children's hospital in 16 years.

The SPEAKER: Member for Unley!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —to make sure that we get that facility—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Unley!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —that is going to survive for decades and decades and decades to come as a high-quality service—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Badcoe! The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —for the women and children of South Australia.

PATIENT HOSPITAL DISCHARGE

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (14:24): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. How is the government planning to improve timely patient hospital discharges?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Karna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:25): Thank you very much to the member for Adelaide. I appreciate her very keen interest in terms of making sure that we can improve the healthcare outcomes for people in South Australia. I think people understand that it is important that we address all elements of the health system and the patient journey to make sure that we can improve the healthcare outcomes for people. A critical element of that is not just the front door of our services but also as people leave, as people can transfer to other services.

There are particular delays that happen at that element that lead to delays in people being able to get into the hospital in the first place and, ultimately, for those people who are calling 000 waiting for an ambulance to arrive. That is why we are delighted that one of the elements of Thursday's budget will be in relation to tackling this issue on two fronts. One is in terms of a \$27 million investment that will be going into making sure that our hospitals can operate more across the weekend in terms of continuing the ability for people to get timely discharges when they are medically fit to be discharged.

This will be going into both additional doctors and additional allied health professionals being available to make sure that they can continue those assessments of patients across the weekend, whereas other patients sometimes wait until they get that assessment done on the Monday to be able to be discharged. That obviously leads to significant bed block that happens at the start of the week. The more we can keep that work happening across the weekend the better it is for the patient, who obviously would much prefer to be in their own home if they are medically ready to do so, but also for the health system overall and the next patient who needs that bed.

It was just obviously yesterday that we announced this. One of our consumer representatives in SA Health, Bronwyn Caldwell, spoke about her experience when she said that she was in and out

of hospital for three months and getting home was her most important priority. You are there on a Friday morning, everyone else knows you are ready to go, but you are waiting on one thing, and if that doesn't come in on time it is three more nights in hospital at the moment. That's why it is so critical we get additional medical staff and additional allied health staff across the weekend to make sure that that can happen.

The other element that we announced is a continuation of the work that we are doing in relation to people who get stuck with NDIS packages in our hospitals. At the moment, there are about 70 patients a day in our system who are medically ready to leave with an NDIS package but are waiting on other elements to be put in place for that to happen. That is significantly down from where we were before, and my colleague the Minister for Human Services and I have been working together on this over the past six months. That was, I think, 130 or 140 at some stage in the middle of last year. While that has come down, there is a lot more that we can do to reduce that even further.

One of the elements that we are continuing the funding for is a site called Regency Green, where we are partnering with a non-government organisation to help people with psychosocial mental health conditions to leave hospital, get into that supported accommodation unit and ultimately take the next step to get home or into other accommodation after that. That has helped people who have been in our hospital beds. Sometimes they have been in a hospital bed literally for years, and Regency Green has been helping them to do that.

In addition, there is other funding that will help people who are waiting for other accommodation or fixing up elements of their homes and that's the barrier in terms of their discharge. All these people are medically ready to leave hospital, but they're stuck in hospital waiting for those other elements. These are really important measures—I thank the Treasurer for his support—and they will make a big difference to our patients.

ADELAIDE AQUATIC CENTRE

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley) (14:29): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Did the government approach Adelaide City Council or the federal government for a contribution towards the new Adelaide Aquatic Centre redevelopment and, if so, what was the outcome of those approaches?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:29): We took our commitment to the people of South Australia. I note—

The Hon. V.A. Tarzia: Not \$135 million!

The SPEAKER: Member for Hartley! Order, member for Hartley! The minister has the call.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I note that my young friend talks about co-contributions. I don't remember any co-contribution from the commonwealth government being agreed to by the commonwealth government. He's a big fan—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —of looking at budget papers. If I look at all the Morrison budgets, all the ones that were delivered by my good friend Josh Frydenberg, not one of them had \$25 million for an Adelaide Aquatic Centre to partner with the Marshall government—not one of them. Why? I suspect the previous government didn't even bother to ask.

The Hon. V.A. Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Hartley!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Too busy doing other things like attending, potentially, festivals and fringes and the other things.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: However, we knew that for this state to have a world-class recreation centre for people to enjoy aquatic activities—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Marion swimming centre has a competitive pool; this is a recreation centre.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Colton! The member for Colton is called to order and warned. The minister has the call.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I find it fascinating, members opposite deriding our investment in the aquatic centre in the city.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: It's extraordinary.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is extraordinary—deriding it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Morialta!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Again, every time this government attempts to build social infrastructure for the people of South Australia, the members opposite are opposed to it. You see the opposition right hip it: LIV Golf opposed, Gather Round opposed, aquatic centre opposed.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Badcoe!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I've got to say, why wouldn't we want to teach our young people how to swim? Why we wouldn't want to offer a world-class, nation-leading recreation centre for our citizens in the City of Adelaide?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Why wouldn't we want to do that? We are not going to have one in every council. We are going to have one in the City of Adelaide, where we promised we would put it—where we promised we would put it, and we went to the election—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Colton, order! Minister, you have the call.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you very much, sir. The new centre will include a 50-metre, 10-lane indoor pool for swimming carnivals, water sports and recreational use—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Colton!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —something the members opposite now oppose—a 25-metre, six-lane outdoor pool with a lagoon; a dedicated warm-water indoor pool for rehabilitation programs and separate indoor learn-to-swim pools; diving amenities; indoor leisure water and splash zones and waterslides; a spa, sauna and steam room; an outdoor splash pad and water play—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Badcoe!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —an outdoor aquatic zone with barbecues and lawned areas; a cafe for both centre visitors and other park users; a gym; facilities three times the size that

were planned; inclusive amenities and change rooms; improved car parking and access for Jeffcott Street 100 metres from—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —and two new sporting facilities, outdoor sporting grounds, if you look on the Parklands.

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The opposition of the members opposite is well noted and will be well distributed in and around the local areas, especially in Prospect.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I call the member for Hartley, I observe that the member for Florey is on two warnings, as well as the member for Morialta and the member for Colton.

ADELAIDE AQUATIC CENTRE

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley) (14:33): I have another question for the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Is the new Adelaide Aquatic Centre being built to meet international competition standards?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:33): Our plan is to build—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Morialta, order! Member for Adelaide! The minister has the call. Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I would advise my young friend to coordinate the interjections. You can't say we are spending money on a pool when we've already got one at Marion and then demand to know why the new pool we are building is not just like Marion.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It's an easy trick for young players to fall into. He needs mentoring. He needs a mentor. I would ask the older members to mentor but, looking at the backbench, there's only one he could take advice from—someone from the South-East, potentially, who might give him some advice about how to move forward and get some good structure around his questions.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I suspect the dead hand of a former administration—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —reaching out from the grave to give some advice. No, it will not be international competition standard: it's a recreation centre for people to learn how to swim, to stay fit and healthy, to go and encourage people to get involved in their local community, to connect with each other, to use sporting facilities. I would advise the members who represent the eastern suburbs to go to the Burnside pool. Have a look at how that interacts with the parklands there and think, 'Wouldn't that be nice to have in the Adelaide Parklands as well?'

An honourable member: I think you're digging a hole.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We are digging a number of holes—for a pool, a very good pool, a pool that South Australians will use and love.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Newland!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I have to say all this opposition will be noted the day the ribbon is cut on the new facility. They can't think more than one move ahead. Let's factor in the opposition now: 'Too expensive.' 'Don't build it.' 'Waste of money.' 'Not competition size.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Where will they be on the day when it is opened? 'We could have done all of this for less.' That is what they will say. They will be there, trying to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta! Order! Member for Colton!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Listen to this. Listen to them squirm.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: This will be a world-class facility that the nation will look on with envy. It will be the best recreation facility for swimming in the country.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Colton!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: There will be water slides. There will be amenity for families, interacting with the Parklands. People will love this facility. In fact, I reckon when it's open they will claim it wasn't big enough because of the demand. They will claim we haven't factored in enough; we shouldn't have given land back to the Parklands. That is what they will say.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I think, quite frankly, the opposition should stop telling us what they are opposed to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Colton!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —and tell us what they are for. Give us something you are in favour of—anything, one thing, something.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Morialta!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What do you actually support? You are opposed to LIV Golf, opposed to Gather Round, opposed to Majors Road, opposed to the upgrade of South Road, and now you are opposed to the Aquatic Centre. What do the opposition actually stand for? They are opposed to the women's and kids' hospital upgrade. What do they actually stand for? What are they for? We know what you are opposed to. What are you in favour of?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Badcoe, member for Newland!

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

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta on a point of order. I anticipate 'debate'.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The minister may possibly have breached 98 at the end there.

The SPEAKER: Very well. There was a strong rhetorical flourish. I myself am opposed to interjections, and there have been a number. The member for Florey and the member for Colton are on final warnings.

ADELAIDE AQUATIC CENTRE

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley) (14:37): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. What does the minister say to residents like Annmarie who use the Adelaide Aquatic Centre? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: Annmarie has recently taken to social media to say: 'We the community who use the facilities daily were promised the existing centre would remain open during the new build. I am disappointed that this is not the case anymore.'

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:38): I won't sugar-coat it: it is a tough decision, a very tough decision, to close the centre, but we are not closing it permanently. We are closing it to build a brand-new, better centre. I would say to the people who use the facility that what they are going to get is a lot more than they are currently using. They are going to get a better facility with more amenities. They are going to get a facility that is incorporated into the Parklands.

The people who use the site have looked at a holistic solution to this site. When we took to the election our commitment of either building on the existing site, which would have facilitated a closing, or an adjacent site alongside it, we knew full well when we went to the election that there could have been a scenario where we were closing this pool. We did some initial soundings with the Department for Infrastructure and Transport and Office for Recreation and Sport about how to build this facility.

We thought initially we could keep it open, but on consultation with the users—and when I say users, not just of the Aquatic Centre but people who use the Parklands and the surrounding areas—what we found the best outcome was here for the entire site was to get the extra playing field, to get the constructability of this done properly, to maintain connectivity with the car park, to give back 1,000 square metres of Parklands.

The best thing in the long term—not short-term thinking, long-term thinking—was that for some short-term pain we would get a better long-term outcome. As the Premier has said over and over and over again, short-term thinking leads to short-term outcomes which have long-term consequences on the state and its budget.

I will give you an example. Building the women's and kids' on the expansion site for the NRAH is top of that short-term thinking that we have pushed aside and taken some tough decisions. We are doing that now with the Aquatic Centre. The easy solution is to build something that is not as good and leave the existing centre open, so we wouldn't have these questions from the opposition. What is the right thing to do in the long-term interests of this state? The right thing to do is to make a tough decision and close the centre. That means we are giving ourselves plenty of notice—over 12 months, over a year—to try to relocate as many users as possible.

My friend the Minister for Recreation and Sport and I are working closely together to do everything we can to try to relocate as many people as we possibly can to have use of these pools. That doesn't mean that the occasional user who walks in there for social interaction or just to go for a swim isn't going to be inconvenienced. Of course they are, but what they are getting at the end of it is something better than they have ever had and long term.

The Hon. V.A. Tarzia interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Quite frankly, the cheap interjections from the cheap seats don't add to an alternative vision. What they should be doing, instead of just criticising everything the government does, is give us an alternative. Give us the alternative. What is it about the new pool that we are building, the new facility that we are building, that we should forgo in exchange for keeping the centre open? That would be an honest policy alternative, but we don't get that. We don't get that from the opposition. All we get from the opposition is opposition. We don't get constructive oppositions. During the long four years we spent in opposition, we always offered an alternative—always—and it paid off in spades.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Badcoe! Member for Newland! Member for Morialta! Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It paid off in spades because members opposite never countenanced the idea that there might be an alternative idea that might have any worth. We do believe that there are alternative ideas that have worth, and we have an independent Public Service that has given advice and we have followed it.

LIV GOLF

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley) (14:42): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier received a guarantee from the PGA that Adelaide will host a LIV Golf event each year for the next three years?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:42): The irony of this question coming from those opposite is not lost on me. One minute they are opposed to LIV Golf; now they are demanding that we get more of it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: It is quite extraordinary. I note the fact that the question hasn't come from the Leader of the Opposition, who himself is somewhat conflicted by even his own admission I think that his brother is on the US PGA, or connected to the US PGA, which might explain why he has been so ardently opposed to the event which was an unparalleled success.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Wright! The Premier has the call.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: I am more than happy to confirm that the government has been in touch with the executives of the LIV Golf tournament. We have received a number of assurances—

Mr Cowdrey interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Colton is on a final warning.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —that the LIV Golf event is scheduled to go ahead as planned in 2023. The government has signed a four-year deal with LIV Golf. There are a range of contractual obligations upon them, and for as long as that tour goes ahead we very much look forward to an event here in Adelaide that we believe can be bigger and better than the huge success that it already was only a few weeks ago.

FAMILY-BASED CARERS

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (14:43): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. How is the government assisting carers with the day-to-day costs of caring for a child or young person?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:44): I thank the member for his question and for his ongoing interest in how we can best support carers and families to ensure that the support given reflects the role and the cost of caring. As I often speak about in this place, carers are incredible. I say thank you to every single one of them, and I recognise and appreciate the extremely important role that they play in the child protection and family support system and acknowledge the many complexities that can be involved in providing care for a child.

Our government acknowledges that family-based care is a vital placement option for children and young people in care. Carers are crucial in keeping children and young people safe and giving them a home environment that nurtures, loves and supports them to thrive and to grow. Through numerous round tables, forums and conversations with carers across the state, I have learned more and more about carers' generosity, their commitment and also their needs, and I am really proud that our government is listening and acting on carers' calls for increased support as part of our strong investment in the child protection and family support system.

I am really proud that in recognising the needs of carers our government has announced \$32.1 million over four years to increase carer payments from 1 July 2023. This increase sees a 4.8 per cent boost to all carer payments to assist with cost-of-living pressures, plus an extra \$50 per fortnight for general foster and kinship carers for each child or young person in their care under the age of 16 years.

These increases to carer payments directly and rightly respond to a recommendation of Dr Fiona Arney's report of the Independent Inquiry into Foster and Kinship Care to better reflect the true cost of caring. Dr Fiona Arney's inquiry received submissions from foster and kinship carers, from carer representative groups, from service providers, academics and practitioners, about their experiences and their ideas for improvements to the way in which carers are supported to care for children and young people.

We have a really strong vision to work toward ensuring all children and young people in South Australia have the best opportunity to grow up safe, loved and cared for. To begin to progress that vision, we know that there are pressing challenges that must be met. This additional financial support will help to address need.

In recognising the complexities of caregiving and in honouring the generous way in which carers nurture children, opening their hearts and homes to them, it is imperative that our government listens to their experience and their knowledge and acts upon their calls for increased support. Mr Speaker, we are. To ensure we hear from carers and are able to learn from their experiences, an additional \$800,000 was also committed over four years in the last budget to provide for an even stronger carer voice. As I spoke about in this place last sitting week, we are also establishing and providing support for the new Carer Council.

This additional funding for carer payments sits within the \$216 million boost for the state's child protection and family support system that will be further outlined in this week's budget. At the core of this additional investment are children and a focus on effective interventions to support and strengthen families and carers to provide the best chance for children to grow up safe and strong in family, community and culture.

ENTREPRENEURIAL LEARNING STRATEGY

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:48): My question is to the Minister for Education, Training and Skills. Is the government ending funding for entrepreneurial leadership positions at Mount Gambier, Murray Bridge, Heathfield, Banksia Park, and Seaton High Schools at the end of this year? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: In an answer provided through the parliament today by the minister to a question taken on notice on 8 September last year, the minister said, and I quote:

Funding has been committed to the Entrepreneurial Learning Strategy in 2022-23. This funding supports the five entrepreneurial specialist schools to complete their program of initiatives and deliver on the outcomes of the Strategy which are due to be completed by the end of 2023.

Separately, members of the affected school communities have raised concerns with the opposition that these positions, including assistant principals, will be let go at the end of this year.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (14:49): I thank the member for Morialta for his question. I might say that I have taken the very clear attitude in my time as minister that programs and initiatives that the former government did that I thought were working and were of a positive benefit should stay, and I have made that decision in the case of a lot of programs that were either commenced or continued under the member for Morialta's tenure.

I would have to get some specifics probably about the questions to which he refers today, although I understand that the programs were funded for a certain period of time. The funding was designed to conclude at the end of that period and that the programs were designed to make sure that those schools and the five that the member for Morialta raises were self-sufficient after that time and not requiring more funding.

I will take the question around whether or not the leadership roles, particularly the assistant principal roles, are still being funded or not, and I will come back to the house on that, but I think I have a pretty good track record so far of supporting programs that are doing good things for South Australian kids regardless of whether they commenced under Labor governments or Liberal governments. If this is indeed the case of a program that was receiving funding that is no longer, I am pretty sure it would only be the case that the program had a natural conclusion and that it has now reached that natural conclusion.

EDUCATION STANDARDS BOARD

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:50): My question is to the Minister for Education, Training and Skills. Will the government provide extra funding to the Education Standards Board to increase their volume of assessments and ratings? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Board minutes of the Education Standards Board released under FOI indicate that the minister has recently been advised by the board that they require additional funding of \$2.2 million to facilitate what they say is a necessary increase in the volume of assessments and ratings to ensure our childcare centres are providing safe environments for our very young children.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (14:51): I thank the member for Morialta, again, for this important question. I know as a former minister for education he understands only too well the issues that we face in terms of the role that the Education Standards Board plays in being the regulator under the national regulations in terms of the quality, safety and standards that need to be met by our child care, preschool, out-of-school-hours care, vacation care and other learning and care institutions and that there has been a longstanding issue around the capacity of the ESB (the Education Standards Board) to carry out their job and keep pace with the number of checks of those sites that it is supposed to do each year.

Of course there was, as some members may have seen—yesterday, I think it was—a very interesting article in the *Adelaide Advertiser* by Lauren Novak which went into some important detail around some of the challenges that we are facing, particularly in terms of staffing, with out-of-school-hours care.

It will not come as a surprise to anyone in this place that skills shortages are a national problem. We are not immune to it here. We are certainly not immune to it in my portfolios, and nor

are we immune to it in terms of out-of-school-hours care. I was pretty frank, I thought, in my comments, and I said that I thought that OSH had been treated like the poor cousin for far too long. It has not been prioritised.

I say this as someone who relies very heavily on OSH as a parent of three daughters in the public education system. We use it all the time. I am constantly in admiration for the staff who work there. They are more often than not younger, they are paid less and they get our kids when they are at their most tired and ratty, at the end of the day, and are expected to care for them.

Of course, we have a jobs and labour market here now where there are basically a record number of job vacancies, and it is increasingly a very hard value proposition to put to a person around why they should choose teaching, why they should choose child care, why they should choose out-of-school-hours care as opposed to another job which might be available and probably requires less stress and concern for the young people they are caring for and probably pays more as well.

I give that background because that is one of the issues driving some of the incidents we do see at some of our sites, particularly in OSH, to which the article on the weekend referred. But I want to lay to rest here—and I appreciate the opportunity that the member for Morialta's question has given me—to say that there is no government in South Australia which has done more to prioritise the issues around out-of-school-hours care than this one. We might only be 16 months into our term here, but there is no South Australian government that has done more to prioritise the issues that the early years sectors face than the Malinauskas Labor government.

It was out of opposition that we announced, along with the Deputy Premier and the Premier—and it was the Deputy Premier who actually drafted the first terms of reference—and we sat down and all agreed that we absolutely need to have a term of reference in there which deals with issues around accessibility, affordability and quality of OSH. I can tell you that in terms of your specific question, member for Morialta, I may defer to the Treasurer for specifics, but I understand that there is provision in the budget.

That, of course, is the Treasurer's purview, and I am confident that some funding will towards the ESB should be a part of that provision. We have received the royal commission's interim recommendation, which I think amounts to about \$2.2 million that is needed, and we are absolutely clear on this side of the house how important that is. I very much look forward to hearing a bit more about what might be coming out in the budget later in the week.

EDUCATION STANDARDS BOARD

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:55):

Supplementary: is the \$2.2 million the minister just referred to coming out of the allocation for public schools as provided in the Gonski agreement?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (14:55): I will probably refer the member for Morialta to Thursday's budget. It is just a couple of sleeps now. It is not long to go.

Ms Stinson: I know you're all excited.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: Indeed, you are eager, but I think the point to which the member for Morialta alludes is that, given the ESB's role is across the government and non-government sector—and in terms of the government sector there are about 248 out-of-school-hours care services but a lot of non-government ones as well—would it be right if we were to fund the money that is coming to the ESB, I hope, to go towards making sure they can keep pace with the cheques to come out of Gonski money which is for the public system.

I do not envisage that that would be the case, but it is something that will be dealt with not only in the budget but once we receive the final recommendations from the royal commission in August. We are not going to jump the gun. We are well and truly aware and cognisant of the challenges that are faced by the out-of-school-hours care sector, and if there is anyone in here who doubts that I would point you to the fact that we announced a royal commission and wrote the terms of reference that had out-of-school-hours care quality, accessibility and affordability in it from opposition. There is no government in this state that has done more to prioritise this, and I well and

truly intend to make it, I hope, a longstanding focus for me as long as I am lucky enough to be in this job.

SOUTH EAST COASTAL LAKES REVIEW

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (14:56): My question is to the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water. Has the minister received correspondence from CHASA inviting the minister and the department to a public forum being held in Millicent on 14 July regarding concerns in the community about the South East Coastal Lakes Review and the proposal by the Department for Environment and Water to proclaim these lakes under the national parks act?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (14:57): To answer your question simply, yes, I have received that correspondence. I received it directly into my parliament address—which I am only able to log into infrequently due to a peculiar incompatibility between being on the SA government account and the parliament account at the same time, but we won't go through that trying experience here in question time. However, I believe that there has also been a letter that has gone through to the ministerial office for consideration. I am not yet sure whether I will be free for 14 July, but I am having a look at that.

Just to give some context for why CHASA might be getting in touch, when the previous minister was in charge there was a decision taken to have a look at all of those coastal, lake and landholdings down in the area to see whether the right tenure of land was over each one of them. So that work was well underway when I came into government and, in fact, I think there was an interview I did on the radio not long after coming in where my shadow had suggested that I would be putting it on hold, but in fact, as with the previous answer from the Minister for Education, if something is happening that seems to be a reasonable proposition, just because it has come from the other side there is no need to call a halt to it immediately.

That work had some targeted consultation initially and then through that process has come up—and particularly some work with First Nations. The first briefing I had was very much about First Nations engagement and the importance of getting that right. Now the department have come up with a proposition about how they think the land allocation should work and, indeed, some parts of land are proposed to go into the national park system. That has come to me simply to say that they are going out for public consultation now. So there has been no government decision taken as yet.

It seemed to me entirely reasonable that something that started under the previous government and continued under ours, being led by the experts in the department, ought to go out for public consultation. I appreciate that there are some concerns being raised by CHASA on the basis that they are concerned that that might constrain some of the access to hunting habitat, but it seems to me it is best to let the process go and allow that public consultation to occur.

I have no particular objection to attending, but if I am not able to attend there will be, I am sure, departmental people there. I will also be very pleased to hear how the discussion went and what the proposition has been from the community, and then once all of that is consolidated we will make some decisions. As members might be aware, if we do add to the park system that requires coming through parliament, so there will be plenty of opportunity for people to express their views.

FORESTVILLE HOCKEY CLUB

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:59): My question is to the Minister for Education, Training and Skills. Can the minister update the house on the future of the Forestville Hockey Club at Unley High School, and is he aware of any alternative views?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (15:00): I thank the member for Badcoe for her excellent question. I want to take the opportunity, first and foremost, to congratulate and thank the member on the fantastic advocacy she has provided in her local community along with the members for Elder and Waite, who have helped as well.

I know we have already seen one petition lodged in this place today with I think 756 signatures from local residents who are in favour and committed to the government's election

commitment to deliver a multi-use synthetic turf pitch adjacent to Unley High School, which, for those unaware, I think is in the top six largest public high schools in South Australia. It boasts some very famous alumni, including former Prime Minister Julia Gillard and former Premier Dean Brown.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: And, of course, the Minister for Health—how could I possibly forget? The reason that the petition has been necessary and has come about is that the then Malinauskas Labor opposition made a very clear election commitment before the last election to support and fund the relocation of the Forestville Hockey Club from its current location. I might add, I have had many conversations with the member for Badcoe, and it is obviously a growing club. We want to promote opportunities for people to go and play sport, and so on that basis we committed to funding and supporting the construction and establishment of a new multi-use synthetic turf pitch adjacent to Unley High School so there would be space for the Forestville Hockey Club to be able to go along, expand and operate in brand-new facilities.

For those who follow hockey in this place, all high levels of hockey are basically now played on synthetic turf, not traditional grass. That is another very important factor, and we supported the club to do that. We were of the opinion or the understanding until recently that we had bipartisan support for that, but then of course, lo and behold, tuning into 891 radio in the last few weeks and listening to David Bevan's program—as I know many people in this place do—we had the local member, the member for Unley, come on and out of the blue do a 180 about-turn and call on the government to start looking for and investigating alternative solutions and locations, which was very interesting indeed.

We acknowledge and understand on this side of the house that there are some local residents who do have concerns about putting the new synthetic turf pitch where it is and, to the Premier's credit, he agreed to meet with those local constituents. I was part of that meeting; it went for at least an hour. We heard all the issues raised by those local residents, and the Premier gave them a very firm commitment that we would go away and look at the alternative proposals that were put to us by those residents and see what could be done. It is just simply the case that they are not feasible.

Although we may have a different position when it comes to meeting election commitments on this side of the house—and I point out that this is a government that is reminded by the Premier every single day that this will be a government that meets its election commitments—we will not have the same kind of casual attitude to the meeting of election commitments that those opposite have. In that vein, I am very pleased to be able to update the house—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: I am very pleased to be able to inform the house that this commitment will be going ahead. We will make good on the election commitment that we made before the state election. We will stand with local residents, and we will stand with the Unley High School, which is still very much in support of having this turf co-located on this school. I look forward to updating the house as this project completes.

TAFE SA

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:04): My question is to the Minister for Education, Training and Skills. Has the minister been advised or briefed about any quality issues with courses at TAFE SA this year and, if so, will he advise the house of those details?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (15:04): I appreciate the question from the member for Morialta. Off the top of my head, I can't think of any. I am happy to go away and ask that question and come back to the house. I know there are some courses in particular that we have paid a great deal of attention to since coming to government, most notably those courses that were cut from metropolitan TAFE campuses in Adelaide, including early childhood education and care, individual support (disability), individual support (ageing).

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

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister, there is a point of order, which I will hear under 134.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Standing order 98: this question was short and direct to the issue of quality issues raised, and the minister is going far broader than that.

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order. I will listen carefully. The minister is early in his answer. Some context is permitted, but I bring the minister to the question.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: I did commit to taking that question on notice and coming back to the house, but I thought it may be prudent not just to talk about any potential courses where I may have heard about quality issues but also to talk about all the TAFE courses where I haven't heard anything about quality issues. Of course, that includes the three that we have brought back to metropolitan campuses that were cut by the former government.

They didn't allow TAFE to offer those courses at metropolitan campuses. Of course, it wasn't an issue of interest or enrolments: it was simply an attempt by those opposite to cut TAFE off at the knees and make them uncompetitive, which was the hallmark of their four years.

Members interjecting:

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

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister, there is a point of order. I anticipate that the member for Morialta presses 98.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Certainly.

The SPEAKER: It may be that the minister, having taken the question in, has also concluded any additional extemporaneous remarks.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: I will now of course because—

The SPEAKER: Very well, if the minister will wish to continue then I must emphasise the terms of standing order 98.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: I just thought that perhaps I could add a few more words in the spirit of bipartisanship, which I know drives all of us in this place, and suggest that perhaps if the member for Morialta is very keen to get a speedy answer to his very valid question he may furnish the house or me with a few more details around the basis of that question.

RIVER MURRAY FLOOD

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:06): My question is for the Minister for Small and Family Business. Can the minister provide an update on how the state government is supporting the communities and businesses impacted by the flooding of the River Murray?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (15:07): I thank the member for Torrens for the question and for her interest in the welfare of small and family businesses across the state, but in particular along the River Murray.

We all know in this place that the River Murray floods have had a devastating impact on many river communities. We know the waters have receded, but residents and business owners are still counting the cost and still working to a return to normal. The Malinauskas government is continuing to implement a comprehensive support package for small businesses. We are continuing to provide targeted support as it is required.

I am pleased to advise that across the four grant programs being administered by the Office for Small and Family Business more than 600 grant applications have been approved, with a total value of over \$4.3 million. This has included the Early Business Closure Grant and the Generator Grant for those business who were advised early on that they would be impacted with the water coming and were advised that their electricity supply would be impacted. Both those grants have now closed; they have done the job that they were intended to.

The Industry Support Grant and the Flood Recovery Grant remain open to support small businesses who are experiencing a loss of trade or who are undertaking the clean-up of their premises. We will continue to provide support through the Small Business Financial Counselling Support Program as well, through Rural Business Services. This service is helping impacted small businesses and individuals develop recovery and continuity plans, understand the short-term and long-term impacts of the flood event and help manage their financial wellbeing as they recover and rebuild. More than 200 small businesses have so far accessed this service.

Based on the community feedback we have received through ongoing discussions with small businesses, councils and RDAs and other stakeholders, we have recently implemented several changes to grant guidelines. I want to thank the Treasurer for his support in making those changes, making it easier for small businesses to access available funding where it is needed. For example, the eligibility criteria for the Small Business Industry Support Grant have been updated to allow flexibility in the months that are selected to make up a quarter, meaning small businesses can access funding sooner. Changes to this particular program also allow for businesses who commenced trading less than 12 months before the flood event to be eligible for that grant as well.

The government understands that many small businesses are not yet in a position to apply for some of those grants, particularly the recovery grants. They are going through the process now of assessing their damage and working through insurance claims and making decisions about what their future holds, so I am pleased to advise that we are extending the Industry Support Grant through to 30 September this year and extending the Flood Recovery Grant through to 31 December this year.

Of course, in addition to these specific grants there are other grants and programs helping tourism businesses, agricultural businesses and residents, including the new round of River Revival Vouchers with a new \$750 category of vouchers. I want to thank the Minister for Tourism for all the support of those tourism businesses through those programs. A new ballot opens on 19 June, and I again want to acknowledge the tourism minister for her support of those local tourism businesses and her continued support for those businesses being impacted along the River Murray.

Grievance Debate

STATE BUDGET

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (15:10): This week marks the second Malinauskas Labor government budget, and it gives us an opportunity to pay close attention to the budget, to make sure that the government are responding to what they said they would do for the people of South Australia. In particular, the opposition is very keen to see a budget that responds to two key areas, that responds to the government's primary election commitment and that of course was to fix the ramping crisis. I have said it many times here: we saw the posters and we saw the statements, 'Labor will fix the ramping crisis.'

Of course, we now know that it is much more of a problem now than it was when the Liberal Party left office in March 2022. In fact, it has almost doubled and Labor has delivered record ramping in South Australia. Record ramping rolls off the tongue quite easily, but what does that mean for South Australians? It means more people undergoing significant discomfort, more people in pain, more people whose lives may be at risk because they are sitting in the back of an ambulance truck. It means some of the people who are most vulnerable in our society not getting the care that they need, not getting into the EDs, and when they get into the emergency departments not necessarily getting the health care that they need when they are at their most vulnerable.

It means that there is a stressful element built into calling an ambulance: 'Will it turn up for me?' That doubt that has seeded itself in the South Australian public's consciousness is something we are greatly concerned about on this side of the house, because if an ambulance will not turn up for you does that mean that people are taking the situation into their own hands, presenting at EDs, travelling themselves? There are a whole range of complexities that sit underneath the fear that an ambulance will not arrive in your time of need.

In the 21st century in a state like South Australia, having an ambulance turn up for you in your time of need is the least that South Australians should be able to expect, especially when this

government said that they would fix the ramping crisis. This budget must contain more funding for South Australia's health system. It must include initiatives to reduce the pressure on our paramedics, reduce the pressure being experienced in emergency departments and, critically important, also address the shortage of healthcare workers available to respond to patient needs.

The shadow health minister and I have been calling repeatedly for incentives to be put in place in South Australia that will attract workers from other jurisdictions, whether interstate or overseas, or perhaps stop workers who are based here from going interstate or overseas. We need to be competitive. This is a competitive market and we know that at the moment we are not at all competitive.

The Victorian budget handed down a few weeks ago included more than \$200 million worth of incentives for frontline healthcare workers to get them into jobs in Victoria. Within the packages that we are seeing not just in Victoria but right across the nation, we are seeing particular commitments for regional South Australia. When it comes to provision of health care, yes, we want world-class health care in Adelaide but we also want our regions to be looked after. Regions should not have to put up with second-class care when it comes to our health system.

The shadow minister for regional health services and I have been calling, for many weeks now, for this budget to respond to the needs of South Australians when it comes to regional health care: better incentives to get doctors and nurses in place in our regions, an increase to the accommodation subsidy within the PATS and, of course, good-quality security services in place where there are particular vulnerabilities in some regional communities.

There is a chance here for the Labor government to stand up and respond to these most pressing needs in our healthcare system, both in metropolitan Adelaide and, just as importantly, in regional South Australia. We are calling for it, and we hope that this government responds to this call.

WALKING IN TWO WORLDS PODCAST

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Stuart—Minister for Local Government, Minister for Regional Roads, Minister for Veterans Affairs) (15:15): On Wednesday 31 May 2023, I was honoured to attend a community event at Murray Bridge Library to launch a podcast commissioned by Virtual War Memorial Australia for its South Australian schools program. The production of the podcast by award-winning podcaster Megan Spencer was made possible through a grant from Virtual War Memorial Australia, which receives funds from the South Australian Department for Education.

Over 80 people attended this special Reconciliation Week event, and it was wonderful to see so many people from so many different sectors gather, and also travel, to be part of it. The Welcome to Country was supported by a smoking ceremony conducted by senior Ngarrindjeri and Kaurna elder, Uncle Major Moogy Sumner AM, who was also a speaker on the day. Other speakers included Uncle Frank Lampard OAM, who is Co-Chair of Aboriginal Veterans SA, and Auntie Verna Koolmatrice, the great-niece of Ngarrindjeri ANZAC Privates Cyril and Rufus Rigney.

There were also other family members of the Rigney brothers; elders and local community members; representatives of state and local government, including the member for Hammond as the shadow minister for veterans affairs; current and former service members of the Australian Defence Force; members of the RSL; Aboriginal Veterans SA; Reconciliation SA; local schools; and the broader community, who all made this a very special event. Our parliamentary colleague the Hon. Kyam Maher MLC, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, also provided a terrific speech for the launch via a video link.

The podcast *Walking in Two Worlds* explores the stories of the teenage Rigney brothers, Cyril and Rufus. We visit their homelands and hear from their Ngarrindjeri relatives firsthand, learning about the brothers' lives and wartime service. Neither of these two brave young men returned to their families from the Western Front. The impact of this loss on their families and their community, across many generations is underscored by the weaving together of the different voices and the soundscape of their land. This is a powerful and incredibly moving story and an exceptional resource for our students, the South Australian community and the nation.

I congratulate everyone associated with the *Walking in Two Worlds* production. It is available on the Virtual War Memorial Australia site now. I commend it to everyone in this room here today. I know that the Chairman of the Virtual War Memorial, Mr Peter Williams, and the CEO, Ms Sharyn Roberts, do a magnificent job to preserve our military history and that they have been very grateful for the support received from Department for Education to help create these podcasts as a student learning resource.

I look forward to the launch of the next audio podcast, *When the War Comes Home: The Beachport Mine Tragedy*, on 14 July at the Naval Association of Australia sub-branch in Port Adelaide. The launch will take place exactly 82 years, to the day, after this tragic wartime incident where a German sea mine exploded on a quiet stretch of beach just outside Beachport, which is currently in the MacKillop electoral district.

This mine killed two young Royal Australian Navy sailors, Able Seaman Thomas Todd and Able Seaman William Dunswan. Seven months before the bombing of Darwin, they were the first Australian servicemen to die on home soil as a result of enemy action in World War II. This is one of Australian military history's least known stories, but the launch of this audio podcast aims to change all that. I congratulate the Virtual War Memorial Australia on the role it plays in preserving our military history.

In closing, I am sure that I speak on behalf of the member for Hammond and the shadow minister when I say that the story that was told by Verna was so moving. It was absolutely heartbreaking to hear her story about her nephews from years gone by, the journey that they made and the challenges that they persevered through, from their families from the years coming on. I am sure the member for Hammond would also indicate that. We both went up individually and expressed our great gratitude to Verna. It was an absolutely heartbreaking story.

It just brings back the tragic issues and incidents of the Second World War, the families that were impacted by it and the trauma going forward. It also highlights some of the incidents and the stories that we have not understood in our Australian history. Again, I commend this to everybody in this house.

STATE BUDGET

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley) (15:20): I rise today to speak on what is the eve of the second budget of the Malinauskas Labor government. What this government needs to remember is a simple concept called OPM, OPM being other people's money. This government were elected on the basis that they would fix the ramping crisis and that they would divert funds away from a community recreation space at the time and put that money into ramping.

Instead, what have we seen 12 months later? What we have seen is that in fact the ramping crisis has ballooned, and what are they doing? Spending \$135 million of OPM on an exorbitant swimming pool. It is absolutely flabbergasting. It is absolutely incredible that after all the platitudes, all the lectures and all the pontificating that they delivered to us before the election, now what have they gone and done? They have effectively doubled the ramping crisis and then gone and blown out, to the tune of \$55 million extra, on what I can only see as a very large recreational swimming pool. It is absolutely amazing.

It is OPM. It is other people's money, and that is why you have to consider what is in the best interest of the taxpayers of South Australia. Do you know what my residents are telling me at the moment? They are saying that they are struggling to pay their energy bills. They are struggling to get housing. They have been waiting for houses for many months and even years in some cases. They have been on the housing maintenance waiting list for some time.

They are saying that they are struggling to make ends meet day to day with rising interest rates and inflation, and what has this government gone and done? It has gone and taken a price tag of \$80 million before the election to \$135 million now. Today, we heard it from the minister responsible. It is not like they have actually gone to other levels, other tiers of government, like other governments have done when they make these recreational facilities.

For example, in my own electorate, there is the Campbelltown leisure centre, otherwise known as the ARC. What did we do there? We went to the federal government, we went to the state

government, we went to some of the beneficiaries of the new facility. We got a little bit of money from all of them and we put that together. That is called being fiscally responsible. But, no, what have we got? We have this nirvana, utopia, socialist, state-controlled world on this other side of the chamber where the state needs to do it for you the state needs to do everything for you, and the state needs to pay for it.

The state can pay for it, but what happens when it is OPM, when it is other people's money? It is other people's money. The people of South Australia will determine whether this is in their best interest, and they will determine whether this is where the money should be spent at the moment. Let me tell you, the government came in on a mantra that they would fix the ramping crisis, and instead of fixing the ramping crisis it has actually doubled. Instead of diverting money for that community sporting facility that we spoke about before the election, what have they gone and done? They have spent \$135 million on an exorbitant swimming pool. It is absolutely flabbergasting. I have no words.

I looked at one of the Facebook comments made on a certain member of parliament's page only recently, where they were just so disappointed. They are so disappointed that the facility that they obviously use almost daily will not be able to be used for over a year. Did people on the other side of the chamber say that to these residents? No, and they will pay the price. They will pay the consequences of misleading the people of South Australia.

I also want to talk about the shadow transport portfolio area. We know that the road maintenance backlog has spiralled out of control. When we found it, it was just shy of \$750 million. It has now blown out to \$3 billion. We do not want to see any delays in this budget to the part of the north-south corridor that this government left to the last possible point in time. We want to see the cash stumped up to make sure that the north-south corridor is completed, because we have already seen a \$5 billion blowout on that particular project.

We want to see the priorities of the RAA met—for example, commit to fix the backlog, publish actual spending on road maintenance each year and ensure that we are rebuilding the road network that has been damaged in the recent flooding events that we have seen in South Australia. Of course, we also need to progress critical upgrades to our road network.

FEMALE COMMUNITY WORK

Mrs PEARCE (King) (15:25): We all know the proverb 'A woman's work is never done,' but it was great to see my local community taking a minute over the past few weeks to recognise and pay tribute to all the amazing women whose work in our community is immeasurable but often goes unseen.

It started off at the Modbury Football Club where the usual sea of brown and gold turned purple for Ladies Day, helping to raise awareness for mental health research. The club was absolutely packed with members young and old, players, supporters and family members all coming together to celebrate the amazing women associated with the Hawks. I thank Jodie, the Modbury Hawks Clubwoman of the Year 2022, for bringing this event to my attention and for all the efforts she and other members put in to making the day a success.

Funnily enough, there ended up being a last-minute call for assistance at the canteen on the day because so many of the regular volunteers were being celebrated, as they should, as part of the Ladies Day. Wanting to do what we could to help, the member for Newland and I put up our hands to take on a shift, helping with serving and taking orders for a famished lunchtime crowd. Fortunately, we had Rhys and the Sheriff himself, John, helping us to learn the ropes and pump out all the orders.

Mr Speaker, you may not be aware that there is a little friendly rivalry between a few clubs in my local community, and it did not take long for my local club, the mighty Kookaburras, to hear that I was lending a hand over at the Hawks' nest. It is safe to say I was stirred up quite a bit almost immediately, and it is safe to say I can expect some payback the next time I am rostered on at the club. Knowing my luck, it will probably be gravy duty because they know how terrible I am at making it, and I am sure the Tea Tree Gully Football Club will get in on the fun the next time I am at one of their games.

Fortunately, I had the opportunity to celebrate the amazing women at the Golden Grove Football Club the following Saturday during their Ladies Day, and I thank Donna for all her hard work and efforts to make the day the success that it was. I had a great time cheering on the A grade, who took home another incredible win, and catching up with all the amazing women who are associated with the club.

As I mentioned earlier, the work by some women in our community is immeasurable, but it often goes unseen. I would like to shine a light on a few women who have once again made an incredible contribution in helping to raise funds for a very important cause: the Cancer Council. Firstly, Tania and Simone each year take turns at hosting an afternoon tea, welcoming the community into their homes. They go to so much effort. You walk into the lounge to find it completely covered with auction items that have been kindly donated by local businesses in the area such as Garden Grove and Litharian Wines, and then there is an amazing spread in the dining room.

I must say that I cannot get enough of Tania's jelly slice. It is always what I make a beeline for because it is absolutely one of my favourite desserts. I am so appreciative that she always saves me a slice. I hear Tania and Simone have cleared \$3,000 in their efforts this year, and I commend them for all their hard work and labours.

I also commend Madeline, the City of Salisbury's Young Citizen of the Year, and her family, for the morning tea they then hosted the following weekend. I do not think I have ever seen so many homemade biscuits in such a long time. I doubt that they slept much that week, with all the preparation they had put in. This is an event that Madeline and her family have hosted for many years now; in fact, since 2009, they have been able to fundraise either \$14,000 for this very important cause—that is absolutely incredible.

I am also blown away by the amazing work being done by younger members of my local community. Last week, with the member for Light and the member for Spence I had the pleasure of attending a youth leadership gathering hosted by the Australian Refugee Association. It was there that I met up with girls from Golden Grove High School and Salisbury East High School to hear firsthand how we can make our schools and our community stronger and more connected. They were so considerate with what they put forth, and it was a delight to see that student wellbeing was a core priority. I thank them for their feedback and I look forward to catching up with them again soon to discuss further how we can work together for this shared goal.

NARUNGA ELECTORATE

Mr ELLIS (Narunga) (15:30): I rise to put a couple of community initiatives on the record on behalf of our electorate and in doing so would like to start by acknowledging the wonderful work of Derryn Stringer, who is the chair of the Snowtown Progress Association and also a representative on the Wakefield Regional Council, with whom I had the great pleasure of meeting last week to discuss his plans for a revitalised Snowtown.

Derryn's passion and energy for Snowtown came through in spades on that occasion, and it was wonderful to see all the plans that he had to revitalise that area. It started with the oval precinct, on which there has been some work done recently, including new change rooms. Derryn has ripped out an almighty number of pine trees and replaced them with tuckeroo and other sorts of tree, and that has done a really outstanding job in making the area a bit more palatable for the RVs that come in to use it as an accommodation precinct.

They have also ripped out the old archways, which were precluding quite a number of RVs from making it into the campsite in the first place. In doing that, they have made it a far more beautiful place for the RVs to stay and made a far more practical place for them to get into. I am led to believe that the visitation numbers have gone through the roof as a result.

The next step in that oval precinct, as Derryn and the Snowtown Progress Association see it, will be to move the tennis courts. They have a grant to resurface, so they are hoping to attract some funding to make up the difference to enable those courts to be moved. They want to move them to open up more space for RVs and, again, increase revenue just that little bit more.

Secondly, they want to beautify the entrance into the town. Currently, arriving in Snowtown can be a bit of a bleak prospect, but Derryn has these wonderful plans to plant some native trees

and shrubbery and make the entrance to Snowtown that much more beautiful and that much more enticing for people driving past on the highway. He has plans to do that not only from the highway side but also from the other side.

On the other side, members may or may not know that there is a council dam used for some irrigation. Amongst other things, Derryn has plans to enlarge that dam and create somewhat of a walking trail around it, which again would be good for those people who pull up for the day or stay a night and give them something to do, to walk around the oval. He has wonderful plans. I am trying to facilitate a meeting with Derryn and the Minister for Planning. I think there are some wonderful things we can do for very little investment that would have a tremendous impact on the town of Snowtown.

Again, I want to emphasise that this is not a progress association coming in with its hand out for the entire amount; it is an energetic, passionate person who has the volunteers and the wherewithal to secure donations and suppliers with grand plans to make a significant difference to a town that has been suffering, honestly, off the back of an unfair reputation that has come about as a result of some crimes that were committed elsewhere, the back end of which has left Snowtown with a reputation from the bodies in the barrels murders. It is wonderful to move on from that and create a new, energetic Snowtown; hopefully, we can bring that about with some modest investment and some really exciting plans.

The second community issue I would like to bring to the attention of this house is the situation we have currently going on in Moonta. Relatively recently, the gentleman who owned the three pubs in Moonta—the Moonta Hotel, the Royal Hotel and the Cornwall Hotel—sold out to an interstate investor who has since shut off the meals at two of those three pubs and limited them at the third one. For a town the size of Moonta, for a tourism town like Moonta, this is a completely unacceptable situation and it narrows down the options for someone to have a feed to the Port Hughes Tavern (which does a wonderful job and I could not recommend highly enough) and not much else.

Unfortunately, Cafe Capella's burned down recently, and they are in the process of rebuilding. There are not a great deal many other options for people who are visiting Moonta and enjoying all it has to offer, so we need to do something about it.

I bring this up because council recently, at their last meeting, resolved to bring this situation to my attention and ask that I bring it up in parliament as a matter of urgency, which I am doing today. I have to make clear to the council that I have done this previously in different ways and in different forms, but I think a solution needs to be found ASAP.

One measure that is underway, I am led to believe, is that the commissioner is reviewing the licensing regulations to see whether we should return to a situation where pubs are compelled to provide food when serving alcohol so that investors like the people who own the three hotels in Moonta are not allowed to just shut off the kitchen, serve alcohol and have pokies; they would have to provide feeds at the same time. I look forward to seeing that review takes place and the recommendations from it tabled here relatively soon.

Again, at the risk of repeating myself, something needs to be done to provide more options for people who visit Moonta. I congratulate Brent Walker, who I believe was the initiator of this motion at council, on his work, and I congratulate the council. I am looking forward to getting stuck into working with the government to ensure that Moonta returns to its place at the top of the tourist town rankings.

MAWSON LAKES SCHOOL BRIDGE

Mr BROWN (Florey) (15:35): I am pleased to be able to inform the house that today marks the opening of the new bridge across Dry Creek at Mawson Lakes School. The construction of this bridge, a joint project between the Malinauskas government and the City of Salisbury, has been over five years in the making. The school community and the community of Mawson Lakes more generally have been advocating for the construction of this bridge to replace the small causeway that joins the two halves of the school since 2018. Members may recall I have given speeches in this house and also presented a petition on this subject to the house.

I was disappointed by the attitude of the previous government in not providing sufficient funding for the project to go ahead, but I was fortunate enough to be able to make the provision of

extra funds a commitment at the last state election. It was therefore with great pleasure that I joined the Acting Principal, Ms Tammy Lambden, at the site this morning to witness children cheerfully walking to class over the bridge.

I would like to thank all those who fought to make this project a reality. I would like to thank the members of the local community who signed my petition to the previous government. I would like to thank the Treasurer and the Minister for Education for both being extremely supportive of this project. I would also like to acknowledge those who have provided support from the City of Salisbury, especially the Deputy Mayor, Councillor Chad Buchanan, and Councillor Beau Brug. It is with their support and the support of the local community that we finally made this bridge a reality.

I would also like to inform the house that on Saturday 3 June I had the honour of representing the government at a service to commemorate the service of members of RAF Bomber Command during World War II. I wish to acknowledge that the member for Hammond was also there, representing the opposition.

RAAF historian Hal Stevens has said:

No single group of Australians from any service probably did more to help when World War II than the men who fought in Bomber Command.

Over 3½ years, 135,000 allied Bomber Command aircrew, supported by ground personnel, fought at considerable cost in an offensive that was the longest and costliest campaign of the war. More than 55,000 members of Bomber Command lost their lives over the campaign. About 10,000 Australian airmen served with Bomber Command. While some Australians did serve in Australian squadrons, at least three-quarters of them served in RAF and allied squadrons in either RAAF or RAF uniforms. Of those 10,000 Australians, more than one-third paid the ultimate sacrifice. A further 650 were killed in training accidents.

An operational tour was 30 missions, with the option of a second tour. The chances of surviving a first tour were one in two; a second tour, one in three. Losses were devastating. Over the entire campaign, 460 Squadron lost 1,083 aircrew and 188 aircraft, more than three times its squadron strength throughout the war. In 460 Squadron alone, 11 per cent of those who perished died on their first mission and almost half by their sixth. From the second half of 1943 until mid-1944, the statistical chance of survival was estimated to be zero.

Following the ceremony, the member for Hammond and I were also fortunate to meet with a small number of Bomber Command veterans who were present at the ceremony and express our thanks for their service. I am sure the whole house will agree that we honour them and their courage in serving our country and preserving our freedom. Let us not forget.

Bills

NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE (WOMBAT BURROWS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services) (15:40): I rise to speak on this very important bill and offer my support. Our very own southern hairy-nosed wombat (*Lasiorhinus latifrons*) is one of three living species of wombat as well as being South Australia's faunal emblem. This excellent wombat grows to be up to one metre long, weighing between 18 and 32 kilograms of pure muscle.

They use their big blunt heads to excavate deep, cool, humid burrows, which are essential for them to survive in hot desert conditions. Wombat burrows can cover a large area and will have many entrances. All wombat species live in burrows, often creating a complex network of burrows with tunnels and chambers that can extend up to 150 metres in radius; sometimes these burrows can even be seen from space.

The southern hairy-nosed wombat unfortunately has many threats to its population, including habitat destruction and fragmentation, illegal culling, grazing competition from domestic livestock and feral animals such as rabbits, and also collisions with motor vehicles and drought can really bring the

a cropper. For both our faunal emblem and the common bare-nosed wombat (*Vomatus ursinus*) that are found in limited areas in South Australia, we are bringing forward this bill.

Both species are currently protected under the National Parks and Wildlife Act, which means that individuals are prohibited from taking action such as killing, injuring or capturing protected animals (under section 51) without a permit. Furthermore, it is also prohibited to interfere, harass, molest or engage in activities that may be detrimental to the welfare of protected animals (section 68).

This bill includes the following provisions: the first is inserting a provision that landholders are permitted to destroy a wombat burrow where it poses a risk to human safety, farming crops and machinery such as harvesters, or infrastructure such as tracks or built structures. This provision will not derogate from the requirement of a person to comply with sections 51 and 68 of the National Parks and Wildlife Act or the Animal Welfare Act. I believe that this is very important in a civilised society.

Landholders may occasionally have valid reasons to damage burrows due to concerns related to human safety and potential risks to their very valuable equipment and infrastructure; however, the Department for Environment and Water (DEW) promotes a 'living with wildlife' approach. This encourages people to consider alternative methods of managing wombat populations, with DEW recommending nonlethal approaches to landholders, including electric fencing, fence alterations, wombat gates and burrow marking.

Destroying burrows with the intention of harming wombats is not an approved method and would likely constitute an offence under the National Parks and Wildlife Act and/or the Animal Welfare Act 1985, particularly in relation to animal mistreatment (section 13). The second provision allows the minister to declare a wombat protection zone, a geographical area where a person must not without a permit granted by the minister destroy, damage or disturb the burrow of a wombat. This is really good news for wombats.

I do really love wombats. I have loved wombats ever since *A Country Practice* and Fatso. In fact, one of my favourite episodes features Fatso. I am sure we can all reflect and we know that he was a beautiful wombat. But I digress just a tad. However, this is not the first time I have spoken about wombats in this house. In 2021, I gave some great tips about how you can re-use corflutes and, if you were not here for that one, let me tell you how you can make a sustainable choice and help native wildlife.

Ms Stinson: Do tell.

The Hon. N.F. COOK: I will. We know that wombats suffer from sarcoptic mange, an awful disease.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. N.F. COOK: Yes, mange—terrible. Wildlife rescuers are able to use recycled corflutes as a burrow flap. You attach a milk bottle cap to the corflute and in that goes cydectin, which is the medication. As the little wombats scurry along and trundle off to bed at night or in the day—because they can be a bit lazy; but in the daytime or the night-time, whenever they go into their little house—they scurry in, the flap swings, the cydectin pops out of the milk cap and runs down the little back of the wombat, and it allows the illness to be treated. It is fantastic: mites gone, mange fixed. You might all like to try that at home, or maybe not, but it is a terrific use for corflutes.

I do not think you can talk about wombats, though—I have talked about Fatso, that was important—without talking about the square poop. Wombat poop is wildly geometric in its cuboid design. It does make one wonder how it gets shot out in such a form, but it does very regularly. You should google this; it is quite fascinating stuff. Some of my colleagues may already know that the wombat is the only animal in the world that has cube-shaped poop.

Bare-nosed wombats can excrete four to eight scat pieces at a time, that is pieces of poop, and they might poop up to 100 pieces of square scat poop a day. After the wombat defecates, the furry little critter uses its little fat hands and its nose, and gathers up the two-centimetre size cubes of poop and places them around their territory, probably to communicate with other wombats and, horrifically, to attract mates. If they could use their little hands, they might be able to build stuff out of

it. Anyway, it is a great fact for young people. I am sure some of the kids in your electorate would be most entertained—or, indeed, your staff—but back to the bill.

Transferring or rehabilitating wombats from their natural habitats can be problematic due to their strong territorial nature and potential for high-risk conflict. While there is no real easy solution to this particular problem, it is crucial to ensure that wombats are sufficiently protected under the legislation so that any authorised destruction of wombats or their habitat is carried out with the utmost of humane considerations. Taking these measures is a sensible step towards addressing the situation responsibly. I want to pass on my thanks to the very excellent Minister for Environment, Minister Susan Close, for bringing this fantastic issue to the house. I commend the bill.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Thank you, minister—most informative. The member for Flinders.

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (15:48): I rise to speak on this amendment of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972, and I do so as one of the few members who actually have wombats within their electorate. I have been listening to the speeches from the other side, and you say 'informative' Mr Acting Speaker, but I will let others be the judge of that.

I seriously want the minister and the government to consider the ramifications of this amendment because those of us who are actually in electorates that have these—as has been described already—up to one-metre long, 18 to 30 kilogram balls of muscle, know that it is actually quite a challenge to live in areas where these wombats are often endemic, and some of the wording that is within this amendment really does concern me.

When you talk about interactions between landowners and wombats, you may think flippantly about it and talk about things like fence alterations and gates. Let me tell you right now: wombats do not respect fences and wombats do not use gates. In the sorts of numbers that you have to deal with in my electorate, and especially up the western side of my electorate, wombats are an absolute challenge for landowners to have to deal with.

I have had a look at some of the wording that is within this amendment, and it really does concern me. It talks about 'destroying, damaging or disturbing' burrows of wombats. Now, let me tell you, if you are driving around the Far West Coast of my electorate—the beautiful West Coast, the wild side of our state—it is pretty easy for you to be driving along and actually 'disturb', as the wording is within this amendment, a wombat burrow. Some parts of the state have wombat burrows all over. Landowners and farmers, whether they are graziers or whether they are broadacre farmers, have to deal with this all the time. To put rules in place, to make law within this place which actually does put at risk business and put stipulations that cannot effectively be followed is, I think, really poor lawmaking.

The other aspect that I highlight within this amendment bill is the stipulation around a wombat burrow protection zone. We see the definition in this bill as 'an area declared by the Minister by notice in the *Gazette* to be a Wombat Burrow Protection Zone for the purposes of this section'. We do not know what these wombat burrow protection zones are going to be. It may be that within the CBD is a protection zone and the rest of the state is not. I am maybe assuming a bit more than I may within this amendment, but I would assume that a wombat burrow protection zone probably is within an area where there are wombats.

There are not too many places within metropolitan Adelaide, or even some of our regional centres, that actually have wombats. So I am assuming that some of these wombat burrow protection zones are going to be in Flinders, in Giles, in Stuart, in Narungga and in the Riverland in Chaffey. This is where the uncertainty for landowners actually does come in. It is up to the minister to declare a wombat burrow protection zone, and this being in legislation means not just this minister but subsequent ministers to come. The intention might be there; it might be a positive one, but the ramifications for landowners, especially within my electorate of Flinders, are significant.

We see within this amendment that if a burrow is outside a wombat burrow protection zone then there is a process that needs to be followed. We have already heard, even in the previous speech in this place, that wombats are protected already. They are already protected. There is already a significant process that needs to be followed by landowners if they want to have to manage

or deal with some of the challenges that they face with wombat burrowing. That is only exacerbated with this amendment, and that is only if the burrow is outside a wombat burrow protection zone.

This amendment puts so much more uncertainty into the lives of landowners who are doing their best to be productive, working with and around wombats already. I would challenge every member who gets up and speaks on this to actually go to the Far West of the state, talk with landowners there, and realise that the damage that is done to the land by wombats is significant but the way that this amendment has been put together actually makes it near on impossible to technically follow the legislation. You can be driving across your paddock, you can be putting your crop in, just like the thousands of acres in the Far West, and you can even inadvertently be disturbing a wombat burrow because they are literally everywhere. These little balls of muscle are so prevalent in some areas.

I remember only last year I was travelling from Elliston down to a beautiful part of the coastline that is about 20 or 30 kilometres south of Elliston. I counted 45 wombats on the side of the road as I was driving along. Let me tell you, the interactions that these wombats already have with landowners are really challenging. If we are to put extra stipulations, extra obligations and extra hurdles on landowners and actually bring law forward that is not practically workable, I think it is really poor lawmaking. The uncertainty that this amendment does create is causing a lot of concern within my electorate of Flinders.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Tourism, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (15:54): I rise in support of this bill, the National Parks and Wildlife (Wombat Burrows) Amendment Bill 2022. I recognise and thank the Hon. Tammy Franks in the other place for her work on this bill. At its heart, the bill is designed to give additional protection to wombats. Wombats are an iconic species in South Australia. In fact, they are an iconic species for us as a nation. There is value in increasing the protection of wombats and clarifying for landholders and the community how wombats and their habitats are protected.

As Minister for Tourism, it would be remiss of me not to speak to the value of wildlife tourism to our visitor economy. Nationally, the nature-based tourism sector contributes \$23 billion to the Australian economy each year. In South Australia, the most recently available value of nature-based tourism is \$1.9 billion, and that is part of our \$8.3 billion tourism economy. The data shows that demand is only rising. There is great interest in this type of tourism. There is a focus on conservation and protection of species, and we know that wildlife tourism has shown a positive conservation result.

This kind of tourism provides an economic incentive for maintaining or restoring natural habitats of Australia's iconic species. When you look at Tourism Australia's guide to wildlife tourism, our beloved wombats are front and centre. 'That moment you first see a kangaroo bounding across the plains, or glimpse a wombat waddling through the forest, is one you'll never forget,' is a quote from the guide.

Included in Tourism Australia's wildlife guide is excellent information on how tourists can engage with Australia's wildlife responsibly. In this list, there is information about how visitors can contribute to the conservation of wildlife habitats, including information for our working holidaymakers on how they can volunteer with wildlife conservation charities.

In South Australia, two species of wombat can be found: the southern hairy-nosed wombat and the common bare-nosed wombat. Both species are found in our state's glorious Eyre Peninsula. I have been very fortunate to travel to Eyre Peninsula several times as the Minister for Tourism, and I have also visited with my family in an unofficial capacity when working in the portfolio for opposition. In fact, we are heading there again later this year. It is one of our favourite places to go.

But even before visiting I knew that when it comes to wildlife encounters Eyre Peninsula really is the wild side. So important is wildlife to the Eyre Peninsula visitor economy that four of the top five tourism experiences in the region include wildlife encounters. One of the Regional Visitor Strategy priorities for Eyre Peninsula is to capitalise on the region's 'pristine nature, immersive wildlife experiences and coastal lifestyle to drive increased overnight stays from international and domestic visitors'.

Over and over again, the data is very clear. Interstate visitors cite unique experiences around interaction with wildlife as very appealing and they think about this when considering a trip to Eyre Peninsula. International visitors travelling our regions choose Eyre Peninsula for viewing and engaging with local wildlife both on sea and on land. Even us locals, the intrastate South Australians, name the opportunities for wildlife encounters among our top reasons for visiting the area.

It is only in Eyre Peninsula that you will find the opportunity to go swimming with the great whites. There is nowhere else in the world now where thrillseekers get face to face with all those teeth, but if you fancy a little less adrenaline you can stay on the EP to jump into the water to play with the sea lions and the dolphins. There are several animal species that are endemic to Eyre Peninsula; that is, they occur nowhere else. There are the furry friends of our wombat species, like the Pearson Island black-footed rock wallaby and the sandhill dunnart, and the scaly, like the Eyre Peninsula dragon.

Some of Eyre Peninsula's offshore islands are important for the survival of several threatened species, such as the southern brown bandicoot, the greater bilby, the Pearson Island black-footed rock wallaby and the greater stick-nest rat. Their survival is possible due to these islands being free of predators and competitors, such as foxes, cats, goats and sheep.

The southern hairy-nosed wombat, called Wardu across the Far West Aboriginal language groups, is an important species in Aboriginal culture and celebrated as part of the Dreaming for First Nations people in Western Eyre Peninsula. While both species are protected under the act, it is the common bare-nosed wombat, despite its name, that is recognised as a rare species in South Australia under the National Parks and Wildlife Act.

As my colleagues have already outlined, the National Parks and Wildlife Act currently prohibits a person from taking—that is, to kill, injure or capture (section 51)—a protected animal without a permit, or interfering, harassing or molesting a protected animal, or undertaking an activity that is or is likely to be detrimental to the welfare of a protected animal. With the following provisions agreed upon in the other place, the government will be supporting this bill. The provisions are to include:

1. That landholders are permitted to destroy a wombat burrow where it poses a risk to human safety, farming crops and machinery, or infrastructure, such as tracks or built structures.
2. That the minister is allowed to declare a wombat protection zone, a geographical area where a person must not, without a permit granted by the minister, destroy, damage or disturb the burrow of a wombat.

Importantly, the first provision will not derogate from the requirement of a person to comply with sections 51 and 68 of the National Parks and Wildlife Act or with the Animal Welfare Act.

Landholders may have a reasonable need to damage burrows from time to time due to human safety or risks of damage to equipment and infrastructure. The Department for Environment and Water encourages a 'living with wildlife' approach to how people think about and interact with wildlife. Burrow destruction is rarely effective when undertaken as the only means of managing a wombat population. The department recommends other methods to landholders. Nonlethal methods of management for wombats include electric fencing, fence alterations, wombat gates and marking burrows.

Destroying burrows with the intent of destroying an animal is not an approved method of destruction and would likely be an offence under the act and the Animal Welfare Act 1985, particularly the ill-treatment of an animal (section 13). I understand that the department will also be increasing compliance and education efforts to raise awareness of nonlethal methods of wombat management to reduce identified risks and impacts and the inefficacy of destroying wombat burrows in isolation from other management methods to reduce risks and impacts to safety and machinery. There will also be education on how to destroy a burrow in a manner that lessens the likelihood of an offence being committed.

This bill strikes a balance between the conservation of this iconic species and the needs of landholders. I commend this bill to the house.

Mrs PEARCE (King) (16:02): I rise to speak in support of the National Parks and Wildlife (Wombat Burrows) Amendment Bill. Our great state is home to two species of wombat: we have the bare-nosed wombat and, of course, the southern hairy-nosed wombat, which was adopted as our state's faunal emblem nearly 53 years ago, I believe, under the Don Dunstan government.

It is interesting to know that these friendly looking guys are real ecosystem engineers and that they juggle the important role they play in our ecosystem while spending most of their days burrowed underground and coming out at night to feed. Their burrows, which they tend to spend most of their days in, not only help to cycle nutrients around the soil and provide new avenues for water absorption into the soil but also happen to provide shelter to a range of animals, ranging from geckos to rock wallabies.

The bare-nosed wombat is also currently recognised as a rare species under the National Parks and Wildlife Act. Both the southern hairy-nosed wombat and the bare-nosed wombat, namely, the two species of wombat found here in South Australia, are both protected under the act, which means a person cannot take a protected animal without a permit—which includes killing, injuring or capturing them—and must not interfere, harass or molest a protected animal or undertake an activity that is or is likely to be detrimental to the welfare of a protected animal.

As a country girl, I appreciate that from time to time it remains an unfortunate reality that landholders may have a reasonable need to damage burrows due to human safety and risk of damage to equipment and infrastructure, albeit the natural benefit they bring to helping with soil nutrients, as we discussed earlier.

The Department for Environment and Water encourages landholders to take a 'living with wildlife' approach to how people think about and interact with wildlife. Burrow destruction is rarely an effective approach if done in isolation with no other measures of managing a wombat population supporting it. Other methods of managing wombat populations, particularly those methods that are non lethal, will also be encouraged by the department, such as the use of electric fencing, fence alterations, wombat gates and marking the location of burrows to alert others to their presence.

The government is supportive of the bill with some provisions, the first being inserting the provision that landholders are permitted to destroy a wombat burrow where it poses a risk to human safety, farming crops and machinery or infrastructure such as tracks or built structures. As I have mentioned, it is an unfortunate reality that sometimes landowners will have to remove burrows from their properties where they present a risk. This amendment therefore ensures that a landowner's ability to take care of a burrow is not impacted where it does present a risk to human safety, crops, machinery or infrastructure.

However, if a landowner's intention when destroying a burrow is undertaken with intent to also destroy an animal in that process—for example, a wombat that may be buried alive if the burrow is destroyed—this would not be an approved method of destruction and would remain an offence under the act and the Animal Welfare Act. This provision will not derogate from the requirement of a person to comply with sections 51 and 68 of the National Parks and Wildlife Act and the Animal Welfare Act.

The second provision allows the minister to declare a wombat protection zone, a geographical area where a person must not, without a permit granted by the minister, destroy, damage or disturb the burrow of a wombat. I understand that the department will also be increasing compliance and education efforts to boost awareness of other nonlethal methods of wombat management to reduce any identified risks and impact, something that I am pleased to hear.

As destroying wombat burrows in isolation can often be a largely ineffective endeavour, the department will be working with landholders to boost awareness of this inefficiency and will provide further information on other management methods. I think quite importantly the department will also be educating landholders on how to destroy a burrow where there is a need to do so and how to do it in a manner that lessens the likelihood of an offence being committed.

Having spent time over the years in the Riverland, while wombats may not be a common sight during the days as they are burrowed away, I know that in certain locations you can easily spot a wombat burrow around the place. Over the last few months, we have all seen how our wombats

and other wildlife, particularly around the river area, have had a tough start to the year. We have seen how the flooding event has severely devastated their environments and impacted their burrows, with many wombats around the river having had their homes washed out from under them and with many not lucky enough to escape in time.

This has undoubtedly had a devastating impact on their populations, but during all of that there was a dedicated team volunteering their time helping to keep the isolated southern hairy-nosed wombats alive during the flood. While they encountered a great deal of tragic finds, their efforts undoubtedly helped save the lives of many wombats and other wildlife, and I believe they even managed to successfully relocate 10 of the wombats to the Adelaide Hills for specialty care.

On a more positive note, I am pleased to learn that, with the breaking of the drought, on the other side of our state we have seen a big boost in the numbers of southern hairy-nosed wombats in the Nullarbor, with a promising increase in their population. In fact, the signs of their bounce back are able to be spotted on satellite imagery by following the burrows.

With the southern hairy-nosed wombat, our state's faunal emblem, being such a uniquely Australian animal, rugged enough to survive the harsh and hot outback conditions, we should be taking great pride in an animal that does so much for our state's ecosystem. As such, ensuring that our wombats are better protected from badly performed burrow destructions and not left buried alive, whilst also teaching landowners how to better manage wombat population on their properties, is something worthy of supporting, and it is why I am commending the bill to the house.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (16:08): I rise to support this bill. In doing so, I have heard everything I need to hear about wombats now, both the heavy-duty stuff and their bowel habits and the shape of the products. There has been a fair amount said. I see this bill as another expression of an orientation towards native wildlife in our state and on our continent.

I remember, when I first came out from England, my dad getting us into the EH and going to the Flinders Ranges and other places. We did not see any wombats up there, but we did see something that was at that time indicative of a more generalised attitude to native wildlife, and that was all the wedge-tailed eagles that were strung up on the barbed wire fences. These eagles had been shot and, I think in some cases, poisoned.

Fortunately, you do not see that anymore, so there has been over the decades a cultural change, not just in our urban areas but in our rural areas as well. Most farmers and pastoralists do take seriously the importance of conservation and looking after the environment, and sometimes there are compromises involved in that.

I listened with interest to some rural members of the opposition speaking. As they said, it is in our electorates that we find wombats. Indeed, the last time I was in the Gawler Ranges a four-wheel drive rolled onto its side because it hit a wombat burrow on the side of the road—so it can have an impact and at times a potentially dangerous impact. This legislation is an attempt at a compromise, trying to look after the interests of farmers and pastoralists while recognising the importance of enhancing protection for wombats.

It is interesting to hear some of the discussion about methods such as the 'living with wildlife' approach that sometimes impose costs on farmers. I think we need to have at times a greater recognition of that. We are expecting farmers to carry out some of the environmental obligations, and I believe that in many cases they probably need a bit more support to do that because they are doing it on behalf of the broader community.

The other thing I would say, which can also be said of a lot of legislation, is that there is sometimes a bit of a set and forget approach, but it is worthwhile, down the track, reviewing what has been done to see how effective it is, how effective on the ground it is, how well it is assisting the protection of wombats. As I said, I think this legislation is part of that orientation and direction that we have pursued now for many years in order to enhance the protection of our wildlife.

I referred to the wedge-tailed eagles that used to be strung up on fences. When it comes to extinction rates, Australia has absolutely nothing to be proud of, especially in regard to mammalian extinction. In just about every decade since the Europeans turned up, we have lost between one and

two species, and we actually lead the world over that time period in the loss, in the extinction, of mammalian species.

In addition to that, when you look at species in general, once again our record is not great. I think we are in the top four or five in the world when it comes to extinction of species. It is a record that we have to do a lot about. There is a lot more talk these days about biodiversity and the value of biodiversity, both in a practical sense but also in an intrinsic sense, because there is absolutely no doubt that at the moment, when you look at the rate of background extinction globally, we are now heading into one of the great extinctions.

I think this will be the sixth period in which the globe has experienced extinction at this particular rate. Sometimes the cause has been a catastrophic event, such as 60 million-odd years ago when a very large meteorite hit this planet, but we are the agency, we are the cause now of the extinctions that are taking place.

Back in 2019, a major UN report came out and it indicated the future of both animal and plant extinction. The estimate was that in the coming years there would be around about one million plus when it comes to extinctions of species. The thing about this is that we still do not have anywhere near the perfect record of all those species that we share this planet with; in fact, it is why you get all sorts of numbers in this area. There are a lot of species that at this stage have not been discovered and have not been counted and we are probably in the process of losing some of those species before we even have knowledge of them.

The whole thing about an intact biodiversity is that it makes the planet run. We wreck it and we dilute it at our expense. This is getting a little bit away from wombats, but I think it is about the legislation and the orientation. It would be worthwhile in the future, with farmers, conservationists and others, to track whether these changes have worked, and to ask: can they be improved and what else is it that we might need to do? With those few words, I commend the bill.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (16:16): I will close the debate, of course, by thanking all those who have contributed, but I would like to offer some clarity or perhaps guidance on what is likely to happen next once the legislation goes through, assuming that that is the will of the house. I have listened attentively to the comments and questions raised by the opposition contributions and I understand the concerns or perhaps anxieties for landholders in particular who live in areas where there are significant amounts of wombat burrows.

I understand the challenges that they pose for managing a farm or an area of primary production. I do not want people to be left with a concern that this might become something that will cause enormous challenges in running their businesses, as long as they are within the law, or nor that it will be an overly administrative or bureaucratic process—that is not the intention.

Of course, this legislation has a slightly unusual history, not by any means unique, but slightly unusual, in the sense that it originated not only in the other place but from one of the smaller parties, from the Hon. Tammy Franks from the Greens, and therefore did not have, initially, the benefit of a contribution from the government department that might have views about the way in which administration might occur and was not the subject of ongoing internal discussions and resolution prior to its being presented to parliament—as I say, unusual but not unique.

As part of the process in the Legislative Council, a couple of amendments were proposed by the government that were accepted by the Hon. Ms Franks, which have made this a proposition that we in the government believe will be manageable.

In essence, what it is saying is that while there are already restrictions based on what can happen to a protected animal, and also what can happen or ought not to happen to any animal under the Animal Welfare Act—recognising that there are concerns in some areas in particular where there have been accusations of poor treatment of wombats through the filling of burrows while it is known that the animals are there, therefore knowingly, or perhaps even if not knowingly at least recklessly and with disregard, causing harm to and the death of those animals—there is an additional layer of protection that can be declared by a minister by declaring this protected area and that within that

area not only does the legislation continue to exist as it exists outside but a permit needs to be sought in order to be certain that the process will be undertaken appropriately.

That is what the legislation does. What sits outside of that has been canvassed a little in my speech but also reasonably significantly in some of the other speeches that we have had on this side. They talked about what the department has done but intends to do more of in terms of working with landholders and the way in which they go about managing wombats, including all of the range of options for managing wombat impact on primary production areas, bearing in mind that dealing with burrows is not recommended as a solo or necessary management technique at all, but even in that case ways in which to do that in order not to break the law by harming a protected animal or by causing animal cruelty. That work that has existed will continue apace and will be more significant.

At the same time, assuming that the legislation does go through the parliament, the department will work with a group of stakeholders—people who have long expressed concerns about the welfare of wombats and landholders and those who represent landholders in areas where there are a significant number of interactions between primary production and wombats—to work on a way in which we can determine what would trigger having a protected area declared by the minister, what those conditions would be.

The member for Bragg was wondering whether it would be time limited or permanent, and that is a legitimate question but one I do not want to foreclose on now. It is whether it would be for a period of time or whether it would be about the geographical area and the circumstances under which perhaps reports of mismanagement might trigger having such a protected area for a period of time versus whether there are areas where there are a significant amount of wombats all the time—that that might be a place where management needs to occur more closely.

All of that needs to be worked through. Having now got the power to do that, should this go through the parliament, we will be in a position to work with landholders and with those who are deeply concerned about the welfare of wombats, including, I note, several members of the team on this side of parliament, to really make sure that there is a process that is clear and predictable for all those involved.

Keep in mind that the goal of this legislation, and will be the goal of this process in declaring those areas, is that these very, very precious animals are protected from harm, from cruelty and from being pushed closer to extinction. I particularly appreciated the member for Giles' contribution in talking about the relationship to the extinction crisis and the fact that South Australia and Australia have a terrible record over the last couple of hundred years—but it has not stopped—in losing particularly mammalian species.

We have a bit over 1,000 species of all sorts currently regarded as being under threat of extinction in South Australia alone. Plants and vertebrates—birds, mammals and other animals—are very much under pressure. We know that wombats not only are threatened but also can have the kind of interaction with landholders that leads to a degree of frustration from the landholders and might lead to a mismanagement of those animals.

That is where we need to make sure the government, the environment department, is working well with those landholders and avoiding that cruelty and that threat to the numbers of animals before it happens rather than waiting to hear that something bad has happened and then having to send rangers out to determine whether it was deliberate and how many animals have been killed.

That is the intention. I say again that I pay tribute to the member from the Legislative Council the Hon. Tammy Franks, the co-leader of the Greens, for having wanted to do something like this for a very long time and having raised with me the issues of what has been happening with wombats during the time when we were in opposition. It is a great pleasure to be able to deliver a bill that has had such a degree of burning passion in the other chamber to get something done and to be able to do that in partnership, with one of the minor parties—well, a third party; I do not mean to be in any way dismissive of the size, but a non-major party, one of the crossbench parties—and the government having been able to operate in cooperation.

It is important to our democracy not only in that all legislation does not have to originate from the government but also in that it is not just about whether the two big parties get together and agree on something. There are opportunities for legislation to originate in this way. This is not the first one that has occurred in the last year or so, and it is unlikely to be the last, but I think it is a good sign when we are able to do that. What is important is that we take that legislation in now and get the proper administration built behind it so that it operates in the way in which it is intended. I therefore commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (16:25): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (SEXUAL OFFENCES) BILL

Second Reading

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (16:25): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I am very pleased to introduce to this house the Statutes Amendment (Sexual Offences) Bill 2023 and to take carriage of it in this place. This bill represents crucial work that we are utterly determined to progress because doing what we can to prevent child sex abuse, and to appropriately and firmly deal with perpetrators, is of utmost importance to our government, and I am sure to all members of this place and indeed to our community and particularly to those brave survivors who have suffered the horror of being sexually abused as a child, and their families.

Every one of us I am sure wholeheartedly agrees that the safety and protection of children and the enabling of them to live their lives free of abuse and violence, having the best opportunity to be empowered to physically, mentally and emotionally thrive is everybody's business, and it is absolutely ours in this place. This bill sits alongside a range of steps we are taking and will also sit alongside impending important changes to the Children and Young People (Safety) Act later this year.

This is a bill that rightly progresses an election commitment that the now government made to firmly close loopholes that make it easier for people who shamefully possess child pornography or childlike sex dolls to access greater sentence discounts or bail. The bill continues the government's steadfast commitment to ensuring that our laws dealing with child sex offenders and the horrific crimes they perpetrate are fit for purpose and appropriately account for the awful harm that this kind of horrendous offending inflicts upon children, offending which sadly impacts often the entire trajectory of a person's life.

Possessing this kind of horrific, abhorrent exploitative material is never a victimless crime simply because the offender does not have direct contact with the child who is abused. This is so because, shamefully, every single time exploitative images of a child are downloaded or viewed, that child is revictimised and retraumatised. The downloading or viewing of the abusive material fuels demand which then incentivises others to continue to abuse children to generate more material and meet that sick demand.

The bill amends the Sentencing Act 2017 so that possession of child exploitation material and offences involving childlike sex dolls are deemed 'serious indictable offences' for the purposes of the sentence discount provisions. Currently they are both considered as 'indictable offences' rather than 'serious indictable offences'.

Under the Sentencing Act, the maximum sentencing discount that can be awarded for a guilty plea is based on when the plea is entered and the seriousness of the offence. Some serious indictable offences attract less of a sentencing discount than the normal discount in recognition of the particular harm that these offences cause to the victims and to the community. Our government believes that possession of child exploitation material and childlike sex dolls should absolutely be considered part of this serious category.

This amendment will help to ensure that the sentences given to child exploitation material and childlike sex doll offenders who plead guilty are in line with community expectation and properly reflect the gravity of the offending. The bill also amends the Bail Act 1985 to legislate a new bail principle that authorities must take into account when considering whether to grant bail to a person charged with child exploitation material or childlike sex doll offences.

Under the current law, bail authorities consider the gravity of the charged offence when determining whether somebody should be given bail. The bill rightly provides that, when determining the gravity of an alleged offence involving child exploitation material or childlike sex dolls, bail authorities must take into account the terrible harm that these offenders cause to children by contributing to that sick demand for child abuse material. This principle will ensure that bail authorities unanimously consider the particular impact of such possession offences on the victimisation, the traumatisation of children, and create a legislative statement about the gravity with which this parliament views this type of offending.

Finally, the bill amends the language used in the sexual exploitation offences in part 3, division 12, of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 so that they better reflect the exploitative nature of such conduct. Currently, the division centres around commercial sexual services offences, being the forcing of a person to provide such services or using a child in such so-called services. The bill rightly changes this language to 'commercial sexual acts'. The use of the word 'services' is considered utterly inappropriate in the context of these offences.

A child or adult who is being sexually exploited for profit is not—indeed, never—providing anybody with a so-called service. The language is changed to reflect the exploitative nature of the offending and to be more sensitive to the experiences of victim survivors. Importantly, this amendment will not change the substance of the offence, as the definition of a commercial sexual act is equivalent to the current definition of a commercial sexual service. The bill also amends the Child Sex Offenders Registration Act 2006 to update references to the commercial sexual services offences to reflect these changes that I have just spoken of.

First and foremost, in introducing this bill to this house I acknowledge the survivors of child sexual abuse—those courageous people who have traversed such a difficult path who often bravely go on to advocate for change that can strengthen the support available on that difficult journey that others may traverse. I also acknowledge the Hon. Connie Bonaros MLC, who raised this language issue of the current offence during debate on the Statutes Amendment (Child Sex Offences) Bill 2022, which raised penalties for some of these offences. In saying that, I also thank Ms Bonaros for her longstanding advocacy in this space.

I also acknowledge the fine work of the Attorney-General toward this bill and his steadfast commitment to ensuring our government continues to listen to survivors of child sex abuse and their families and that South Australia has laws that are steeped in compassion, that acknowledge the experience of survivors, that appropriately protect children and that, rightly, fulsomely punish predators. I commend the bill to members and seek leave to insert the explanation of clauses in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Bail Act 1985*

3—Insertion of section 10AA

This clause inserts a new provision in the Act requiring a bail authority considering a bail application by a person who has been charged with a child sexual material offence to take into account the harm that people who deal with child sexual material cause to children by contributing to demand for the abuse of children in considering the gravity of the offence.

4—Transitional provision

The new provision will apply in relation to a person who applies for bail on or after the commencement of this Part.

Part 3—Amendment of *Child Sex Offenders Registration Act 2006*

5—Amendment of Schedule 1—Class 1 and 2 offences

These are consequential to Part 4.

Part 4—Amendment of *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*

6—Amendment of heading to Part 3 Division 12

7—Amendment of section 65A—Definitions relating to commercial sexual services

8—Amendment of section 66—Sexual servitude and related offences

9—Amendment of section 67—Deceptive recruiting for commercial sexual services

10—Amendment of section 68—Use of children in commercial sexual services

These clauses make various amendments to remove references to 'commercial sexual services' and to instead use the new terminology of 'commercial sexual acts'.

Part 5—Amendment of *Sentencing Act 2017*

11—Amendment of section 40—Reduction of sentences for guilty pleas in other cases

This clause makes offences against sections 63AA, 63A and 63AAB of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935* 'serious sexual offences' for the purposes of section 40.

12—Transitional provision

The amended definition will apply in relation to the sentencing of a person for an offence to which the person pleads guilty on or after the commencement of this Part.

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services) (16:34): I rise to speak on the Statutes Amendment (Sexual Offences) Bill 2023. Labor went to the 2022 election with a comprehensive set of policies to invest in the future of South Australia, address cost-of-living pressures and improve community safety. While the former government did not make many commitments in this particular area to help South Australians, we laid out a plan for the future.

A huge part of that plan was making our community safer for families and for children and providing opportunities to help them to live their best lives. This included the first proper increase in public housing in a generation that gives some of our most vulnerable community members a safe and affordable home. As I have said in this place before, the last time public housing went up under a Liberal government was 1982, when David Tonkin was the Premier. Depending on how South Australians vote in coming elections, it may be half a century or more before it goes up again or even has the chance of going up if an alternative government is elected.

We have committed to a royal commission into early childhood education and care, along with focusing on the first 1,000 days of a child's life. Through our first two budgets, plus the Mid-Year Budget Review, we have invested in both formal child protection and early intervention services. In my department alone, early intervention services now receive around \$70 million per annum. This is critical in building safer homes and safer families where children can grow and thrive.

We promised to double the Cost of Living Concession in 2022-23, which provided \$78 million in support to more than 211,000 households. This was the biggest concession payment in the state's history, but it will be dwarfed by more than a quarter of a billion dollars in the coming year. This will help more than 400,000 households with energy relief of \$500 and tens of thousands of small businesses with \$650.

In early June, we announced help for parents and caregivers with schoolchildren. For some of the most marginalised, we have promised to boost inclusion. This includes a range of measures: developing our state's first-ever autism strategy and autism charter; \$28.8 million for autism lead teachers in public schools; establishing a ministerial advisory committees for youth, disability and LGBTIQ+; as well as investing \$50 million for 100 wellbeing workers in schools.

We also committed to change laws to reflect the importance of children and young people. Some of this work involves fixing oversights that happened under the previous government, and that is what this bill is doing. The bill's main purpose is to enact election commitments made in the government's Justice for Victims policy. This policy promised to close loopholes that make it easier for people who possess child porn or childlike sex dolls to get bigger sentence discounting or bail. When the former government moved legislation in this area, they left these offences out of the list. This is a slight improvement, though, on failing to pass the legislation, which also occurred with some other child sex offence bills.

The first loophole makes it easier for people who possess child porn or childlike sex dolls to get bigger sentence discounts. This loophole exists because certain child sex offences are indictable offences, but they are not currently considered serious indictable offences. As such, they do not attract lower sentence discounts for guilty pleas in the same way that most other child sex offences do, such as producing child exploitation material and grooming children online. Passing this bill will meet our election commitment in this area by amending the Sentencing Act to class possession of child exploitation material or dealing with childlike sex dolls as a serious indictable offence for the purpose of the discounts.

These offences would then attract lower sentence discounts for guilty pleas, capped at 25 per cent rather than 35 per cent, compared with other indictable offences. This change will emphasise that possession of child exploitation material and childlike sex dolls is considered equally as serious as other child sex offences. I know how serious this offending is. It has terrible generational consequences.

The second aspect of the election commitment was to close a loophole regarding bail. Currently, defendants charged with possession of child exploitation material or a childlike sex doll offence must be given bail unless it is inappropriate, taking into account factors such as the gravity of the alleged offence and the likelihood of the defendant absconding or reoffending whilst on bail. The gravity of the offence the bail authority already considers is assessed by not just the charge itself but the particulars of the alleged offending. This should hopefully include the indirect impact that accessing child exploitation material has on child victims by fuelling demand for its production.

However, we are delivering on this election commitment by legislating a special principle that bail authorities must take into account when considering bail for persons charged with child exploitation material or childlike sex doll offences. The principle states that when considering the gravity of the alleged offence the bail authority must take into account the harm that people who deal with child sex material cause to children by contributing to the demand for the abuse of children.

Whilst authorities are already free to take this into account, a legislated principle will specifically draw their mind to the harms of child exploitation material and in each case ensure a uniform approach between bail authorities and create a legislative statement of the gravity with which the parliament views this type of offending.

Finally, the bill alters the language used in part 3, division 12, of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. This contains offences in relation to commercial sexual services, including forcing a person to provide commercial sexual services or knowingly using a child in commercial sexual services. The phrasing of 'provide commercial sexual services' will be amended to 'perform commercial sexual acts'. This language better reflects the exploitative nature of the offending.

This change is in response to comments made by the Hon. Connie Bonaros MLC in the other place during debate on the Statutes Amendment (Child Sex Offences) Bill 2022, which raises penalties for some of these offences. Ms Bonaros queried whether the word 'services' was appropriate in the context of forced sexual activity or the exploitation of children. Language is important.

This approach to reforming the language of our laws mirrors recent changes related to maintaining an 'unlawful sexual relationship' with a child. Whilst I am sure it was never intended, the language raised the prospect of a lawful sexual relationship with a child and indicated a form of relationship, as distinct from outright abuse. As many of you would be aware, Grace Tame visited South Australia twice in recent weeks to bring additional focus to this change. We are really fortunate to have vocal, brave and eloquent survivors who remind us about the human impact of these matters.

As a community, we have had to face up to many changes in recent decades as our views of and our responses to sexual or violent offending have, thankfully, changed. This has happened in relation to rape in marriage, crimes motivated by a person's sexuality, domestic and family violence, and child sex offences. In opposition, Labor moved a number of bills to crack down on child sex offenders, and this continues in government.

Our focus has also included other sexual offending. Last year, the Statutes Amendment (Child Sexual Offences) Bill 2022 increased penalties for a range of child sex offences and strengthened Carly's Law. Maximum penalties were increased from 10 to 15 years for a range of offences, and we removed the age distinction for offences involving child exploitation material that previously drew a line between standard offences and aggravated offences.

The second of these changes was critical when it was difficult or impossible to know whether the victim portrayed in the exploitation material was under 14. The age, the apparent age or the defendant's belief about the age of a victim are still important when determining penalties, but the earlier bill removed an outdated part of our legislation that did not reflect the modern world, where offenders have used miraculous technologies for horrific purposes.

I also note the positive impact this change had on those who work to prevent, detect and prosecute child exploitation offences. We should never underestimate the potentially traumatic impact this work has on people. A change like the one I just described has two key benefits: it means investigators can spend less time focusing on a particular image or set of images and it means that time can be spent working to apprehend and convict the next offender.

Investigators were also given a major boost when we amended Carly's Law. Concerns had been raised that an alleged offender may seek to avoid conviction where their victim was a police officer posing as a child online. In particular, the earlier bill made it clear that the following offences can include communications with fictitious children, including:

- grooming offences under section 63B(3) of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 that are aggravated based on the knowledge that the victim was under 14 years old;
- a registrable child sex offender failing to inform police of reportable contact with a child; and
- dishonest communication with children, better known as Carly's Law, which is pursuant to this Labor government's election commitment to strengthen Carly's Law so that police can hunt online predators with confidence.

I take this opportunity to thank my friend Sonya Ryan for her incredible work in the name of her daughter, Carly.

The bill also amended various sentencing provisions that reference the age of the victim. This made it clear that if the victim was fictitious, their age, for the purposes of sentencing, can be considered as the age the defendant believed them to be at the time of the offence. The same bill added various offences to the child sex offender register.

I note that the former Liberal government moved legislation to increase penalties and strengthen Carly's Law, but I think the preference was to adjourn parliament ahead of the election rather than to pass critical legislation. This sadly demonstrated a lack of courage in this area. They failed to deliver on important work that began while they were in government.

While we understandably have a focus on protecting children, we also know that adults suffer terrible consequences as a result of sexual offences. In recent months, we passed legislation to outlaw stealthing, where an offender removes or deliberately damages a condom without the consent of their partner. The stress this can cause a victim is huge, whether it relates to pregnancy, sexually

transmitted diseases or simply other matters that they feel violated by. Fundamentally, this is about respect.

Relationships and sex must be based on respect by all parties. Removing or deliberately damaging a condom where one party has requested its use is a low act and one that this parliament has moved to make illegal. That legislation was first moved in the other place by the Hon. Connie Bonaros and was supported by the Malinauskas Labor government. I will take this opportunity to also commend the Hon. Connie Bonaros for her progressive, innovative and determined legislating.

My colleague the Minister for Child Protection spoke on this bill. She has noted that it proposed various legislative reforms to improve the operation of laws around sexual offences and consent to sexual activity, including amendments to:

- section 46 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 to put beyond doubt that stealthing, whereby a person deliberately and without consent does not use, damages or removes a condom before or during sexual activity, is unlawful conduct;
- section 124(8) of the Criminal Procedure Act 1921 to require the disclosure of experts' reports to the prosecution where the expert evidence relates to topics that are dealt with in section 34N of the Evidence Act 1929; and
- section 34N(1) of the Evidence Act to broaden the jury directions that must be given in cases involving a sexual offence where consent is an issue and to allow for the admission of expert evidence to address certain misconceptions about non-consensual sexual activity.

The prior legislation regarding consent was particularly close to my heart, given my responsibility around disability policy and legislation. People with disability, like others in the community, deserve to have an enjoyable, safe and consensual sex life. While understanding and implementing good consent practices can be a challenge, this can be magnified when people have different ways of communicating. As such, I was very pleased that this government expanded the direction to be given to juries when consent is an issue and allowed expert evidence about misconceptions around consent.

While the previous legislation is outside the scope of the current bill, it is important to highlight the work that is happening across portfolios and over time to improve a suite of laws. These are complex arrangements across many pieces of legislation that deal with every step of the process. They include the work of police to detect and apprehend offenders. It moves onto bail arrangements to keep the community safe and give confidence to victims following an arrest.

It covers the language we use to describe the offences so that it reflects community values and calls out vile behaviour exactly for what it is. It touches on the evidence that can be presented at trial and the advice given to juries when deciding whether to convict, and it ultimately ends with the factors that judges must take into account at sentencing and the types of penalties available to them.

I am proud this government is addressing all of these areas, but I want to end this contribution with a reflection on what comes before police, courts and prison, even before the offending itself—in fact, especially before the offending. People often talk about restorative justice. I think there is a huge role for this to play in both our adult and youth justice systems, but the experts on restorative justice will be the first to acknowledge that it can be difficult, sometimes even impossible, to restore things to how they were before a person was harmed.

This is why we must all work—government, community, families and individuals—to build a more respectful and inclusive society. People need a clear understanding of what is acceptable and what is not. Adults and young people alike need to know where the line is and, if they have doubts or uncertainty, need to be confident about asking the question and getting help. Where those efforts fail, and where people cause or contribute to harm, especially when harming children in the course of sexual offending, government needs to take strong action. This bill does exactly that, and I commend the bill to the house.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (16:51): In rising to support the bill, I hear and note the contribution of the Minister for Child Protection on introducing it to this house, coming as it does from the other place, the minister's remarks echoing those of the Attorney in the other place on 9 March 2023. This is a short bill, and it makes—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Sorry to interrupt, member for Heysen. Are you the lead speaker for the opposition on this bill?

Mr TEAGUE: Yes, and I will not be terribly lengthy in my remarks. I simply highlight that this work to make what are a number of discrete amendments to the Bail Act, to the Child Sex Offenders Registration Act, to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act and to the Sentencing Act in turn indeed reflects the serious nature of the sexual offending to which they relate and, as we have seen in recent days also, exhibits an ambition to adopt words in legislation that describe offences in terms that reflect their abhorrent nature. As I did in a previous contribution, I draw attention to the need to ensure that, when we do that, we move to amend both the style and the substance in the way that we define and spell out the nature of offences, and this is one example.

In terms of the change that this will make to the reduction of sentence that is available for a guilty plea—and of course this is a categorisation of these offences as serious sexual offences and, in so doing, makes them caught by the regime for a lesser range of discounts that are otherwise available for pleas of guilty—I just make the observation that sentence reductions generally I think are matters that ought rightly be under a spotlight.

It has been the case for 40 and more years that South Australia has been somewhat of an outlier in wholeheartedly embracing broad-based sentencing reductions, and we are here talking about reducing those discounts that are available in relation to these offences, but we are doing that in the context of section 40 of the Sentencing Act, that contemplates discounts at different stages, including in relation to these offences.

I just highlight that there is I think an ongoing debate about the efficacy and the utility and the justice of having such sentencing discount regimes in place. There has been a lot written about that, and there might be more to say about that as we continue to consider the administration of justice. Suffice to say that this bill will provide for these offences relevantly to be caught and defined as serious sexual offences and thereby render them subject to the reduced maximum sentencing discounts, and that is a welcome change.

The amendment to the Bail Act has been addressed in others' contributions. It requires a specific consideration of the relevant tribunal to the harm that people who deal with child sexual material cause to children by contributing to the demand for the abuse of children, so in doing that, and in inserting that special consideration when considering bail in these circumstances, it again highlights the seriousness of these offences and this kind of offending.

I just foreshadow that there are one or two technical matters in relation to the way in which the definition as it is expressed for the purposes of what will be section 10AA of the Bail Act are described that I might take up in committee briefly, but otherwise I indicate the opposition's support for the bill.

As other speakers have done in the course of this debate, I recognise the work of the Hon. Connie Bonaros in the other place in this regard and draw the connection between this bill and the bill in the previous session that was focused on similar subject matter and, in particular, the definition of childlike sex dolls. The Hon. Connie Bonaros has indeed been focused on development in this particular area for some time, and I recognise her work and that of the Attorney in bringing it to the other place. With those words and foreshadowing a brief moment in committee, I indicate the opposition's support for the bill.

Mrs PEARCE (King) (16:59): I rise to speak in support of the Statutes Amendment (Sexual Offences) Bill, which will provide better protection for our kids, strengthen our commitment to fighting this scourge within our state and improve language within our legislation to better reflect the gravity of the offence. The passing of this bill will further our commitments to ensure justice for survivors and victims and that the laws we have in place are up to the standards expected by the community and

that they correspond to the gravity and harm this kind of offending has on the lives of victims and modifies language to properly reflect the crime.

We are acting to ensure that any loopholes, where they might exist, are closed, to ensure that people who possess child exploitation material or childlike sex dolls do not get bigger sentencing discounts. Although these offences currently on the books are indictable offences, they are not currently considered serious indictable offences and therefore do not carry with them lower sentencing discounts, which most other child offences do, such as producing child exploitation material and grooming children online, which are classed as serious indictable offences.

To close this loophole and ensure that people who commit these offences do not benefit by receiving a higher sentencing discount, we are amending the Sentencing Act to class the possession of child exploitation material or dealing with a childlike sex doll as a serious indictable offence. This charge will better reflect community expectations when it comes to this level of offending, as well as properly acknowledge the impacts that this type of offending has on the lives of children and victim survivors because it will cut the discount for an early guilty plea at 25 per cent compared with 35 per cent for other offences.

Further to that, this statute amendment also delivers the commitment we have made to close loopholes with regard to bail. At present, where individuals are charged with possession of child exploitation material or childlike sex dolls, they are to be given bail unless it is inappropriate, taking into account factors such as the severity of the offending, gravity of the alleged offence and the likelihood of the defendant fleeing or reoffending while on bail.

This bill will ensure that, where the particulars of the alleged offending are considered, the bail authority must take into account the harm that people who deal with child sex material cause children by contributing to the demand for the abuse of children. By making sure that this legislated principle is a requirement of the bail authority, we will ensure that their minds are drawn to the harm of child exploitation material in each case and that there will be a uniform approach taken between bail authorities.

Importantly, it will also make clear this parliament's position when it comes to this type of offending and ensure that there is no place for such an act in our community, even when it indirectly contributes to further pain among child victims and fuels a further demand for the production of child exploitation material.

The bill will also amend the language in part 3, division 12, of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, which contains offences relating to commercial sexual services, including forcing a person to provide commercial sexual services or knowingly using a child in commercial sexual services. Amendments to the act will also apply to section 65A, definitions relating to commercial sexual services; section 66, sexual servitude and related offences; section 67, deceptive recruiting for commercial sexual services; and section 68, use of children in commercial sexual services. In these sections, 'provide' will be changed to 'perform' and 'services' substituted for 'acts'.

I would like to thank members in the other place, namely, the Hon. Connie Bonaros, for pointing out the use of the word 'services' and questioning its appropriateness in the context of forced sexual activity or the exploitation of children. Given recent statements by the likes of Grace Tame and also debates in this place regarding matters such as this, I also believe that the words we use in our legislation must reflect the seriousness of the crime.

Our changes will not change or alter the scope of the offence, but they will better reflect the offence, with phrasing changed from 'to provide commercial sexual services' to 'to perform commercial sexual acts', better reflecting the exploitative nature of the offending. I understand that language changes will also apply to the Child Sex Offenders Registration Act.

I have spoken in support of many such bills in this place, whether they be strengthening penalties for child sex offenders, ensuring laws like Carly's Law are as good as they can be, or backing in victim survivors. For as long as there are changes to be made, such as through the statute bill we debate before us, know that we will help to improve the likelihood of victims being able to seek justice. I am more than happy to continue coming back to the floor of this house and lending my support to the bills to come.

We made a commitment to the people of South Australia that we would take this type of offending seriously and that we would do everything we could to protect the safety of our children, and we are set on delivering that. Today, we deliver on that with another commitment by closing loopholes that should not be afforded people who commit such heinous acts against the most vulnerable population in our state, which impacts them for the rest of their lives, and we will update our laws to better reflect the nature of the crime.

We are set on ensuring that our laws reflect the community's expectations when it comes to such heinous crimes, providing our authorities with all the tools they need to deal with such disgusting acts whilst signalling that this parliament is behind them 100 per cent in doing so. With that, I commend this bill to the house.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley) (17:06): The member for Heysen has spoken about the bill and the opposition support for the bill, and I think it is fair to say that the bill is long overdue. Many of us who still sit in this place have been touched by a very close event that affected many of us, with the child pornography charges laid against Labor Party stalwart Bernard Vincent Finnigan—30 various charges on 21 April 2011. He sat in this place for four years, stalling the court process and taking a parliamentary salary that entire time, with very little demand from the Labor Party for him to leave this place at that time.

There was no move by the Labor government at that time to bring this legislation in then, when we were all exposed to it. We all saw how, when he was arrested, those 30 various charges led to just one conviction four years later. It is one thing to have higher penalties, and we support that, and turning these offences into much more serious offences by making them serious indictable offences is a very good start, but, of course, we must look at how it is that 30 charges ended up in just a single conviction after four years.

The police were obviously confident enough to lay those charges in the first instance but, chip by chip by chip, with lawyers—and one of the most expensive lawyers you could buy in Adelaide—Mr Finnigan was able to reduce those charges and have them slowly eroded from the charge sheet and then only be convicted on a single charge, which led to just a 15-month suspended sentence. No jail term for that. I think all of us in this place were surprised.

I know that when I raised the Bernie Finnigan matter as an opposition frontbencher in media and in press conferences I was criticised by the Labor Party for even raising it—because there was a law at that time where you could not raise a situation where somebody had been charged with a sex offence. That has now changed, of course. I was criticised for breaching the law, but there was no criticism from the Labor Party of what Bernie Finnigan was doing. I did not hear any of that.

This is obviously the beginning. More needs to be done, we know, as technology grows and more things develop from the use of technology. I was very pleased to hear about the formation of a select committee on AI. AI is very exciting for the world, but it also has challenges. I have no doubt that there will be challenges in dealing with child exploitation as the use of AI is expanded and exploited by people for the wrong reasons. We will be back here again, I know, amending laws like this to ensure that we continue to keep our children safe.

Some of the messages in this bill are very important, including the fact that payment, not just to somebody who might be delivering the service but to anybody else involved in that service, will be covered by these changes. Clause 3 of the bill inserts a requirement for the bail authority to take into account the harm that people who deal with child sexual material cause to children by continuing the demand for the abuse of children. That certainly was obviously not the case in the conditions that were placed on Bernie Finnigan when he was arrested. How can a crime as serious as that linger in the court system for four years?

The only planning to deal with such a matter that I could see from the Labor Party was who was going to replace Bernie Finnigan when he was finally convicted. Of course, he was replaced in 2015, and that is when we saw the now Premier Peter Malinauskas replace Mr Finnigan in a casual vacancy in the upper house, where he very quickly went on to become a minister and move into the health ministerial portfolio not long after that.

I stand here supporting the bill and know that we will be back with similar bills as we continue to combat the exploitation of children in South Australia and around the world. There is no doubt that technology has made the world such a smaller place. For many years now, for decades now, we have had laws in Australia where you can be convicted of paedophilia as an Australian citizen if you have moved to or if you are on holiday in a country that is known to have a child sex industry.

If it can be proven that you have been involved in that industry, you can face charges and sentencing here in Australia. It was a very big move, I think in the seventies, before possessing child pornography material was even illegal. I am working from memory there, as I was only a child myself at that time, but I do recall it being a very big topic of debate when those changes came through.

It has been an evolving process. We must continue to evolve and, if we can, continue to be one step ahead of the child pornography industry and any sex exploitation industry that involves unwilling participants and exploitation in order for that industry to continue. It does take all of us to be the watchdogs, all of us to raise their concerns. It does not matter if somebody is your friend or if somebody has been associated with your success. We must come forward when we suspect, hear or even witness that type of behaviour so that person can be stopped, those children can be protected, and justice can be delivered.

Ms THOMPSON (Davenport) (17:14): I also rise to speak on the Statutes Amendment (Sexual Offences) Bill that will close loopholes that give sentencing and bail leniency to those who possess child pornography or childlike sex dolls. We need to do everything that we can to ensure that the abhorrent perpetrators of these vile crimes feel the full force of the law. Appallingly, child sex offences are perpetrated so frequently that cases are tried in our state's court system daily. It is heartbreaking, and it is hard to comprehend just how prevalent child sex offending is across our state and right across our globe.

Every year, authorities receive thousands of reports of images and videos of innocent children being sexually abused for the gratification of child sex offenders. Sadly, behind every image or video is a real child—a child who has been subjected to despicable acts of sexual abuse, a child who will forever feel the effects of that abuse.

This bill continues the government's commitment to ensuring our laws dealing with child sex offenders properly account for the harm that this kind of offending causes our children. Currently, when someone is charged with the possession of child pornography or childlike sex dolls, it is considered an indictable offence but not considered a serious indictable offence. That means these offences do not attract lower sentencing discounts for guilty pleas in the same way that most other child sex offences do.

For the purposes of sentencing discounts, this bill amends the Sentencing Act to class possession of child exploitation material or dealing with childlike sex dolls as a serious indictable offence, emphasising that these offences are equally as serious as other child sex offences such as production of child exploitation material and grooming children online. This means that these offences will rightly attract lower sentencing discounts for guilty pleas compared with other indictable offences.

This bill also removes a loophole with respect to bail. We are legislating a special principle that bail authorities must take into account when considering whether to grant bail to a person charged with child exploitation material or childlike sex doll offences. Under the current law, bail authorities consider the gravity of the charged offence when determining whether someone should be given bail.

The bill provides that, when determining the gravity of an alleged offence involving child pornography or childlike sex dolls, bail authorities must take into account the harm that these offences cause to children by continuing to contribute to the demand of the abuse of children. Possessing this kind of exploitative material is not a victimless crime simply because the offender does not have direct contact with the child.

Every single time an image is downloaded or viewed that child is revictimised. The downloading or viewing of this sort of material then fuels demand for more to be created, incentivising

others to continue to abuse children. This new principle will ensure that bail authorities consider the particular impact of such possession offences on the indirect victimisation of the child.

Lastly, the bill alters the language used in part 3, division 12, of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, which contains offences in relation to commercial sexual services. These include forcing a person to provide commercial sexual services or knowingly using a child in commercial sexual services. The phrasing of 'provide commercial sexual services' will be amended, rightly, to 'perform commercial sexual acts'. This language better reflects the exploitative nature of the offending.

I would like to acknowledge the Hon. Connie Bonaros from the other place, who has raised issues of language in current statutes that deal with sexual offences, including the highly inappropriate use of the word 'services' in the context of these offences. A child or adult who is being sexually exploited for profit is not providing anyone with a service. This bill changes the language to reflect the exploitative nature of the offending and to be more sensitive to the experience of victims.

The amendments in this bill address the gravity of any offence directed at exploiting or harming children. The impact of these heinous offences can be catastrophic for the child, and the impacts can last a lifetime. I have never been so sure about the position of my community as I am on this matter. I know that I am speaking on behalf of every single person that I represent when I say that child sex offenders do not deserve any amount of leniency. I commend this bill and I look forward to seeing it enacted as soon as possible to keep our kids safe.

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (17:20): I rise to speak to this bill. It is a topic of great interest for me, both professional interest and also in my past life as a reporter, and a court reporter in particular, when on many occasions I sat down with victims of child sex offences. Those occasions weigh heavily on me. I remember each of those conversations and I remember the pain inflicted on those victims. I remember how terrifying it was for them to have to recount their stories in court. I remember how terrifying it was for those who were brave enough to talk to a reporter and to talk to the public, really, about what had happened to them and just what a difficult task that was that the courts and the wider public asked of them, to recount those harrowing experiences.

Some of the things that appear before our courts, some of the things that happen to young people, are just unspeakable. I do not think that there is a level of appreciation in the wider community of just how prevalent this kind of offending is. Most people, of course, who are not court reporters or lawyers or courts administration staff who are looking at and checking the court list each day, would not be aware of how many hundreds of cases of sexual abuse of children are before our courts each and every day and, of course, how many hundreds and thousands and tens of thousands and even hundreds of thousands of instances of abuse have happened in South Australia in the past but also, unfortunately, continue to happen to our most vulnerable citizens, our little children.

This bill is an incredibly important one. I think there is quite a deal of work to be done, although there has been much done by governments of all persuasions to work on and improve the law in relation to this kind of heinous offending. There is still much work to be done. I think the people we should be listening to are victims. Those in this house would know that I was previously also a board member of the Victim Support Service prior to coming into parliament and also served on the board of JusticeNet SA. I have a longstanding passion for the justice system and in particular for the experiences of victims of crime and making sure not only that those victims are treated well through our court system but also that those victims, where they choose to, can find voice through other systems such as our parliamentary system and our governmental system.

I would encourage governments of all persuasions, now and well into the future, to turn their minds acutely to the voices of victims: very, very brave people who go through shocking offences against them, survive that offending and then make the choice to speak out in whatever forum suits them.

I think that is an incredibly inspiring thing for people to do, and certainly it has inspired me over the years, both in my work as a journalist and in my work in this house. In fact, it is those voices that motivated me to put up my hand to run for parliament in the first place to be able to ensure that they are heard, that our laws are improved and that we do all we can to ensure that their experiences are not repeated.

This act has a number of different functions. I might just turn to the one that I am most passionate about first, and that is the issue of bail. Closing the loophole in relation to bail certainly was an aspect of Labor's election commitment. There are no features in the Bail Act that make it easier for people charged with possession of child exploitation material or childlike sex doll offences to be granted bail, as compared with other nonprescribed applicants. One may say, 'Well, why would you be amending this then, if there is nothing that specifically is prohibiting police or other charging authorities from taking a hard line in relation to granting bail for these sorts of offences?'

That would be a perfectly respectable position to hold, looking at how the laws are crafted right now. In theory, the laws are perfectly constructed right now in relation to bail and there is nothing that should, for example, give someone an easier time or a greater opportunity to be released on bail for serious offending. However, the practical experience, particularly of those victims I spoke about only a moment ago, is that on occasion there is a lighter response, there is a different view taken of offending to do with child sexual exploitation material, than there might be for what we might call direct physical abuse of children.

That should not be the case, and I know that there is a great deal of education that goes on, both with our judicial officers and with our police, to make it clear to them that the expectation of our parliament and our public more generally is that those crimes that are to do with child exploitation material are just as heinous as direct physical abuse of a child. Put simply, there is still a victim. There is still a victim even when it is a case of child exploitation material.

In fact, as one of my colleagues—I think it was the member for Davenport—just a moment ago pointed out, a child is revictimised every single time that that child exploitation material is accessed or shared or downloaded or distributed. Every single time, that child is re-abused. And so it is critically important that when our charging authorities—often police, but sometimes the courts—are considering the aspect of bail they are on no uncertain ground about how the public views this, and that is that child exploitation material offences are just as serious as direct physical abuse of children.

At the moment, two factors are taken into account when bail is granted: one is the gravity of the offence and the other is the propensity for an alleged offender, an accused person, to abscond or reoffend while on bail. That is what a charging police officer has to take into account when granting police bail, but it is also what the court looks at if bail is deferred for a Magistrates Court decision. I might just pause at this point to seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

At 17:30 the house adjourned until Wednesday 14 June 2023 at 10:30.

*Answers to Questions***ABORIGINAL EDUCATION STRATEGY**

7 The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (8 September 2022).

1. Will the government continue the work previously underway as part of the Department for Education's Aboriginal education strategy?

2. What initiatives are currently underway as part of the strategy, and will they be supported in an ongoing manner?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised: Implementation of the Aboriginal Education Strategy 2019-29 continues.

The strategy continues to be implemented with three-year rolling implementation plans to allow the department to periodically review and evaluate the program over the 10-year life of the strategy. The 13 key initiatives as part of the strategy's second implementation plan, build on the delivery the strategy's first implementation from 2019 and findings from the strategy's mid-implementation review.

The implementation plan includes:

- Scoping pilot initiatives for child development screenings for Aboriginal children and families.
- Increasing preschool access and participation by Aboriginal children.
- Aboriginal learner achievement leaders resources.
- One Plan—personalised learning support for Aboriginal students
- English as an additional language or dialect learners (EAL/D) hub and capability framework.
- Strengthening Aboriginal languages and literacy.
- Supporting Pitjantjatjara and Yankunytjatjara language and culture in Arrangu schools.
- Aboriginal contexts are being embedded into teaching and learning resources aligned to the Australian curriculum.
- Aboriginal student pathways to enable Aboriginal young people to transition to further study, training and employment.

Key strategy enablers include working alongside Aboriginal families and communities and building a confident, culturally responsive and inclusive workforce through the:

- Aboriginal Workforce Plan
- Aboriginal Voice Framework
- Aboriginal funding reform.

The Aboriginal Education Expert Advisory Panel will continue to guide the strategy to help deliver outcomes for Aboriginal children and young people.

ENTREPRENEURIAL LEARNING STRATEGY

9 The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (8 September 2022).

1. Will the government continue the work underway as part of the Department for Education's entrepreneurial education strategy, along with continuing financial support for the entrepreneurial programs at Mount Gambier High School, Murray Bridge High School, Heathfield High School, Seaton High School and Banksia Park International High School?

2. What initiatives are currently underway as part of the strategy, and will they be supported in an ongoing manner?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised:

Funding has been committed to the Entrepreneurial Learning Strategy in 2022-23. This funding supports the five entrepreneurial specialist schools to complete their program of initiatives and deliver on the outcomes of the strategy which are due to be completed by the end of 2023.

The funding has enabled the five entrepreneurial schools to embed entrepreneurial learning within their own schools and it is expected that these programs will continue to be offered, beyond the term of the Entrepreneurial Learning Strategy funding.

The five entrepreneurial specialist schools have also worked to support other schools with their entrepreneurial learning programs.

They have delivered a comprehensive range of initiatives, which include curriculum materials and resources, professional development and a range of programs.

These initiatives ensure sustainability and support for those that need it beyond the funding term of the Entrepreneurial Learning Strategy.

DIGITAL EDUCATION STRATEGY

10 The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (8 September 2022).

Will the government continue the work underway as part of the Department for Education's digital education strategy?

(a) What initiatives are currently underway as part of the strategy, and will they be supported in an ongoing manner?

(b) What measures are being put in place to distribute free and subsidised laptops to South Australian students and has proposed expenditure or timing on this initiative been adjusted since the election?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised:

The Department for Education's Digital Strategy 2022 to 2025 is currently still underway.

Ensuring equity and access for all learners so that South Australian children and young people are equipped with the digital technologies and capabilities they need to live and thrive in a digital world, remains a key focus area for the government.

Several strategy initiatives are currently underway, including:

- ICT foundations uplift.
- Student home internet program.
- Digital maturity assessment.
- Digital Adoption Group.
- Business improvement support.
- ICT traineeships and pathways.

The department has also been working closely with schools to ensure that a personal digital device has been provided to all students that require one for the purpose of learning at school or at home.

COUNTRY EDUCATION STRATEGY

11 The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (8 September 2022).

1. Will the government continue the work underway as part of the Department for Education's country education strategy?

2. What initiatives are currently underway as part of the strategy, and will they be supported in an ongoing manner?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised:

The government continues to prioritise the Country Education Strategy.

Since the announcement of the strategy in September 2021, good progress has been made implementing the key initiatives. They include:

- Relief teaching improvements.
- ICT infrastructure uplift.
- Supported pre-service teacher practicums.
- Pre-service teacher employment program.
- Business improvement.
- Access to psychology and speech pathology.
- Country voice.

- Country education website.
- Broadening curriculum options.

MOBILE PHONE BAN

In reply to **the Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (7 March 2023).

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised:

The government's mobile phones advertising campaign does include billboards and other outdoor advertising methods, such as bus shelters.

I have been advised that \$102,657.22 has been budgeted for the outdoor advertising component of this campaign.

The campaign is scheduled to run between March and August 2023.

MARINE DISCOVERY CENTRE

In reply to **Mr COWDREY (Colton)** (7 March 2023).

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised:

In 2018 a three-year grant request from The Star of The Sea Catholic Parish Primary School Henley Beach was approved for the Marine Discovery Centre. That grant expired on 30 June 2021.

I am pleased to advise that, following a request for funding on 31 March 2023, I recently approved a \$100,000 (ex GST) grant for the Marine Discovery Centre in 2023-24.