

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 4 February 2025

The **SPEAKER** (Hon. L.W.K. Bignell) 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

PREVENTIVE HEALTH SA BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

TRANSPLANTATION AND ANATOMY (DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION AND DELEGATION) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

The SPEAKER: Welcome back everyone. It is like we never left. Everyone is looking a little more tanned, and a few people have changed positions I have noted in the off-season, but I hope people had a break because it is important that we do get to have some sort of rest and come back revitalised for a new year.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (STALKING AND HARASSMENT) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 28 November 2024.)

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic, Family and Sexual Violence) (11:02): Thank you very much, Mr Speaker, and happy new year to you, and to everybody here. I recall that at the conclusion of our last discussion about this bill that I was in the midst of closing remarks. I certainly do not propose to continue for too long with those closing remarks. Rather, I will, again, say thank you to all of those who have contributed very thoughtfully to this debate in a really heartfelt way, with some of those contributions providing horrific examples about the conduct to which this bill pertains, so thank you very much to the member for Gibson and the member for Florey. Again, I particularly acknowledge the awful example that the member for Gibson provided, and I also say thank you to the member for Heysen for his contribution.

As all of these speeches on the bill have canvassed, this is a really important bill for a number of reasons. Firstly, it again sends a message to our community that our state does not stand for any form of stalking or harassment, that we are determined to prevent any forms of disrespect and violence toward women and all people. Again, this bill sends a very important message about our state's commitment to that.

Secondly, it contemporises what we understand stalking and harassment to be. It is incredibly important in all areas of our work in preventing, responding to, intervening in and providing recovery and healing around experiences of violence that we always contemplate the current context in which we find ourselves and this bill is about doing just that. It ensures that, sadly as they need to, our laws will now consider those new insidious ways that perpetrators find to harass and stalk those whom they seek to harm.

For those two reasons, again, sending that message to our community about what our state stands for and ensuring that we have the most contemporary laws in place in which we can expand that definition of what constitutes this behaviour is incredibly important. That is exactly what this bill does. With those few short remarks, I commend this bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

The CHAIR: Member for Heysen, which clause would you like to start off with?

Mr TEAGUE: There are discrete questions and I think they can be contained to clause 4.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4.

Mr TEAGUE: I think I might have given an indication in the course of my second reading contribution of some discrete issues that have been raised by the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement and by the Law Society, the first of which is raised by both of them. I deal firstly with the issue that has been raised by both: that is the introduction of an objective test, the reasonable person test that we see, the subject of the amendment at subclause (8).

The ALRM captures it I think most concisely, indicating criminal provisions about action and intent. I might just indicate the words of chief executive Chris Larkin in his letter, at least to me—and I expect in similar terms to the government—dated 1 October where he states:

Criminal law is based on act and intent. In our view, the term 'ought reasonably to have known' has no place in the context of a serious offence leading to incarceration. This is particularly so where there is likely to be an overrepresentation of Aboriginal defendants who are of a different language and culture to those of the police charging and courts convicting on a subjective 'reasonable person' test.

The proposal of the ALRM is to replace with 'recklessly indifferent' instead. Perhaps in the circumstances of those representations having been made, I just put the question to the government in terms of its consideration of that particular matter and why it has favoured the application of the reasonable person test.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: I thank the member for the question. I certainly welcome the views of the ALRM and Mr Larkin and assure them that we have thoroughly considered those views. We have landed with the clause that we have for a couple of reasons. Firstly, because obviously, as is always important to do, we have considered this particular matter in the context of what other jurisdictions do, and certainly this provision is consistent with a number of other jurisdictions, but also we are of the view that the provisions around 'ought reasonably to have known' would indeed take account of a particular context and a particular set of circumstances.

Mr TEAGUE: I take that then just one step further in that it deals with the second part of the ALRM's proposal seeking to ensure—the ALRM styles it by way of legislative guidance—measures to ensure that courts take into account the realities, and I am quoting here from the second part of the proposal:

...the realities for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples in considering any reasonableness tests, any imputed intentions and any notions of recklessness.

I invite the minister to add anything about what further steps the government might take in that regard, if any.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: I think we are in alignment here in terms of the intention of the government with that provision, as I articulated in my earlier answer, to take account of those contexts and circumstances. As the member is well aware, of course, in any particular hearing, etc., on a matter pertaining to an alleged breach of this act, through submissions, etc., a person's particular context and circumstances will be taken account of.

Mr TEAGUE: I now, then, turn to the issue that has been more particularly addressed by the Law Society, and this time it is by way of a letter to the Attorney dated 12 June 2024. As I said at

the outset, the Law Society also addresses the reasonable person test and adopts a view in line with the ALRM in that regard. The Law Society also addresses concern about the threshold in terms of seriousness. I won't stay to address that further, but the government has certainly made clear that it has charted a course in that regard.

The point I would raise is that in the final couple of paragraphs of the President's letter to the Attorney, which really encapsulate paragraph 17, the Criminal Law Committee has suggested that conduct that is otherwise caught by this now broadened provision be subject to an express defence around a reason for doing so, the way the Law Society has described that as a reasonable excuse. And one might say that common sense ought to prevail, and we know that there are all sorts of circumstances in which means, electronic and otherwise, are used to monitor family members, and so on.

I just highlight in particular the Law Society's concern that we are talking about criminal provisions that have tests that are the subject of the legislation and, without express reference to a defence of this kind, it may be that there are these unintended consequences that on the face would constitute the offence without catching the intended conduct. So I just give the government an opportunity to address that for the purpose of the record and the committee.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: Thank you to the member for his question. I think it goes to an issue that I could speak for days about; I will not. But I think what the member highlights is that in relation to this particular piece of legislation, but also any legislation, with any policy discussion that we are currently having as a state, and indeed globally, we are constantly in this new environment where we are balancing the very positive things that new technologies can do, that they can provide, the ways that we can access information, the ways that we can stay connected to people. We are constantly balancing and deepening our understanding—and I am saying this in a much broader context than this bill—about those important opportunities technology can provide with the fact that it also creates risk in terms of how it can be used to harm people.

So I think the area that the member has touched upon is very important, and it is one that I have no doubt whatsoever in the course of community debate about all sorts of issues we will continue to contemplate. On that note, I congratulate the new assistant minister in our government, Mr Michael Brown, who will focus, I am sure, in his duties around artificial intelligence and digital economy about how we continue in every area of life to get that balance right. I congratulate him again on his elevation and I look forward to working alongside him around these opportunities but also some of the worries that this access to information and technology create.

I welcome the Law Society's submission; I thank them for it. What I would say more specifically in relation to clause 4(8) is that, with the example that the member gave, amongst a family with everybody consenting, should they be connected with each other through their technology and know where each other is and there is absolute consent about that, as long as there is that consent, as long as everybody is happy to be part of that technological environment, it would be less likely that that would cause physical or mental harm or serious apprehension or fear.

What this particular clause assists us with is those circumstances where the technology is not used for that purpose that the member spoke about that I have just spoken about further, but rather where it is used in a way that will cause that physical or mental harm or serious apprehension or fear. So, in terms of the unintended consequences question, in that context in a family where there is that consent, where everybody is part of that particular technology, where everyone is communicating in that way, I cannot see that that would cause serious apprehension or fear or physical or mental harm, unless there was something else going on, and of course we want to capture that particular behaviour that does cause that physical or mental harm or apprehension or fear.

Clause passed.

Schedule and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic, Family and Sexual Violence) (11:23): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Thank you to the officials who have been here and all who provided input and advice on this bill.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:23): In addressing the third reading briefly, I just look to summarise those matters of focus the subject of the committee and, I suppose, where the bill leaves us in terms of the clause 4(8) application of the reasonableness test. There has been now kind of a fairly heavy reliance on what the interpretation of that reasonable person test is going to constitute.

On the one hand, the ALRM and the Law Society have provided an alternative, having raised the concern about the centrality of act and intent, as Chris Larkin has put it. At the other end, the Law Society has highlighted that in these circumstances, in which much of our ordinary day-to-day life is increasingly reliant upon particularly electronic means of using technology to assist us in all sorts of reasonable day-to-day ways, the inclusion of an express defence would assist to alleviate concerns about the offence being constituted by actions that ought not properly be the subject of this new legislation.

I just flag that aspect in particular. This is new territory, as the minister has indicated. There is a necessary appreciation of the new and ever-continuing evolving nature of the use of technology. We use it in many ways for beneficial purposes. There is a considerable amount of room for the use of technology in particular to have one character perhaps at one time or over a period of time and then change to another. Similarly, there is the possibility for those involved to take a different view about the benefits, purposes and otherwise of the use of technology from time to time.

So it is clearly an area of concern. It is important that this be monitored for unintended consequences. I certainly indicate again my appreciation of the careful and thoughtful engagement by both the ALRM and the Law Society on those and the rest of the contents of the bill.

Bill read a third time and passed.

DOG AND CAT MANAGEMENT (BREEDER REFORMS) AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 25 September 2024.)

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (11:29): Firstly, I would like to acknowledge that I am the lead speaker for the opposition on this bill. I would also like to thank the Deputy Premier, her staff and the staff of her department for organising briefings in relation to this bill and other bills at very short notice. I was appointed to this role a fortnight ago, so I have had a short amount of time to get across these bills in detail. I thank them for doing everything they could to make that work. I look forward to working with the Deputy Premier, her staff and the department going forward in this role.

I will speak very briefly on this. I was just looking at the media today and noticed that there has, sadly, been a dog attack on a nine month old. My thoughts are very much with that family in relation to that attack. It is certainly very distressing when we hear of these things and it just reminds us of the risk that particularly dogs can pose with families and with others in the way they sometimes react and sometimes attack when it is not necessarily expected. Our thoughts are with that particular family. The opposition very much supports this legislation and we are happy to see its very quick passage. With those few words, I thank you for the opportunity to speak.

The SPEAKER: Congratulations to the member for Finniss on his elevation into the shadow cabinet.

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (11:31): I rise today in support of the Dog and Cat Management (Breeder Reforms) Amendment Bill 2024, legislation that fulfils our government's election

commitment to eradicate puppy factories and prevent such cruel operations from establishing themselves in South Australia.

I will start by telling you the story of Bowdee. Bowdee is my blue heeler cross that has brought so much joy to my family. I rescued Bowdee from the Moorook Animal Shelter out north after seeing her and her sister on the Facebook page. I had every intention of actually bringing them both home because they were both very cute; however, by the time I went to pick up Bowdee her sister had already gone.

Bowdee had clearly been through some trauma and was timid and shy. She came home with me and after a few days of working out that she was now safe she sprang to life. She has since brought our family so much joy. She is funny, sometimes very naughty, and highly unpredictable, but she is very smart.

One day I was scrolling through Facebook and I saw a lost dog post. I could see a strong resemblance to Bowdee and I asked if the missing dog had a tail. This sounds a bit strange, but Bowdee is a stumpy tail blue heeler, so she does not have the benefit of telling other dogs how she is feeling and neither did this dog.

The owner, who was very worried about her dog, Poppy, was very defensive about her dog's tail and revealed that Poppy also had no tail and after chatting we worked out that it was, in fact, Bowdee's sister that was missing. Fortunately, Poppy was found and we arranged a meet-up for the two dogs to let them do their thing and we talked about how we were really pleased that we were able to rescue these dogs. That was eight months on, so they sort of knew each other and had a good time. Poppy moved to Darwin, sadly, but I hope she is still bringing her owners joy up there.

As you can probably tell, I love my dog and I cannot understand how anyone could think to harm a dog whose sole existence is to please his owner or her owner. It is terrible that people seek to exploit dogs to make money, mating them to a point of sheer physical exhaustion and then dumping them when they can no longer produce their cute little puppies.

I am here in support of this bill because the inhumane practice of puppy farming needs to be stamped out. We need to have better laws to protect our animals and to stop the exploitation and profiteering at all costs that we see from dodgy puppy farms.

This bill represents a significant step forward in ensuring that the standards governing the commercial breeding of companion animals in our state are at least as strict as any other jurisdiction in the nation. By doing so, we remove an incentive for unscrupulous operators to move here and establish their inhumane operations.

At the heart of this bill is a new breeder licensing scheme. This scheme will require the breeders to adhere to strict standards for breeding, impose limits on the number of female animals per breeding program and restrict the number of litters that may be bred by each licence holder. Additionally, we are introducing mandatory reporting of each litter. These measures effectively outlaw large-scale, inhumane puppy farms that increase the risk of animal cruelty. In doing so, we are bringing South Australia into line with Victoria, currently the strictest jurisdiction for breeding programs in the nation.

Under this new scheme, applicants will have to apply for licences and will be denied if they are convicted of relevant offences. We are introducing fines of up to \$10,000 for breeding animals without a licence or contravening licence conditions. Furthermore, we will have the ability to suspend and cancel breeder licences.

This bill also addresses another critical issue that has, sadly, been in the public eye, which is dog attacks. This bill significantly increases fines and penalties for offences associated with dogs wandering at large, dog attacks and other safety offences. If a dog attacks a person or another animal causing serious injury or death, the owner will now face a maximum fine of \$25,000, a tenfold increase on the current \$2,500 penalty. If the attacking dog was already subject to a dangerous dog order, the fine would increase to \$50,000, up from \$10,000.

We are also introducing the new 'wandering dog' order to manage dogs that continually escape. Dogs escape for all sorts of reasons. Sometimes they just want to take themselves for a

walk, but quite often it is because they are stressed at night-time when people decide to set off fireworks or there are fireworks celebrating special events. No matter how many times we encourage people to bring their dogs inside, they may not be home or they may not heed the warnings and off go the dogs and up come all the Facebook posts of the lost dogs—and quite often it is the same lost dogs.

We all need to take personal responsibility for these beautiful animals that we are allowed to look after. The wandering dog part of this bill will allow the recognition of certain interstate orders and make sure that the owners take reasonable steps to prevent their dogs from escaping and to attend training where appropriate.

Moreover, this bill allows for the recognition of certain interstate orders. The minister will now have the power to recognise interstate dangerous dog orders and prohibition orders. This amendment aims to proactively manage risks identified in other jurisdictions without having to wait for an attack or an incident to occur.

In addition to these key reforms, the bill includes several other important amendments. We are ensuring that the operation of the online registration system, Dogs and Cats Online, is accurately reflected within this legislation. Dogs and Cats Online makes sure that if your dog goes missing they are chipped, they are registered and they can be found very quickly.

I was really fortunate when I was looking after my mother-in-law's dog at one stage. He was a little stressed, she was in hospital—actually, I was not looking after him, my sister was—and he disappeared. I had a call from the council telling me that they had my mother-in-law's dog. Fortunately, he was registered, not only with council but also with Dogs and Cats Online, so we were able to get to him very quickly and they very graciously gave him back without any further issues.

The bill does include explicit provisions for sharing information, particularly where there is a risk of harm to animals, making sure that we are able to get the information we need when dogs or cats are needing to be controlled. Plans of management relating to dogs and cats will be changed to allow councils to incorporate their dog and cat management planning with other operational planning, simplifying processes and improving clarity for the community.

We are removing the requirement for retired racing greyhounds to wear a muzzle, consistent with the approach in other states. This will reduce barriers to greyhound adoption. I know several families within my community who cherish their greyhounds—fur babies who are the most beautiful dogs and will benefit from not having to wear a muzzle. I make a special shout-out to the beautiful Shirley who always pops by my office for a cuddle with her mum, Helen. She is the most beautiful dog and I cannot imagine her ever needing a muzzle, and it is really good to know that this has now been removed.

We are also changing several definitions to clarify ambiguities, adding new definitions as required and addressing other minor issues to ensure the effective operation of the act. This bill represents a significant step forward in animal welfare and public safety in South Australia. It demonstrates our commitment to protecting not only our beautiful pets but also our communities. By introducing strict breeding regulations, we are ensuring that companion animals are bred in humane conditions. By increasing penalties for dog attacks and introducing new measures, we are managing dangerous dogs and prioritising public safety.

The legislation does strike a balance between supporting responsible pet ownership and breeding, while cracking down on those who would exploit animals or endanger public safety. I commend the bill to the house.

Ms THOMPSON (Davenport) (11:39): I also rise to support this bill, the Dog and Cat Management (Breeder Reforms) Amendment Bill 2024, legislation that this government introduces to lift commercial breeding standards and outlaw large-scale puppy farms. Anyone who knows me even a little bit would know that I am an absolutely dog-crazy pet lover and so I was extremely proud at the 2022 election to be part of a Labor government that made a commitment to ban puppy factories and to prevent operations from setting up their businesses here in South Australia.

The premise for this commitment was simple: as humans, we value companionship, and for approximately 40 per cent of South Australians that companionship, at least in part, is provided by a

pet dog. But when demand outstrips supply, it presents an opportunity for new operators to enter the market in search of a quick buck. Unfortunately, the motivation of some breeders is purely financial—not for the wellbeing of the dogs, not for the families who stand to benefit from the joy a pet dog born into a loving environment would bring.

We have heard the horror stories: dirty and overcrowded factories, some in plain sight, some underground, established only to breed as many puppies as possible for the lowest cost and highest return. Those poor mother dogs are just required to produce litter after litter after litter. This is greed, pure and simple, and we are doing something about it.

Already, we have had an opportunity to debate amendments to the Animal Welfare Act, and in my contribution I referenced how animal-specific pieces of legislation need to interact with one another to ensure we are achieving the best possible outcomes. The changes that we propose to South Australia's Dog and Cat Management Act are just one example of this government's multifaceted approach to real and lasting animal welfare reform.

We want to do and see better and, because there is no silver bullet, we are doing the hard work, combing through all of the relevant legislation and looking for every possible improvement. We are consulting with the communities that we represent and taking their feedback onboard and progressing the necessary change because that is what a good government does.

The Dog and Cat Management (Breeder Reforms) Amendment Bill brings South Australia's laws in line with those of Victoria, being the strictest in the nation where breeding programs are concerned. What we propose is a new breeder licensing scheme, a cap on the number of female animals in each breeding program, and mandatory reporting on each litter. Any applicants convicted of any animal welfare offence can expect to have their request for a licence denied. Fines of up to \$10,000 will apply for breeders without a licence or those found to be in breach of licence conditions.

There are a handful of breeders in my electorate who do the right thing and I have spoken with them about this bill and they are welcoming it because they know that they are working really hard to do the right thing and it is extremely disappointing for them to see other groups out there who continue to do the wrong thing. These steps that we are applying are not unreasonable for a government to take, and that is supported by commentary that we received during public consultation, which included 334 YourSAy responses, 123 written submissions and 24 contributions from the local government sector.

Despite its title, it is important to note that this bill captures more than just breeder reforms; it addresses an alarming increase in reported dog attacks and the number of dogs that we see wandering at large. Recently, a gentleman by the name of Craig visited my office to tell me about his beautiful dog, Paddy. About 12 months ago, Paddy was attacked by two dogs while out walking on his lead. The dogs that attacked were on leashes as well but their owner was still unable to appropriately restrain them, leaving Craig to defend Paddy by himself.

Fortunately, Paddy survived and has recovered well, but only after an extremely traumatic ordeal for both Paddy and Craig and a huge vet bill that followed. What is most disappointing is that the owner of the attacking dogs chose not to identify himself, leaving Craig both out of pocket and looking for answers. Sadly, the council was not in a position to release the details either.

It is true that owners have a responsibility to their dogs, but they also have a responsibility to the broader community, and that is why we are increasing penalties associated with dog attacks and other safety offences. Currently a \$2,500 fine, this bill proposes increasing penalties for dog attacks on another animal or person resulting in serious injury or death to a maximum of \$25,000. In the event the attacking dog is the subject of a dangerous dog order, the maximum penalty will be a fine of up to \$50,000, representing a \$10,000 increase on the penalty as it stands today. These are steep increases, I know, but strong deterrents are required if we want to ensure the public safety of people and animals.

Let this be a reminder to all dog owners, even the good ones, that now is the time to take stock of how you are managing your dogs. Check their leashes, make sure you can appropriately restrain them if you need to and consider accessories that might help prevent attacks without causing

your dog any discomfort, because that should be avoided too. Do what you can to keep yourself, your dog and the rest of our community safe.

One last point that this bill addresses, and one that I know will be of interest to passionate greyhound lovers Ross Schurgott and Steve Maguire from my local Happy Valley Football Club, is the rule for retired greyhounds to wear a muzzle out in public. We know retired greyhounds undergo a significant assessment process before they are placed for adoption and ready to move into their forever homes, and that the use of a muzzle, as the RSPCA suggests, should be considered against the behaviour of each individual dog. So we are removing that requirement and, of course, while we ask that owners exercise their best judgement, I cannot wait to see their smiling faces up a little bit closer because greyhounds really are some of the most gorgeous creatures going around.

A shout-out to Will in my team of Davenport who last weekend at the Happy Valley footy club adopted a retired greyhound, Remy, who will be joining their family this Friday. I hope Remy becomes a regular in my office also. Another addition to the Davenport family is a pup that I rescued from the RSPCA just a couple of weeks ago. His name is Ollie. He is a Lab x staffy. He is still a puppy, so he is still very bitey and learning lots of lessons, but it has been a really fantastic experience working with the RSPCA to choose a dog that needed a forever home.

I would encourage anybody who is thinking about finding a new furry family member to think about adopting one that needs help, rather than looking for a breeder. The RSPCA on Majors Road in my electorate of Davenport does an incredible job and there are some beautiful souls up there looking for homes right now, so if you have a chance I would encourage you to visit. You can also hop on to the RSPCA website and trawl through the profiles of not just dogs but beautiful cats, rabbits, guinea pigs and all creatures great and small, so I would certainly encourage you to do that.

I am so pleased to form part of a government that is prioritising the emotional and physical health of not just dogs but animals more broadly, and I trust my community will be as pleased as I am to see this change enacted. With that, I commend the bill to the house.

Ms PRATT (Frome) (11:47): I happily rise to add my contribution to the conversation today on the Dog and Cat Management (Breeder Reforms) Amendment Bill. The house is reflecting on our own personal connections to dogs and cats. My family has never not known a border collie to be part of the extended family; in fact, you would be surprised to discover a farming family without a dog and it forms part of the kitchen table conversation, really, to reflect on all the dogs that we remember.

I have fond memories of my grandpa, Reg Michael of Barunga Gap, who became known quite widely in the region as a good breeder of his own litters of working dogs. He was one of those types of farmers who understand the right puppy for the right farmer and the capacity to train and breed a working dog. They are essential services in our farming communities. The family reflections are fond. As grandchildren, we kicked around in the caravan as my grandpa travelled the state and in my own backyard, whether it was Hamley Bridge or Stockport or all the way out to the Riverland to the Barmera dog trials—they still continue and may they do so forevermore.

The dog-trial family is quite connected, and Anthony Ireland is someone who comes to mind as a younger farmer who approached my grandpa for one of his pups. You see those connections through farmers continue but also the blood line of those purebred dogs. If you have not worked out yet, Mr Speaker, I am a big border collie fan to the point where I have my own border collie: a black-and-white, long-haired Reggie. She is a she Reggie—a Regina—but named after my grandpa Reg, and she is much loved. We both have a bit of condition on us after a summer full of cheese and Christmas pudding, but where would we be without our pets?

In reflecting on our connection to dogs, yes, they are wonderful fur babies, fur friends, and they are part of our households at the domestic level but, at the farming level, they are a critical resource. It is no surprise that we often hear that farmers who appreciate the value of a good dog will pursue them to no end. A good dog is the equivalent, perhaps, of two sloppy farmhands or fellas who do not quite know how to work as hard as a farm dog.

My grandpa's farming property in Snowtown/Barunga Gap was very hilly and part of the Hummock Range, and we wish we had vision now of him being able to whistle the dog off the back of the ute, send it over the hills out of sight, and we would sit on the back of the ute chucking stones

to find that a couple of whistles later that dog had done the work of four farmers on quad bikes. Those sheep came back with one dog in tail.

Before I move on to the legislation, I want to put on the record how important dogs are to farming communities. They are certainly worth the crumble that they are fed. A record was set last year in 2024, up in Rockhampton as I understand it, where Liz the border collie was purchased for \$40,000. Previously, I think the record set was in 2018 for a kelpie purchased at \$22,000. Why are these significant? Because a farmer would argue that, while a dog might cost them up to \$8,000 a year in feed and vet bills and care, that is not at all equivalent to what a worker might cost. So farmers will argue a good dog is the replacement of two farmhands.

The reflections in the chamber today certainly reflect on the reform that has come through this amendment bill. On behalf of the opposition, and on behalf of my community, I certainly welcome reform that ends or imposes fines on the repulsive practice of puppy farming. They have no place. But today I am prompted to represent my community in perhaps a different way and that is, in particular, representations and advocacy that I can bring to the chamber on behalf of the Adelaide Plains region. That encompasses Two Wells, Lewiston, Mallala, Dublin, Reeves Plains and other communities where there is a really strong, happy, vibrant, healthy dog community, a mixture of dog owners at the domestic level, dog breeders and those who breed their dogs for showing—so a lot of kennels and different activity.

I want to read from the Adelaide Plains Council Dog and Cat Management Plan 2022-2027. The data is a little bit old—this goes back to the year 2021—but at that point in time there were 7,333 registered dogs within the Adelaide Plains Council. That is a big business community. If we have pets, we know that vets are a big part of that, but there would be kennelling infrastructure and all those sorts of things. The council's document reflected that the number of dog-based businesses remained steady. Those businesses include dog kennels and dog keeping. Having read that document, I think the Adelaide Plains Council have done a really comprehensive job of establishing what their strategy or plan is for managing dogs registered in their community.

In fact, to break it down to the locations within that council and the number of dogs registered, Lewiston is the biggest community. It is a fantastic residential area, or rural living really, with multiple acre blocks. It has a country lifestyle that gives people an opportunity to develop their passion for breeding and showing dogs. In Lewiston, there are 2,500 dogs registered; in Two Wells, there are 1,300; in Mallala, there are 200; and, in Dublin, there are 200 as well.

As I move towards some final remarks, I want to thank the people in my community who, in discovering that the act was under reform or being considered as an amendment bill, have reached out to me to express their concerns about reform that will inhibit their ability to continue their practice of raising their dogs and showing their dogs and that there are some restrictions coming through the bill that have concerned them.

I want to thank Brian Parker, who is the current president of Dogs SA, and a lovely fellow called Peter Damarell, both from the Adelaide Plains Council, who took the time to meet with me and my community to make sure, as we work through this amendment bill, that the government hears from all numbers of people who own and breed dogs that, while reform is welcome on making sure that the animals (the dogs and cats) that we love have legislation that protects their welfare, we are not too heavy-handed on those who pour their time and their money into their hobby of showing dogs.

I do not know if anyone in this chamber has spent time at dog trials. I do not go to dog shows as much but we enjoy attending, and we need to understand that a lot of work goes into raising those dogs and keeping them well. On behalf of some constituents in my region, I want to share some brief concerns and move on to conclude my remarks.

The feedback I got certainly was residents expressing strong opposition to the approval of IGP training by the Adelaide Sportdog Club, citing some concerns about the protection aspects of this training. Some arguments were that the approval influenced by a robust dog sport community neglected significant negative practical implications and disregarded the opposition from established organisations like Dogs SA and the RSPCA. Some critical questions have been raised at the local level. We are trying to work through them. I think there is always a solution to be found, but

constituents raising concerns or highlighting the risk of misuse by trained dogs is certainly an avenue that we are exploring.

I sincerely want to thank those in my community who felt that, by coming forward to have a conversation with me about the amendment bill, it gave them an opportunity to have a voice in this chamber. I thank the Adelaide Plains Council in particular. As I understand it, it is the council representing the largest number of dog breeders or dogs registered in the state. Therefore, it is a significant player in how this incoming amendment bill will affect their ratepayers, the by-laws that govern how those dogs are raised and, if there are some elements to be worked through, then hopefully advocacy or communication continues with the government and with the minister.

I thank the house for the indulgence of being able to reflect on my border collie, Reggie; my amazing grandpa, Reggie Michael; all dog triallers who travel the state; and farmers who rely on their dogs even more than their farmhands because a dog will respond to a whistle and a jackaroo may not. With that, I conclude my remarks.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Frome. It is all about the indulgence when it comes to dogs and cats. Before I call the member for King, I would like to give a shout-out to our dog, Dusty, the Kangaroo Island kelpie. Not only does he have his own beer and is a tireless fundraiser for the people in our community but during COVID he was a great source of companionship to people who were isolated, and via social media they often reached out to him. He is a regular on the school visit circuit. We read books to kids and we go to clubs like the Probus club as well. He also has the distinction of being the only dog ever kicked out of this place, in a very undemocratic way, back in 2020, and do not think he has not been lobbying me since I became Speaker to get him back in here, but it is not the number one priority that we have.

Mrs PEARCE (King) (12:00): I would like to echo that sentiment. I would say that Dusty is one of the most community-minded pups that I have ever met. Very much like the member for Frome, my household is a border collie household. Our Ollie certainly was not \$40,000. He was a rehome from a neighbouring farm back when I was growing up, but to our family he is absolutely irreplaceable. That is why I rise today to speak on these very important reforms, which seek to improve the health and the safety of our closest four-legged friends, not only through the breeding industry in South Australia but also through the prioritisation of community safety when it comes to dog-related incidents in our streets.

At the last election, we made a commitment to ban the operation of puppy farms and prevent them from establishing themselves in South Australia. We are all too well aware of some of the devastating conditions that shonky breeders force their animals to live in, the toll that this takes on the animals and the complexities that are faced when they are taken to their new families. It is absolutely heartbreaking when we see this footage on social media and on the news channels and the like, but I am also really pleased to see that the community is keeping a vigilant eye on this matter and we are seeing a desire to have better protections put in place and to stamp out this behaviour altogether.

Over the holidays, we had concerns raised with us about the conditions and the wellbeing of an animal in our local area. They had snuck out, and through that members of our community were able to recognise the signs and make appropriate inquiries to the relevant authorities to ensure that those animals were safe and well. I am so pleased that today, returning to parliament, we are seeking to put an end to this by now delivering on our promise to the South Australian public, because the evidence is clear.

Where we have these large-scale and inhumane puppy farms, we know that those at the helm are doing nothing more than prioritising the profits they seek to make at the expense of an animal's welfare. This in turn leads to despicable and deplorable conditions that contribute to nothing more than unnecessary and distressing suffering. To combat these operators and to shut down their exploitative business practices, this bill introduces a new breeder licensing scheme that will set the new standards for dog breeding in South Australia and ensure that breeders adhere to the new strict standards.

The scheme includes specific limits that align our state with the standards in Victoria, which stands as the strictest jurisdiction across Australia. It will see no more than 50 female dogs per

breeding program, effectively outlawing large-scale puppy farming operations. While most of our existing breeding kennels operate well below this limit, aligning the cap with that of the strictest jurisdiction will prevent South Australia being an easy alternative for dodgy breeders to set up shop.

Protections for breeding dogs will see female dogs limited to a maximum of five litters in their lifetime, which will limit the damage that excessive breeding can do to their health and also their welfare, and will require that every litter born be reported under the mandatory reporting requirements. Registering as a breeder will also be contingent upon thorough criminal background checks, and if someone decides to risk breeding without a licence they will face fines of up to \$10,000, with the legislation also providing for suspension and cancellation of breeder licences.

I am excited that we are once again delivering on another promise that we made at the last election, but I am even more pleased that this bill will help us put a stop to the inhumane operations that some operators have undertaken in our state. Bringing South Australia in line with the strictest jurisdiction in Australia will go a great way to stopping animal cruelty in pursuit of profit.

This bill will also see improvements made to our legislation and regulations when it comes to dealing with roaming dogs, which we also know puts the safety of our community at risk. In recent times we have seen the devastating impact that dog attacks have had on individuals, highlighting the urgent need to address the issue of dangerous dogs and irresponsible ownership.

Just last year, we had a particular case in my community that was brought to my attention which really highlights how much action needs to be taken and support provided to the community on this matter, and I will relay that to the house. A constituent of mine was at the back of their home weeding, with their two little dogs running around. The owner had left the flat open, when suddenly another dog, a staffy, wandered in. It was not an aggressive dog, but it did not have a tag and it was marking its territory all over the property.

The resident then remembered that they have a really old cat—his name is Puddy and he is 21 years old and a bit deaf. He was inside, but in the time it took the owner to go to his cat to ensure that he was safe that was all it took for the staffy to take attention and lunge for the cat. It was quite a distressing experience for the owner to try to rectify the matter and get the dog back in safe hands, but he had the added complex problem of needing to find the owner whilst also needing to seek attention for his cat and support in that matter.

It is no secret that dog attacks in South Australia are skyrocketing, with 503 people presenting at a public hospital in the past year from attacks, up from 211 in 2012. More than 1,200 dog attacks were reported to South Australian councils last year, but independent research suggests that many more are not reported.

It is for reasons like this that we are introducing this legislation in addition to other measures that are being implemented as part of a joint campaign with Australia Post and the state government. Last year, members may remember having your four-legged friend introduced to a gentleman pup called Buddy, who is the dog bite safety educator. He is on a mission to share practical safety messaging to keep South Australian posties safe and reduce the overall number of dog bites in South Australia.

Australia Post is delivering 314,000 letters free of charge, a service that would otherwise have cost about \$390,000 in stamps and other postage charges, which highlights the significance of this campaign in helping keep these workers safe while they deliver important services to our communities. In addition to the letters, free bumper stickers and collectible dog safety leaflets that feature Buddy and his friends are available to collect from South Australian post offices.

I have been really fortunate to get some of these, which I have available in my office for anybody in my community who might find this information useful. Sometimes just having the reminder on a property that there is a dog and to be cautious of behaviours of dogs can be the difference between an attack and not having one. It is a great opportunity to talk about what we can all do to keep our four-legged pals safe, as well as those servicing our neighbourhood.

There are also three short animated videos of Buddy, demonstrating the warning signs that dogs give before they bite, and explaining reasons why sometimes dogs bite, which have been uploaded to the government's dog bite safety website, Good Dogs Have Bad Days. This is something

that I think is quite useful when we are teaching our children and more vulnerable members of our community about dogs. It is a really valuable tool that we have available now, thanks to this initiative.

To combat the concerning rise in dog attacks we have seen, this bill seeks to increase the penalties for these offences to reflect the severity of these incidents. This will see significant increases to fines and penalties for offences associated with dogs wandering at large, dog attacks and other safety offences. For example, if a dog attacks a person or another animal, causing serious death or injury, the owner will face a maximum fine of \$25,000, which marks a tenfold increase from the current \$2,500 penalty. In a situation where the attacking dog was already subject to a dangerous dog order, a fivefold increase will take place marking the maximum fine of \$50,000, up from \$10,000.

The bill also introduces subclauses regarding a new wandering dog order, requiring an owner to take responsibility and reasonable steps to prevent their dogs from getting out and roaming the streets, if their dogs consistently manage to escape. Another important aspect of this bill is the incorporation of interstate orders, which allows the minister, upon application, to recognise other states' dangerous dog orders or prohibition orders.

This bill is filled with solid reforms that support responsible dog ownership here in South Australia and takes a strong stance against breeders who seek to exploit the health and wellbeing of animals in the pursuit of profit. This bill introduces strong measures that will go a long way to protecting our community and promoting animal welfare in South Australia and for that reason I commend this bill to the house and I am very proud of this government for doing the work to combat these problems.

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (12:10): I rise to indicate my support for the Dog and Cat Management (Breeder Reforms) Amendment Bill 2024, a bill that bans large-scale puppy farms which increase the risk of animal cruelty, introduces a new breeder licensing scheme and increases the fines and penalties for offences associated with dogs wandering at large, dog attacks and other safety offences. This bill is the fulfilment of another Malinauskas Labor election commitment. Our election commitment was to ban puppy factories and to prevent any such operation from setting up in South Australia. No animal should be housed in inhumane conditions, forced to constantly breed, with their puppies then to be sold in a pet shop to an unsuspecting family.

The commitment was to ensure that standards governing commercial breeding of companion animals in South Australia are at least as strict as any jurisdiction in the nation, so that there is no incentive for unscrupulous operators to move here to establish their core operation. This bill addresses this issue, implements strict standards and brings South Australia into line with Victoria, currently the strictest jurisdiction for breeding programs in the nation.

The new breeder licensing scheme will require breeders to adhere to strict standards for breeding, and adhere to limits on the number of female animals per breeding program and the number of litters that may be bred by the licensed holder. Breeders will have to apply for licences and will not receive licences if they, or a current spouse or domestic partner of the applicant, have been found guilty of a prescribed offence within the five years immediately preceding that application. Fines of up to \$10,000 will apply for breeding animals without a licence, or contravening a condition of licence, as well as the ability to suspend and cancel breeder licences.

The board must keep and maintain a register for the purposes of this bill and the bill introduces offences relating to the sale of certain dogs and cats. Mandatory reporting of each litter will also be introduced, along with reporting if a fertile female dog or cat, owned by the licence holder, or under the control of which the licence holder is responsible, dies, is desexed, or otherwise ceases to be part of the licence holder's breeding program.

I will now move on to another aspect of this bill, relating to increases in the fines and penalties for offences associated with dogs wandering at large, dog attacks and other safety offences. We have sadly seen a number of dog attacks in recent times and unfortunately another headline this morning of a baby who is now in hospital after being attacked by a dog in the family home. That is a terrible situation for that family.

As we know from the current Good Dogs Have Bad Days campaign, any dog can bite, and last year over 500 South Australians were admitted to hospital for dog bite-related treatment and

recovery. It is an offence for a dog to attack, harass or chase people or pets. Dogs, as we know, are not usually deliberately aggressive. This is often a response to fear, perceived threats or behaviours caused by their environment or the people around them. This bill states that if a dog attacks a person or another animal, causing serious injury or death, the owner will face a maximum fine of \$25,000 instead of the \$2,500 penalty that currently applies. Additionally, the fine will be up to \$50,000 if the attacking dog was already the subject of a dangerous dog order—an increase from \$10,000.

If a council animal management officer has assessed a dog to be potentially dangerous, it must wear a collar to identify it. This collar warns others to give this dog space. These collars have yellow and red diagonal stripes. Any dog of any breed or any size could be a dangerous dog. The changes to the bill further allow for the recognition of certain interstate orders, allowing the minister, on application, to recognise interstate dangerous dog orders or prohibition orders. This amendment aims to manage the risk identified in another jurisdiction without having to wait for an attack or incident to occur in South Australia.

This bill also introduces subclauses regarding a new 'wandering dog' order to manage dogs which continually escape. The new order will stipulate reasonable steps to be taken by the owner to prevent the dog escaping and to attend training where appropriate. Dogs should not be wandering beyond their homes, as they can become frightened, lost, attack people or wildlife or, unfortunately, be struck by a vehicle.

Finally, this bill removes the requirement for greyhounds having retired from racing to wear a muzzle. This will bring South Australia into line with other states, free these beautiful animals to fully enjoy their environment and reduce barriers to greyhound adoption. On that note, I will give a shout-out to Gibson's favourite adopted greyhound, Grandpa Joe, who is currently staying cool in our electorate office today. Once again, I cannot give a speech in this house without giving a shout-out to Freya. Happy 10th birthday for last week. She is the most magnificent addition to our family. Despite the fact that she went blind last year, she is an absolute delight every single day. I commend dogs to the house.

Ms CLANCY (Elder) (12:16): I rise today in support the Dog and Cat Management (Breeder Reforms) Amendment Bill 2024, which seeks to amend the Dog and Cat Management Act 1995 and the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935. I know this is a controversial and divisive statement to make—and we tend to try to avoid those in politics—but I would like to put on record, as I am sure many of you have been wondering, I am a dog person.

My allergies mean that cats are not for me. They are also not super friendly. If I am going to the member for Badcoe's house with her lovely cats for any extended period of time, I always have to take an antihistamine 30 minutes before. When my daughter was three, she kept asking for a cat. I would explain that we cannot have one because of my allergies. She eventually got to the point of saying, in the sweetest, most lovely voice, 'That's okay, you can live somewhere else.' The hypothetical cat was apparently more desired than me.

In December 2022, we did bring a pet into our home—our dog, Pepsi, a beautiful tan standard poodle. My wonderful dad retired when he was around 70. He did not really last long in retirement. Having worked in agriculture, viticulture, journalism, communications, all sorts of things, he decided to turn our garage into a dog grooming salon. He is a very kind and generous man and did not charge very much money, even for the biggest dogs. No-one was paying more than \$100—no-one. He got to the point of having 200 dogs on his books, including a number of dogs of some of the Crows footy players. He was a very busy man.

Over the last couple of years, he has had to tone down, as he is 77 years old, about to turn 78. He has fewer dogs on the books now, but he still has a few. A couple of those are two standard poodles from one household. The family thought that it would be nice for them to make one litter before desexing, so we got a call from my dad saying, 'I am currently washing eight tiny, beautiful puppies. You guys should come see them,' so then I did. I took a five year old with me, and what would you know? We ended up getting one of those puppies, and so did my dad and so did one of my brothers. So we have three of the eight, and they are beautiful dogs.

My partner is not a dog or a cat person and did not really want one. That being said, very early on I came home one day from a parliamentary sitting day, walked into the house at about 6.30, and I could smell food cooking. I thought, 'Oh my gosh, my partner has made dinner on a sitting night. This is excellent.' I was so excited. I walked in and said, 'What have you made?' and he said, 'No, I'm not making dinner for you; I'm making food for the dog. I don't like the dry biscuits that you're feeding her; it's not good enough.' So he now cooks for her every four days. He makes a big batch of rice and veggies and meat. She is a very spoilt puppy and very loved by the man who did not want a dog.

Being such a dog person, I am particularly proud to speak on this bill today, and I know many in my community will be stoked to see this bill's passage. One of the most abhorrent examples of animal cruelty in our state is the practice of puppy farms, where dogs are forced to breed year after year, crammed in filthy conditions. At the 2022 state election we promised to eradicate this practice, banning puppy farms once and for all. In September of that year, we took our first step towards fulfilling that promise by introducing an immediate cap on the number of fertile breeding females that could be kept on a premise or by one owner. This reform, equal to the strictest in Australia, put an end to any prospect of inhumane breeders who had plans to move from states with stricter laws to continue their immoral practice in South Australia.

Last year we took another step towards fulfilling our promise, as the draft of the bill before us today was opened to community consultation between May and June. I would like to thank each and every one of the more than 300 compassionate South Australians who took the time to share their views and experiences on this bill and who continue to advocate to me and to everyone else in this place to continue the pursuit of promoting animal welfare in this state.

I would also like to thank all the members of my community who have shared with me their views on this important reform and who tirelessly advocate for a better environment and community for our fluffy four-legged friends. As Terri wrote, upon hearing that we were delivering on our promise to ban puppy farms, 'That's absolutely fantastic news. At last, a state government that is sticking to promises made in an election.'

This bill seeks to introduce a new breeder licensing scheme that will require breeders to adhere to strict standards for breeding, such as limiting the number of female animals per breeding program and the number of litters that may be bred. Mandatory reporting of each litter will also be introduced. This proposed reform will bring South Australia in line with Victoria, which is currently the strictest jurisdiction for breeding programs in the country.

In addition to banning puppy farms, this bill also seeks to increase the fines and penalties for offences associated with dogs wandering at large, dog attacks and other safety offences. This bill proposes increasing the maximum fine for the owner of a dog that attacks a person or another animal, causing serious injury or death, from \$2,500 to \$25,000. If the attacking dog was already the subject of a dangerous dog order, the maximum fine would be increased to \$50,000, rather than the existing increase of up to \$10,000. We all very much love our animals, but we all do need to take responsibility and keep people safe as well. I want to congratulate the Deputy Premier, the Dog and Cat Management Board and everyone involved in the 'Good dogs have bad days' campaign, which is a simple message but I think a really effective one.

Furthermore, this reform also introduces a subclause regarding a new wandering dog order to help manage dogs who continually escape. This new order will stipulate reasonable steps to be taken by the owner to prevent the dog escaping and to attend training where appropriate. While Pepsi has only escaped twice, I will make sure I advise her of this change as well. These reforms are nation-leading and sensible, and I am really proud to be part of a state government that continues to promote animal welfare in line with the expectations of our community. I would also like to say that I am really happy with the changes for greyhounds as well. We have a greyhound in our family, with my brother and sister-in-law having their beautiful dog Katie. I am so happy to see these changes for her and other beautiful greyhounds.

In closing, I would like to again thank the Deputy Premier and everyone in her team for their ongoing support and work to bring this reform to this place. South Australians seeking to bring home

a new four-legged friend can finally be assured that their loved pet was not bred in a puppy farm. I commend this bill to the house.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (12:24): I will make a brief contribution, because everyone loves a good dog story or a cat story. I am rising to support this bill. I think it is important that humans do not continue to exploit what is one of the great companions of all time.

If only a dog or a cat could talk. Living on different types of farms over many, many years we have had different types of dogs on farm. We have had house dogs, we have had working dogs, we have had companion dogs. Along the way we have had many working dogs, whether they are out in the paddocks, whether they are in the yards or whether they are there to ease the pressures of handling livestock, particularly out in some of the more challenging country.

In the early days the traditional house pet in my household used to be the cuddly golden labrador or some form of terrier, but they have always been a great companion. They were always allowed to break the rules within the house. They are always able to lie on chairs, lie on the carpet and come inside when they are told not to. They soon become one of the house favourites, if you like.

I think there is a reason for that. As I said, if only a dog or a cat could talk. I am not a cat person, as has been explained, for different reasons. But if a dog—a working dog or a house dog—could talk wouldn't we be in a world of pain, because they do hear a lot, but they do not say much. Dogs have the ability to put a smile on your face when things are tough, and they have the ability to make you grumpy when they are not doing exactly what you ask them to do.

Over time in terms of our working dogs I think the majority of them have been a kelpie or a border collie, because they seem to have been very adaptable not only to our climate but to the challenges of what a working dog means: intelligent, yes, and able to take orders from their master, yes, and learn to be a better dog or a better animal at every given challenge.

Along the way some of those dogs, whether they be a house dog or a working dog—they are always companions. They are always there to help soothe the soul. They are always there to listen. They are a sounding board in many instances. Over time I have had the luxury of being able to talk to the dog. Some people say you are going a bit cray-cray when you start talking to the dog, but I think they give you the ability to download and get rid of some of that internal angst that sometimes builds up.

Again, dogs come in many different shapes, sizes and forms. For what it is worth, some of the newer house dogs now—the designer dogs, if you like—have been bred primarily as crossbreeds. They do not shed hair, they are somewhat more predictable and in many ways, shapes or forms they are quite adapted to living in more of a confined space. We know that some of those working dogs need large paddocks to burn off energy so that when they come in after a day's work or come in at night they actually sleep rather than run around and do circles in the backyard, if you like.

We have talked about dogs within sport. Obviously, the greyhound racing sector has had somewhat of a chequered history, but I am very pleased to see that the latest review will see that industry held to account. If the greyhound racing sector does uphold all the recommendations in the latest review, it will be better for the industry, it will be better for the reputation of the industry and it will be better for the dogs that are there as competitive dogs. We do have different breeds of dogs out there as part of retrieval, whether it be retrieving during a hunting exercise bringing back the prey. I think if those dogs are trained properly, and if those owners respond and act in a proper manner, there should not be the controversy that we see from a lot of quarters when it comes to that sport.

Of course, there are other parts of industry with working dogs. I think a seeing eye dog is probably one of the great masters of what we associate with a companion dog, helping those people less fortunate, those who have no eyesight or partial blindness. Those highly trained, highly intelligent dogs give those people who, sadly, have no eyesight the opportunity to live a more natural life out and about, out walking with that companion, with the dog giving them the eyes that they have lost either through birth or through injury or accident or degenerative disease along the way. No-one could praise a seeing eye dog enough for the great work that they do to help those less fortunate.

Biosecurity is another set of working circumstances, particularly biosecurity dogs that work on our borders and dogs that work in our police force. Nothing gives people more satisfaction than a morning news report when we hear that the police have taken out one of their police dogs that has captured someone who has committed an offence. It really does give people a sense of warming that this dog has caught, captured and pushed someone into a corner, and it is really a reward for what is a great commitment not only by governments but by their handlers and by society for the acceptance they have for the dogs. We have dogs that perform biosecurity measures at airports, we have dogs that perform biosecurity measures, particularly on our borders, preventing unwanted materials and unwanted or disallowed drugs and that sort of thing coming into our society.

What I must say is that there is also a downside to being an MP knocking on doors, particularly in a regional setting, which has just happened to me in recent times. Along my quite expansive doorknocking exercises, I have had the odd nip on the back of the leg or on the backside but, sadly, in December last year I was attacked by a dog. I have lost a piece out of my leg, I have lost a piece out of my back, I have a bit missing out of my arm. They are the challenges of pulling up at a farm, pulling up at someone's house, getting out of your vehicle and not realising that you are about to lose something that you treasured, and that is a piece of your leg or your back.

But that is what it is. It is one of the challenges we endure knocking on doors and introducing ourselves to people. I must say that the family who own that dog were Liberal voters. They were not Labor voters and it was not the fact that that dog picked out who I was; it was just the fact that I was in that dog's territory and it decided to take a piece out of me.

In closing, I would say to people to please, in this hot weather, look after your animals, look after your dogs and cats, understand that you cannot walk them on the footpaths or out on the roads, particularly when they are exposed to the sun. If you are a responsible owner or caretaker of an animal, particularly a dog or cat, make sure you understand the challenges of what weather, particularly hot weather, means to them. Owners, remember to register your animal, and remember that the microchip service is there.

If you are what I consider to be a responsible dog or cat owner you should have a collar on them. Make sure that you look after your dog; groom them, and make sure their nails are clipped so that they do not develop deformities or diseases. Make sure you treat your dog or cat the way you would like to be treated.

I commend the bill, and it will be supported by the opposition. It is something I think every person acknowledges, that we need to better protect our dogs and our cats from the people who look to exploit them, who look to create an industry that usually revolves around money. Those who do that, shame on you. Those who are for the betterment of their pets, their animals, their dogs and their cats: continue to look after them, and treat them like they are a treasure.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Workforce and Population Strategy) (12:36): I am delighted to stand as final speaker to close debate, and to have the opportunity to thank everyone for their contributions. I would also like to welcome the member for Finnis, who is my new shadow as we head into the next year. I have known the member for some time, of course, because we have all been around for a while, and I have enormous respect for what he brings—a great deal of sincerity and thoroughness—to any portfolio he is involved with.

The contributions have been very good in covering what this bill seeks to do. Of course, I have already delivered my second reading speech so I will not repeat them, but I could—and possibly for a very short period will—talk about my own love for the dogs I have shared my life with.

I have always been a terrier fan, although I have recently become a convert to the King Charles Cavalier, because that was the little angel that showed up in our household about 10 years ago now. Despite being reasonably aged, she frolics about like a small puppy still. I always say that with the four of us in the household there are shifting alliances and relationships, but all four of us always really adore the dog. She is the one constant source of affection and agreement.

Importantly, I think each person who has spoken has shared a little insight into their relationship with dogs as they have grown up and now, and it reminds us all that we are humans who

share common experiences despite the often partisan and at times the very sincerely held views that exist. It is wonderful for me to start this parliamentary year with a bill we can all agree on.

The member for Hammond and I were on a select committee many years ago. I was newly in parliament—I suspect it was 2012, my first year—and we looked into the question of breeding dogs and cats, and dogs in particular of course; how that was managed, and when it was managed well. It was my first opportunity to really spend time with the member for Hammond and I enjoyed that very much. We were also on a sustainable farming committee, I think, with then member Ivan Venning, which was also a lot of fun.

The important thing is that at that committee we determined that there were some gaps in the way in which breeders were managed, and the first stage of reforms happened in the following years when there was a registration of breeders. This legislation takes it to the next stage, and says that you need to be licensed. The difference is that anyone can say, 'I'm a breeder. I know that I'm required to be registered as a breeder, so I will submit the paperwork.' What the licensing does is attach far more conditions to that, so that people who purchase an animal from that breeder can be assured not just that they are known, which is what the registration scheme did, but that there are conditions to the licence, which we can be sure meet community standards.

That is what this piece of legislation does. It does not dictate, for example, what the limit is for the number of breeding cycles for a mother dog will be. It simply says that the licence will include that limit. That enables the Dog and Cat Management Board to determine what is appropriate over time. It may well be that there is a different standard for the number of dogs. It may well be that there is a different standard for the number of cycles in order to make sure that we are at the forefront in Australia, and therefore not being the recipients of, as we know, the concerning dodgy breeders.

That, I think, is important to point out, particularly in reference to the questions asked by the member for Frome of how this will actually play out for breeders. Her area does have a number of breeders within it, and they are understandable questions, although I think that there has been such good consultation that they ought to all have a reasonable degree of certainty. The legislation says if you are already doing a good job breeding with the animals, you are not going to be disturbed by this change in legislation. What you are going to be able to do is know that (a) you are not being undercut by dodgy breeders who do things on the cheap and still sell the dogs expensively, and (b) you are not going to have your entire industry besmirched by the appearance in the media periodically of those shocking breeders.

Members will recall—I think I mentioned it in the second reading speech and, if not, I have discussed it frequently in the media—that there really are two kinds of breeders that are problematic: one is the very large-scale breeders. People do not like the idea of 300 or 500 breeding females being kept by breeders, and I understand that, although we have a willingness for some species that we do have, with a large number of them aggregated to dairies and piggeries and so on. But people have a concern about our companion animals being treated that way, and I respect that position, and so that is one of the reasons why we have said there must be a limit to the number, so that we do not have large-scale breeders coming from interstate where limits are imposed.

The other concern, and the one that I think is a very serious concern, is about these dodgy backyard breeders who may not have very many, but treat their animals appallingly: breed them far too many times, do not feed them properly, groom them, show them affection or give them access to proper bedding. That is the one that is of greatest concern to me, and one that we see periodically in the media. That will be addressed through the conditions being imposed on the licence. With both of those approaches, we are able to say this is an industry that is cleaned up, and that if anyone behaves in a way that is not acceptable, and not part of the conditions of the licence, we can get rid of them.

Dog attacks have been mentioned several times. It is appalling to see in coverage on Adelaïdenow the baby who attacked today at a residential address. We are increasing our tough approach on dog attacks. I appreciated that there were several references made to the very good work done by the Dog and Cat Management Board on the Good Dogs Have Bad Days campaign. I will also give a little shout-out to Australia Post, who went into partnership where they paid for the posting of letters to all the households with dogs, to remind them about that.

Of course, the reason that Australia Post has a particular interest is the same as was just described where MPs go to doors, and knock on the door, and can have a dog suddenly leaping out at them. So, too, for posties. There is a shift that we have seen recently—over the last several years really—of posties no longer being able to go past and put something in the letterbox, but they are delivering packages, and they are therefore having to go to the door and a number of times someone just opens the door and the dog jumps out. Even if nothing happens, it is alarming for the postie and, of course, at times there is an attack involved, and so we have to just keep in mind our responsibility for the dogs under our control.

I would like to thank everybody who has participated in this debate. I am glad it has been supported across the chamber. I think it is an important reform. It is an election commitment that was given and therefore it is an election commitment that has been kept, but I think beyond that it is also reform that we all see is necessary for us all to get behind and I am grateful for the support of the chamber.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Workforce and Population Strategy) (12:45): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

BIOSECURITY BILL

Second Reading

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Police) (12:46): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I am very pleased to introduce the Biosecurity Bill 2024. South Australian primary industries generated a record \$18.5 billion in revenue in 2022-23. This comes in a year when floods and global trade and geopolitical issues impacted the sector, including global recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic. Strong results achieved over recent years, despite global challenges and extreme weather events, illustrate the importance of a robust and resilient primary industry sector and this is no less the case when it comes to biosecurity. A strong biosecurity system is critical to underpinning the productivity and profitability of our primary industries.

Australia's biosecurity system has been valued at \$314 billion by the Centre of Excellence for Biosecurity Risk Analysis at the University of Melbourne, reflecting a 30:1 return on investment. Australia, and South Australia, are world leaders in biosecurity, but significant changes domestically and internationally are leading to increased or changed biosecurity risks and we need to keep pace with these.

Increased national and international movement of goods and people, climate change, changes in land use, the surge in e-commerce and changes in global pest and disease distribution are placing increasing pressure on South Australia's biosecurity system and the nation as a whole. To effectively manage the increasing risks, there is a need for South Australia to introduce more contemporary, flexible biosecurity legislation.

The presence of foot-and-mouth and lumpy skin disease on Australia's doorstep, the recent incursion and establishment of varroa mite in New South Wales, our ongoing fight against fruit fly and the recent emergency responses to the presence of abalone viral ganglioneuritis in the South-East of the state and tomato brown rugose fruit virus in the Northern Adelaide Plains are all significant challenges which underline the need for a strong and effective biosecurity system.

South Australia's current biosecurity legislation has served us well. However, there is the opportunity to strengthen the regulatory tools to respond to current and emerging risks effectively and consistently. Disparate provisions in acts covering plant health, animal health and

aquatic-related biosecurity also impede efficient, flexible delivery and can be confusing for system participants.

The commonwealth government and state and territory governments are progressively shifting to consolidated biosecurity acts. As part of the national biosecurity system, a consolidated biosecurity act is needed for South Australia to enable a harmonised, flexible and risk and evidence-based approach to preventing, controlling and managing biosecurity risks and to ensure that South Australia remains a strong link in the national system.

This is a crucial bill for ensuring the future sustainability of our state's primary producers, our environment, and our wider community. A thorough review of existing legislation and the opportunity for multiple rounds of stakeholder consultation culminated in an eight-week public consultation on the draft bill in August and September 2023. This has allowed us to make sure that the voices of system participants have been heard.

The bill brings consistency to the management of animal, plant and environmental biosecurity across industries by keeping and improving the best of what has worked in existing legislation, and adding new tools and concepts to embed these in a single, modern, flexible legislative framework. It draws on the experience and lessons of other jurisdictions such as Queensland, New South Wales, Tasmania and Western Australia in developing their biosecurity legislation to ensure that the bill is cutting-edge and tailored to meet the needs of our state. The Biosecurity Bill 2024 introduces new concepts to the way biosecurity is managed and regulated in South Australia.

A fundamental concept in the bill is that of biosecurity matter, which includes any animal, plant or other organism apart from a human being, animal and plant pests and diseases, disease agents, prions—which are, I am advised, abnormal proteins implicated in animal diseases—contaminants and animal and plant products. For example, bees, varroa mites, and honey would all be kinds of biosecurity matter.

The bill also defines a carrier of biosecurity matter, which is any living or non-living thing that has, or is capable of having, biosecurity matter on it, attached to it or contained in it. For instance, a hive or a vehicle may be a carrier of bees, bees are carriers of varroa mites, and varroa mites may themselves be carriers of serious viruses (or viri) such as deformed wing virus. Humans are not within the definition of carrier, but it does include things that are worn or carried by a person, such as clothing, footwear, and personal baggage.

A third crucial concept is that of a dealing, which includes most human interactions with biosecurity matter or carriers. Common examples of dealings include growing plants, selling or moving produce, keeping animals, and researching a pest or disease. Additionally, there are the concepts of biosecurity risk and impact. Biosecurity risks are the risks of biosecurity impacts arising from biosecurity matter, a carrier or dealing. These detrimental impacts may be economic, environmental or social. Examples include livestock sickness or death, crop yield loss, products made unfit for market, harm to native animals or plants, damage to infrastructure, and dangers to public safety.

The bill provides for certain biosecurity matter and carriers, or classes of biosecurity matter and carriers, to be declared prohibited. These are the biosecurity matter and carriers that pose a significant biosecurity risk to South Australia and for which regulation and controls are necessary to prevent, eliminate, minimise, control or manage that risk.

Similarly, the bill allows for prohibited and regulated dealings to be declared by regulation. Prohibited dealings pose biosecurity risks in the same manner as prohibited matter, and require similar regulation and controls to prevent, eliminate, minimise, control or manage those risks. Regulated dealings require anyone undertaking them to be registered for that purpose and to carry them out subject to conditions of their registration to ensure that dealing does not pose an unacceptable biosecurity risk.

The bill aims to build a culture of shared responsibility among government, industry and the community for protecting our state from the impacts of pests, diseases and contaminants. To support this outcome it introduces the key new concept of general biosecurity duty, which is a duty everyone

has to prevent, eliminate, minimise, control or manage biosecurity risks when dealing with biosecurity matter or a carrier.

The general biosecurity duty requires a person to take reasonably practicable measures in relation to a risk they know, or reasonably ought to know exists. The standard for complying with the general biosecurity duty is set at that which can be expected for someone in their circumstances and with their knowledge, and would be different, for example, for a professional researcher or agronomist than a member of the public. There is also guidance within the bill as to the meaning of 'reasonably practicable'.

In addition to the general biosecurity duty, there is a biosecurity duty to notify a biosecurity event in the bill. If prohibited matter or an incursion of a new pest or disease is observed or suspected then there is a legal requirement to make a notification. This requirement is critical to facilitating an early response to a pest or disease incursion, providing the greatest likelihood of successful eradication.

The bill also contains a suite of tools for implementation of responses to biosecurity risks and impacts. This includes tools to establish areas subject to certain measures necessary to regulate a biosecurity risk. These range from a short-term emergency order through to a medium-term control order to a long-term biosecurity zone.

Emergency orders have a wider range of measures available and are for use in emergencies that present a high risk and/or impact, such as an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease, while a control order might be used for a fruit fly outbreak and a zone established for ongoing measures to protect the pest or disease-free status of a particular area, such as the Riverland or Kangaroo Island. Authority to issue emergency and control orders resides with the minister, with zones established by regulation. Outside of emergency situations, if there would be adverse effects in relation to relevant acts, there are requirements to consult with the appropriate minister.

These tools are supported by individual and group directions. The Chief Executive of PIRSA may give a general biosecurity direction to people that prohibits, regulates or controls particular dealings and specifies measures to be taken for the purposes of assessing, preventing or managing a biosecurity risk or impact. The chief executive, a chief officer or an officer authorised by the minister under the act may give an individual biosecurity direction to a person, requiring them to undertake or cease specified actions to manage a biosecurity risk or prevent a contravention of the act; for example, directing them to take specified actions to destroy a pest on their property which is a prohibited matter or cease a particular activity which is prohibited under a control order.

Authorised officers also have a range of powers they can exercise for authorised purposes in administering and enforcing the act, which includes the scope of powers in existing biosecurity-related legislation. They strike the right balance between allowing officers to act in implementing the bill and ensuring appropriate checks and balances are in place.

Importantly, the bill gives authorised officers authority to act if they believe or reasonably believe the situation requires action to prevent, eliminate, minimise, control or manage a biosecurity risk or impact. Provisions such as these are central to supporting the bill's aims of risk-based decision-making and acting early to achieve the best biosecurity outcomes.

The bill contains a number of provisions to support access to domestic and international markets for South Australia's produce, enabling it to be certified as pest and disease free and traced through the supply chain, meeting entry conditions of the receiving jurisdiction. These include the registration of people engaging in the regulated dealings and provisions to enable the allocation of identification codes, such as the existing Property Identification Code for livestock producers. This can be extended under the new framework, for example to property ID codes for producers of plants. Such identification schemes are increasingly important in supporting market access and are also critical in tracing movement of pests and diseases in an emergency.

Another central theme of the bill is supporting shared responsibility. Examples of this include co-regulation with industry, provision for the establishment of biosecurity programs, and the general biosecurity duty. Industry codes of practice, standards and market assurance schemes can be legally recognised under the bill. Further, both government and non-government organisations can be

accreditation authorities. Such authorities accredit biosecurity certifiers who can certify that products meet required conditions for market access.

Biosecurity programs are an important new tool to prevent, eliminate, minimise, control or manage a particular biosecurity risk or impact. These can be proposed by an industry or community body or be led by government. These will foster partnerships, shared responsibility and co-investment in tackling issues of interest to specific industry or community groups. Shared responsibility is also supported by the general biosecurity duty, which will encourage and facilitate collective responsibility for biosecurity risks that affect us all. Everyone will need to meet the general biosecurity duty when dealing with biosecurity matter.

The bill provides for a modern, flexible framework and brings outdated penalties into line with the risk and impact of the offences involved. Of these, the release of a prescribed agent with intent to harm or infect/infest animals or plants and cause substantial harm to an industry or the state economy is the most serious and carries a maximum penalty of \$1 million, 10 years in prison or both. I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading speech and the explanation of clauses inserted into *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Another important provision in the Bill relates to extra-territorial application of the Act, to ensure it may apply to the greatest extent it can. This could be used for example, to take compliance action against online retailers sending prohibited matter into South Australia from interstate.

The Bill also provides the required flexibility where a person or group of people need to undertake an activity that would otherwise be unlawful under the Bill, and this can be done with certain prescribed conditions to manage this risk. This is managed through a system of individual and group permits, which for example could be used to allow a grower, or group of growers, to move fruit out of a fruit fly affected area once suitably treated and certified.

The Bill seeks to address significant risks to South Australia's economy, environment and people, and as such contains necessary powers, many of which I have touched upon. It has been carefully crafted to ensure strategic decisions with potentially significant implications reside with the Minister or Chief Executive, and decisions relating to day-to-day and on-ground application reside with the Chief Plant Protection Officer, Chief Veterinary Officer, or an authorised officer. Scope exists for delegation where appropriate. Furthermore, the Bill provides for review of decisions through the Minister, or, where appropriate, externally through the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal.

The Bill will also replace the Dog Fence Act 1946, continuing the Dog Fence Board in its important role managing the dog fence, to ensure wild dogs are prevented from entering pastoral and agricultural areas of the State. The Bill updates existing provisions, while maintaining the essential functions related to the Board and the dog fence.

The Biosecurity Bill is the result of a significant body of work to ensure that South Australia has fit-for-purpose, modern legislation to manage biosecurity risks now, and into the future. There has been significant consultation, which showed broad support for the proposed reforms and creation of a consolidated Biosecurity Bill. It also resulted in some substantial improvements to earlier drafts of the Bill.

I commend the Biosecurity Bill 2024 to the House and look forward to further debate.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

Division 1—Formal

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Division 2—Interpretation and key concepts

3—Interpretation

This clause defines terms used in the measure.

4—Meaning of *biosecurity event*

This clause sets out the meaning of a *biosecurity event* for the purposes of the measure.

5—Meaning of *biosecurity impact*

This clause sets out the meaning of a *biosecurity impact* for the purposes of the measure.

6—Meaning of *biosecurity matter*

This clause sets out the meaning of a *biosecurity matter* for the purposes of the measure.

7—Meaning of *carrier*

This clause sets out the meaning of a *carrier* for the purposes of the measure.

8—Meaning of *dealing*

This clause sets out the meaning of a *dealing* for the purposes of the measure.

9—Meaning of *emergency*

This clause sets out the meaning of an *emergency* for the purposes of the measure.

10—Meaning of *pest*

This clause sets out the meaning of a *pest* for the purposes of the measure.

11—Meaning of *suitable person*

This clause sets out the meaning of *suitable person* for the purposes of the measure.

12—Meaning of *reasonably practicable*

This clause sets out the meaning of *reasonably practicable* for the purposes of the measure.

Division 3—Classification of matter and dealings

13—Prohibited matter

This clause establishes what constitutes prohibited matter.

14—Prohibited and regulated dealings

This clause establishes what constitutes prohibited and regulated dealings.

Division 4—Principles that apply to biosecurity duties

15—Duty not transferable

This clause provides that a biosecurity duty cannot be transferred to another person.

16—Person may have more than one duty

This clause provides that a person can have more than 1 biosecurity duty.

17—More than one person can have a duty

This clause provides that more than 1 person can concurrently have the same biosecurity duty.

18—Duty to prevent, eliminate or minimise biosecurity risk

This clause provides that there is a duty imposed on a person to prevent, eliminate or minimise a biosecurity risk.

Division 5—Extraterritorial application

19—Extraterritorial application

This clause provides that the measure is to apply within the State and outside the State to the full extent of the extraterritorial legislative capacity of the Parliament.

Division 6—Status of Act

20—Interaction with other Acts

This clause sets out the interaction between the measure and other Acts or laws.

21—Act does not give rise to or affect civil causes of action

This clause provides that a provision of this Act does not confer a right of action in civil proceedings based on a contravention of the provision.

Part 2—Objects

22—Objects

This clause establishes the objects of the measure.

Part 3—Administration

Division 1—Chief Officers and deputies

23—Chief Officers

This clause establishes that there will be a *Chief Plant Protection Officer* and a *Chief Veterinary Officer* and provides for their appointments.

24—Deputy Chief Officers

This clause establishes that there will be a *Deputy Chief Plant Protection Officer* and a *Deputy Chief Veterinary Officer* and provides for their appointments.

25—Roles of Deputy Chief Officers

This clause establishes the roles, powers and functions of the deputy chief officer.

Division 2—Authorised officers

26—Appointment of authorised officers

This clause provides for the appointments of authorised officers.

27—Identity cards

This clause requires that an authorised officer is issued with an identity card.

28—Use of assistants

This clause provides that an authorised officer performing a function under this Act, may perform the function with the assistance of such other persons as the authorised officer considers necessary in the circumstances.

29—Use of animals

This clause provides that an authorised officer, performing a function under this Act, may perform the function with the assistance of an animal to detect the presence of, or to manage, biosecurity matter.

30—Provision of assistance

This clause provides that an authorised officer may require an owner or occupier of any premises, any person in or on any premises (other than a public place), or a person apparently in charge of any vehicle, plant, equipment or other thing, to provide any reasonable assistance and facilities that the authorised officer or a person assisting the authorised officer reasonably requires for the effective exercise of a power.

31—Performance and exercise of functions and powers in emergency

This clause states that the fact that a provision of the measure only authorises an authorised officer to perform or exercise specified functions or powers in an emergency (or in the case of an emergency) does not prevent the authorised officer from performing or exercising any other function or power under the measure in that emergency.

32—Extraterritorial performance and exercise of functions and powers

This clause provides that the Minister may enter into an agreement with a Minister of the Commonwealth or another State providing for the performance of powers or the exercise of functions on behalf of the Commonwealth in another State or under a corresponding law in South Australia by interstate officers.

33—Hindering etc persons engaged in the administration of Act

This clause provides for an offence of hindering authorised officers.

Division 3—Authorised analysts

34—Authorised analysts

This clause provides for the appointment of authorised analysts.

Division 4—Statutory corporations

35—Establishment of statutory corporations by regulation

This clause provides for the establishment of statutory corporations by regulation.

36—Dog Fence Board

This clause provides for the continuation of the *Dog Fence Board* as a statutory corporation.

Division 5—Quarantine stations

37—Quarantine stations

This clause provides for a designated authority that may, by notice published on the Department website, declare a place to be a quarantine station.

Division 6—Register

38—Register

This clause provides for a register of certain matters.

Division 7—Delegations

39—Delegations

This clause makes provision for a power of delegation by a statutory authority.

Part 4—Biosecurity duties, dealings and measures

Division 1—General biosecurity duty

40—General biosecurity duty

This clause provides for the general biosecurity duty.

41—Failure to comply with general biosecurity duty

This clause makes it an offence to fail to comply with a biosecurity duty.

42—Specified biosecurity requirements

This clause makes provision for specified biosecurity requirements.

Division 2—Dealings

43—Prohibited matter

This clause provides that a person who deals with any biosecurity matter that is prohibited matter throughout the State is guilty of an offence.

44—Prohibited dealings

This clause makes it an offence to engage in a prohibited dealing.

45—Regulated dealings

This clause makes it an offence to engage in a regulated dealing except in certain circumstances.

Division 3—Other requirements

46—Manifests

This clause creates offences relating to prescribed biosecurity matter.

47—Biosecurity matter sold for propagation

This clause makes it an offence to sell any prescribed biosecurity matter for propagation unless it is accompanied by a label or other notice in writing containing the information prescribed by the regulations.

48—Packaging and labelling for sale

This clause makes it an offence to pack for sale or sell prescribed biosecurity matter in packaging unless the packaging meets specified requirements.

Division 4—Duty to notify biosecurity event

49—Biosecurity duty to notify biosecurity event

This clause provides that a person who becomes aware of, or who reasonably suspects, the occurrence or likely occurrence of a biosecurity event has a biosecurity duty.

50—Failure to comply with biosecurity duty

This clause provides that a person must not fail to discharge the person's biosecurity duty.

51—Protection against self-incrimination

This clause provides a protection against self-incrimination, other than for certain offences under the measure.

Part 5—Registration scheme

Division 1—Preliminary

52—Nature of biosecurity registration

This clause sets out the nature of a biosecurity registration.

Division 2—Obtaining registration

53—Application for registration

This clause provides for the making of an application by a person for a biosecurity registration.

54—Grant or refusal of biosecurity registration

This clause provides for the grant or refusal of a biosecurity registration.

55—Duration of biosecurity registration

This clause provides that a biosecurity registration remains in force for a period, not exceeding 5 years and that the registration may be renewed.

56—Periodic fees and annual returns

This clause provides that a prescribed registered entity must in each year pay the prescribed fee and lodge a return.

57—Variation of biosecurity registration

This clause provides that the Chief Officer may, at any time, by written notice to the registered entity, vary the biosecurity registration.

Division 3—Renewal of biosecurity registration

58—Renewal of biosecurity registration

This clause provides that a registered entity may apply to the relevant Chief Officer for renewal of biosecurity registration.

59—Grant or refusal of renewal of biosecurity registration

This clause provides that the relevant Chief Officer may, after considering an application for renewal of biosecurity registration, renew the biosecurity registration with or without conditions, or refuse to renew the biosecurity registration.

Division 4—Conditions of biosecurity registration

60—Conditions of biosecurity registration

This clause provides that the relevant Chief Officer may impose conditions on a registered entity's biosecurity registration.

61—Compliance with standards

This clause provides that a condition imposed on a registered entity's biosecurity registration may require the registered entity to engage in a regulated dealing in accordance with all of, or part of, a specified standard, code, guideline, protocol, program or other similar instrument.

62—Conditions requiring specified works or measures

This clause provides that a condition imposed on a registered entity's biosecurity registration may require the registered entity to carry out specified works, or to put in place specified measures, to prevent, eliminate, minimise, control or manage the biosecurity risk of a biosecurity dealing.

63—Conditions imposing alternative arrangements

This clause provides that a condition imposed on a registered entity's biosecurity registration may require the registered entity to have in place an alternative arrangement that has been approved by the relevant Chief Officer.

64—Conditions for insurance cover

This clause provides that a condition imposed on a registered entity's biosecurity registration may require the registered entity to take out and maintain a policy of insurance that indemnifies the registered entity against any liability to which the registered entity may become subject in connection with the regulated dealing under the biosecurity registration.

65—Conditions requiring biosecurity audits

This clause provides that a condition imposed on a registered entity's biosecurity registration may require the registered entity to co-operate with, or arrange, mandatory biosecurity audits and may provide for the frequency of biosecurity audits.

66—Conditions requiring financial assurances

This clause provides that a condition imposed on a biosecurity registration may require certain financial assurances.

67—Conditions for record keeping and the provision of information

This clause provides that record keeping conditions and conditions in connection with the provision of information may be imposed on a biosecurity registration.

68—Conditions to take effect later

This clause provides that a condition on a biosecurity registration may take effect at the end of a specified period or on the happening of a particular event or on the occurrence of a specified state of affairs.

69—Failure to comply with condition

This clause imposes a penalty for a contravention of a condition of a biosecurity registration.

Division 5—Suspension, cancellation or surrender of biosecurity registration

70—Grounds for suspension or cancellation of biosecurity registration

This clause establishes grounds for the suspension or cancellation of a biosecurity registration.

71—Suspension of biosecurity registration

This clause makes provision for the suspension of a biosecurity registration.

72—Cancellation of biosecurity registration

This clause makes provision for the cancellation of a biosecurity registration.

73—Surrender of biosecurity registration

This clause makes provision for the surrender of a biosecurity registration by a registered entity.

74—Effect of suspension, cancellation or surrender

This clause provides that a biosecurity registration may be suspended, cancelled or surrendered under this Division unconditionally or subject to such conditions as the relevant Chief Officer may impose.

Division 6—Identification codes

75—Identification codes

This clause enables the provision of 1 or more schemes for the allocation of codes identifying certain issues relating to biosecurity matter.

Part 6—Biosecurity accreditation, auditing and certification—administration

Division 1—Preliminary

76—Interpretation

This clause defines terms for the Part.

77—Appointment policy for biosecurity auditors

This clause provides that an accreditation authority that is authorised to appoint biosecurity auditors under this Act must adopt a policy in relation to the appointment of biosecurity auditors.

78—Accreditation policy for biosecurity certifiers

This clause provides that an accreditation authority that is authorised to accredit biosecurity certifiers under this Act must adopt a policy in relation to the accreditation of biosecurity certifiers.

Division 2—Accreditation authorities

79—Accreditation authorities

This clause provides for accreditation authorities and sets out what an accreditation authority is authorised to do.

80—Responsible accreditation authority

This clause makes provision for a responsible accreditation authority.

Division 3—Applications

81—Applications

This clause provides for the making of applications for—

- (a) approval as an accreditation authority; or
- (b) appointment as a biosecurity auditor; or
- (c) accreditation as a biosecurity certifier.

82—Grant or refusal of application

This clause provides for the grant or refusal of an application.

83—Scope of appointment or accreditation

This clause provides for certain matters in relation to the appointment of a person as a biosecurity auditor and the scope of that appointment. It also provides for certain matters in relation to the accreditation of a biosecurity certifier and the scope of that appointment.

84—Duration of relevant authorisation

This clause provides that a relevant authorisation remains in force for a period, not exceeding 5 years, specified by the relevant decision-maker, unless sooner cancelled or suspended.

85—Variation of relevant authorisation

This clause provides that a relevant decision-maker may, at any time, by written notice, vary a person's—

- (a) approval as an accreditation authority; or
- (b) appointment as a biosecurity auditor; or
- (c) accreditation as a biosecurity certifier.

Division 4—Renewal of relevant authorisation

86—Applications to renew

This clause provides that the holder of a relevant authorisation may apply to the relevant decision-maker for renewal of the relevant authorisation.

87—Grant or refusal of renewal of relevant authorisation

This clause provides for the grant or refusal of a renewal of a relevant authorisation.

Division 5—Conditions of relevant authorisation

88—Conditions of relevant authorisation

This clause provides for the imposition of conditions on a person's relevant authorisation at the time of the grant, or renewal of the authorisation, or at any other time by variation to the relevant authorisation.

89—Conditions of approval as accreditation authority

This clause makes provision in relation to the conditions of approval as an accreditation authority.

90—Conditions of appointment as a biosecurity auditor

This clause sets out the conditions of, or that may be imposed on, an appointment as a biosecurity auditor.

91—Conditions of accreditation as a biosecurity certifier

This clause sets out the conditions that may be imposed on the accreditation of a biosecurity certifier.

92—Failure to comply with condition

This is an offence provision relating to breaches of conditions.

Division 6—Suspension, cancellation or surrender of relevant authorisation

93—Grounds for suspension or cancellation of relevant authorisation

This clause sets out the grounds for suspension or cancellation of a relevant authorisation.

94—Suspension of relevant authorisation

This clause makes provision in relation to the suspension of a relevant authorisation.

95—Cancellation of relevant authorisation

This clause makes provision in relation to the cancellation of a relevant authorisation.

96—Immediate suspension in certain circumstances

This clause makes provision in relation to the immediate suspension of a relevant authorisation in certain circumstances.

97—Surrender of relevant authorisation

This clause provides for the surrender of a relevant authorisation.

98—Effect of suspension, cancellation or surrender

This clause makes provision in relation to conditions that the cancellation, suspension or surrender of a relevant authorisation may be subject to.

Part 7—Biosecurity audits and certification

Division 1—Biosecurity audits

Subdivision 1—Preliminary

99—Interpretation

A definition of *designated authority* is set out for the Division.

Subdivision 2—Authority to act

100—Biosecurity auditors

Biosecurity auditors are provided for.

101—Approval of authorised officer to perform functions of biosecurity auditor

The Chief Executive may approve an authorised officer to perform the functions of a biosecurity auditor.

102—Entry to premises by biosecurity auditor

This clause provides for entry to premises by biosecurity auditors.

103—Use of assistants

This clause provides for use of assistants by biosecurity auditors.

Subdivision 3—Biosecurity audits generally

104—Biosecurity audits

This clause makes provision in relation to biosecurity audits.

105—Biosecurity audit mandatory in certain circumstances

Biosecurity audits will be mandatory in certain circumstances.

106—Reporting requirements

This clause makes provision in relation to reporting requirements for biosecurity audits.

107—Biosecurity auditor to provide immediate report in certain circumstances

This clause sets out certain circumstances where a biosecurity auditor must provide an immediate report.

Subdivision 4—Accreditation audits

108—Accreditation audits

This clause makes provision in relation to accreditation audits.

109—Imposition of requirement to perform accreditation audit

The Chief Executive, a Chief Officer or an authorised officer may require the performance of an accreditation audit in certain circumstances.

110—Engagement of auditor

This clause makes provision in relation to the engagement of an auditor.

111—Functions of biosecurity auditors—accreditation audits

This clause sets out the functions of biosecurity auditors in relation to accreditation audits.

112—Recovery of fee for accreditation audits

A fee is payable for an accreditation audit carried out by an accreditation auditor in accordance with the measure.

113—Use of biosecurity audits

This clause provides that a person who requires an accreditation audit must have regard to that accreditation audit in performing the person's functions under the Act in relation to the audit target under the measure.

Subdivision 5—Compliance audits

114—Compliance audits

This clause sets out the purposes for which a compliance audit may be performed.

115—Imposition of requirement to perform compliance audit

This clause sets out the requirement to perform compliance audits.

116—Decision to require compliance audits

This clause provides that in deciding whether to require a compliance audit or determining the frequency of compliance audit regard must be had to certain specified matters.

117—Audit frequency policy

This clause provides for an audit frequency policy to be adopted by a designated authority.

118—Engagement of auditor

This clause provides for the engagement of a biosecurity auditor to perform audits.

119—Functions of biosecurity auditor—compliance audits

This clause provides for the functions of a biosecurity auditor in connection with a compliance audit.

120—Recovery of fee for compliance audit

This clause provides for the payment of a fee in connection with a compliance audit carried out by a biosecurity auditor who is an authorised officer.

121—Use of compliance audits

This clause provides that a designated authority that requires a compliance audit must have regard to the compliance audit in performing the designated authority's functions under this Act in relation to the audit target.

Subdivision 6—Related matters

122—Audit agreements

This clause provides that the Chief Executive may enter into an audit agreement with another accreditation authority.

123—Hindering etc biosecurity auditors

This clause creates an offence of hindering a biosecurity auditor.

Division 2—Biosecurity certificates

124—Biosecurity certifier may issue biosecurity certificates

This clause provides for the issuing of a biosecurity certificate by a biosecurity certifier.

125—Content, form and duration of biosecurity certificates

This clause provides that a biosecurity certificate certifies certain matters in respect of a specified biosecurity matter or carrier, or any other specified thing or specified area, for the purposes of this Act.

126—Specific powers of biosecurity certifiers

This clause provides that a biosecurity certifier may take specified action before issuing a biosecurity certificate in relation to any biosecurity matter, carrier, thing or area.

127—Fees

This clause makes provision for the setting and payment of a fee for a biosecurity certificate.

128—Recognition of interstate biosecurity certificates

This clause provides for the recognition of a biosecurity certificate under a corresponding law.

129—Approval of authorised officers to perform functions of biosecurity certifiers

This clause provides for the appointment of any authorised officer to perform any specified function or power of a biosecurity certifier.

130—Use of assistance

This clause provides that a biosecurity certifier performing a function conferred by or under the measure may perform the function with the assistance of such other persons as the biosecurity certifier considers necessary in the circumstances (subject to any conditions of accreditation as a biosecurity certifier).

131—Offences

This clause makes provision for offences in relation to biosecurity certificates.

Part 8—Permits

Division 1—Preliminary

132—Interpretation

This clause defines *relevant decision-maker* for the purposes of the Part.

133—Types of permit

This clause provides for the different types of permit that may be granted under the Part.

134—Effect of permit

This clause makes provision for permits.

Division 2—Individual permits

135—Application for permit

This clause provides for applications by a person to a relevant decision-maker for an individual permit.

136—Grant or refusal of permit

This clause provides for the grant or refusal of a permit.

137—Duration of permit

This clause provides that an individual permit remains in force for a period, not exceeding 5 years, specified on the permit, unless sooner cancelled or suspended. It provides for the renewal of a permit also.

138—Variation of permit

This clause provides that a relevant decision-maker may, at any time, vary an individual permit by written notice to the permit holder.

139—Renewal of permit

This clause provides that a permit holder may apply to a relevant decision-maker for the renewal of an individual permit.

140—Grant or refusal of renewal of permit

This clause provides that a relevant decision-maker may, after considering an application for renewal of an individual permit, renew the permit with or without conditions, or refuse to renew the permit.

Division 3—Group permits

141—Grant of group permit

This clause provides that a relevant decision-maker may grant a group permit, with or without conditions, on the relevant decision-makers own initiative or at the written request of a person.

142—Form of permit

This clause provides that a group permit must be in the approved form and specify other matters.

143—Variation of permit

This clause provides that a relevant decision-maker may, at any time, vary a group permit by written notification.

144—Renewal of permit

This clause provides that a relevant decision-maker may renew a group permit, for such period not exceeding 5 years, and on such terms, as the relevant decision-maker thinks fit by written notification made in accordance with the regulations.

Division 4—Conditions of permits

145—Conditions of permit

This clause provides that a relevant decision-maker may impose conditions on a permit at the time of the grant, or renewal, of the permit and at any other time by variation to the permit.

146—Conditions relating to insurance

This clause provides that a condition imposed on a permit may require the permit holder to take out a policy of insurance.

147—Conditions requiring biosecurity audits

This clause provides that a condition imposed on a permit may require the permit holder to co-operate with, or arrange, mandatory biosecurity audits at specified intervals.

148—Conditions requiring financial assurances

This clause provides that a condition imposed on a permit may require the permit holder to provide certain financial assurances and evidence of such financial assurances.

149—Conditions to take effect later

This clause provides that a condition of a permit may provide that all or a part of the permit does not take effect until the end of a specified period or on the happening of a particular event or on the occurrence of a specified state of affairs.

150—Failure to comply with condition

This clause makes it an offence to contravene a condition of a permit.

Division 5—Suspension, cancellation or surrender of permit

151—Grounds for suspension or cancellation of permit

This clause sets out the grounds for suspension or cancellation of a permit.

152—Suspension of permit

This clause provides that a relevant decision-maker may, by written notice to the permit holder, suspend an individual permit if the relevant decision-maker is satisfied that there are grounds for the suspension of the permit.

153—Cancellation of permit

This clause provides that a relevant decision-maker may, by written notice to the permit holder, cancel an individual permit if the relevant decision-maker is satisfied that there are grounds for the cancellation of the permit.

154—Voluntary surrender of individual permit

This clause provides that a permit holder may surrender the permit holder's individual permit.

155—Effect of suspension, cancellation or surrender

This clause provides that a permit may be suspended, cancelled or surrendered under this Division unconditionally or subject to such conditions as a relevant decision-maker may impose.

Part 9—Biosecurity programs and agreements

Division 1—Approved biosecurity programs

156—Preparation of draft biosecurity program

This clause provides that an entity representing the interests of any industry, or any part of the community, may prepare a draft program relating to the prevention, elimination, minimisation, control or management of a biosecurity risk or biosecurity impact.

157—Approval of draft biosecurity program

This clause provides that an entity that has prepared a draft program may apply to the Minister for approval of the program.

158—Amendment of approved biosecurity program

This clause provides that the Minister may, on application from the entity that prepared an approved biosecurity program amend the approved biosecurity program or refuse to amend the approved biosecurity program.

159—Termination of approved biosecurity program

This clause provides that a Minister may terminate an approved biosecurity program on the Minister's own initiative or on the application of the entity that prepared the approved biosecurity program.

160—Cost of implementing approved biosecurity program

This clause provides that the Minister may, by written notice, agree that the Crown will reimburse the entity that prepared an approved biosecurity program for any specified costs incurred by the entity in implementing the program.

Division 2—Government biosecurity programs

161—Government biosecurity programs

This clause provides the Minister may direct the Chief Executive to implement a program relating to the prevention, elimination, minimisation, control or management of a biosecurity risk or biosecurity impact.

Division 3—Biosecurity control agreements

162—Biosecurity control agreements

This clause provides that the Chief Executive may make an agreement with the owner or occupier of any premises in relation to carrying out treatment, destruction or other activities on those premises for the purpose of preventing, eliminating, minimising, controlling or managing a biosecurity risk or biosecurity impact.

Part 10—Biosecurity zones

Division 1—General scheme

163—Biosecurity zones

This clause provides that the regulations may prescribe biosecurity zones.

164—Biosecurity zone measures

This clause provides for a *biosecurity zone measure* which is a measure to be implemented in respect of a biosecurity zone for the purpose of preventing, eliminating, minimising, controlling or managing a biosecurity risk, or biosecurity impact, in respect of which the biosecurity zone was established.

165—Failure to comply with a biosecurity zone measure

This clause makes it an offence to contravene a biosecurity measure.

166—Chief Officer may authorise required action and recover costs

This clause provides that in addition to any penalty imposed under the measure, if a person contravenes a biosecurity zone measure, the relevant Chief Officer may authorise a person to enter premises and take action necessary to ensure the biosecurity zone measure is complied with or otherwise to remedy the contravention.

Division 2—Accreditation of biosecurity zones

167—Accreditation of biosecurity zones

This clause provides that if the Minister is satisfied that through the exercise of good management by the producers or processors of animals or plants, or animal products or plant products, in a specified biosecurity zone, the biosecurity zone is free of a specified pest or disease, or specified pests or diseases, the Minister may, by notice in the Gazette, declare the biosecurity zone to be free of the pest or disease, or pests or diseases, specified in the notice and authorise the use of specified statements in respect of animals or plants, or animal products or plant products, produced or processed in the biosecurity zone when advertising, packaging or selling those animals or plants, or animal products or plant products.

Division 3—Limitations on regulation-making power

168—Interpretation

This clause defines the term *biosecurity zone regulation* for the purposes of the Division.

169—Detention or treatment of persons

This clause provides that a biosecurity zone regulation may not prohibit, regulate or control the movement of a person or require treatment measures to be carried out on a person.

170—Destruction requirements

This clause provides that a biosecurity zone regulation may not require or authorise the destruction of a thing except in certain specified cases.

171—Consultation requirements

This clause sets out the requirement for the Minister to consult before recommending to the Governor the making of a biosecurity zone regulation.

Division 4—Warrants

172—Warrants

This clause makes provision for the issuing of a warrant by a magistrate.

Part 11—Orders and directions

Division 1—Emergency orders

173—Emergency orders

This clause makes provision for the declaration of a biosecurity emergency.

174—Duration of emergency order

This clause provides that an emergency order remains in force for the period specified in the order, not exceeding 12 months from the date on which the order is published or served under this Division.

175—Notice of emergency order generally

This clause provides that the Minister must give notice of an emergency order by causing a copy of the order to be published.

176—Notice of emergency order relating to specific property

This clause provides that if the Minister makes an emergency order that is property-specific, the Minister may give notice of the order by causing a copy of the order to be served on the owner, occupier or person apparently in charge of the property.

177—Emergency zones

This clause provides for the specification of emergency zones.

178—Emergency measures

This clause authorises the Minister to specify in an emergency order any measures that the Minister considers are reasonably necessary to respond to a biosecurity emergency.

179—Additional emergency measures

This clause provides for additional emergency measures.

180—Measures which may not be emergency measures

Certain matters are not permitted to be emergency measures.

181—Inspection of persons

An emergency order may require that a person allow themselves to be inspected.

182—Emergency order prevails

This clause provides that an emergency order prevails over specified laws or instruments (including provisions of designated Acts (which are defined)).

183—Offences

This clause makes provision for offences relating to emergency orders.

184—Variation or revocation of emergency order

This clause makes provision in relation to the variation or revocation of emergency order.

185—SA Police

This clause confers a member of SA Police with all the powers of an authorised officer during the declaration of a biosecurity emergency in relation to the emergency.

Division 2—Control orders

186—Control orders

The Minister may make orders establishing control zones and control measures in relation to a zone.

187—Content of control orders

This clause provides for the content of control orders.

188—Duration of control orders

This clause provides for the duration of control orders.

189—Notice of control orders generally

This clause provides for how notice of control orders is to be given generally.

190—Notice of control orders relating to specific property

This clause provides for how notice of control orders is to be given in relation to specific property.

191—Control zones

Provision is made in relation to control zones.

192—Control measures

Provision is made in relation to control measures.

193—Measures which may not be control measures

Certain matters may not be included in control measures.

194—Destruction requirements

Requirements are set out in relation to the circumstances where a control order may not require or authorise the destruction of a thing.

195—Consultation requirements

Consultation requirements that must be followed before making a control order are set out.

196—Offences

This clause provides for offences relating to control orders.

197—Variation or revocation of control order

This clause makes provision in relation to the variation or revocation of control order.

Division 3—Biosecurity directions

Subdivision 1—Preliminary

198—Interpretation

This clause defines the term *designated entity* for the purposes of the Division.

199—Types of biosecurity direction

Biosecurity directions may be general or individual.

200—Period for which biosecurity direction has effect

This clause provides for the period for which a biosecurity direction has effect.

201—Related provision

This provision is interpretative.

Subdivision 2—General biosecurity directions

202—General biosecurity direction

The Chief Executive is authorised to give general biosecurity directions.

203—How general biosecurity direction is given

This clause provides for how general biosecurity directions are to be given.

Subdivision 3—Individual biosecurity directions

204—Individual biosecurity direction

A designated entity is authorised to give an individual biosecurity direction.

205—How individual biosecurity direction is given

This clause provides for how an individual biosecurity direction is to be given.

206—Special emergency powers—inspection and treatment measures

A special provision is made for giving an individual biosecurity direction in an emergency.

207—Recovery of costs

This clause provides for the recovery of costs from the person to whom an individual biosecurity direction.

Subdivision 4—Related provisions

208—Measures which may not be included in biosecurity direction

Certain matters may not be included in biosecurity directions.

209—Interaction with other Acts

This provision relates to the interaction between the exercise of powers under the Division with other Acts.

210—Variation or revocation of biosecurity direction

This clause provides for the variation or revocation of biosecurity directions.

211—Offences

This clause provides for offences relating to biosecurity directions.

Division 4—Action on default

212—Action on default

This clause provides for action to be taken for failure to comply with a designated instrument (an emergency order, control order or biosecurity direction).

Division 5—Warrants

213—Warrants

This clause provides for a magistrate to issue a warrant for the purposes of the Part.

Part 12—Reimbursement and compensation

Division 1—Reimbursement

214—Eligibility for reimbursements

This clause provides for the eligibility for reimbursements to owners for the death of an animal, plant or other property.

215—Claims for reimbursement

This clause provides for a claim for reimbursement.

216—Amount of reimbursement

This clause provides for the amount to be reimbursed.

217—Determination of value

This clause provides that the calculation of the value of any animal, plant or other property that may be the subject of a claim for reimbursement under this Division must be made in accordance with the regulations.

218—Reimbursement may be withheld

This clause provides that the Chief Executive may cause to be retained the whole or part of the reimbursement payable under this Division if a doubt or dispute arises as to the eligibility of a person for the reimbursement.

219—Payment of reimbursement

This clause provides for the reimbursement of an animal, plant or other property destroyed under an approved biosecurity program and in other cases.

220—Recovery of reimbursement

This clause provides that if the Crown has mistakenly paid an amount by way of reimbursement, or partial reimbursement, under this Division to a person who was not eligible for the reimbursement or partial reimbursement, that person is liable to repay that amount to the Chief Executive (on behalf of the Crown) within 3 months after receiving a written demand for repayment from the Chief Executive, or such other period as may be agreed between the parties.

221—Offence to make false claim

This clause creates an offence for making a claim for reimbursement that is false or misleading or fraudulent.

Division 2—Compensation

222—Compensation for loss or damage as consequence of a biosecurity order or direction

This clause provides that a person who has suffered loss or damage as a direct result of an order or direction under Part 11 may apply to the Minister for compensation under this section.

Part 13—Review

Division 1—Preliminary

223—Interpretation

This clause defines terms for the purposes of the Part.

Division 2—Internal review

224—Application for internal review

This clause provides for applications to the Minister for internal reviews of reviewable decisions.

225—Consideration of application for internal review

This clause provides for the matters the Minister must consider in dealing with an application for review.

226—Operation and implementation of decision or direction subject to review

This clause provides that an application for review does not affect the operation of the decision or direction to which the application relates or prevent the taking of action to implement or enforce the decision or direction.

Division 3—External review

227—Application to Tribunal

This clause provides for applications to the Tribunal for a review of the Minister's decision in relation to a reviewable decision.

Part 14—Functions and powers of authorised officers

Division 1—Preliminary

228—Purposes for which functions and powers under Part may be exercised

This clause provides for the functions and powers of authorised officer under this Part.

Division 2—Information gathering

229—Exercise in conjunction with other powers

This clause provides that a power conferred by this Division may be exercised whether or not a power of entry is being exercised under another part of this Act.

230—Power to require information and records

This clause provides that an authorised officer may, by written notice, require a person to furnish to the authorised officer such information or records as the authorised officer may require for an authorised purpose.

231—Power to require answers to questions

This clause provides that an authorised officer may require a person to answer questions in relation to a matter if the authorised officer reasonably believes that the questions may assist in the performance of an authorised purpose.

232—Recording of evidence

This clause provides that an authorised officer may cause any questions and answers to questions given under this Division to be recorded if the authorised officer has informed the person who is to be questioned that the record is to be made.

233—Power of authorised officer to demand name and address

This clause provides that an authorised officer may require a person whom the authorised officer suspects on reasonable grounds to have committed, or to be committing, an offence under this Act or the regulations to state the person's full name and residential address.

234—Requiring information in case of an emergency

This clause provides that a person is not excused from a requirement made by an authorised officer to furnish information or records or to answer a question on the ground that the information, record or answer might incriminate the person or make the person liable to a penalty if the authorised officer makes the requirement in the case of an emergency and the authorised officer warns the person that the authorised officer is making the requirement in the case of an emergency.

Division 3—Power to enter

235—Power to enter

This clause provides that an authorised officer has the power to enter any premises or vehicle.

236—Entry to residential premises

This clause provides for the entry of authorised officers into dwellings.

Division 4—Investigation powers

237—Powers that can be exercised on premises or in relation to a vehicle

This clause provides for the powers of an authorised officer in relation to vehicles.

238—Recovery of fee for action taken

This clause provides for the payment of a fee by a person for any action taken by an authorised officer under a power conferred by this Division if, in the opinion of the Chief Executive, it is reasonable to do so.

Division 5—Provisions relating to seizure

239—Provisions relating to seizure

This clause provides for certain matters, including the seizure of a thing that is subject to the operation of clause 237.

Division 6—Warrants

240—Warrants

This clause provides for a warrant required for the purposes of this Part in relation to premises or a vehicle if a warrant issued by a magistrate.

Division 7—Related matters

241—Care to be taken

This clause provides that in the exercise of a power of entering or searching premises under this Part, or doing anything else on premises under the measure, an authorised officer must do as little damage as is reasonably possible.

242—Detention or treatment of persons

This clause provides for limits and prohibitions around the examination, control of movement and testing of a person by an authorised officer.

243—Destruction requirements

This clause provides for the destruction of a thing in limited circumstances.

244—Destruction proposal

This clause provides that before taking action to destroy any thing an authorised officer must give written notice.

245—Interaction with other Acts

This clause provides for prohibitions and limitations around the exercise of powers that would interact with protections conferred under other Acts.

246—Interference with device, trap or equipment

This clause creates an offence if a person without reasonable excuse, moves, damages or otherwise interferes with any device, bait, trap or other equipment, or any sign, placed on premises by, or under the direction of, an authorised officer for an authorised purpose.

Part 15—Specific biosecurity offences

247—Interpretation

This clause defines terms for the purposes of the Part.

248—Act to cause substantial or material harm or risk

This clause creates an offence provision that arises where a person releases a prescribed agent.

249—Act that may cause harm or risk

This clause creates an offence provision that arises where a person releases a prescribed agent.

250—Substantial harm and material harm

This clause creates establishes whether harm is (or would be) substantial or material for the purposes of the Part.

251—Alternative finding

This clause provides that if in proceedings for an offence against this Part the court is not satisfied that the defendant is guilty of the offence charged but is satisfied that the defendant is guilty of an offence against this Part that carries an equal or lower maximum penalty (determined according to the relative maximum monetary penalties), the court may find the defendant guilty of the latter offence.

Part 16—Legal proceedings

Division 1—Offences generally

252—Classification of offence

All offences against the measure (except one clause) are classified as summary offences.

253—Proceedings for offences

This clause sets out who may commence proceedings for an offence under the proposed Act and time limits for matters to be pursued as breaches of the Act.

254—Offences by employers (vicarious liability)

This clause provides that if an employee or agent commits an offence under this Act, the employer or principal is taken to have committed the same offence, except as provided in the clause.

255—Offences by bodies corporate

These clauses are standard clauses.

256—Offences by employees and agents

This clause sets out where an act or omission of an employee or agent will be taken to be an act or omission of the employer or principal.

257—Continuing offences

A person convicted of an offence will be liable to a penalty with respect to any continuing act or omission.

258—General defence of due diligence

This clause provides for a general defence (relating to due diligence) to a charge of an offence under this measure.

259—Defence of lawful excuse

This clause provides for a defence of lawful excuse.

260—Actions done under direction of an authorised person

A person is not guilty of an offence under the measure for an act done, or omitted, by the person in good faith at the request of, or under the direction of certain specified officers.

261—Common carriers

This clause makes provision relating to criminal liability of common carriers.

262—Burden of proof in certain circumstances

This clause provides that certain matters must be proved by the defendant in criminal proceedings.

263—Expiation of offences

This clause makes provision in relation to the expiation of offences against the measure.

Division 2—Evidentiary provisions

264—Evidentiary certificates

This clause provides for certain things to be proven by certificate evidence.

265—Evidence of allegation

This clause provides for certain allegations to be taken to be proved.

266—Evidence of authorised analyst

This clause contains evidentiary provisions relating to evidence of an authorised analyst.

267—Evidence of state of mind of body corporate

This clause contains evidentiary provisions relating to evidence of the state of mind of a body corporate.

268—Evidence of publication of instruments on website

This clause contains evidentiary provisions relating to evidence of the publication of instruments on the Department website.

269—Evidence of part to be evidence of whole

This clause contains evidentiary provisions relating to evidence of the whole or part of a sample.

270—Evidence in relation to bees

This clause contains evidentiary provisions relating to bee hives.

Division 3—Court orders

271—Preliminary

This clause sets out the capacity for a court to make orders under this Division.

272—Orders for restoration and prevention

This clause provides that the court may order the offender to take such steps as are specified in the order, within such time as is so specified (or such further time as the court, on application, may allow in certain specified cases).

273—Orders for costs, expenses and compensation at time offence proved

This clause provides that the court may, if satisfied of specified matters, order the offender to pay to a government agency or person an amount fixed by the court for costs and expenses incurred or by way of compensation for loss or damage suffered.

274—Recovery of costs, expenses and compensation after offence proved

This clause provides that if, after the court finds an offence proved, a government agency or person may recover from the offender the costs and expenses incurred or the amount of the loss or damage in a court of competent jurisdiction.

275—Orders regarding costs and expenses of investigation

This clause makes provision in relation to orders that may be made regarding the costs and expenses of an investigation.

276—Orders regarding financial benefits

This clause enables the court to order an offender pay an amount which the court is satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, represents the amount of any financial benefits acquired by the offender or an associate of the offender, or accrued or accruing to the offender or an associate of the offender, as a result of the commission of an offence.

277—Prohibition orders

This clause enables the court to make certain prohibition-type orders.

278—Forfeiture

This clause enables the court to make forfeiture orders.

279—Publication order

This clause enables the court to make order requiring the publication of certain information.

280—Failure to comply with orders

An offence is provided for a failure to comply with an order.

Part 17—Miscellaneous

281—Reasonable suspicion of carrier

This clause sets out where an animal, plant or other thing may reasonably be suspected of being a carrier of biosecurity matter.

282—Reasonable suspicion of infection

This clause sets out where an animal, plant or other thing may reasonably be suspected of being infected with a disease.

283—Reasonable suspicion of infestation

This clause sets out where an animal, plant or other thing may reasonably be suspected of being infested with a pest.

284—Public warning statements

The Chief Officer may make public statements or erect public signs about certain matters.

285—Management of stray livestock

This clause provides for the detention and management of stray livestock.

286—Facilities for temporary detention of stray livestock

This clause provides for arrangements for facilities for the temporary detention of stray livestock.

287—Implied contractual terms and conditions

The regulations may provide for certain contractual terms and conditions relevant to the measure.

288—False or misleading information

This is a standard clause.

289—Self-incrimination

This clause makes provision in relation to the privilege against self-incrimination.

290—Vicarious liability

This clause sets out where an act or omission of an employee or agent will be taken to be the act or omission of the employer or principal.

291—Service of orders, notices, directions and other instruments and documents

This clause provides for the service of a prescribed instrument.

292—Description of land in instruments

This clause provides for the description of land or premises in a prescribed instrument.

293—Statutory declarations

This clause provides for the requirement to verify information in the form of a statutory declaration.

294—Protection from liability

This clause provides that the disclosure of information by a person in good faith in certain cases does not incur any civil or criminal liability, is not to be taken to have breached any duty of confidentiality and is not to be taken to have breached any professional ethics or standards or any principles of conduct applicable to the person's employment or to have engaged in unprofessional conduct.

295—Collection, use and disclosure of information

This clause provides for the collection and use of information by a designated person.

296—Immunity

This clause provides a protection from civil or criminal liability to the Crown or a designated person.

297—Planning or other requirements for authorised actions excluded

This clause permits action taken on land despite the requirements for a consent, approval or other authorisation under a designated Act or any other Act.

298—Requirements may continue to have effect

This clause provides for the continuing effect of a requirement imposed by or under the measure.

299—Civil proceedings by the Crown

This clause provides that any civil right of action or recovery under the measure vested in the Minister, the Chief Executive, a government department, a public sector employee or other agency or instrumentality of the Crown may be instituted and exercised by the Crown in right of South Australia and in accordance with the *Crown Proceedings Act 1992*.

300—Application of *Personal Property Securities Act 2009* of the Commonwealth

This clause establishes exclusions for the *Personal Property Securities Act 2009* of the Commonwealth.

301—Establishment of biosecurity advisory groups

This clause provides that the Minister may establish 1 or more biosecurity advisory groups in relation to any sector of an industry that has an interest in the operation of the measure.

302—Charges on land

This clause provides that if a charge on land is created by another provision of the measure or under the regulations, the person in whose favour the charge is created may deliver to the Registrar-General a notice, in a form determined by the Registrar-General, setting out the amount of the charge and the land over which the charge is claimed.

303—Use of equipment or computers to make decisions

This clause provides for the use of equipment, computer, software or other mechanical or electronic device or process of a class or kind approved by the Minister may be use in certain cases.

304—Defence if act authorised under another Act

This clause establishes a defence for an offence against the measure, if the defendant proves that the act alleged to constitute the offence was authorised by or under the *Fisheries Management Act 2007* or an Act, or a provision of an Act, prescribed by the regulations.

305—Exemption from Act

This clause provides that the Minister may, by notice in the Gazette, confer exemptions from the measure or specified provisions of the measure Act.

306—Regulations, notices and instruments

This clause provides for the making of regulations, notices and other instruments.

Schedule 1—Statutory corporations

This Schedule makes provision for the establishment of statutory corporations.

Schedule 2—Dog Fence Board

This Schedule sets out provisions in relation to the Dog Fence Board and other provisions in relation to dog fences, such as arrangements relating to the collection of rates and maintenance of dog fences.

Schedule 3—Specific measures and provisions to deal with biosecurity risk or biosecurity impact

This Schedule sets out specific measures and provisions to deal with biosecurity risk or biosecurity impact.

Schedule 4—Biosecurity advisory groups

This Schedule makes provision for biosecurity advisory groups.

Schedule 5—Regulations

This Schedule makes provision for the power to make regulations.

Schedule 6—Related amendments, repeals and transitional provisions

This Schedule makes related amendments to other Acts, repeals other Acts and provides for transitional arrangements to support the measure.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PARLIAMENT—EXECUTIVE OFFICER AND CLERKS) BILL

Assent

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

**MOTOR VEHICLES (MOTOR DRIVING INSTRUCTORS AND AUTHORISED EXAMINERS)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Assent

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

RETIREMENT VILLAGES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL*Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

ELECTORAL (ACCOUNTABILITY AND INTEGRITY) AMENDMENT BILL*Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (VICTIMS OF CRIME) BILL*Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE (OVERSIGHT AND ADVOCACY BODIES) (CHILD DEATH AND SERIOUS INJURY REVIEW COMMITTEE) AMENDMENT BILL*Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

OFFICE FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT BILL*Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

NATIONAL ELECTRICITY (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (ORDERLY EXIT MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK) AMENDMENT BILL*Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

GREYHOUND INDUSTRY REFORM INSPECTOR BILL*Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

TRANSPLANTATION AND ANATOMY (DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION AND DELEGATION) AMENDMENT BILL*Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (SMALL BUSINESS COMMISSION AND RETAIL AND COMMERCIAL LEASES) BILL*Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

JUDICIAL CONDUCT COMMISSIONER (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL*Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

ELECTORAL (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL*Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

PREVENTIVE HEALTH SA BILL*Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

*Parliamentary Procedure***ANSWERS TABLED**

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

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

House of Assembly—Register of Members' Interests—Primary Returns Registrar's Statement February 2025 [Ordered to be published]
Independent Commission Against Corruption—Integrity State 2023-24: Corruption prevention recommendations Corrigendum 12 December 2024
Ombudsman SA—Corrigendum Annual Report 2023-24 [Ordered to be published]
Reports of the Public Works Committee Received and Published Pursuant to Section 17(7) of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991:
114th Report—Gawler Tank Project
115th Report—Adelaide Road, Mount Barker Roundabout Upgrade
116th Report—Horrocks Highway—Wild Dog Creek Culvert Replacement Project
117th Report—Main South Road Overtaking Lanes—Normanville To Cape Jervis
118th Report—Mount Barker And River Road Junction Upgrade Project
119th Report—Brahma Lodge Kindergarten New Facility
120th Report—Women's And Children's Hospital Sustainment Project Variation—Paediatric Intensive Care Unit Upgrade
121st Report—Northern Crisis Stabilisation Centre
122nd Report—New Women's And Children's Hospital Early Works Package—Stage 2

By the Premier (Hon. P.B. Malinauskas)—

Remuneration Tribunal—
Accommodation and Meal Allowances—Judges, Court Officers and Statutory Officers Determination No. 9 of 2024
Accommodation and Meal Allowances—Judges, Court Officers and Statutory Officers, 2024 Review of Report No. 9 of 2024
Accommodation and Meal Allowances for Ministers of the Crown and the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Opposition Determination No. 8 of 2024
Accommodation and Meal Allowances for Ministers of the Crown and the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Opposition, 2024 Review Report No. 8 of 2024
Accommodation Reimbursement and Allowances for Country Members of Parliament Determination No. 16 of 2024
Accommodation Reimbursement and Allowances for Country Members of Parliament, 2024 Review of Report No. 16 of 2024
Conveyance Allowances—Judges, Court Officer and Statutory Officers Determination No. 15 of 2024
Conveyance Allowances—Judges, Court Officer and Statutory Officers, 2024 Review of Report No. 15 of 2024
Electorate Allowances for Members of the Parliament of South Australia Report No. 10 of 2024
Exemption to the financial year cap of fees for Deputy Board Member Mr Greg May for the year 2024-25 Determination No. 17 of 2024
Exemption to the financial year cap of fees for Deputy Board Member Mr Greg May for the year 2024-25, Application for Report No. 17 of 2024
Minimum and Maximum Remuneration for the City of Holdfast Bay Council Local Government Chief Executive Officer, 2024 Review of Report No. 18 of 2024

Overseas Accommodation and Daily Allowance Pacific Judicial Conference—
Chief Justice Kourakis Determination No. 13 of 2024
Overseas Accommodation and Daily Allowance Pacific Judicial Conference—
Chief Justice Kourakis Report No. 13 of 2024
Reimbursement of Expenses Applicable to the Electorate of Mawson—Travel to
and from Kangaroo Island by Ferry and Aircraft Report No. 11 of 2024
Salary of the Governor of South Australia Determination No. 12 of 2024
Salary of the Governor of South Australia, 2024 Review of Report No. 12 of 2024
Salary Sacrifice Arrangements for Judges, Court Officers and Statutory Officers
Determination No. 14 of 2024
Salary Sacrifice Arrangements for Judges, Court Officers and Statutory Officers,
2024 Review of Report No. 14 of 2024

By the Deputy Premier (Hon. S.E. Close)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Guardianship and Administration—Prescribed Amount
Public Sector—Ministerial Travel Reports
Return to Work—Limits on Costs
Succession—General
Rules made under the following Acts—
South Australian Employment Tribunal—South Australian Employment Tribunal
Rules 2024
Supreme Court Act 1935, District Court Act 1991, Environment, Resources and
Development Court Act 1993, Youth Court Act 1993, Magistrates Court—
Joint Criminal—No. 5
Supreme Court Act 1935, District Court Act 1991, Magistrates Court Act 1991,
Youth Court Act 1993, Environment, Resources and Development Court
Act 1993, Mining Act 1971, Local Government (Elections)
Act 1999, First Nations Voice—Uniform Civil—No. 13
Supreme Court Act 1935, District Court Act 1991, Youth Court Act 1993,
Magistrates Court—Uniform Special Statutory—No. 4

By the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water (Hon. S.E. Close)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Animal Welfare—Use of Traps
Single-use and Other Plastic Products (Waste Avoidance)—Food Containers

By the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Motor Vehicles—
Classification of Licences
Demerit Points
Emergency Workers
Passenger Transport—
Airport Taxi Fare
Miscellaneous (2025)
Rail Safety National Law (South Australia)—Drug and Alcohol Testing
Road Traffic—
Light Vehicles Standards—Emergency Vehicles
Miscellaneous—Helmet Standards and Emergency Workers
Road Rules—Ancillary and Miscellaneous Provisions—
Emergency Workers

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

Forestry SA (South Australian Forestry Corporation)—Charter 2023—2024
Metropolitan Fire Service Superannuation Scheme, South Australian—Annual Report 2023—24
Regulations made under the following Acts—
Fisheries Management—
Demerit Points—Miscellaneous (2024)
General—Miscellaneous (2024)
Marine Scalefish Fishery—Carriage of Devices on Registered Boat
Rock Lobster Fisheries—Miscellaneous (2024)
Sardine Fishery—
Fishing Zones
Quota Entitlement
Vessel Monitoring Scheme—Sardine Fishery Zones
Livestock—Electronic Identification of Sheep and Goats

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Assisted Reproductive Treatment—General
Automated External Defibrillators (Public Access)—General
Controlled Substances—Poisons—Pharmacist Vaccine Administration
Tobacco and E-Cigarette Products—
E-Cigarette and Other Reforms
Fees Notice—No. 2 (2024)

By the Minister for Human Services (Hon. N.F. Cook)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Cost of Living Concessions—Miscellaneous—No. 2 (2024)

By the Minister for Small and Family Business (Hon. A. Michaels)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Retail and Commercial Leases—Prescribed Threshold

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration—Fees Notice—Fees (2025)
Gaming Machines—Approved Trading System

Ministerial Statement

COPPER AND SCRAP METAL THEFT

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Police) (14:07): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Today the Malinauskas Labour government continues its record of cracking down on crime, with new reforms announced to prevent copper and scrap metal theft, with the reforms released for public consultation. The government has continued to deliver law reform, cracking down on child sex offending, dangerous driving, arsonists causing bushfires, outlaw motorcycle gang members, domestic violence perpetrators, drug traffickers, and those who assault retail workers and police officers. We have also substantially increased resourcing to South Australia Police to get more sworn officers onto frontline duties and to invest in the equipment and premises necessary to help them protect the community.

Today's reforms continue this proud record by targeting the theft of copper and scrap metal, which is a dangerous and expensive crime. It is not only inconvenient due to the delays caused to building works for householders and builders but it also comes at a huge expense to businesses, which often spend tens of thousands of dollars a week on replacement and prevention measures.

Concerningly, the theft of copper wiring also poses a significant safety risk to members of the public as well as to construction workers, with criminals often leaving live wires exposed on construction sites. It can also cause huge disruptions to public infrastructure, such as in July 2023 when the theft of a \$2,000 piece of copper cabling launched the metropolitan train network into safety mode, causing significant morning peak-hour disruptions.

The state government is consulting the public and scrap metal industry and the community on our proposal to develop a standalone piece of legislation to make it harder for criminals to sell stolen scrap metal and copper. This includes reforms such as:

- requiring scrap metal dealers to be registered and undergo probity checks;
- prohibiting cash or the use of cryptocurrency to buy and sell scrap metal;
- requiring proof of ID and accurate records for all scrap metal transactions;
- requiring scrap metal dealers to upload transaction details into a digital portal;
- allowing police to inspect scrap metal dealer premises and issue closure orders to those who do not comply; and
- enforcing appropriate penalties for breaches of the act.

I encourage members of the community to have their say on the proposed copper and scrap metal reforms as part of a three-week public consultation period by visiting the YourSAy website.

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (14:11): I bring up the 123rd report of the committee, entitled Seaton Apartment Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Question Time

HYDROGEN POWER PLANT

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:13): My question is to the Premier. Will the government still deliver its hydrogen plant in full and, if so, when? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: It was reported this week that the Queensland government will not invest any further in the Central Queensland Hydrogen Project due to significant cost blowouts.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:13): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question on an important subject. The South Australian government—or the South Australian Labor Party at the time—committed to our Hydrogen Jobs Plan in the lead-up to the last state election and, through the Office of Hydrogen Power, which sits under the auspices of the Department for Energy and Mining, ever since then has been working assiduously to bring this policy to fruition. We have been candid in the public realm repeatedly, particularly over the course of the last 18 months, that this is an exceptionally complex project and is a unique policy in that it seeks to be globally leading.

One of the key pillars that underpins the policy that underpins the Hydrogen Jobs Plan is its location. We made a very conscious and deliberate decision, in no small part on the back of the advocacy from the member for Giles, that the hydrogen project be located in Whyalla immediately adjacent to the steelworks. The reason for that, of course, is we see a substantial opportunity in

green iron production, whether it be through hot briquetted iron or in other forms, for an export opportunity into the future.

We made it clear that the government's ambition around the Hydrogen Jobs Plan—and we have been consistent around this, particularly as a result of the work that we have done over the course of the last couple of years—isn't to see to hydrogen export in its rawest form, but in the long term we actually see an opportunity for hydrogen to be used domestically in the production of decarbonised iron—

Mr Patterson interjecting:

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —into the future. Similarly, as the member for Morphett interjects, there was also the power station element of the policy proposition. I think I have made plainly known in the public realm over a period of time that one of the first elements we were able to sign up to is that power plant function. That is why, as we speak, in the United States—in Ohio—the turbines for the power plant, which have the capability to be powered or fuelled exclusively by hydrogen, are under production and we expect them to be in South Australia in the not-too-distant future. So we remain committed to it but we don't make any apologies for making sure that, as we develop the policy, we do so in concert with would-be off-takers and we particularly have in mind the steelworks.

Now, there is no secret about the fact and we have been very candid about the fact that the steelworks represents a substantial policy challenge at the moment for the state and the country writ large. We know that GFG is enduring very challenging circumstances financially at the moment, and this is of grave concern to the South Australian government. That is why, ever since really September/October last year, through the work of the Steel Task Force, we have been contemplating a suite of policy responses and potential interventions, which may or may not be needed.

The best outcome for the future of Whyalla is, of course, for Mr Gupta to realise his ambitions in and around the steelworks, including its transformation to be able to produce green iron or green steel and then the state government would be in a strong position to partner with that endeavour. Having said that, the government is increasingly concerned, as I have said more recently—in fact, most recently on Thursday of last week when I held a press conference in Whyalla, along with the member for Giles—we remain increasingly concerned about the capability of GFG to be able to invest the capital that is required to realise that transformation.

Having said that, we continue to work on this policy endeavour, because making sure that we realise the full potential of everything that the Upper Spencer Gulf has before it remains a critical economic objective of the government.

POWER PRICES

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): My question is to the Premier. Will the government's hydrogen power plant lower power prices for South Australian households and, if so, by how much and when?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:18): We have been very clear that our entire aim with the generator is threefold: we want the generator to offer competition in the wholesale market, we want to showcase our ability to show that hydrogen can store energy when there are times of oversupply of renewable energy and we want it for some security.

The Premier made a very big point at the last election about politicians promising price decreases in retail pricing. Members opposite made these types of promises to the people of South Australia and couldn't meet it—could not meet it—and the truth is our job is to make sure that we have a competitive market and we want to make sure that the generator is there to provide system security.

The reason we have to provide that system security is that, you might recall, in the term between 2014 and 2018 the state government, in response to a statewide blackout, put in place temporary generation that was there for the state's strategic reserve. For the first time since ETSA, the state government had state strategic reserve of a power—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left! Member for Unley, you can leave the chamber until the end of question time. It has been six minutes.

The honourable member for Unley having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That state strategic reserve was there to provide the state with the ability to have sovereign capability. When the private sector let us down and couldn't provide the power we needed, we had state reserve there to pump into the system. Once again, on leaving office our opponents returned to form and privatised those assets. When they—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Florey is on his final warning.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That strategic reserve was then sold to the private sector and put into the market, and the market responded by taking supply out—taking supply out. In the end, we were no better off in terms of strategic supply and, of course, capacity in the system.

What we have seen subsequently is we have seen more power come out of the system, but thankfully this government, which is not anti-renewables, is seeing more wind farms being built, more storage being built and more capacity in the system. More capacity is seeing wholesale prices drop. You are seeing more competition in the market, and because of what is going on globally you are seeing an increase in the cost of gas that is setting the price across the country.

What is causing gas prices to increase? Scarcity of gas. What was the political party in this chamber that banned exploration and production of gas, one of our largest bases? The guilty party opposite—the guilty party opposite. So we won't be lectured about power prices, we won't be lectured about energy security and we won't be lectured about the state owning generation in this state. It is the right thing to do, because we agree with Tom Playford: power belongs in the people's hands, not in the private sector.

HYDROGEN POWER PLANT

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:21): My question again is to the Premier: will the hydrogen plant be delivered on budget?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:21): The government is in the procurement process, and what members opposite want me to do is to signal to the companies—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What they want us to do is signal to the people we are negotiating with on price either an increase or decrease and set a price. We won't do that. We are in a procurement. We will be protecting the state's interests and making sure that we get the best possible price we can, because we believe that the state owning generation is fundamentally important. We believe that the state should have a strategic reserve. We believe that we should own a generator. We believe that we should be able to provide South Australians with that security.

Just last year, members opposite voted for a piece of legislation to allow the state to require generators that were exiting the market to stay in the market, and after they had voted for it they went out and complained about it. They voted for it and then complained about it.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The interview begins.

Mr TEAGUE: Point of order. The minister is nearly two minutes in. It is 98(a): he is debating in almost the most generational terms. The simple question was: will the hydrogen plant be delivered on budget? He needs to answer the question.

The SPEAKER: Minister for Energy.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: As we have said previously from the day we came into office, we are in a procurement process. We won't be making comments outside that procurement process. Our focus is on the Upper Spencer Gulf, is on the people of Whyalla. We want the very best outcomes for them. We want to protect the jobs we've got in place now. They are our first priority, making sure we can look after the people of Whyalla. We will be doing everything we can to make sure we can give all the tools and equipment to that community to make sure that we can continue to prosper steelmaking and mining and ultimately decarbonise that process.

GREEN STEEL

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): My question again is to the Premier. Will green steel be produced in Whyalla this decade?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:24): Green steel will be produced in Whyalla and the only way it could be stopped is if there was a change of government.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Hear the laughing. First they forced car manufacturing out of the state, daring Holden to leave. We believe in steelmaking. We believe in steelmaking in this country. South Australia is the first iron ore miner in this country. We are the last jurisdiction in this country to manufacture long products. We make rail line in structural steel. We are a continent nation with the largest iron ore reserves in the world. Can we really be a country that is sovereign without having our own steelmaking capability? The answer to that question is no.

Everyone knows we need to decarbonise our industry, so of course we want to decarbonise green steel. We need a partner. Importantly, the hard part for us is that we have a partner who is currently not investing. They are not investing in Whyalla. There are countless numbers of contractors who remain unpaid.

There are a stream of promises that have been made to the people of South Australia when both governments were in office. We want those promises to be fulfilled. The one constant, throughout this entire time, since the Arrium administration until today, is that the people of Whyalla have had one constant, that we have got their back, that we will back them. Whyalla is too big to fail. We will back steelmaking, we will back the steelworks and we want it to remain.

From the member for Giles, throughout every person on this side of the chamber—and dare I imagine, everyone on the crossbench as well—we want Whyalla to succeed. It has got an important industrial port; it has got great capabilities. The Middleback Ranges are some of the best magnetite resources anywhere in the world. It is adjacent to some of the best renewable resources anywhere in the world.

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader has a point of order.

Mr TEAGUE: It's 98(a) again. There is a rule against debating. It is a simple question: is green steel going to be produced in Whyalla this decade?

The SPEAKER: I think the minister is giving some context about Whyalla. The minister will resume his answer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: To produce green steel you need a magnetite resource, we've got that. You need a port close to the magnetite resources, we've got that. You need a capable workforce, you've got that. We need components. We need gas and hydrogen, two things members opposite oppose; they oppose. You need renewable resources. We have got vast amounts of that which these members opposite oppose. What we are doing is laying out the framework to have a green steel industry in this state. Why? It is a centrepiece of our Prosperity Project.

The Prosperity Project is all about adding value to our mineral resources that we have here in the state. No amount of interjecting and attacking the people of South Australia for their ambitions and wanting to have prosperity on the Eyre Peninsula and the Upper Spencer Gulf is going to change any of that. It is not going to change it. They laughed when we wanted to reinvest in Port Pirie. They

celebrated Arrium going into administration, they cheered Holden leaving, and now they are trying to celebrate the end of the steelworks in Whyalla. Shame on all of you.

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader.

Mr TEAGUE: It is a point of order on 98(a). Again, the minister seems hell-bent on debating rather than answering the question.

The SPEAKER: I thought the minister was wrapping up. Yes, he has finished.

VEHICLE REGISTRATIONS

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:28): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister explain to the house why the automated telephone service for renewing vehicle registrations has been discontinued. With your leave, Mr Speaker, and the leave of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr McBRIDE: It used to be the simple, quick and easy to renew registrations via the automated service with no need to speak to a customer service operator. Now that system has been discontinued and people who wish to renew via phone have to wait for an operator to become available, if they can understand, which is extremely time-consuming as well.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:29): I want to thank again the member for MacKillop for his question and his deep concern for regional constituents, which is welcome in this chamber. It is good to see someone fighting for the regions.

Mr Brown: It's not just hashtag.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: There's a hashtag there somewhere, isn't there? The member is referring to the Interactive Voice Response service, and the acronym is IVR. The service was introduced in 2003 as a means for our customers to renew their registration via an automated service by calling a designated phone number. At that point in time, digital renewal options, including the EzyReg app, direct debit and the mySAGOV account, were yet to be introduced to the public, so this is a legacy service that we have had in place before all the digital improvements. The introduction of these multiple other payment options since 2003 has resulted in a considerable decline in people using the IVR service. The drop in service has rendered it unviable for us to continue it operating.

This renewal payment option was decommissioned on 27 October, as only 0.6 per cent of all renewals were being processed through this process. Customers can still call Service SA on 131084 during business hours to renew their registration, so you can still talk to a person to do it. Upon calling, customers will be connected to a service delivery officer and have access to a range of Service SA services and transactions.

For the house's information, my department advises that over 80 per cent of registration renewals are now processed digitally. The IVR has served us well, but it's time has come and gone. The remainder is processed through the Service SA centres and local post offices. I know there is some concern from that small cohort who still use the IVR. They have become used to it. They have been doing it now for nearly two decades, but time has moved on. I apologise to the constituents of MacKillop who have enjoyed this service, but Service SA is more than happy to assist the member and his office to help people get onto the other services to be able to access these appropriate new services.

There are many other ways you can register your vehicle or renew it, whether it's through the mySAGOV account, turning up in person—which I know is difficult for people in regional centres, so I don't say that in any way to try to engage a response—and of course there is always Australia Post. There is a series of Service SA centres throughout Adelaide and, of course, they can do it by post still. You can still use Australia Post. That of course is by a renewal notice with a return payment to Service SA at GPO Box 1533, Adelaide SA 5001. You can pay by money order or cheque marked 'not negotiable' made payable to the Department for Infrastructure and Transport, not me personally.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT PRIVATISATION

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (14:32): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier provide an update to the house on progress towards ending privatisation of our trains and trams?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:33): I thank the member for Waite for her question. The member for Waite is an enthusiastic supporter of public transport. I know the member for Waite very much values the train service on the Belair line. I am very happy for the member for Waite and all her constituents, that when they catch the train—this morning or tomorrow or the day after—they will be doing it on a publicly run train service.

The contrast couldn't be starker in terms of policy approaches on behalf of the government and the former government in that the former government, of course, made a crystal clear commitment at the 2018 election that they did not have a privatisation agenda. Very quickly after forming government, what was the first thing they went about doing? Privatising an essential public service in the train and tram system.

We made a commitment of our own. Very quickly upon that privatisation being announced and then subsequently realised by the former government, we said that, if we were elected, we would reverse the privatisation of our train and tram system. Here we are. In stark contrast to those opposite, we have made a promise and we have kept that promise. Now a critical service like our train network is back operating in the interests of the people.

Now why does this matter? Well, apart from the fact that there was a promise made and a promise kept, it of course makes a difference in terms of the outcome and the amenity of the service for the South Australian people. Let me give you an example. We know that when they privatised the train network, they also simultaneously authorised the reduction in the number of passenger service assistants who will be out there doing work on the ground.

Now passenger service assistants (PSAs), what do they do? They help disabled people get on and off our trains and trams, they look after fare evasion, they make the service more secure. So fewer of them means less security; it also means more fare evasion and a lower quality service. Now that that service is back in public hands, we are going back to having more PSAs, with an additional over 30 PSAs working on the network, particularly after 7 o'clock at night, making the service safer, with less fare evasion and of higher quality. This is just one example of our investment in the public transport system.

The member for Black has only been in the parliament for a few weeks and he is already delivering a major upgrade to the Marino train station, something that was mooted by those opposite as well. He is already getting on with the job. I have seen in recent days the Leader of the Opposition taking a half present position of saying that if he gets elected he also doesn't have a privatisation agenda on the train and tram network, but is he willing to stand up and say, 'I was party to a mistake. We got it wrong. We should have never broken our promise. We should have never devalued the service and we should have kept it in public hands.' We have not seen any contrition on behalf of the Leader of the Opposition on this important subject.

But for the people of South Australia as it stands today, when they catch a train they know they are catching a publicly owned service operating in the interests of people rather than profits going to the French or some other overseas company. And in the middle of this year, we will yet have cause for more celebration in regard to our public transport network as the trams also come back into public operation. This government values public transport, we see it being a public good, and that is why we are very proud of honouring our promise to the people of South Australia.

HYDROGEN POWER PLANT

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:37): My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. How much taxpayer money has the government spent on the hydrogen power plant and the Office of Hydrogen Power to date?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:37): I don't have an estimate. I will check. The budget was \$593 million. I will find out how much of that we spent and get back to the member. I also

want to point out to the house that there has been a very big event over the summer. The member for Morphett became the first father/daughter pick for Collingwood and everyone in the house congratulates him on seeing his daughter excel his career, and kick more goals, win more premierships and do much better than him.

HYDROGEN POWER PLANT

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:38): I also have another question for the Minister for Energy and Mining but I concur with that last statement. That is the first thing we will concur on. As I said, my question is for the Minister for Energy and Mining. How much taxpayer money will be spent on the hydrogen power plant and the Office of Hydrogen Power this year?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:38): Again, I will go away and have a look at that and get back to the house as quickly as I can. I think the term is sine die.

HYDROGEN POWER PLANT

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:38): My question is again to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Has the government provided the Auditor-General with all the cabinet documents relevant to the hydrogen power plant?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:38): Cabinet deliberations, as the shadow minister knows, are for cabinet, but the Auditor-General gets the information he needs to provide an adequate audit to the house.

SHARK TASKFORCE

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (14:38): My question is to the minister representing the Minister for Primary Industries. Is the \$500,000 funding package delivered to Surf Life Saving SA on the recommendation of the Shark Taskforce going to help prevent shark attacks on the Yorke and Eyre peninsulas? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr ELLIS: The Shark Taskforce was formed after four shark attack deaths, two on the Yorke Peninsula and two on the west coast of the Eyre Peninsula. In response, the taskforce has delivered \$500,000 to Surf Life Saving SA, of which there are no clubs on the YP or the EP aside from Whyalla which I don't understand to be a very popular surfing destination, and the expansion of the Westpac Life Saver Rescue Helicopter service to survey coastline predominantly south of the city, rather than where the shark attacks have actually occurred.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Police) (14:39): I thank the member for Narungga for his question because I think all members and, of course, all South Australians are very aware of the devastating impact that shark attacks can have on local communities in particular. We have had a number of instances not just here in South Australia but around the country of shark attacks and in particular fatalities arising from shark attacks. For regional communities, when a local member of the community is attacked, let alone killed in one of these attacks, it is absolutely devastating for the community.

It has been a challenging issue for governments of both political persuasions in South Australia in recent decades to grapple with, because South Australia has a very long coastline across not only the member for Narungga's territory, the Yorke Peninsula, but also across the member for Flinders' territory and Eyre Peninsula, let alone some of those beaches a little closer to where we are today, whether they are metropolitan beaches or beaches around the south coast and, of course, down in the South-East. These are beaches that are outside the metropolitan area, located in smaller regional communities, and many of these beaches sought out by surfers can be quite remote and difficult to access.

What this government has done is build on the work of previous governments and extend shark patrols, which the member for Narungga rightly says are predominantly within the metropolitan area and also the south coast, not too far from Adelaide, but in addition to that has entered into a

\$500,000 program for a series of initiatives with Surf Life Saving SA to try to expand the reach of—this is perhaps not the best way of putting it—shark prevention activities.

This includes, for example, better signage at beaches around South Australia alerting swimmers and surfers to the potential presence of sharks and to the dangers of swimming in remote beaches where help is not often readily at hand, education programs and also trying to diversify the way in which we patrol for the presence of sharks at beaches where people might be swimming and surfing using relatively new technologies, for example, away from the fixed and rotary wing shark patrols including using drones and making sure that not only is there an investment in the necessary equipment but also the training to use those as well, as well as the necessary reporting mechanisms.

I don't think anyone can pretend that a government is ever able to come up with a series of initiatives that will completely and fully protect the community of South Australia from the risk of shark attacks given the nature of the state's geography, its coastline and the attraction of some of our remote beaches for swimming and surfing activities, but I am pleased that this government has extended the efforts of previous governments to make more resources available for the community to try to lessen the frequency of these horrendous incidents occurring in our state.

SOUTH AUSTRALIA POLICE

Ms CLANCY (Elder) (14:43): My question is to the Minister for Police. Can the minister please update the house on initiatives for the retention and recruitment of South Australian police and whether he is aware of any alternative approaches?

The Hon. V.A. Tarzia interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Police) (14:43): Are you commenting about changes in personnel? Really? A bold strategy. South Australia's strong labour market has meant that it has been a challenge for employers across our state, including the Liberal Party, to attract and retain skilled workers. Such is the strength of our labour market that not only is our unemployment rate at historic lows but 52,000 jobs have been created across our state and there still remains 23,000 job vacancies.

South Australia Police has found itself in the same predicament as many other employers in South Australia, needing to fight for talent to attract more people to their workforce, and of course like the rest of the community South Australia is experiencing a relatively ageing workforce with an increased number of retirements. As we would all be aware, policing is some of the most challenging work that can be undertaken in our state. It is, by its very nature, unsafe. It is incredibly demanding and it is very mentally and emotionally taxing for those people undertaking it. That is why the state government has committed more than \$300 million in additional funding to South Australia Police to support their efforts, in particular, with the attraction and recruitment of new staff.

One of the challenges has been that, even as funded sworn police officer numbers remain at very high levels, it has been a challenge to fully staff those levels. We have partnered with police, for example, in a nearly \$82 million commitment to enable South Australia Police to recruit an extra 189 sworn police security officers, allowing those police security officers to undertake more not so much frontline tasks and also releasing sworn police officers onto the frontline.

We have also committed \$12.2 million to accelerate police recruitment and training, and we have also committed \$9.3 million to facilitate the deployment of 24 police officers into priority policing duties. These are just some of the initiatives that we have invested in.

Of course, just before Christmas we entered into a new interim enterprise bargaining deal with police officers to give them a very substantial pay rise: a 4 per cent salary increase in the month just gone and another 4 per cent salary increase next January, and a new retention allowance of \$2½ thousand, with a further one-off payment next January. This is giving South Australia Police the support they need.

I am aware that those opposite believe they have a strong story to tell when it comes to retention, despite the frequent personnel changes, despite those people who continue a conga line of exits from the South Australian Liberal Party. This government not only remains united and growing but we also back our police in those strategies that will improve recruitment and retention. It might

be good for those opposite, including the fledgling shadow minister, to go down to speak to police about how retention strategies can work, because I am sure the whole party could benefit from some of those strategies.

POWER PRICES

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:47): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier take action to bring down power prices in South Australia and, if so, when? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr PATTERSON: The latest Australian Energy Regulator's wholesale market report shows that in South Australia the average wholesale power price increased from \$100 per megawatt hour in the 2023 calendar year to \$128 per megawatt hour in the 2024 year.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:48): When you compare the AEMO Quarterly Energy Dynamics report, the AER Q4 wholesale price report, which the shadow member will not quote, to quarter 3 of 2024, when South Australia was impacted by high price events, we have seen a 60 per cent decrease in prices in Q4 of 2024. He cherrypicks, right? Even a clock is right twice a day. What he is doing is he is cherrypicking an argument, sticking to that to go out and frighten people—

Mr Patterson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morphett, you have asked your question. Please listen to the answer or you will leave the chamber.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —to not turn on their air conditioners. What I am showing is the volatility in the wholesale market is so volatile that you have these extraordinary price fluctuations, but picking out a point in time and saying this is a norm forever is just simply not accurate. The member knows this. This is complicated—

Mr Patterson: That's why I chase for the whole year, Tom.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, chasing is the right word; it's the part in front that you have forgotten. I have to say, it is encouraging to note that South Australia's average wholesale prices have fallen by 32 per cent in the 2023-24 financial year. This report, the way AEMO and the AER release it, is more holistic. We will talk about strategies to lower power prices. The truth is, what is setting power prices in South Australia is gas. The higher price of gas is setting power prices.

When you have high prices in thermal production, what offsets it is renewable energy. What you've got under this government is an active policy piece to have more renewable energy into the system to help lower power prices, and it is working. The more we use renewables, the less we pay for our power. But when you have gas backing up wind and solar in an intermittent way, what you find then is that gas then sets the price for power prices, and that means it is higher.

As I said earlier, the reason gas prices are higher is because of restrictive policies that have been legislated in this place by members opposite. They legislate—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Morphett, I have asked you to remain quiet while listening to the minister's answer to your question. If you want to ask your next couple of questions and not be in the tuckshop, you might want to be quiet.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I will give the house some real-life examples. When gas sets the price, prices spike. As you saw in that part that the shadow minister was quoting, gas is setting the price. But in Q4 of 2024, South Australia had a record number of negative price intervals due to a combination of better weather, higher rooftop solar output, and continued increase in generation from renewables. Negative prices led to a quarterly volume weighted average price of \$9 per megawatt hour lower in South Australia.

Mr Telfer: That's in quarter 2024.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: 2024, yes, that was two months ago.

Mr Telfer: Quarter 4—well, unfortunately, we've got 12 months. We've got four quarters that we have to do, not just one.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Congratulations. Tell your colleague.

Mr Telfer: What's it like compared with quarter 3?

The SPEAKER: Member for Flinders, has the member for Morphett just passed you a little note to say that you can yell them out?

Mr Telfer: He's opening the door, sir.

The SPEAKER: I don't want any noise from there, from that little part of the chamber. I want to hear the answer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is important to note that South Australia does not have the highest prices in the NEM, and just yelling it out doesn't make it so.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE (SAFETY AND SUPPORT) BILL

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:52): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Has the minister read any of the submissions to the Legislative Council's select committee inquiry into the Children and Young People (Safety and Support) Bill 2024 and, if so, which submissions?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic, Family and Sexual Violence) (14:52): Thank you very much for the question from the now deputy leader, who I think now has five or six portfolios. However, all of these portfolios and not one policy for the child protection and family support system—not one. In contrast, in this absolutely complex area of child protection and family support, we are beginning, just beginning, to see change.

I am so pleased that the most recent Report on Government Services, released just last week, showed that South Australia is now leading the nation in providing permanent, stable homes for children and young people leaving out-of-home care. Also, in the latest RoGS data, we are slowing the growth in terms of the number of children and young people coming into care. We have had a net increase in carers and in workers in the system. It speaks to our \$580 million investment into the system.

Our Family Group Conferencing investment is delivering in terms of around 90 per cent of families who go through that process being able to safely care for their children and young people. They are really important reforms but we have more to do. That is why I introduced the new Children and Young People (Safety and Support) Bill, which has passed this place, supported by the deputy leader, without amendment.

Through the process of developing that bill, in reviewing the current legislation, we heard from around 1,000 people and organisations who provided significant feedback that informed the development of that bill. In our further consultation processes, we have received further feedback to inform that process going forward.

What I would say is that amongst all those submissions what we see is a complexity of views, because this area of public policy is really challenging and there are differing views from birth families, carer families, the children and young people themselves who I have spoken with directly, various people in the sector, and Aboriginal community-controlled organisations. There is a diversity of views.

In developing legislation and taking account of those views, we know that we develop legislation that takes us forward that will help to improve the safety and wellbeing of children and young people. We also know that that diversity of views will continue to exist as we progress that bill and as we continue with the determination that we have on our program of reform. I have been listening, I will keep listening, and I look forward to debate in the upper house.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:56): My question again is to the Minister for Child Protection. When did the minister last speak with Belinda Valentine? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr TEAGUE: Belinda Valentine has today written to all members of parliament criticising consultation processes undertaken by the government. She said, and I quote:

If you are...going to ask people with lived experience what they think, really listen, don't just tick a box and move on. I engaged in the recent consultation at first but I stopped when it became clear it was another box-ticking exercise.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic, Family and Sexual Violence) (14:57): I have a great deal of respect for Belinda Valentine. She and I have had a number of conversations about reform in the child protection and family support system and I appreciate her views and I appreciate the views of all of that diverse group of stakeholders that I just spoke about.

One of the things I have done since coming to government is to establish for the very first time ever in South Australia—and many other jurisdictions are looking with interest at what we are doing here in this space—a Direct Experience Group. That means that I hear directly from families who have been involved in the child protection and family support system.

The group is supported by the incredible people at the Reily Foundation who also made submissions about the content of the legislation. They have made submissions taking account of people with direct experience of the child protection and family support system. As I have with all of the submissions, I have looked carefully at those.

I want to commend the bravery of Belinda and those people on the Direct Experience Group and, indeed, many others with that direct experience who choose to speak up and advocate with courage, sometimes after going through the most heartbreaking circumstances that we can imagine. At the most recent Child Protection and Family Support Symposium, to which I extended an invitation to the shadow minister for the second year in a row—unfortunately, he couldn't be there for that discussion—for the very first time a really special thing happened, and that was that carer families and birth families actually spoke together on a panel.

The significance of that is that anything that happens in the child protection and family support system often encompasses a situation where there is heartbreak for one family and happiness for another. There is always this balance and difficult situations to navigate—situations that we always navigate with children and young people at the centre of our hearts and minds.

Carer families and birth families actually spoke on this panel together, and they spoke with such courage again about how important it was for them to hear from one another, for them to listen to each of their perspectives as we go forward towards reform. I think about them when I say this: I am committed to doing exactly that. I will listen, I have been listening, I will continue to listen to that broad spectrum of views about child protection and family support. I have finished.

Mr TEAGUE: There are 40 seconds to go. It's a straightforward question: when did the minister last speak with Belinda Valentine? The minister needs to stop debating this to answer the question.

The SPEAKER: The minister says that she has finished her answer.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:00): Supplementary arising from the answer: has the minister spoken to Belinda Valentine since Belinda Valentine wrote to all parliamentarians in the terms that I have described to the house?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic, Family and Sexual Violence) (15:01): I haven't spoken to

Belinda Valentine today but I have spoken to her many times and I appreciate the conversations, the in-depth conversations, that we have had.

As I said, I have spoken with Ms Valentine, I respect her, I appreciate her views, I appreciate the views of a diverse group of people with direct experience of the child protection and family support system. I have been listening, I will keep listening. I note that the shadow minister did not have any amendments when the bill he refers to passed through this house—no amendments whatsoever—no amendments here in this house. I presume that there won't be any from those opposite in the Legislative Council, but I look forward to those amendments that I understand may come from the crossbench, and to considering them—of course we will.

NEW MOUNT BARKER HOSPITAL

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN (Kavel) (15:02): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Can the minister update the house on progress towards the construction of the new Mount Barker hospital?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:02): Can I firstly thank the member for Kavel and, I think on behalf of everybody certainly on this side of the house, sincerely thank him for his contribution as a member of the state cabinet and pass on our sadness that he has made a decision which we understand in terms of his own personal circumstances in terms of not running as the member for Kavel at the next election. It is fair to say that the member for Kavel will leave an incredible legacy for the people of Mount Barker.

Through the efforts and the advocacy of the member of Kavel, Mount Barker is receiving the infrastructure that it needs to meet its growing population. Not just in my area of health but in transport and a whole range of other services—in sport and recreation areas—the government is investing in the Mount Barker region, which has missed out, unfortunately, for a long period of time.

It was only recently, a few weeks ago, that the member for Kavel and I were at the opening of the brand-new ambulance station in Mount Barker, which has been long overdue—not just the new ambulance station itself but, importantly, the additional ambulance crews, the additional staff working there to service the growing area, to make sure that the Hills gets the coverage it needs and I credit the member for Kavel for leading a very significant petition to get that happening.

The other area, of course, that the member for Kavel has advocated for over a long period of time is for a new Mount Barker hospital, and we are delivering that now. The Mount Barker hospital only has 34 beds. It had 34 beds back when the population was about 4,000 people in Mount Barker. It is now about 10 times that and growing even further into the future, so we need additional services at Mount Barker hospital and that is why we are building the new hospital there.

This is a \$320 million investment at Mount Barker to increase the capacity and triple the number of beds in the hospital. The increased inpatient capacity will support a whole range of additional services and capacity being available at that hospital. It will make sure that we meet the needs of the growing population and allow the hospital to deliver high complexity of care and, importantly, it will mean that fewer people have to travel to city hospitals to receive their care, also reducing pressure on city hospitals.

I am really excited to report to the house that this project is now underway. Just a couple of months ago, the Premier, the member for Kavel and I were on site, turning the sod for the works to get underway for the early works. This includes civil works to establish the brand-new multideck car park and install crucial site infrastructure.

Refurbishment works are being carried out to ensure the continuity of the existing services during the construction period, and as of this week several key activities are being undertaken, including the installation of bitumen on the temporary access road, continuation of the sewer installation works, formwork for the new car park retaining wall, and electrical and mechanical service installation in the community and allied health building.

The construction of the multideck car park will commence shortly, and that is anticipated to be complete by the middle of next year, in advance of the hospital being complete in 2027. That multideck car park will increase the car parking capacity of the site to 654, up from the current 431.

So there is significant progress being made. It is in large part due to the member for Kavel's hard work, and it will be an incredible legacy that he has left for the people of his community.

DOMESTIC, FAMILY AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (15:06): My question is to the Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic, Family and Sexual Violence. How is the government addressing increased demand on state domestic, family and sexual violence services?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic, Family and Sexual Violence) (15:06): Thank you very much, first of all, to the member for her question and her absolutely enduring commitment to preventing violence against women. I am really pleased to inform the house that the Malinauskas Labor government is taking positive steps to address demand on services by significantly boosting funding for our crucial Domestic Violence Crisis Line and personal protection app. I offer immense gratitude to our South Australian domestic, family and sexual violence sector for all that they do to support and empower women and children experiencing violence and for their frontline work on the crisis line and app, responding to those experiencing the horror of violence.

As the royal commission continues and with a rightly heightened national and state level focus on domestic, family and sexual violence, our services are seeing these and other factors increasingly prompting women at different levels of risk to reach out for assistance. We are determined that when women at risk do reach out we help ensure there is somebody there for them.

Through the Mid-Year Budget Review, our government is doing this. We have allocated almost \$1 million in additional funding annually to enhance the Domestic Violence Crisis Line operated by Women's Safety Services. This funding will increase staffing levels and expand its capacity to respond to calls, particularly during after-hours periods.

Upon the service expanding to 24/7 coverage, in its first 14 months the DV crisis line averaged almost 1,200 calls per month, with an answer rate of around 57 per cent. In 2023, this grew to an average of over 2,600 calls per month, with on average 79 per cent of calls answered. Through 2024, with the start of the royal commission, the volume of calls increased and the call answer rate reduced to around 70 per cent.

When a call is not answered, that caller may choose to utilise the voicemail service and receive a call back when safe to do so. However, we know that the best outcome is for a woman to receive an immediate response at the time she reaches out for help. This additional funding to boost staffing levels will ensure more calls can be answered. Very simply, this funding will help save lives.

I recently visited the remarkable, dedicated frontline staff at the call centre. In chatting with them, they reiterated how important this new funding is, given that by the time a woman is calling the crisis line her life may already be in danger and it is imperative that they can respond. Crisis line staff also advise they are being contacted by women who are experiencing violence with increased complexity and therefore the initial call to undertake their needs assessment is taking longer. This boost to staffing numbers will help ensure staff are able to talk through the needs of the caller, fully understand their circumstances and what action can be taken to increase their safety.

In addition to supporting the crisis line, the government is also allocating significant funding to the personal protection app, a key tool designed to protect individuals at high risk of domestic family and sexual violence. That provides users with direct access to SAPOL through a 24-hour monitored security centre. The government's additional nearly \$200,000 per annum will enable the app to support an additional 120 of the individuals to stay connected with authorities.

The funding boost to both of these supports are crucial and demonstrate our government's ongoing steadfast commitment to providing critical support to survivors and to our state's broader strategy to prevent and tackle the horror of domestic, family and sexual violence.

CHILD PROTECTION STAKEHOLDERS

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:10): My question is again to the Minister for Child Protection. What advice, if any, has the minister received from the Guardian for Children and Young People, the Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People and

the Commissioner for Children and Young People in relation to legislative reform, and when did the minister last meet with these stakeholders? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr TEAGUE: A letter to members of the Legislative Council dated 25 November 2024 and co-signed by all three stakeholders said:

As experts in this field, and on behalf of children and young people in South Australia, we have substantive advice and evidence to provide government on required legislative reform. To date, our advice and evidence has not been heeded.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic, Family and Sexual Violence) (15:11): Again, thank you—

The SPEAKER: Minister, is this the legislation that came through this morning and is still before the house?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: No.

The SPEAKER: No, different legislation. The minister.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: So, again, this legislation is very complex. Firstly, I have had a number of meetings with each of the stakeholders that the shadow minister, deputy leader, speaks about. I have had a number of meetings with each of those parties—of course I have—and many discussions about issues pertaining to the child protection and family support system. One of the issues—because there are so many complex issues in this field that it would be very difficult to take the shadow minister through each of them in addition to the briefing I have already given him about this bill. One of the areas I would focus on is in relation to advice received from the Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People.

In line with the report—her Holding on to Our Future report that was tabled in this house—one of the things that is recommended and that she turns her mind to in that report is the application of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principle and how we could embed in legislation the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principle to the standard of active efforts, something that has been long discussed by SNAICC, the Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People and a range of other stakeholders. So, for instance, in relation to that particular element that is in this legislation. It is very clearly a centrepiece of this legislation. There are other issues that have been raised by those stakeholders and I look forward to our continuing discussions with them beyond the passage of this legislation.

Ministerial Statement

MOUNT REMARKABLE FIREFIGHTER INJURY

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (15:13): I table a copy of a statement made in the other place by the Hon. Emily Bourke MLC.

NATION LEADING KNIFE LAW REFORMS

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Workforce and Population Strategy) (15:14): I table a statement made in the other place by the Hon. Kyam Maher.

Grievance Debate

MALINAUSKAS LABOR GOVERNMENT

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (15:14): As we begin this parliamentary year, we have one sole focus and that is to fight for all South Australians but also to hold this government to account for its failures right across the board. For nearly three years South Australians have been let down by this Labor government's broken promises. We know that the state is grappling with a future that is far less certain than it once was. Not so long ago, for example, a young South Australian couple could work hard, get a decent salary, buy a home, raise a family and build a better life. It was a promise that was passed down through generations—the

hope that each generation would get a little bit better than the last. Under this Premier and his government, that promise is literally unravelling right before our eyes.

The cost-of-living crisis, for a start, is real—it is very real. Rising bills, inflation and high rent are hurting families across the state at the moment. This government's wasteful spending has made this worse. We know that net debt is spiralling out of control. We have seen the recent figures. South Australians expect better from their government. The opposition will push for policies that reduce unnecessary costs, cut waste and also put money back into the pockets of South Australians.

Next, let's address the ongoing ambulance ramping crisis. We know that Labor promised to fix it. They talked all about promises today. The only promise they do not want to talk about is in fact the one about ramping. Their campaign was clear; the corflutes were clear. They said to 'Vote Labor like your life depends upon it.' It was pretty clear, yet under this government we have seen the worst 31 months of ramping in South Australia's history, and we know in some respects it is only getting worse. It is just another broken promise from a government that cannot deliver on any of its major promises.

Let's not forget Labor's big promise on energy. Wasn't that interesting? Literally, jurisdictions around the country are pulling their hydrogen promises. Whether it is in WA or Queensland, whether it is Twiggy Forrest, Origin Energy or whoever it is, they all seem to be going one way, but not under this government. Here they promised a pretty big promise. They pledged a \$593 million hydrogen plant, claiming that it would be operational by sometime in 2025. Do you know what? We are in 2025 and barely a single shovel has been put into the ground.

Meanwhile, what does the Premier do? He throws his energy minister under the hydrogen bus. What does he do? Across the nation we know that hydrogen projects, at the very least, are stalling or they are facing huge blowouts. These things are massive. The minister was sent out on radio to try to explain away the failure to deliver this hydrogen plant. While Labor mismanages the politics, South Australians are left to deal with soaring electricity prices. At the end of the day, I think that is what most care about at the moment: how can they get their electricity price down? How can they help their bill? It is \$798 a year extra for the average household. Instead of delivering affordable, reliable energy, the government has only given us higher costs and these broken promises as well.

Then of course we also face a growing housing crisis. While Labor are great on the grand announcements about land releases and affordable housing, what have we actually seen? How many new homes have we actually seen? 'Not many, if any' is the answer to that question. The government's failure to act is leaving families priced out of the housing market. Now they are proposing more changes that will only make it harder to get into the market, with sky-high rents and home ownership literally slipping out of reach. South Australians are now paying up to \$40,000 in stamp duty on the median-priced home in metropolitan Adelaide. It is clear: the government's actions do not match their rhetoric.

We also know that public safety is also a critical issue. Crime is on the rise in many areas, with South Australians feeling unsafe in their own communities as well. Labor's response has been inadequate. We need stronger laws, tougher penalties and an urgent increase in the number of police officers on the streets. Now we see three police ministers in the space of less than three years under this government. Whether it is housing, fixing the ramping crisis or delivering a hydrogen plant to lower electricity prices, this Premier and this government have failed to meet the test.

NEWLAND ELECTORATE

Ms SAVVAS (Newland) (15:19): Unlike some, I like to use grievance time to talk about some really positive, exciting announcements for my community, and I think today is a really good opportunity to talk about our incredible investment at Fairview Park Primary School. It has been almost 50 years now since some transportable buildings were put down on Hamilton Road there at Fairview Park to service the needs of a growing community in Tea Tree Gully, and for 49 years there has been a beautiful school community housed in those buildings.

Despite that, and despite the incredible work of teachers, the incredible work of staff at that school and a really, really beautiful school community, those buildings have needed some work and they have been crying out for investment from a government that will listen and build a purpose-built

school at the site for the needs of students in our community, for not just for this generation but of course generations to come.

Last week I was incredibly pleased after advocating for some years for upgrades at Fairview Park Primary School to announce, alongside the Minister for Education and the incredible principal, Becky Jones, that the government will be making a \$10 million investment in that school so that there will be purpose-built buildings at the site for the first time. We know that the only real investment that has been there at the site in that 49-year period was, of course, the new library as a result of the Building Education Revolution funding a few years back now.

Aside from that, the majority of the school has been these transportable DMAC-style buildings and has been needing actual school buildings to service the community for generations to come. It is such a pleasure to have been on that journey with the school, to have met with the governing council, to have continually met with parents and to have advocated to the minister's office, to the government, for much-needed investment at a beautiful school set there in the foothills right across from the Tea Tree Gully golf course. What a beautiful setting it is for a new school in Fairview Park.

I would also like to take a moment to acknowledge a really special milestone for Bene Aged Care. Many of you would be familiar with Bene as they are aged care facilities run by the Italian Benevolent Foundation, as they are known, in multiple parts of the state. But, of course, the original Bene site was the Italian Village at St Agnes which is, of course, still there on Mumford Avenue in my electorate. For 50 years, the Bene group of aged care homes has been servicing our community and providing culturally appropriate, linguistically appropriate, aged care services for Italian residents here in South Australia.

I have a bit of story with Bene myself. When I was in year 10, it was actually where I went and did work experience at the Italian Village in St Agnes. I think it was actually a place like that that gave me a real love for community service, and showed me once and for all that I really wanted to continue working with people. Of course, then when I was elected to the council and then of course elected to state parliament, I continued my relationship with the incredible people at Bene, and it has been a real privilege to attend a number of events at the site over the last few years.

On a personal note, however, the real privilege has been watching a loved one go into Bene at St Agnes over the last few months and getting to see how it works from the other side of the coin, that other perspective as you watch someone you love going into aged care. I would really like to put on the record my personal and sincere thanks to Bene for the care that they are giving a loved one for me, but also for loved ones across the state, and they have been doing so for 50 years.

It was really lovely to celebrate that incredible work that they have done at Government House last week alongside a number of colleagues and, of course, leaders in the Italian community who have been fundamental in the service that Bene has provided across our community here in South Australia. I do look forward to continuing to celebrate their incredible work and hopefully watching them continue to progress and provide that incredibly important service for Italian residents, and, like my loved one, non-Italian residents who just really love Italian food, here in South Australia for many years to come.

FROME ELECTORATE

Ms PRATT (Frome) (15:23): I want to speak today on the fabulous region of the Adelaide Plains around the Gawler River, and to kick off by talking about the Tourism Summit that was held most recently, hosted by the Adelaide Plains Council and supported by the South Australian Tourism Council and TiCSA. That summit held at the football club really kicked off some serious ambition that my region has to lift their profile and to attract the visitor economy.

They name themselves, rightly, the gateway to the north. You cannot cross the Gawler River without a plan to head further north and you have to do that through my electorate of Frome. It was with great pleasure that we heard from Jamie Koch, who is part of the Northern Adelaide Plains Food Cluster on the day they were launching a new logo for that cluster group. Some of the best things are simple, with the logo and the branding simply saying 'Grown on the Adelaide Plains'.

It will not surprise you, Mr Speaker, as someone who has a great appreciation for marketing and promotion of the regions, that it does not just stop at 'Grown on the Adelaide Plains'. If you're out at Port Parham crabbing, well it was caught on the Adelaide Plains. If you're calling into the Two Wells bakery for a lamb shank pie, then it was baked on the Adelaide Plains. And if you are consuming mesclun lettuce from Rainbow Fresh, then it was probably picked on the Adelaide Plains. They've got a fantastic story to tell about their produce.

To unpack the economy of the 'salad bowl' of the Adelaide Plains, then we know that the vegetable industry is worth over \$400 million for that region; that nuts bring in \$17 million to our economy; fruits over \$700,000; grains, no surprise across the beautiful Mallala Plains, at \$70 million; and the livestock, tying that up for a healthy \$40 million.

This region, this river region, these plains are rich. The alluvial soil delivers us a bounty. We get to consume those baby qukes from Perfection Fresh. It is a product that should be celebrated. They know that and they want to tie that to the tourist dollar, and why shouldn't they? So this community is certainly very excited about a community led strategy to build a local economy around tourism. The Adelaide Plains Council shares this vision with local businesses, and I think we all share the knowledge of exciting opportunities to come.

But all is not well when it comes to government investment in infrastructure and services. This chamber has heard from me many times since August last year of the very unfortunate discovery of the arrival on our shores, and the Adelaide Plains, of the tomato brown rugose virus. It has crippled a South Australian industry that represents between 50 to 70 per cent of the nation's supply.

And I must draw attention to the energy that we saw from the government today, from the Minister for Energy and Mining, his enthusiasm and passion for a passionate project based in Whyalla for green steel and hydrogen. It is a tragedy every time jobs are lost in South Australia, but this is a government that is quick to get on a plane for 250 jobs lost in Whyalla, but not a peep from the government or the local members, the member for Light and the member for Taylor, when it comes to 500 jobs lost from Perfection Fresh. It is shameful that we have a government that picks and chooses, cherrypicks, pun intended, the jobs that it is going to fight for.

So, whether it is Perfection Fresh losing 500 jobs or standing people down, Perpetual Holdings in the seat of Taylor, in the region of Riverlee, that has just gone into voluntary liquidation last week, or SA Tomato and the fabulous Peter and Ariana Petsios who are devastated by their business being forced to close down while the quarantine and test results continue to cripple their business, I demand from the government and the Minister for Primary Industries that more is done for this group.

When it comes to the school, I note that the member for Newland demonstrated that advocacy and letters to the minister is enough for \$10 million to her school, and I look forward to the Two Wells Primary School receiving something similar.

GIBSON ELECTORATE AWARD RECIPIENTS

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (15:28): I rise to celebrate a number of citizens in the Gibson community who have recently won awards. First up, Samantha Kerr, who won Citizen of the Year at the City of Marion's Citizen of the Year awards. She took home the top gong, and I must say it was fabulous to see the look of shock on her face when she won. I think she was rightly surprised because it was an incredibly strong field of candidates from our community. It was particularly great to see the recognition of her environmental work commended.

She created the Friends of Sturt River Landcare Group over 14 years ago. This group has now grown to over 700 volunteers and has adopted 10 sites along the Sturt River, planting and maintaining over 120,000 plants. If you have been visiting the Oaklands wetlands over a number of years, you would have seen how absolutely transformed that site has become thanks to the Friends of Sturt River Landcare Group, led by Samantha Kerr's hard work. I would like to commend her for achieving that award.

The City of Holdfast Bay recently awarded a number of awards as well. I am so pleased that one of the Active Citizenship Awards went to Andrea Bodey who is well known at Brighton, particularly for her volunteer work on the Brighton Jetty Sculptures Committee. She has been working

on that committee for over 14 of the last 17 years. Hopefully, you have all visited the Brighton Jetty Sculptures over the last couple of weeks. It finished on Sunday night. It draws in such fabulous crowds along the Esplanade at Brighton and there are also tents for the smaller sculptures.

What this event means is that art is accessible to the community. There are almost 300 sculptures lined up along the Esplanade. It gives the community a chance to engage and be challenged by some of the pieces of work. Some of the pieces of work will just bring you pure joy. It gets people having a discussion about art in a way they might not always. Of course, it is a free event, it is along the Esplanade and the people who are there are probably enjoying many of the fabulous amenities at Brighton—obviously the beach and Jetty Road—but they may also be the people who would not necessarily go to a gallery to have a look at sculptures, so it is a very accessible event. I would like to commend all the volunteers who work on that committee.

It finished up on Sunday night and I bet they do not get much of a breather until they are back again preparing for next year's event. It is an enormous piece of work. It not only supports artists across South Australia who enter into the exhibition and enables us to look at the world through a new lens but also gives money back to the artists who sell their work and provides vital funds for the Brighton Surf Life Saving Club that supports both our community and the visitors to Brighton beach. It is fabulous to see Andrea win an Active Citizenship Award.

Also a member of the Brighton Surf Life Saving Club, well known for their volunteer efforts, is Julia Church who also won, with a number of others: Nick Corbett and Brent Bunting, the Community Event of the Year in the Holdfast Bay Australia Day Awards and that is our largest open water swim. Once again, it was happening last weekend, like it seemed everything was down at Brighton. That is a really big event in our community.

I would also like to commend Frank White of the Rotary Club of Somerton Park who leads that group in an awful lot of fundraising. One of the events I particularly like to attend is the Symphony By The Sea. I will make sure I give shout-outs at a later date to others in our community who also won awards and who we are very proud of.

MEMBER FOR MORIALTA, EXPRESSION OF GRATITUDE

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta) (15:34): I am pleased today to have an opportunity to express my gratitude to some people who have been very kind to me over the last six or seven weeks since I made an announcement about my future, that I was not going to be continuing in the parliament post the election. It was very humbling, in fact, to have heard from a range of people around the community: in education, in my electorate in particular, people throughout the South Australian community, and even one or two kind souls from within the parliament from outside the Liberal Party. I want to say thank you to them because it is an extraordinary time when anybody makes the decision to move on from their career, whether in politics or other ranges of endeavours. I appreciate them.

I am in a uniquely privileged position, as we all are in being members of parliament representing our communities. Stepping down at the next election does not mean I have less energy or hunger to serve my constituents over the coming year, but potentially it might reflect the fact that I anticipate having a bit less energy and hunger for the political battle post March next year.

I think one recognises that if you do not have any more of that hunger to pursue objectives then perhaps one's time in politics needs to come to an end because it is an endeavour that creates challenges in a personal life and for one's family in particular and to ask one's family to bear that challenge going forward when you do not have the hunger, the energy or the passion in the same way I think would be unreasonable.

I believe that we have to come into this place with a fierce purpose to fight for one's convictions, to try to achieve things for your area and indeed to make our state stronger. I still have those convictions and I still have the same values, but I feel that, with the energy I have put into this role over 15 years, I am looking forward to exploring other opportunities to serve.

To the people who have contributed to my electorate office and the work we have done in Morialta through education, policy, training and arts most recently, I really want to thank you for that and assure you that I will continue to pursue those causes until March next year.

With that, I am sure I will have more to say later in the year. I had a number of people contact me in late December when I was dealing with a couple of health challenges and, I will be honest, I have not written back to all of them individually at this stage. Some of them may be getting the *Hansard* of this speech as a very special personal thank you. They know who they are. They know that this speech is just for them.

ENTERPRISE AGREEMENTS

Mr FULBROOK (Playford) (15:37): It is wonderful to be back and welcome back to all of my wonderful colleagues. I rise today to speak about a number of fairly recent enterprise agreements negotiated by the Shop, Distributive and Allied Employees' Association (SDA) between companies including IKEA and Bunnings. Before anyone gets too carried away, I want to express very clearly that I am not calling for any employer to follow in their immediate wake but instead to pay close attention to their outcomes over the next few years.

For those unaware, in recent times the SDA, on behalf of its members, reached agreements with companies like Bunnings and IKEA whereby their employees would receive five weeks' annual leave. I understand that it was in the 1970s when the last major increase to workers' leave rose to four weeks a year. Now that it has been 50 years since we have seen any major change on this front, I take this opportunity to encourage corporate Australia to pay close attention to the outcomes of these agreements.

Given that over the last decade we have not seen wages rise dramatically, an increase in annual leave could be seen as a perfect compromise between employers and workers, much in the same way as we saw other indirect benefits improve working conditions in the eighties and nineties. I am under no illusion that paid time off from work does cost money, which the employer must bear, but at the same time we are talking about some big firms with a lot of resources at their disposal, which I am sure reached their decision in full consideration of the bigger and broader picture.

Workers with an extra week off a year have the potential to be less stressed and therefore more productive, keeping in mind they will still spend 47 weeks a year in the workplace. An extra week of recreational leave also gives scope for workers to become tourists and circulate their earnings across the regions and our tourist destinations. It also allows families to spend more time with one another, enjoy each other's company and, while these days social costs can probably be measured in some form or another, I would argue the benefits are priceless. This is supported by 49-year-old mum, Paula, who works at Bunnings at Parafield, who said this in response to the agreement with her employer, and I quote:

When my kids were younger, I was always trying to secure more leave and stretch it over the school holidays. Having access to 5 weeks annual leave will help so many parents with young kids during the school holidays. It means they'll save money on vacation care, childcare and be able to spend more time together as a family.

Lisa from the same store added, and I quote:

I've worked for Bunnings for the last 15 years. By having the availability of 5 weeks of paid annual leave, it means we can afford our holidays and be better rested to do our work more safely.

Again, I point out that it costs money for this to happen, but it needs to be seen in a bigger and broader context. It will take some time before business, government and academic communities evaluate the outcomes of the agreements and gain a full grasp of the true cost, and indeed the opportunities that they may create.

In bringing this issue to the chamber, I urge that every effort is made to begin to analyse every facet of data that these changes create. While I am borrowing from the textbooks, we know employees with more leave options are better able to rest, recharge and maintain a healthy work-life balance. This in turn can lead to higher levels of job satisfaction and overall wellbeing, which I would argue is crucial in retaining talent and may give employers a significant cost saving on numerous HR fronts.

That said, we really need work done to determine if this is a wise move for companies to adopt more broadly. As I said earlier, I am not calling for any business to follow in the immediate wake, but I strongly encourage interested parties to look closely at these outcomes, as what may

seem like a cost burden for business may deliver the opposite, with improved productivity not just within an isolated business but potentially across the entire economy.

Before anybody chastises me on the suggestion that an allocation of five weeks' annual leave could ever happen, I draw their attention to other leading economies such as Austria, France and across Scandinavia where this already is the norm.

We have several large companies that are the first big cabs off the rank, and they deserve praise for their decision. From where we sit at this point in time, I urge all of us to be curious, follow things closely, and ultimately have an evidence-led discussion on whether this delivers better outcomes for both workers and employers.

Private Members' Statements

PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:42): This past weekend in Renmark saw the 45th Dinghy Derby festival. On Friday evening was the dash for cash under lights—it was fast, it was furious, and it was a sprint along the riverfront. There were fireworks watched by thousands of locals and visitors into the region. On Sunday we saw the Dinghy Derby, the pinnacle of dinghy racing at a world level, with 180 competitors. It was a 100-kilometre race up the open river sections and into the network of creeks north of Renmark.

A big congratulations to the club president, Scott Jenke, and his able committee: Jeremy Newman, Sue Jenke, Cody Richards, Shaun Jenke, Reece Yard, Shane Pitman, Joel Woodrow, Ben Pilgrim, Nathan Burgess, Lisa and Tony Richards, Ty Wagenknecht and Kelvin John. The derby is heavily supported by volunteers and it generated an economy of somewhere in the vicinity of \$2½ million over the weekend.

Thank you to all of the sponsors but, of course, the winners are grinners: the 30 horsepower sports, Kodi Morena and Doug Mowbray; the 30 horsepower rookies, Jeremy Morrison and Riley Schwarz; the 30 horsepower super standard, Hudson and Ollie Pearce; and the 30 horsepower standard, Sean Peterson and Sophie Lampard. The 300cc modified saw the stalwart John Chigros and Tom Pilgrim get up, the 25 horsepower standard saw Marley and Garry McConnell win, while the 15 horsepower standard saw Jake Saegenschnitter and Kayos Bronish-Rice as the winners.

It is a great event. It is a world standard event. It has been online and got views from all over the globe. It is a great local event up in the Riverland.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:44): I would like to bring to the house's attention today George Aldridge. As people may know, George is a cartoonist. He has been doing the cartoons for *The Bunyip* for the last 35 years. Now, I suppose, he has put his pencil in the pencil tin for the last time.

During his time as a cartoonist, his life's work has included commissions, residencies, cartoon projects and ongoing works for many other organisations, including the Country Arts Trust, the South Australian Museum, the ABC, the Riverland Horticultural Council, National Parks and Wildlife, the South Australian Institute of Teachers, the PSA, the Maritime Union, SA Health, the Plumbers and Gasfitters Employees Union, the Law Council of Australia, the State Library of SA, National Trust Darwin, the Adelaide Football Club, the CSIRO, Hickinbotham Homes, Rockford's, Trinity College Gawler, the Northern Territory Cattlemen's Association, and Cavpower CAT, just to name a few. He also did the cartoons for my newspaper, *Enlightened*.

During his work, he has also given back to the community as he has played a key role in the camel-handling project with PIRSA and with the community in the APY lands. George has also hosted workshops for the education department in schools, including Bowden Brompton special school with at-risk students and Murray Bridge primary school. One of his proudest moments was creating and managing the Cook Out Back camp oven cooking competition in Blinman in the early 2000s. George was also inducted into the Cartoonist Hall of Fame in Melbourne in 2023.

Ms PRATT (Frome) (15:45): Flinders University recently honoured five distinguished South Australian individuals with honorary doctorates at a recent graduation. Those recipients included Alister Haigh, chief executive of the delightful Haigh's Chocolates, for his sustainable practices; Paul

Vasileff, founder of Paolo Sebastian; Taryn Brumfitt, whose body positivity advocacy we recognise; Patricia Vilimas, technical officer at Flinders; and the very local Robert (Alfie) Hannaford AM for his contributions to the arts and biodiversity preservation.

Robert (Alfie) Hannaford AM was recognised with a Doctor of the University as one of Australia's premier realist painters. His works feature many prominent public figures, including Dame Joan Sutherland and Sir Donald Bradman. He is a multiple award winner, winning the Archibald People's Choice Award three times. In his own words on the day to graduates, Alfie said:

I have noticed that when one is passionate about something, things seem to naturally fall into place. This has happened to me.

He has worked with or met realist painters, outstanding Adelaide artists like Hugo Shaw, Des Hurcombe, Hans Heysen, Ivor Hele and many others. It has been a privilege in my limited time as the member for Frome to be in his orbit. We celebrate the Riverton Light Gallery that he established and runs with Alison. We know that he has left his mark on the Owen Silo Art that tells the story of wheat bags to sandbags. We honour the award that has been given to him this year.

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (15:47): The Thrington Road-Mines Road intersection is in desperate need of an upgrade. It is an increasingly busy intersection with an explosion in popularity of housing in Moonta, Moonta Bay and Port Hughes, and it is the main turn-off to Adelaide for those coming up to enjoy the holiday homes. It is not just me who says it; councillor Brent Walker is hot on this issue and has taken it to council on a number of occasions, and I know the CFS are hot on it. They have put out a quote to quite a few of us, councillors and elected members, saying that this is one of the intersections that they view as being incredibly dangerous. Group officer David Bussenschutt has made his case loud and clear.

Unfortunately, despite the obvious popularity and traffic that goes through this intersection, we have not been successful in convincing the government thus far of the need for an upgrade. They have replied to my pleas and said that, as a result of there not being available crash data which shows reported crashes in the immediate past, there is no precedence being given to having an upgraded intersection.

This is disappointing. You only have to look at the number of new homes that are going up in Moonta Bay and Port Hughes to know that this major intersection is flawed. It needs a turning lane and it needs increased infrastructure to accommodate the higher traffic flow. As a result, despite the fact that there have been no crashes, I will be writing to the entire community and asking them to share with me their near-miss stories. We can take those close calls back to the government and say, 'Well, there might not have been any crashes but there have been this many near misses or close calls and, because of that, let's get in before a crash and prevent one from happening rather than responding to one.'

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (15:49): By leave, I move:

That Ms Hood be appointed to the committee in place of Mr Brown (resigned).

Motion carried.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (15:49): By leave, I move:

That Mr Dighton be appointed to the committee in place of Mr Brown (resigned).

Motion carried.

STATUTORY OFFICERS COMMITTEE

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (15:49): By leave, I move:

That Ms O'Hanlon be appointed to the committee in place of Mr Brown (resigned).

Motion carried.

JOINT PARLIAMENTARY SERVICE COMMITTEE

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (15:49): By leave, I move:

That pursuant to section 5 of the Parliament (Joint Services) Act 1985, Ms Stinson be appointed as the alternate delegate to Mr Odenwalder on the committee in place of Mr Brown (resigned).

Motion carried.

Bills

BIOSECURITY BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:50): I rise to support the Biosecurity Bill 2024. I believe this bill had its genesis back when we were in government in 2019; it was being formed up. It is absolutely vital for our primary industries—for the health of South Australians, in fact—that we do get biosecurity right. I note it is quite a complex bill and hopefully it will lead how we manage biosecurity into the future for better outcomes.

As I indicated, this bill is there to ensure South Australia's biosecurity system remains effective, contemporary and adaptable for future needs. A new Biosecurity Bill has been drafted to update and improve the existing legislation.

The bill proposes to ensure protection from pests and diseases that threaten our economy, terrestrial and aquatic environments, or may affect public amenities, communities and infrastructure, and also to provide South Australia with a modern, flexible and responsive biosecurity framework. It will bring consistency to the management of biosecurity across industries by incorporating a number of biosecurity-related legislation. It will also promote shared responsibility for biosecurity among government, industry and the community.

A technical directions paper in consultation was performed under the previous Marshall Liberal government in 2020, and feedback received was compiled in a consultation summary on the building of a new biosecurity act for South Australia. Stakeholders subsequently had the opportunity to provide further feedback based on the summary. Submissions from these initial consultations were considered when developing the draft biosecurity bill. The draft bill was released for public consultation over an eight-week period, from 1 August 2023, on the YourSAy website. This feedback was further considered and some updates made before the Biosecurity Bill 2024 was introduced to the parliament in the other place.

The creation of a select committee to inquire into the bill was discussed by our side with industry bodies and raised with crossbenchers due to the scope of the changes and in response to the concerns raised by industry. It was raised with the opposition and crossbenchers in regard to the government's response to the recent outbreak of tomato brown rugose fruit virus. Following consultation with stakeholders and industry bodies, the feedback was a recommendation that the bill be progressed in order to update the legislation to meet current conditions and consolidate the state's biosecurity efforts into a modern framework.

We on this side continue to advocate for an independent review into the government's response to exotic disease outbreaks and, if the minister refuses to commission an independent inquiry, we will work with the crossbench in an attempt to establish a parliamentary inquiry.

In progressing the bill, however, fine details within the bill were sought to provide clarity and strengthen the proposed legislation to support industry. Some amendments that were moved in the other place did not make it through here. Some of those involved looking for clarity around third parties accessing land for primary production who could be assumed to present a biosecurity risk and what steps may need to be taken to reduce that risk.

Another amendment was put up by the Hon. Nicola Centofanti regarding employers' liability for employee offences, which would remove the liability of employers in situations where a security breach has been committed by an employee and where that employee has directly contravened instructions when committing an offence. There was also another amendment around using software or artificial intelligence to automate decision-making. As written, the legislation does grant the ability for a computer program or AI model to be used in order to make automatic determinations.

A couple of amendments did get through that obviously we support here, that are in the legislation as transmitted from the other place. An amendment to do with clause 306 is the creation of further biosecurity levies. It is around regulations, notices and instruments, that any additional levies imposed through the bill will require consultation with all relevant stakeholders and a ministerial review before gaining approval. It is pleasing to note that that amendment came through.

Another amendment in regard to the Dog Fence Board is that the proposed legislation ensure the entirety of current Dog Fence Board provisions through the biosecurity act. However, a provision for the Dog Fence Board to raise contributions in clause 21 of schedule 2, which despite being present in the original Dog Fence Act since 1946 has never been enacted, seems a point of contention in the updated legislation by the Local Government Association.

This amendment seeks to retain the provisions in clause 21 for the raising of contributions through local councils when required, but attempts to tighten the situation in which this can occur and ensures the provision must have ministerial approval and approval from the Treasurer of the day. Hence, this measure would only be enacted following consultation with the Local Government Association and the approval of both the minister and the Treasurer. This amendment has been consulted on with the Local Government Association and the Dog Fence Board, seeking consensus on this provision.

Industry groups were sent a copy of the bill and asked for feedback and position statements. Those consulted include Primary Producers South Australia, Grain Producers SA, the SA Dairyfarmers' Association, the Dairy Industry Association of Australia, the South Australian Wine Industry Association, the Wine Grape Council of South Australia, Wool Producers Australia, Egg Farmers of Australia, AUSVEG SA, SA Chamber of Fruit and Vegetables, Fruit Producers SA, Summerfruit SA, Pork SA and Livestock SA.

As I indicated and as a landholder, it is absolutely serious that we get our biosecurity protocols in place. We have recently seen how the breakout of the tomato virus was managed. I am sure some of that was managed well, but there did seem to be protocols in regard to the reporting of outbreaks, the testing, some of the false positives that came through, and the lack of testing facilities. I acknowledge Macro Meats—Ray Borda's company—for getting another lab online to test for these.

I refer specifically to the major growers and the nurseries involved in the tomato industry, where it is reported that up to 500 people lost their jobs in regard to bans on either selling produce or obviously seedlings to be used to grow tomatoes into the future. We certainly believe that the government needs to have its own review of its practices in this space, because we had producers reporting to us inefficiencies and issues with how it was managed and you can easily see why people got upset because this is their livelihood that is on the line. When you get told you are shutting down and if there is even one false positive it can have not just a huge effect on the industry but a major effect—possibly a career-ending effect—on that grower involved in the tomato industry.

There are some very sad stories with regard to this about the impact it has had on growers. Yes, I do acknowledge sometimes you have to be hard in the management of potential threats, but you have to make sure that you have got the people, the preparedness and the systems in place so that you can get the right outcomes, because, as I said, this could mean the end of people in the industry.

Certainly there is a whole range of pests that we need to deal with and there will be more pests coming as time goes by. Certainly varroa mite is something we need to be very mindful of in the honey and bee industry and with the number of plants that need interaction with bees so that they can pollinate properly to grow fruit or almonds—especially almonds. There are schemes where bees are basically run on a commercial basis throughout the almond orchards to get that pollination in place. There are many thousands of hectares of those that have gone in over the years, but it is

not just them; we have to be mindful that there have been outbreaks just across the border from South Australia.

Another thing that we have seen recently is the abalone virus threat and certainly the Pacific Oyster Mortality Syndrome (POMS) which has had a significant effect in the oyster industry over time and the restrictions that have had to be put in place to make sure that seed stock were not brought in from an area that was affected by POMS. It does create serious issues for these multimillion dollar industries and for the livelihoods of people who are doing their best not just to put food on the table but to support the economy here in South Australia.

Fruit fly seems to be something that we are having to deal with forever at the minute. There were outbreaks not just throughout the city but throughout the Riverland, and the member for Chaffey will be able to give more information about what happened in the Riverland, or what is happening in the Riverland. It is something we have to be very mindful of so that we can keep that fruit fly free status into the future. I know we as a government spent many, many millions of dollars in keeping the orange army involved not just to let people know of their obligations under the restrictions and managing fruit fly but what they had to do legally to comply. Certainly, and it is across both colours of government, people have been upset with the tough conditions on the border. I get it. You can have an apple in the car, and I think the fine is several hundred dollars—three or four hundred dollars.

Mr Whetstone: \$405.

Mr PEDERICK: It is \$405, I am informed. There are plenty of signs, plenty of warning, and you just have to make it obvious that you have to look after not just industry but the health of South Australians and the South Australian economy.

Certainly, another issue that we have been aware of, well, all the time but in the not too distant past, a couple of years ago, was the threat of foot-and-mouth disease coming to Australia. This would be absolutely devastating to our sheep and cattle industries here in this country. As I have indicated before, I happened to go to Bali at that time, so I encountered the restrictions on the way in, which were not too bad. I walked through the rubber mats with the liquid on them. Before the group that I was with came home, we had toothbrushes out. I said, 'You clean out every skerrick from whatever shoes you wore, or you leave the shoes behind,' because I certainly did not want to be the one responsible for bringing it into the country.

These things have major economic impacts on our industry if they come in, especially something like foot-and-mouth disease. It is why we need to keep spending so much money to make sure that we do have those biosecurity outcomes with the other disease threats across the board.

Other things that have caused a great impact on Australian more generally are cane toads. They were brought in to fix one problem and created their own problem. They have been marching across Queensland and the Northern Territory. Trying to find a way to eliminate them has been a major issue for this country and those states and territories involved.

Something that is affecting the egg market across Australia are outbreaks of avian flu interstate, where I think at least two million chickens have had to be destroyed. We certainly have a major chicken industry here in South Australia, not just in my electorate but up around Port Wakefield. Obviously, Ingham's processing in Adelaide and north of Adelaide is a vital industry here in South Australia.

In my electorate we have the major feed mill that Ingham's operate, putting many thousands of tonnes through every week and feeding the multitudes of sheds in the area. Each one of these sheds, which are up to 160 metres long, represents well over a \$1 million investment, and there is a lot of compliance to put these sheds, these chicken farms, in place. They obviously have to have firefighting systems in place so that you can virtually save yourself. It is not just the fact of building sheds; you have to put in that water reticulation and make sure you have access to that water in the event that something goes wrong. We certainly hope it does not. Not far from my place, Ingham's have a breeder farm out the back of Yumali, which is a big part of the industry.

It is said that there is a truck on the freeway every 20 minutes carting chickens to the process plant in Adelaide. I have been having discussions with the council and am hopeful that there will be investment by Ingham's into the future locally at Murray Bridge so that we do not have to have that

freight through to Adelaide and that the chickens can be processed locally. It is a major industry for my area and a major industry for this state, going across multiple electorates.

Certainly the pig industry is very mindful of biosecurity measures. I have many friends who are involved in the pig industry, the intense pig industry, and there is lots of animal welfare progress that has been made in how sows have their litters and the management of that and then the way the pigs are raised in the eco shelters into the future. It is probably a far more effective and efficient way to grow pigs, and certainly a more animal-friendly way, than to just have them directly in sheds. Obviously when they are born and farrowing, they need to have that extra protection.

It is not unlike the chicken industry, and I have visited both types of facilities. There are deep protocols in place for visitors to these plants and these growing facilities, obviously with mats soaked in disinfectant so that no diseases are brought on board. Certainly in regard to processing at the facility at Murray Bridge, they have truck-wash systems in place, essentially mats for the trucks like the mats the people need to walk through, to make sure that we keep that area disease free to keep that vital industry. They contract-process there for Coles. There are hundreds of millions of dollars invested across the state in the pig industry, a very vital industry for South Australia. And look, there's a little bit of overseas capital involved in some of this. We even have some Chinese investment in one of the piggeries at Coomandook.

So, in regard to all of our industries, whether it is the intensive industries, whether it is the broadacre industries, we cannot let our guard down. We need to know whichever government is in control has the back of the people and the producers of South Australia to make sure that we can keep up that food production to feed the world. We had our challenges during COVID, when we were in government, and as was said: we were building the plane as we flew the plane. There were lots of restrictions on the management. It was more about people then, which obviously is not part of this bill, but it just showed the level you can get to with working out the best ways to manage a threat to the community.

Certainly, we must be mindful. I know the figure of \$18.5 billion has been mentioned that the agriculture industry in South Australia generated in 2022-23, but that is 18 months ago now. As I have indicated in this place before, we have just come out of what I believe to be the worst drought in over 100 years—in fact, some rainfall records have it at least at 110 years—and it has been a shocker.

I know that the family who operates my farm under a lease arrangement had the worst year they have ever had, and they are not alone by any means. There would be hundreds, thousands of stories across the state on the impact it had on people's incomes.

It does not matter whether you are broadacre or intense, it is because the input costs are so high. When you are in that dryland, broadacre environment, and whether it is running stock, whether it is cropping or both, you are under the pump, you are right under the pump. Some of the issues I believe that people had to interact with were these forecasts that were coming out of the Bureau of Meteorology. Some of these long-range forecasts were saying that we were going to get plenty of rain in September and things were going to be great, and farmers were going out spending hundreds of thousands of dollars minimum on nitrogen, whether liquid or urea, and guess what? It did not rain.

We had a shocker. Stem frost across the board, and it happened at my place and we have never seen it before. Cutting 80-foot windrows—what is that, about 25 metres of windrows—to get a decent windrow so you could get a roll of hay rolled up because otherwise if you cut it with a normal mower, you would not have had enough length of crop to rake it up and you would not have got anything.

But there were certainly some surprises for people who thought all was lost in September and October with some of the standing crops, and they were not huge returns, but I know one example of people with a canola crop where it went 850 kilos a hectare, which in a drought like that was just amazing, but a lot of crops yielded 200 or 300 kilos a hectare or less and people were literally scraping what they could of lentil crops off the ground to get something. I am well aware of bean crops at 200 kilos a hectare and less, and I know a lot of that was left in the paddock right around the state. The only good thing out of that is that it can become sheep feed.

But there is also the dire need for stock feed for those people with livestock enterprises. We saw the Aussie Hay Runners do multiple runs and that kept the core of people's livestock operations going. A lot of people either sold all their stock or got down to the vital core that they may be able to breed out of their core stock, their bulls and cows or their rams and their ewes, to build again into the future but it has had a severe impact on farming in this state. As I said, a lot of it is attributed to the high cost of inputs for people to operate.

There are only a couple of saving graces in this conversation around dryland agriculture which is that wool prices have not been too bad and livestock has not been too bad. But the thing is, once you sell the stock, you cannot get it back, and if you sold most of your breeding stock, you are going to take a long time—multiple years—to get that back to fruition. What I am saying is that we cannot do much about the weather, that is true, but we need to, as with what has been attempted here with the Biosecurity Bill, get things as good as we can for all of our primary producers, whether they be our intensive farming primary producers, the more broadacre primary producers and the like, and people who are running livestock.

We need to make sure that they can get the best outcome they can knowing that if there is a threat of any virus, any disease coming in, and they can be plant-borne diseases, that the legislation and the government of the day have their back because farmers in this state—well, farmers across the country but certainly in this state, the driest state in the driest continent—do a magnificent job.

I have said it here before, if it were not for the forward thinking and the technological advances that we have seen over the last 30 or 40 years, and the one-pass farming using glyphosate, or Roundup, which is the commercial term, and other chemicals to do that one-pass farming, conserving moisture at every instance—even with the poor crops that came off right across the state, people were straight out with their boom sprays to get rid of any bit of green that would suck moisture out of the opportunity for this year's crops. Farmers are still investing, but they are not investing too much, I can assure you, because the cheque books went into the office and most of them got locked up from September.

What I was getting at with those technological advances is if we had had a year like this last year's season 30 or 40 years ago we would have seen the old footage that we had back then where farms used to get cultivated multiple times—eight, nine or 10 times—and you would have had graders grading bitumen to get the dust off the roads. Thankfully, we were nowhere near that because of what farmers do through those advances, working in farming groups, working with consultants, and working with their own knowledge that they learn over time to make it better. They need to be rewarded for what they are doing, as I said, whether they are dryland operators or more intensive operators where they need to bring in feed and water.

We certainly support the Biosecurity Bill. We want to see that it gets enacted in the proper way. We would certainly like to see improvements into the future as to how threats are managed and to make sure that PIRSA is appropriately resourced and that there are procedures put in place so that some of the issues we saw with the tomato rugose virus can be eliminated to give producers the best outcomes. We need to make sure the national protocols are right. I know it is a fine balance between what producers want and what we need to do with disease management but we need to get it right so that we can all progress into the future and have a better time with disease management into the future. With those few words, I commend the bill.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (16:22): I would like to make a contribution to this Biosecurity Bill. As the member for Hammond has so eloquently put it, the importance of biosecurity to the primary sector cannot be overstated. Obviously, South Australia does deserve an effective, contemporary and adaptable biosecurity framework but the bill has to ensure that the framework remains effective for the future needs. What I would like to see in the bill is the capability for the bill to be amended should there need to be some form of nimble change in the biosecurity space.

For those within the primary sector, those within the department and those who live and breathe biosecurity, the impact of a breach cannot be overstated. I want to err with a level of caution to the government, and that consultation was performed under a former Liberal government with me as the responsible minister in the early days. There is crossover with the Biosecurity Act: there is the Livestock Act and there are national committees that do have a lot of crossover. I would like to have

seen a level of consultation with the Marine Pest Sectoral Committee and also other biosecurity measures in other states.

I raise my hand to say that I have been a very proud South Australian primary producer. South Australia does lead the way with a lot of biosecurity measures. We have put enforcement and eradication programs in place over a long period of time, while I have seen other states be quite complacent and allow things to spiral out of control and I will touch on that shortly.

First and foremost, we need to make sure the bill ensures protection from pest and diseases, full stop, but once we do incur an outbreak or disease, whether it is a local disease or whether it is an introduced disease, it threatens an economy. It is a terrestrial environment, but the public amenities and the communities and the infrastructure need to be, as I said, nimble should we have an outbreak and I think, by and large, South Australia has demonstrated that.

We have seen a number of biosecurity breaches. We have seen outbreaks and introduced problem areas right across the board within the primary sector. I guess the framework needs to be, as I said, nimble and flexible so the department can actually move quickly. Obviously, primary industries are the responsible department. Department of the Premier and Cabinet are also a driver within that space to properly resource PIRSA, should there be the need for a quick response.

I think what we have seen over recent times has been that we have implemented a quick response, whether it be land-based, marine-based or commodity-based biosecurity. Whether we are looking at grains or livestock or the marine environment, there has to be the capability to have the resources on hand for the relative agency to be able to address the threats of either an imminent outbreak or an outbreak that has been detected and needs to be very quickly addressed and it is about how quickly the government can manage an incursion.

I must say that there have been good and bad responses by governments and, by and large, it does not matter what colour of government is in: it is about how they address it and the priority they put on making sure they nip in the bud whatever the pressure point is with a biosecurity breach or an outbreak. I think what we need to do when we are building this new biosecurity act—and it has been a while since we put measures in place to amend what the act is—is to actually learn from the vagaries and shortcomings through history.

I think there were two amendments in the Legislative Council that ensure third parties accessing land for primary production are taking the necessary steps to reduce the risk. We need to make sure there is better automated biosecurity oversight with computers and AI models. Obviously, AI is a thing in the distance and we will watch very carefully just how those AI models can be used to address some of the shortcomings that human intervention has missed along the way.

We need to have better automated oversight with outbreaks and response times and it requires ministers and departments to publish reports of these decisions so there is transparency so the industry and the commodity sector can be assured that the government is doing everything in its power to best protect our primary sector.

That also sends a very strong message to our trading partners. Most of those trading partners rely on a very reliable product and they want a safe product and if we can demonstrate to them that as a state with a well-led government we are doing everything in our power to have those biosecurity measures put in place, making sure that product is of exceptional quality with no threats and assure our buying customer, we will go far. We will also be able to draw a premium for those products.

I think what it has shown us over a long period of time is that previously—not so long ago—we had a huge advantage within our vineyards. With phylloxera within our food-growing areas and horticulture, particularly with the Qfly that sadly has now seen a number of outbreaks within the Riverland—we have even seen some outbreaks, particularly the Mediterranean fruit fly down here in metropolitan Adelaide. Just recently we saw another outbreak at Glynde. That raises alarm bells for people who are here in our marketplace buying our products, wanting to be assured that when they buy a product at a premium price they are getting a safe, clean, green product that will not threaten that relationship between buyer and seller or between farmer and agent going into the marketplace.

I just want to touch on some of the biosecurity threats that we have experienced over a short period of time. When we look back in history, it does demonstrate that the biosecurity act must be an

anchor point; it must be rock solid. We are now relying on a global trading economy, more so than ever. We know that there are political headwinds occasionally that do hurt our trading economy, but I think we have to make sure that we have our house in order so that when we are trading into those markets we can ensure that it is safe and it is not there to impact.

Obviously, one of the newly detected diseases or viruses that has come into South Australia has been the varroa mite, the varroa destructor as it is commonly known. It is not just a global pest within the honey industry; it is a global pest within the pollination industry. Pollination is worth many, many dollars' worth of benefit—I have heard closer to \$2 billion—to a food-dependent sector, the horticulture sector.

My electorate runs up into the Victorian border. We have seen some of those pollination services, honeybees, that have been detected in New South Wales with varroa mite. Governments now in their wisdom have gone away from eradication and are now just doing a management-type transition. Management is all very well and good, but government has to better understand that bees have no boundaries. I will declare that South Australia's 2,000 registered apiarists (beekeepers) are not enough to service the sector that we need for pollination services in particular.

Pollination services are a very large part of the bee industry, but they are an even larger part of the pollination services into horticulture, into food production and also into the environment. We know that we have a lot of native bees. We know that we rely more and more on pollination, whether it is on our native plants or whether it is on our food plants. It is also about making sure we have pollination for our food-derivative plants that are feeding our livestock and are helping grow our forests. There is a hugely diverse need for pollination within our natural environment.

As I said, the pollination-dependent industries must be able to act quickly, particularly the almond industry, which is a very buoyant commodity at the moment and is almost totally dependent on pollination services. Some of the new almond varieties are now self-pollinating; they are new breeds. What we are seeing now is that they still require bees. The selling factor is that they are self-pollinating and do not require bees—that is not the fact. The fact is that they require fewer bees and they are less dependent on having to have pollination to, at the end of the day, have a viable crop so that we can make that industry continue to grow.

With regard to the \$2 billion horticulture industry, 85 per cent of that industry relies on pollination services. It cannot be overstated. Obviously, I very proudly say that Chaffey is one of the great food bowls of Australia—it is one of the great food bowls of South Australia—having significant citrus holdings, soft fruits, pome fruits and vegetables. Growing industries are nut crops that are, again, reliant on those pollination services. It is the largest fresh potato-growing electorate in the Southern hemisphere. All of these plants have flowers and all of these flowers produce better yields once they have been pollinated by bees rather than just using the wind or chemicals to make sure that those plants are part of a vibrant, productive food industry.

The almond industry is a growing industry. It is said to double over the next five years. It becomes more and more important to the state's economy. Not only is it the majority of what we grow in the almond sector but the majority of it is exported. About 5 per cent to 6 per cent of the almonds are for the domestic market; the remainder is put into containers, they are value-added and they are sent abroad to our trading partners at a premium price because they are Australian almonds. We produce a premium product. As I said, it is clean and green. There are some producers that are better than others, and that is another complexity with return price. While industry is pouring millions into combatting any biosecurity risks, so must government. It is a government's role to co-contribute to keeping our shores safe from those biosecurity threats.

I will touch on Queensland fruit fly. Sadly, what we have seen is a number of outbreaks in the Riverland—some 50-plus outbreaks. That has only happened over the recent couple of years. I think the measures that were put in place by the former Liberal government, with myself as the minister responsible, were about zero tolerance, about stopping people at our borders, enforcing the rules. There were no new rules. It was about enforcing penalties and making sure that people were educated and better prepared coming into South Australia not to carry fruit, not to carry host material that would potentially further threaten the industry.

It is a great economy but we have to continue to educate people. I thank the current government of the day. They continue to roll out the fruit fly program; however, there are many arms to rolling out a fruit fly program. Zero tolerance is part of it, the liaison officers, and having a sterile fly facility at Port Augusta. Continuing to grow the capacity of that facility has never been more important. At Port Augusta, those sterile flies are fruit flies that have been irradiated; they become sterile and they fire blanks. They give a false reading with the natural fly and those flies have a limited lifespan. Once that sterile fly has done its job it breaks the life cycle, and it is very important that that continues to happen.

We did use the Western Australian Mediterranean fruit fly facility over a long period of time. It was very costly. That Mediterranean facility was used for the outbreak of the Mediterranean fruit flies here in Adelaide. That was eradicated. I commend the work of both the former Liberal government and this current government for the work they are doing to keep it eradicated. Really, it is up to growers, and it is up to householders to be vigilant. It is up to the government to continue to spread the message, to educate people and to make sure that people are responsible in their backyards and that they are not transporting contaminated material, infested larvae, into other regions, only for it to be detected and then have declared outbreaks. It really does create a number of issues.

I do want to say that South Australia is the lens between the west and the east. We are between the outbreak of Mediterranean fruit fly in the west and what we have seen over in the east. At the border, just to the east of the Riverland, the Queensland fruit fly outbreak is endemic. You cannot go into a backyard within Sunraysia, within the Millewa—a lot of those areas, all the way to the eastern seaboard—without picking up a piece of contaminated fruit.

I have said in this place more than once: there is nothing worse than biting into a peach and getting a mouthful of maggots, and that is exactly what is happening, particularly in Sunraysia. There are very few fruit trees in backyards now because they were all contaminated with fruit fly. They all have to be chemically treated and they lose their market share. But here in South Australia we had that huge advantage.

In some of the other sectors—with the short amount of time I have left—obviously with livestock we have seen a lot of pressure with footrot and mad cow. We have Asia on our doorstep, and we have to be vigilant with any host material coming out of Asia. As has been stated, with chickens the avian flu has raised its head, but biosecurity measures put in place by the department are doing a good job to keep it at bay.

The marine environment continues to give people heart palpitations. In abalone, there is the AVG virus. In oysters, we have POMS. In the aquaculture sector, we have seen a number of issues and threats to our aquaculture businesses, including ranching. A lot of production ships come into our ports and drop ballast water. In particular, with some of those, there is the crown-of-thorns starfish and prawn white spot. There are many. In grains, we have rust, fusarium, mildew and nematodes. There are many and some of these diseases can actually kill humans, so it is more than just dealing with what we are currently seeing.

In citrus, huanglongbing is a pathogen. It is an Asian citrus psyllid, and it has almost wiped out the citrus industry in the US. It has had a monumental impact on the Queensland citrus industry. We talk a lot about particularly phylloxera in the wine industry. South Australia is phylloxera free, so please let's keep it that way. Border security—thank you. Keep our state safe and keep our state biosecurity friendly.

Mr FULBROOK (Playford) (16:42): It is a pleasure to rise today and to speak in support of the Biosecurity Bill 2024—an important piece of legislation that seeks to protect and strengthen our state's biosecurity and which aims to provide benefit for our state's industries, for our environment and for the South Australian community. Before I begin, I really want to thank the two previous members for their contributions. It was fascinating to hear your perspective on this particular matter and thank you.

To the member for Chaffey, I did tell you I was going to creep into your electorate a few weeks ago, and it was a relief to be able to buy fruit from the side of the road. I must confess, 12 months earlier I tried that game in ignorance and came home empty-handed and was probably

not willing to confess that to the house then, but it is a welcome relief that we do have growers who are able to sell some of their fruit on the side of the road.

Our primary industries and agribusinesses are enormous contributors to the South Australian economy. We have a very proud history in this state, in this all-important sector, that strongly underpins the wellbeing and success of our communities in a diverse range of ways. To track the advances in South Australian primary industries, the Department of Primary Industries and Regions (PIRSA) releases a series of industry scorecards. These provide value chain measures of annual performance.

The most recent industry scorecard tells us that in 2022-23 South Australian primary industries and agribusiness revenue increased by 7 per cent, to reach a record \$18.5 billion. The value of South Australia's overseas exports of primary industries and associated processing, which is also referred to as food and agribusiness, totalled \$8.8 billion in 2022-23, which represents an increase of 18 per cent relative to the 2021-22 figure and accounted for 51 per cent of our total merchandise exports.

Of course, through the hard work of the federal and state Labor governments we have seen the resumption of trade to China for many agricultural industries, including rock lobster and wine, and the undoing of the damage that the previous federal Liberal government did to our primary producers. In 2022-23, total employment in primary industries and associated processing was estimated to be around 78,000 FTEs. This represents an increase of 10 per cent from the previous financial year.

Overall, results for the full food and wine industry supply chain were up. Combined gross food and wine revenue increased by 10.7 per cent to reach \$26.65 billion, with increases in food commodities, particularly grain exports, as the main driver. The strong results achieved over recent years despite global challenges and extreme weather events illustrate the importance and the value of a robust and resilient primary industry sector to our state. These industries have long been part of our identity, and long may they remain so. This is why a strong biosecurity system is so critical to underpinning the productivity and profitability of our primary industries.

There are also vital environmental and social benefits in protecting our unique flora and fauna, natural environments, culture and public amenity from a wide range of biosecurity threats. Biosecurity is the management of risks to the economy, the environment and the community of pests and diseases entering, emerging, establishing or spreading in an area.

It is the case that we are facing increasing biosecurity pressures. The National Biosecurity Strategy describes how various pressures at the national and global levels are driving increased and changing biosecurity risks. These include climate change, enabling pests and diseases to invade new areas. Climate change also affects the resilience of primary production and natural systems to pest and disease invasions, particularly in the face of more extreme weather events and natural disasters.

Changing land use and increased migration to regional areas, bringing people, primary production and wildlife closer together, brings more pathways for pests and spreads disease. I can recall this in my time living in Scott Creek, when once upon a time we had a conservation park that abutted our house.

At one particular time, it was completely planted with trees. While that is commendable on so many fronts, it also got rid of the natural grasslands, which resulted in the migration of an abundance of kangaroos. They found the backyards and paddocks of my neighbours and my family to be very tempting and appetising, and so as time went on life revolved around adapting to having many kangaroos as neighbours and, of course, to the security and safety threats that came with it; but I do digress.

I also want to add that global trade continues to increase. Coupled with more complex global supply chains, there is more pressure on border screening and increased freight within Australia. More shipping vessel movements raise risks of introducing new marine pests and, of course, diseases. Tourism and migration also continue to increase post COVID-19. This brings associated biosecurity risks, where people unintentionally or deliberately transport biosecurity matter.

Invasive species are a major cause of global decline in biodiversity, including for Australia's threatened flora and fauna. Let us not forget the cane toad. It might take a while, but he is coming. E-commerce is enabling greater volumes of trade, including illegal trade in declared pest species, both into and within Australia. Increasing biosecurity risks overseas are geographically closer to Australia and/or occurring in locations frequented by travellers; for example, foot-and-mouth disease, rabies, lumpy skin disease and African swine fever are present in South East Asia.

Increasing resistance to agricultural and veterinary chemicals can limit what effective controls are available to prevent and manage biosecurity pests that cause diseases. To effectively manage the increasing risks there is a need for South Australia to introduce more contemporary, flexible and consistent biosecurity legislation. South Australia's current biosecurity legislation has served us well; however, there is a clear opportunity to strengthen the regulatory tools to respond more effectively and more consistently to current and emerging risks.

As part of the national biosecurity system a consolidated biosecurity act is needed for South Australia to enable a harmonised, flexible and risk and evidence-based approach to preventing, controlling and managing biosecurity risks and to ensure South Australia remains a strong link into the national system.

The bill that we are now considering seeks to consolidate several existing acts to improve consistency across sectors, including the Plant Health Act 2009, the Livestock Act 1997, the Dog Fence Act 1946, the Impounding Act 1920 and relevant provisions of the Fisheries Management Act 2007.

I am proud of the significant biosecurity funding that both the federal and state Labor governments have made in the north of Adelaide in recent years. Partnering with the neighbouring South Australia Produce Market they have announced the development of a \$50 million biosecurity facility based in Pooraka, within the northern suburbs and within a stone's throw of where I live in Parafield Gardens.

This is a state first for South Australia. The post-harvest treatment facility will provide inspection, quarantine and treatment of fruit and vegetable produce, which is vital for exporting South Australia's produce globally and supporting our primary producers from all across the state. The industry-led initiative is funded through \$9.8 million in federal government funding, \$4.2 million from the state government and \$36 million from industry. The facility will use pressure cooling and treatment technology and will be the largest scale multi-treatment and inspection facility in South Australia. Once completed, the project will unlock an additional \$100 million in fresh produce exports over a five-year period, creating up to 172 direct and indirect ongoing jobs and assist in cost reduction for the state's valued primary producers.

Currently South Australian producers are required to send their produce to Victoria or Queensland for treatment. This new facility is set to reduce those transport costs and improve profitability for South Australian producers which, in turn, will lower product wastage and help reduce the cost of produce at our supermarkets. South Australian growers have previously faced challenges in selling to certain markets in times of fruit fly outbreaks. In 2020 and 2021 South Australia had a medfly outbreak in metropolitan Adelaide and is currently experiencing a prolonged Qfly outbreak in parts of the Riverland.

As members in this place would know, we often face fruit fly outbreaks in metropolitan Adelaide. Currently there are two, one in Salisbury—rather close to home—and the other one in Glynde. This investment will allow producers long-term certainty to continue to trade their produce by allowing access to treatment options right here in Adelaide, as opposed to having to send their products interstate which eats into critical shelf-life days.

Built on the site of the SA Produce Market at Burma Road in Pooraka, the facility will play a vital role in protecting and expanding the state's growing horticultural industry. There are restrictions within Australia and export countries on what produce is allowed to enter each state or country based on what pests and diseases are prevalent in the region where the fruit is grown. The new biosecurity precinct will ensure produce coming from the fruit fly impacted areas within the state are able to be inspected, quarantined and treated if required before produce is distributed overseas and to retailers across South Australia, Western Australia and the Northern Territory.

Stage 1 of the project is well under way and I look forward to continue to see this project develop and support our producers. The facility will also support and grow key industries identified by the state government, such as health and medical. The Biosecurity Bill is the result of a significant body of work to ensure that South Australia has fit for purpose, modern legislation to manage biosecurity risks now and into the future.

Obviously, it takes a lot of effort to bring one of these bills into the chamber. On behalf of this humble backbencher and a lot of my colleagues, I do want to pay my thanks to those who have worked hard behind the scenes to get this bill to where it is today. I have worked as both a member of a ministerial team and a member of the Public Service. Working behind the scenes, I know there is a lot of blood, sweat and tears that goes into a bill like this. I figure that it would be appropriate at this point in time to lay on the record how much we within the government and, I am sure, those opposite appreciate the effort that has gone into this particular bill. With that in mind, it is my pleasure now to commend it to the house, and I urge all members present to support it.

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (16:55): I rise today to offer my support for the Biosecurity Bill 2024. As other members have acknowledged in this place, South Australia's current biosecurity legislation has served us well. However, there is opportunity to strengthen the regulatory tools to respond to current and emerging risks effectively and consistently. Disparate provisions in acts covering plant health, animal health and aquatic-related biosecurity also impede efficient, flexible delivery and can be confusing for system participants.

This is a crucial bill for ensuring the future sustainability of our state's primary producers, the environment and the wider community. A thorough review of existing legislation and the opportunity for multiple rounds of stakeholder consultation culminated in an eight-week public consultation on the draft bill in August and September 2023. That allowed us to make sure that the voices of system participants have been heard.

The bill brings consistency to the management of animal, plant and environmental biosecurity across industries by keeping and improving the best of what has worked in existing legislation and adding new tools and concepts to embed these in a single, modern, flexible legislative framework. The Biosecurity Bill 2024 introduces new concepts to the way biosecurity is managed and regulated in South Australia. The strong results achieved over recent years despite global challenges and extreme weather events illustrate the importance of a robust and resilient primary industry sector. A strong biosecurity system is critical in underpinning the productivity and profitability of our primary industries.

There are also vital environmental and social benefits in protecting our unique flora and fauna, natural environments, culture and public amenity from a wide range of biosecurity threats. Biosecurity is the management of risks to the economy, the environment and the community of pests and diseases entering, emerging, establishing or spreading in an area.

I understand that a fundamental concept of the bill is that of biosecurity matter, which includes any animal, plant or other organism apart from a human being, animal and plant pests and diseases, disease agents, contaminants and animal and plant products. The bill also defines a carrier of biosecurity matter, which is any living or non-living thing that has or is capable of having biosecurity matter on it, attached to it or contained in it. For example, a hive or vehicle may be a carrier of bees. Bees are a carrier of varroa mites, and varroa mites themselves may be carriers of serious viruses such as deformed wing virus.

Similarly, the bill allows for prohibited and regulated dealings to be declared by regulation. Prohibited dealings pose biosecurity risks in the same manner as prohibited matter and require similar regulation and controls to prevent, eliminate, minimise, control or manage those risks. Regulated dealings require anyone undertaking them to be registered for that purpose and to carry them out subject to conditions of their registration to ensure the dealing does not pose an unacceptable biosecurity risk.

The bill aims to build a culture of shared responsibility among government, industry and the community for protecting our state from the impacts of pests, diseases and contaminants. To support this outcome, it introduces a new key concept of 'general biosecurity duty', which is a duty on

everyone to prevent, eliminate, minimise, control or manage biosecurity risks when dealing with biosecurity matter or a carrier.

The general biosecurity duty requires a person to take reasonably practicable measures in relation to the risk they know, or reasonably ought to know, exists. The standard for complying with the general biosecurity duty is set at that which can be expected for someone in their circumstances and with their knowledge and would be different, for example, for a professional researcher or agronomist than a member of the public. There is also guidance within the bill as to the meaning of 'reasonably practicable'.

Authorised officers also have a range of powers they can exercise for authorised purposes in administering and enforcing the act which includes the scope of powers in existing biosecurity-related legislation. They strike the right balance between allowing officers to act in implementing the bill and ensuring appropriate checks and balances are in place.

Importantly, the bill gives authorised officers authority to act if they believe or reasonably believe the situation requires action to prevent, eliminate, minimise, control or manage a biosecurity risk or impact. Provisions such as these are central to supporting the bill's aims of risk-based decision-making and acting early to achieve the best biosecurity outcomes.

The bill contains a number of provisions to support access to domestic and international markets for South Australia's produce, enabling it to be certified as pest and disease free, and traced through the supply chain meeting entry conditions of the receiving jurisdiction. These include registration of people engaging in regulated dealings and provisions to enable allocation of identification codes such as the existing Property Identification Code for livestock producers.

This can be extended under the new framework, for example, to property ID codes for producers of plants. Such identification schemes are increasingly important in supporting market access and are also critical in tracing movement of pests and diseases in emergencies. Biosecurity programs are an important new tool to prevent, eliminate, minimise, control or manage a particular biosecurity risk or impact. These can be proposed by an industry or community body or be led by government. They will foster partnerships, shared responsibility and co-investment in tackling issues of interest to specific industry or community groups.

I would like to take a little minute to talk about a couple of the orchards that I have in my community that continue to not only provide our community with fabulous fresh fruit but take their responsibility of biosecurity very seriously. The Magarey Orchard, also known as Nunkri Orchard, is a family-owned and operated pear and apple orchard located at Coromandel Valley. Established in 1909 by Thomas Charles Alfred and his wife, Agnes Magarey, the orchard has been operational for five generations with the sixth generation now working there—that is 116 years later.

The Magarey family work incredibly hard to produce award-winning fruit and, can I also say, the best pear jam you will get anywhere. The community can drive up to the orchard and buy fruit through an honesty system, and you are right there in the big shed where the fruit is processed so you can witness firsthand all of the work that occurs. They grow pears, including one of the best varieties that I have ever tasted known as the Josephine. The Josephine is not easy to find in stores but a trip to Magareys' can take you to a place where you have a delicious and healthy snack. They also have apples and plums. Last year, I invited the minister to visit the orchard and hear directly from Andrew and John and the Magarey family about their business: the history, their processes and also the challenges that they face.

Also in my community is Allan's Orchard in Upper Sturt. A much smaller-scale operation to the Magareys', Allan and Carol have a peach orchard and every summer, much to the delight of not only our local Upper Sturt residents but also those driving through Upper Sturt, you can go and buy some deliciously homegrown peaches. Allan and Carol work hard from dawn to dusk, on hot days and in the rain to ensure their crop is the best.

Both these orchards are well aware of the threat of pests, be they fruit fly or other issues. I remember as a kid travelling on holidays across the border and seeing the fruit fly warnings and we see them in our airports as well. We also have a personal responsibility to protect our growers. They

are important to our state and our community and this bill adds to the protections and support that they need to continue to provide locally grown produce.

Not quite in my community but pretty close with joint namesake is the Waite research precinct. I have always been aware of the work that occurs at Waite as I grew up across the road from a family, many of whom worked there, led by their father, Tony Rathjen. Tony was a wheat breeder and made an enormous contribution to South Australia's agricultural community. He left a lasting legacy and led the way for his daughter to also work within the Waite Research Institute.

I have visited the campus on several occasions, most recently when they announced their Plants for Space program, growing duckweed and other varieties that are not only packed full of nutrients but also may be able to grow in other extraterrestrial spaces. Maybe some work still to be done on the taste but they are definitely on their way.

Waite through SARDI does a lot more than growing space weed. They are in the integral research arm in our war against pests and diseases and I thank all our researchers and scientists who work there. The South Australian Research and Development Institute (SARDI) Plant Quarantine Unit is the hub of quarantine-related activity at the Waite Campus, providing plant quarantine services to industry and the research community. They provide a disease screening service for plant material imported from overseas and they have the capacity to do onsite screening from seeds through to whole plant and can do heat treatments, if needed.

Biosecurity is incredibly important, as we have said previously, to protect our animals, our environment and our agriculture. We all have personal responsibility. This bill is a result of a significant body of work to ensure that South Australia has fit-for-purpose, modern legislation to manage biosecurity risks now and into the future. There has been significant consultation which shows broad support for the proposed reforms and the creation of the consolidated Biosecurity Bill, which also resulted in some substantial improvements to earlier drafts of the bill. I commend the Biosecurity Bill to the house and I look forward to further debate.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (17:05): I rise to speak in support of the Biosecurity Bill 2024. At the outset, I would like to thank the members for Hammond, Chaffey, Playford and Waite for their contributions. Over the past few years, we have seen many challenges on the biosecurity front, which has required a response to protect South Australia's agricultural commodity groups. We have seen fruit fly outbreaks in both the Riverland and metropolitan Adelaide, heightened awareness of foot-and-mouth and lumpy skin disease from neighbouring countries, along with the ongoing response to the tomato brown rugose fruit virus in South Australia. Indeed, we continue to see a close monitoring of Australia's National Priority Plant Pest List. Identification of national priority pests enables governments to develop national action plans for key incursion risks to:

- better allocate limited resources on a national basis to focus safeguarding efforts on pest or pest groups that are most likely to cause a significant negative impact to Australian primary industries and/or the environment and/or the social amenity and community;
- enable governments to also identify gaps in systems and processes to manage a risk;
- allow better targeting and monitoring of the most significant pests;
- focus research, diagnostics, surveillance, risk reduction and preparedness efforts;
- importantly, support market access and trade based on consideration of the public good through development of standards, protocols and accreditation processes; and
- also work with trading partners to highlight pest threats of mutual concern and harmonise regional approaches.

In 2023, South Australian primary industries and agribusiness revenue increased by 7 per cent to reach a record \$18.5 billion. As we can see, these are important industries to the South Australian economy and our general wellbeing. Overseas exports of agriculture, food, wine and forestry products increased by 18 per cent and totalled \$8.8 billion, accounting for 51 per cent of Australia's total overseas merchandise exports.

The primary industries sector, along with the associated processing sectors, also supported 78,000 FTE jobs in 2023. This was an increase of 10 per cent from the previous financial year. Overall results for the full food and wine industry supply chain were up. Combined gross food and wine revenue increased by 10.7 per cent to reach \$26.65 billion, with increases in food commodities (grain exports) with grain exports as the main driver.

The strong results achieved over recent years, despite global challenges and extreme weather events, illustrate the importance of a robust and resilient primary industries sector to our state. A strong biosecurity system is critical to underpinning the productivity and profitability of our primary industries. Without an effective biosecurity system, our whole industry could be at risk. There are also vital environmental and social benefits in protecting our unique flora and fauna, natural environments, culture and public amenity from a wide range of biosecurity threats.

Biosecurity is the management of risks to the economy, the environment and the community of pests and diseases entering, emerging, establishing or spreading in an area. We are facing increasing biosecurity pressures. The National Biosecurity Strategy describes how various pressures at the national and global level are driving increased and changing biosecurity risks. Some of these risks include climate change enabling pests and diseases to invade new areas. Climate change also affects the resilience of primary production and natural systems to pest and disease invasions, particularly in the face of more extreme weather events and natural disasters.

Change in land use and increased migration to regional areas are bringing people, primary production and wildlife closer together. This brings more pathways for pest and disease spread. It does not mean we should not be doing it, it just means we need to do it smartly.

Global trade continues to increase. Coupled with more complex global supply chains, there is more pressure on border screening and increased freight within Australia. More shipping vessel movements raise the risks of introducing new marine pests and diseases. Tourism and migration also continue to increase post COVID-19. This brings associated biosecurity risks where people unintentionally or deliberately transport biosecurity matter. Invasive species are a major cause of global decline in biodiversity, including Australia's threatened flora and fauna.

Ecommerce is enabling greater volumes of trade, including the illegal trade in declared pest species both into and within Australia. Increasing biosecurity risks overseas are geographically closer to Australia and/or occurring in locations frequented by travellers. For example, foot and mouth disease, rabies, lumpy skin disease and African swine fever are present in South-East Asia.

Increasing resistance to agricultural and veterinary chemicals can limit what effective controls are available to prevent and manage biosecurity pests and diseases, but even the uses of chemicals have their own challenges. To effectively manage the increase in risk, there is need for South Australia to introduce more contemporary, flexible, consistent biosecurity legislation and, as the member for Chaffey mentioned, a more nimble approach to biosecurity.

South Australia's current biosecurity legislation has served us well; however, there is an opportunity to strengthen the regulatory tools to respond to current emerging risks effectively and consistently. As part of the national biosecurity system, a consolidated biosecurity act is needed for South Australia to enable a harmonised, flexible and risk and evidence-based approach to preventing, controlling and managing biosecurity risks to ensure that South Australia remains a strong link in the national system.

The current bill consolidates several existing acts to improve consistency across sectors, including the Plant Health Act 2009, Livestock Act 1997, Dog Fence Act 1946, Impounding Act 1920, and relevant provisions of the Fisheries Management Act 2007. This is a crucial bill for ensuring the future sustainability of our states, primary producers, environment and the wider community.

This bill brings consistency to the management of animal, plant, aquatic and environmental biosecurity across industries by keeping and improving the best of what has worked in the existing legislation and by adding new tools and concepts to embed these in a single, modern, flexible legislative framework. It draws on the experience and lessons of other jurisdictions in developing their biosecurity legislation to ensure the bill is cutting edge and tailored to meet the needs of our state.

Businesses commonly operate across state borders and interstate trade is fundamental to our economy. Consistency in regulatory approach and terminology brings efficiencies in business operations supporting voluntary compliance. Consistency is especially important in conducting biosecurity emergency responses when incursion of a new pest or disease poses a threat to multiple states and territories. South Australia needs to play its part in having appropriate emergency powers that align well with those in other jurisdictions.

The Biosecurity Bill 2024 introduces new concepts to the way biosecurity is managed and regulated in South Australia. Under current South Australian legislation, there are different ways in which pests, diseases and contaminants are prevented and managed. Additionally, there are concepts of biosecurity risk and impact.

The bill aims to build a culture of shared responsibility among government, industry and the community for protecting our state from the impacts of pests, diseases and contaminants. This is an extremely important point to make sure that we all understand that we all have a role to play in the biosecurity of our state. It is not just an issue for primary producers; it is also an issue for government and also for consumers and what we do in our everyday lives.

A biosecurity breakout is not good for producers or their regions, nor for those communities they serve. The key new concept of 'general biosecurity duty' introduces a duty for everyone to prevent, eliminate, minimise, control and manage biosecurity risks when dealing with a biosecurity matter or a carrier, recognising that we all have a role to play. The general biosecurity duty requires a person to take reasonable practical measures in relation to the risk they know or reasonably ought to know exists.

The bill contains a suite of tools for implementation of responses to biosecurity risks and impacts. This includes tools to establish areas subject to certain measures necessary to regulate a biosecurity risk. These range from a short-term emergency order through to a medium-term control order or a long-term biosecurity zone.

Mr Speaker, as a former minister yourself in this area, you know that often tough decisions have to be made in terms of taking action. A decision has to be made for the greater or common good, and sometimes this does impact on individuals. Having said that, though, we need to make sure that those people who are actually impacted and for whom we make decisions about their capacity to produce are supported by us as a community and should not be left to shoulder the burden alone.

These tools are supported by individual and group directions that prohibit, regulate or control particular dealings and specify measures to be taken for the purposes of assessing, preventing or managing a biosecurity risk or impact. The range of tools and powers provided by this legislation enable reasonable and effective measures to be taken that are proportionate to the level of risk and have a proactive focus to protect our state by ensuring appropriate checks and balances are in place.

Importantly, the bill gives authorised officers the ability to act if they believe or reasonably believe the situation requires action to prevent, eliminate, minimise, control or manage a biosecurity risk or impact. Provisions such as these are central to supporting the bill's aims of risk-based decision-making and acting early to achieve the best security outcomes and minimising the risks to other primary producers, the environment and the community at large.

Biosecurity is a key enabler of market access, providing assurances for the supply of safe agricultural, fisheries and forestry products to local, interstate and overseas markets. One of our strengths as a state is that our primary industries have a very clean and green reputation, enabling us to sell products in other jurisdictions—and particularly overseas—when others are stopped from doing so. We need to protect the reputation we have or else our primary industry producers themselves will suffer.

The bill contains a number of provisions to support access to domestic and international markets for South Australia's produce, enabling it to be certified as pest and disease free and traced through the supply chain, meeting entry conditions of the receiving jurisdiction. These include registration of people engaged in the regulated dealings, and provisions to enable allocation of identification codes, such as the existing Property Identification Code for livestock producers. Such

identification schemes are increasingly important in supporting market access and are also critical in tracing movement of pests and diseases in an emergency. These sorts of systems support both producers and also the markets at large.

Industry codes of practice, standards and market assurance schemes can be legally recognised under the bill, and so the bill itself and the new scheme also have a very educative role. It is not just about compliance; it is about educating our producers and the community at large on what their roles and responsibilities are. Further, both government and non-government organisations can be accreditation authorities to accredit biosecurity certifiers who can certify that products meet required conditions for market purposes. This is an important addition because it enables a quicker response at times and also enables us to share information and educate people about their responsibilities.

Biosecurity programs are a new tool to prevent, eliminate, minimise, control or manage a particular biosecurity risk or impact. These can be proposed by an industry or community body or can be led by government. They will foster partnerships, shared responsibility and co-investment in tackling issues of interest to specific industry or community groups.

The bill provides for a modern, flexible compliance framework, bringing outdated penalties into line with the risk and impact of the offences involved. Hopefully, these measures will deter those from doing the wrong thing. Of these, release of a prescribed agent with intent to harm or infect/infest animals or plants and cause substantial harm to an industry or the state economy is the most serious and carries a maximum penalty of \$1 million or ten years in prison or both.

Another important provision in the bill relates to extraterritorial application of the act to ensure that it may apply to the greatest extent it can. This could be used, for example, to take compliance action against online retailers sending prohibitive matter into South Australia from interstate. The bill also provides the required flexibility where a person or group of people need to undertake an activity that would otherwise be unlawful under the bill, and this can be done with certain prescribed conditions to manage the risk.

The bill provides for review of decisions through the minister (an internal review) or, where appropriate, externally through the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal. This right of review I think is very important. When we give government officers more powers and duties, it is important they can be subject to review to make sure that they are accountable for the decisions they made because the cost of making the wrong decisions or inappropriate decisions can be very high for primary producers.

The bill will also replace the Dog Fence Act 1946, continuing the Dog Fence Board in its important role of managing the dog fence to ensure wild dogs are prevented from entering pastoral and agricultural areas of the state. I recall the former minister and the former government had quite a bit to do with working to improve the Dog Fence Act.

The bill updates existing provisions while maintaining the essential functions related to the board and the dog fence. The 2,150-kilometre South Australian dog fence is fundamental to the security of the South Australian sheep industry. The fence prevents wild dogs from the northern two-thirds of the state from moving south into sheep production country. Wild dogs cost Australian agriculture about \$90 million per year.

In 2018-19, wild dogs were estimated to have injured or killed approximately 20,000 sheep in South Australia, costing the livestock sector \$4 million. The South Australian dog fence is undergoing a once-in-a-generation rebuild. The dog fence rebuild project has seen funds contributed by South Australian livestock industry amounting to \$6 million, \$13 million from the Government of South Australia, and the commonwealth government putting in \$10 million to rebuild the highest priority 1,600 kilometres of the 2,150 kilometre-long fence. More than 1,030 kilometres of the fence has now been built, which represents about 64 per cent of the fence, with the remaining fence underway or contracted.

Management of wild dogs underpins the sustainability of South Australia's extensive livestock industries, particularly the sheep industry inside the dog fence. The pastoral cattle industry inside and outside the dog fence can also be seriously impacted by wild dogs.

The Biosecurity Bill is the result of a significant body of work to ensure that South Australia has fit-for-purpose modern legislation to manage biosecurity risks now and into the future. I also believe some of this work started with the previous government and has been continued and enhanced by this government. The bill has been presented to parliament following an in-depth review of existing biosecurity-related legislation, extensive consultation and consideration of the feedback received. I also note the bipartisan support for this bill, which augurs well for our industry, primary industry and also our state.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Police) (17:24): I am very grateful to members who made a contribution, in particular those members representing regional communities in South Australia. I am very grateful for their firsthand understanding and reflections of why biosecurity is important to primary industries. I understand that there are some issues to be canvassed during the committee stage, so I will not speak at length. I look forward to working with members through those queries.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Mr PEDERICK: Minister, in regard to clause 1—and it is a broad biosecurity question around the recent tomato virus issue in this state and how that was managed—in regard to the management of that virus, is the government doing its own internal review of how it was managed to see whether there can be any improvements made? Also, is the government looking at getting an external independent review of the management of that virus for that vitally important industry to the state?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I thank the member for Hammond for his question. While the biosecurity act and the brown rugose virus share a common initial letter, I do not have with me the detail to fully answer the question, but I am happy to take the question on notice and perhaps provide what information I can either at the next session of this committee should we not conclude within the next period, noting it is a brief bill, or between the houses.

Ms PRATT: Minister, thank you for undertaking that. I would just add, as the local member representing a lot of growers impacted by this biosecurity threat, if in coming back to committee between breaks there could be an undertaking for the opposition to understand under what circumstances might a review be considered, noting you are not the minister responsible but acting on her behalf.

The bill obviously has a broader coverage of the threat of all biosecurity breaches to our grower economy. Noting the work of the shadow minister in the other place, feedback from industry about this bill—and any suggestion of an independent review—was broad support for the bill to progress, as we will see conclude through the committee stage. So in a gesture of goodwill, representing the very specific biosecurity issue that has not just been threatening the Adelaide Plains but been detected in Victoria, under what circumstances might the government consider a review separate to the progress of this bill?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I am happy to take that on notice and come back with some detail.

Mr PEDERICK: I am happy to get an answer back, as long as the committee progresses. That was my main point today. Perhaps as part of clause 1, if the minister is going to get some further information he could bring back to the committee an update—just an overview—of another biosecurity threat, being the fruit fly threat to South Australia, acknowledging that it is not just in the Riverland. There was another one at Glynde the other day. Could he bring back an update on the management there, because it is vital to make sure we keep that under control.

Certainly, I do not have a lot more questions to ask in regard to this until we get to schedule 2, which is part of the money bill side of things. My question to the minister is: are you happy to bring back an update on the current fruit fly management that has gone on when we were in government and now that the Labor Party is in government?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: While I understand the member for Hammond and also the member for Frome are concerned about the tomato virus that was the subject of their preceding questions, I would also say that pretty much every South Australian would be aware of biosecurity threats, probably principally because of fruit fly. There has been an extensive effort undertaken by government—and when I say by government I mean by Primary Industries—over a number of years now, which commenced under the previous government and has continued under this government.

I will check this figure so that I am providing accurate information to the house, but I think we have committed nearly \$190 million to fruit fly eradication and control over the last five or so years. Of course, I am the Treasurer, so I would find that amount of money absolutely extraordinary, but I also think it is pause for thought about just how expensive these biosecurity challenges can be and how hard trying to maintain a fruit fly free status can be for South Australia. Once we are dealing with multiple outbreaks—as we have been doing for the majority of the last five years, whether it is up in the Riverland or in metropolitan areas and other parts of the state—it is not only remarkably impactful to the communities affected and the industries affected but it is extraordinarily time and resource-intensive to battle these things. I will come back with some further particulars about that as well.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

Parliamentary Committees

ENVIRONMENT RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

The Legislative Council informed the House of Assembly that it has appointed the Hon. R.B. Martin to the committee in place of the Hon. E.S. Bourke (resigned).

Bills

DEFAMATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TRIBUNAL) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

At 17:36 the house adjourned until Wednesday 5 February 2025 at 10:30.

*Answers to Questions***AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT**

In reply to **Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey)** (29 October 2024).

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Workforce and Population Strategy): I have been advised:

Capital contributions are provided to agencies to ensure that they have enough cash for budgeted operating and investing activities. The \$6 million received in 2022-23 was not directly linked to a specific capital purchase.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **Mr COWDREY (Colton)** (29 October 2024).

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Workforce and Population Strategy): I have been advised:

The Loxton salt interception scheme, which is owned and operated by the Murray-Darling Basin Authority on behalf of the joint venture, is the last scheme in South Australia to have flood repairs completed. Repairs to the Loxton salt interception scheme have commenced and include rebuilding switchboards at several sites and repairing flow control systems.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **Mr TELFER (Flinders)** (30 October 2024).

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining): No.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **Mr TELFER (Flinders)** (30 October 2024).

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining): I have been advised:

The information is publicly available in the Office of Hydrogen Power SA's annual report.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **Mr TELFER (Flinders)** (30 October 2024).

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining): I have been advised:

External legal advice was procured from Piper Alderman, Ashurst Australia, Norman Waterhouse, Gray Andreotti Advisory, MinterEllison, and Lena Grant.

The legal services are supporting a range of project priorities, including the commercial and contract negotiations with project partners.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **the Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (30 October 2024).

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts): I have been advised:

The reduction in the contribution from the foundation in 2023-24 compared to 2022-23 is because the 2021-22 payment was split over two years (2021-22 and 2022-23).

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **the Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (30 October 2024).

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts): I have been advised:

Sundry income is typically income into the program from other presenters, grants, catering and ticketing charges.

The primary reasons for the increase to this line in 2023-24 are as follows:

- \$566,000 relating to co-presenters' income. Adelaide Festival managed an Australian tour for an artist, charging a fee to other presenters for fees and travel, matched by outgoing fees to the artist.
- \$255,000 in increased other grants.
- \$75,000 higher in cost recovery for Adelaide Writers Week, such as where other presenters in Australia contribute to costs of international authors.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **the Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (30 October 2024).

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts): I have been advised:

Of the \$2.3 million allocated to the Adelaide Festival Corporation from the Major Events Fund, the Department of the Premier and Cabinet provided \$1.3 million to the Adelaide Festival Corporation in the 2023-24 financial year.

A further \$0.5 million is profiled in both the 2024-25 and 2025-26 financial years.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **the Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (30 October 2024).

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts): I have been advised:

Artistic Director, Brett Sheehy, commenced on 5 August 2024.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **the Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (30 October 2024).

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts): I have been advised:

I received the Adelaide Festival's 2023-24 annual report, which included their audited financial statements and end of financial year result, on 3 October 2024.

PRIMARY PRODUCERS

In reply to **Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop)** (13 November 2024).

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Police): I have been advised by the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development:

On 26 November 2024 the Premier announced an \$18 million drought support program that includes:

- \$5 million for On-Farm Drought Infrastructure Grants that assist with projects to manage drought conditions and strengthen drought preparedness.
- \$2 million to assist charities with freight costs to transport donated fodder to assist farmers with feeding livestock.
- \$1 million for additional health and wellbeing support through the Rural Financial Counselling Service and Family and Business Support Program.
- \$100,000 for the Connecting Communities Events Grant Program, for groups to host events that foster social connections and provide support during these challenging times.

This is in addition to the

- \$4.4 million budget commitment to provide Family and Business (FaB) Mentors and Rural Financial Counsellors, who provide free confidential and independent services that link people with the appropriate assistance.
- \$5.5 million funding provided to the state and federal governments Future Drought Fund, which includes ongoing programs to help farmers with farm business resilience planning, climate tools and demonstrating more resilient farming practices.

The On-Farm Drought Infrastructure Grants and the Connecting Communities Events Grant programs are now open for applications.

The donated fodder transport subsidy initiative is currently being finalised following discussions with the key organisations and will be launched shortly.

Council rate reductions are a matter for each council.

The commonwealth government has a range of national programs that are always available to help farmers and regional communities deal with the impacts of drought. This includes the Farm Household Allowance for individuals and their partners when in financial hardship and low interest loans via the Regional Investment Corporation.

The Department of Primary Industries and Regions will continue to monitor the situation over the coming months and provide advice through the regional drought roundtables and the Drought Advisory Group.

Estimates Replies

GOODS AND SERVICES

In reply to **Mr BATTY (Bragg)** (21 June 2024). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining):

Department for Infrastructure and Transport

	2024-25
Budgeted goods and services (\$'000)	714 375

Note: figures above exclude the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing, Local Government Grants Commission and Outback Communities Authority.

Department for Energy and Mining

	2024-25
Budgeted goods and services (\$'000)	40 248

Office of Hydrogen Power South Australia

	2024-25
Budgeted goods and services (\$'000)	19 027

These budgets are subject to change during normal budget processes throughout the year and represent operating related expenditure only.

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **Mr BATTY (Bragg)** (21 June 2024). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining): The following tables provides the FTEs budgeted to provide communication and promotion activities for 2024-25 and their budgeted employment cost:

Department for Infrastructure and Transport

	2024-25
Budget number of FTE	25
Budgeted employment cost (\$m)	3.027

Department for Energy and Mining

	2024-25
Budget number of FTE	12
Budgeted employment cost (\$m)	1.50

Office of Hydrogen Power South Australia

	2024-25
Budget number of FTE	4
Budgeted employment cost (\$m)	0.7

GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Mr BATTY (Bragg)** (21 June 2024). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining): I have been advised by the Department for Infrastructure and Transport, the Department for

Energy and Mining and the Office of Hydrogen Power South Australia that the following table outlines the grant program/funds for the 2024-25 financial year—Controlled:

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2024-2025 Estimate \$000
Department for Infrastructure and Transport		
SA Jetties Renewal Program	To assist councils to address immediate and critical concerns regarding the condition and sustainability of a number of state jetties.	5 000
Kangaroo Island Maintenance Project	The conduct of construction works to upgrade specified unsealed roads.	3 639
Regional Level Crossing Upgrade Program	The program is intended to fund programs to make railway crossings safer in regional areas.	3 000
Heavy Vehicle Safety Productivity Program Stage 7 & Bridge Renewal Program Stage 5	Grants from the Commonwealth to local councils in relation to productivity and safety improvement projects on the local government road network and Bridge Renewal Program. These are administered by DIT on behalf of the Commonwealth.	2 013
South Australian Boating Facility Advisory Committee	To establish and improve recreational boating facilities in South Australia's coastal and inland waters.	1 278
National Transport Commission—National Road, Rail and Intermodal Transport	To contribute to the national road, rail and intermodal transport reform agenda.	664
Car Club Grants	Enable clubs to host bigger and better events and get more South Australians involved.	500
Freight SA: Strategy and Grant	To advise on freight enhancement opportunities and develop a freight and supply chain strategy based on the principles developed in the national action plan by the Transport and Infrastructure Council.	454
KESAB Road Watch Program	Delivery of the Road Watch Program	91
Cost of Living Package	Cost-of-Living relief through direct financial support to disadvantaged South Australian	75
Rail Industry Safety and Standards Board (RISSB)	Funding for RISSB	48
Local Government Association (LGA) Grant	Contribution to LGA Mutual Liability Scheme Aerodrome Risk Management Programme for the provision of services to councils and outback areas.	45
Department for Energy and Mining and Office of Hydrogen Power South Australia		
Remote Areas Energy Supply	Funding for the independent operators as per the deed of grant	41,037
Grid Scale Storage Fund	The Grid Scale Storage Fund aims to accelerate the roll-out of grid-scale energy storage infrastructure and address the intermittency of South Australia's electricity supplies. The Fund will target projects that help address some of the key challenges that are having cost impacts on South Australia's power system, now and into the future.	15,000
EV Charging Network	South Australia's Electric Vehicle Public Charging Network aims to leverage private sector investment to accelerate the roll out of a statewide charging network, targeting more than 50 preferred service locations to deliver approximately 500 rapid and fast charging stations.	12,357
Australian Energy Market Commission (AEMC)	South Australia's funding commitment to the AEMC as per COAG Agreement.	11,357
Grid Scale Storage Fund	Phase 3A—expansion of an additional 3,000 home energy systems in South Australia's Virtual Power Plant, the next step in achieving the full 50,000 Powerwall Virtual Power Plant (VPP).	10,000
Renewable Technology Fund	South Australia's Renewable Technology Fund aims to catalyse private sector investments in low carbon and renewable energy technologies, to collaborate with the national Australian Renewable Energy Agency (ARENA) and Clean Energy Finance Corporation (CEFC) and also to fast-track South Australia's energy transformation and improve electricity market competition. Investment guidelines issued via the fund called for projects in three	5,000

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2024-2025 Estimate \$000
	key areas of renewable and clean energy technologies: projects to firm renewable generation, storing energy in bulk and bioenergy.	
Demand Management Trials	The Demand Management Trial Program established to advance the use of demand response and distributed energy resources to benefit customers on the SA electricity grid.	2,433
Hornsedale Power Reserve	Deed for the demonstration of technology from an expanded Hornsdale Power Reserve.	1,855
Rural Business Support Landowner Information Service	To continue and expand operation of a free and independent landowner information service for landowners seeking information on mineral resource regulatory requirements including exploration and mining production activities	1,538
Minerals, resources and heavy engineering	To address issues facing the minerals, resources and heavy engineering sectors, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting (including by providing advice) the development and delivery by government and/or industry of projects to increase the availability and productivity of the workforce, including learning and development and training projects. • Identifying gaps in, and issues with, the skills of the resources industry workforce, and developing solutions. • Working with business and government to translate policy and navigate government programs, and facilitating business access to coordinate and support solutions; and • Identifying and connecting industry to funded organisational development programs. 	1,200
Mining And Petroleum Engineering Scholarship Programme	To fund the 2021 to 2026 Mining and Petroleum Engineering Scholarship Programme with the long-term objective of helping to arrest a forecast skill shortage in the resources sector. Awarding up to 10 by 2- year Scholarships in each of 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024 and 2025.	1,100
HILT CRC	Establish a Heavy Industry Low Carbon Transition Co-operative Research Centre (HILT CRC) being led by the University of Adelaide.	1,000
The Accelerated Discovery Initiative (ADI)	To stimulate exploration activity and accelerate mineral discovery through innovation, collaboration, and the execution of various exploration activities.	545
University of Adelaide	To contribute to meeting the cost incurred by the University of Adelaide in employing a person to hold the position of South Australian State Chair of Petroleum Geoscience for the term ending 30 June 2026. The University may only apply the Funding towards meeting the salary payable to the position and related direct on-costs.	347
Roxby Downs Council	As per the requirements under the Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Act 1982 this is the State Government contribution to the municipal deficit funding.	300
SA Hydrogen Hubs (OHPSA)	To support the ongoing operations of South Australian Hydrogen Hubs Incorporated under the brand of South Australian Hub-to-Hub (SA-H2HTM) Hydrogen Technology Cluster to Accelerate the growth of the hydrogen industry ecosystem in South Australia.	300
Future Fuels CRC	For DEM to provide funding to the Future Fuels CRC to support the research activities being undertaken in South Australia, under the CRCs three research programs: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Future Fuel Technologies, Systems and Markets 2. Social Acceptance, Public Safety and Security of Supply 3. Network Lifecycle Management. 	105
Net Zero Homes—Skills Training (Course Bundle)	To provide access to the Net Zero Homes course energy efficient home design and construction e-learning resources for the Victorian construction industry	100
SACOME	To enhance the Resourceful SA campaign and include the state government's endorsement of mining in South Australia by enabling additional and broader broadcast of messages	100
Hydrogen generation by subsurface iron mineral transformations	Hydrogen generation by subsurface iron mineral transformations—to elucidate key factors responsible for natural hydrogen generation in Australian subsurface environments. Significance Large amounts of	60

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2024-2025 Estimate \$000
	this valuable resource are produced naturally with estimates of production rates of this 'gold' hydrogen at least 100 times the annual demand for this critical resource. Expected Outcomes Based on improved understanding of the source of natural hydrogen, predictive tools will be developed that will assist in assessing the viability in Australia of hydrogen exploration and engineered retrieval. Benefits Ready access to naturally produced hydrogen could enable Australia to replace hydrogen that is currently generated via the use of unabated hydrocarbons.	

Note: The Department for Infrastructure and Transport, the Department for Energy and Mining and the Office of Hydrogen Power South Australia advise that grant programs beyond 2023-2024 are subject to approval through the future State Budget process.

The following table provides details, including the value and beneficiary, or any commitments already made to be funded from the program or funds mentioned in the previous answer in 2024-25.

Grant program/ fund name	Beneficiary/ Recipient	Purpose	Committed Value \$000
Department for Infrastructure and Transport			
SA Jetties Renewal Program	Multiple Councils	To assist councils to address immediate and critical concerns regarding the condition and sustainability of a number of state jetties.	5 000
Kangaroo Island Maintenance Project	Kangaroo Island Council	The conduct of construction works to upgrade specified unsealed roads.	3 639
Regional Level Crossing Upgrade Program	Australian Rail Track Corporation, Northern Areas Council and Flinders Ranges Council	The program is intended to fund programs to make railway crossings safer in regional areas.	3 000
Bridge Renewal Program	Northern Areas Council	Andrews Road Bridges renewal, Andrews	78
	Northern Areas Council	Pine Creek Bridge upgrade, Appila-Laura Road, Laura	1 907
South Australian Boating Facility Advisory Committee	Yorke Peninsula Council	Marion Boat Ramp Upgrade	1 000
	Whyalla City Council	Whyalla Boat Ramp	278
National Transport Commission—National Road, Rail and Intermodal Transport	National Transport Commission	To contribute to the national road, rail and intermodal transport reform agenda.	664
Car Club Grants	SA Car Clubs	Enable clubs to host bigger and better events and get more South Australians involved.	500
Freight SA: Strategy and Grant	SA Freight Council Inc	To advise on freight enhancement opportunities and develop a freight and supply chain strategy based on the principles developed in the national action plan by the Transport and Infrastructure Council.	250
Keep South Australia Beautiful (KESAB) Road Watch Program	Not-For-Profit (NFP)—KESAB	Delivery of the Road Watch Program	90
Rail Industry Safety and Standards Board (RISSB)	RISSB	Funding for RISSB	48
Local Government Association Grant	Local Governments	Contribution to Local Government Association Mutual Liability Scheme Aerodrome Risk Management Programme for the provision of services to councils and outback areas.	44

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Committed Value 2024-25 (\$000)
Department for Energy and Mining and Office of Hydrogen Power South Australia		
Remote Areas Energy Supply	District Council of Coober Pedy	5,249
	Andamooka Power House	1,075
Grid Scale Storage Fund	Dalform Pty Ltd	260
	Hornsedale Power Reserve Pty Ltd	3,308
Australian Energy Market Commission (AEMC)	VPP Project Trust	2,000
	AEMC	2,776
EV Charging Network	RAA Innovation Pty Ltd	1,721
	Jet Charge Pty Ltd	235
	Jolt Charge Pty Limited	132
Demand Management Trial	Greensync Pty Ltd	1,583
Rural Business Support Landowner Information Service	Rural Business Support Service	415
Minerals, resources and heavy engineering	Mineral Resources & Heavy Engineering Skills Centre Inc	300
Roxby Downs Council	Roxby Downs Council	300
Mining And Petroleum Engineering Scholarship Programme	Playford Memorial Trust	220
The Accelerated Discovery Initiative (ADI)	Roma Resources SA Pty Ltd	140
	Indiana Resources Limited	105
HILT CRC	Hilt CRC Limited	100
SACOME	SA Chamber of Mines & Energy Inc	100
SA Hydrogen Hubs (OHPSA)	South Australian Hydrogen Hubs Incorporated	100
Net Zero Homes—Skills Training (Course Bundle)	Pointsbuilt Pty Ltd	60
Renewable Technology Fund	Lake Bonney Bess Pty Limited	50
Hydrogen generation by subsurface iron mineral transformations	University of New South Wales (UNSW)	20
Future Fuels CRC	Future Fuel CRC Ltd	15

The following table provides the requested information on grant program/funds for the 2024-25 financial year—Administered:

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2024-25 Estimate \$000
Department for Infrastructure and Transport		
Catchment Management Subsidy Scheme	Flood mitigation	109

EMPLOYEE RENUMERATION

In reply to **the Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (25 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts): I have been advised:

The main reasons for the difference were:

- The Artistic Director was a contractor for part of the 2022-23 financial year, before becoming an employee for the remainder of that year, and was an employee for the full year in 2023-24; and
- Inclusion of remuneration for one senior management team staff member in 2023-24 that did not meet the employee remuneration reporting threshold in 2022-23.

FESTIVAL BUDGET TARGETS

In reply to **the Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (25 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts): I have been advised:

The original 2023-24 budget and actuals for each of the line items described in the notes under 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5 are as follows:

		BUDGET	ACTUAL
2.1	Government Grants		
	SA Government	\$10,106	\$10,183
	Commonwealth	\$40	\$210
	Overseas	\$25	\$132
	Total	\$10,171	\$10,525
2.2	Box Office	\$4,812	\$4,506
2.3	Other Income		
	Sundry	\$1,670	\$1,733
	Friends	\$135	\$112
	Donations	\$933	\$812
	Total	\$2,738	\$2,657
2.4	Sponsorship		
	Cash	\$922	\$1,137
	In Kind	\$678	\$884
	Total	\$1,600	\$2,021
2.5	Foundation Adelaide Festival	\$1,200	\$1,211

I received the Adelaide Festival's 2023-24 annual report, which included their audited financial statements and end of financial year result, on 3 October 2024.