LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 19 February 2025

The PRESIDENT (Hon. T.J. Stephens) took the chair at 11:03 and read prayers.

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

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (11:04): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable petitions, the tabling of papers, ministerial statements, questions without notice, the giving of notices of motion and matters of interest to be taken into consideration at 2.15pm.

Motion carried.

Bills

WHYALLA STEEL WORKS (CHARGE ON PROPERTY) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (11:05): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation and explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

The Bill I am introducing today seeks to ensure the Crown has appropriate monitoring and enforcement rights and powers regarding the State strategic asset of the Whyalla steel works, and its associated facilities including the mining works and transport, storage or trans-shipping facilities, hereinafter referred to as the Whyalla steel works.

It amends the *Whyalla Steel Works Act 1958*, formerly the Broken Hill Proprietary Company's Steel Works Indenture Act 1958, which approves and ratifies an Indenture between the State of South Australia and OneSteel relating to the operation of its steel works in Whyalla.

The Act came into being after lengthy years-long negotiations with the Broken Hill Proprietary Company (BHP), where a bargain was struck, and the company was provided relevant prospecting, mineral and land rights and commitments to infrastructure, in return for which the company would build the Steelworks within 10 years and pay the relevant rates and royalties.

Summarising the deal, the then Premier explained 'this represents a bargain made between the two parties. In my opinion, it has given this State something that will be of inestimable value in the years to come'.

The preamble of the original Indenture, found in Schedule 1 of the Act, recognises the establishment of steel works in South Australia would greatly increase the economic strength of the State and provide opportunities for the employment and advancement of its citizens and be instrumental in influencing other industries which substantially depend on the products of the Company in their processes of manufacture to establish operations at Whyalla.

The steel works today is as important to Australia, the State and the Whyalla community as was contemplated by the introduction of the Act in 1958.

The steel works provide work for several thousand people and produces steel products of critical importance to the Australian Economy, such as long products including rail, structural beams and columns, steel angle and piles used for domestic and large scale industrial and infrastructure projects.

Whilst the steel works have not been without challenges since their establishment, such as the appointment of a voluntary administrator in early 2016, these challenges have always been overcome.

The sale of the steel works out of administration to Steel manufacturer Liberty House GFG occurred in September 2017 and the GFG Alliance continues to be the owner and operator of the steel works today.

The State has made significant efforts to supporting Whyalla's mining, smelting and manufacturing operations. A Steel Task Force was established in 2015 and a State commitment was made to provide $50 million to support co-investment in capital infrastructures to secure the sustainable future of the Whyalla steel works. Unfortunately, the owners of the steel works have not brought forward a compliant project proposal to access any of that funding.

The situation we find ourselves in today is one where the Crown is owed millions of dollars in mining royalties and water debts by OneSteel Manufacturing Pty Ltd the legal entity that owns and operates the steel works.

It is also being widely reported that there are also significant debts owed to a broad range of supplies to the Whyalla steelworks and multiple stop works by suppliers have been reported over the last few months as suppliers attempt to recover their debt. These stop works by unpaid suppliers include critical contractors across mining, port, rail and steelmaking operations.

The blast furnace, a critical component of the Whyalla steelworks, experienced two prolonged outages in 2024, impacting the production of steel products. As publicly stated by the GFG Alliance Chairman, efforts are still continuing to stabilise and accelerate production.

I am, with the rest of Government and the Whyalla community, concerned.

The State has sought to work with OneSteel on the repayment of their debts. As the continued operation of the Whyalla steel works is of utmost importance, every opportunity has been given to the company to manage this situation.

Attempts to rectify this situation have, however, been unsuccessful and the State has an obligation to the people of South Australia to act on these non-payments.

Whilst the mining royalty debt is secured by way of first ranking charge over all of the property of the Company save in respect of real property and the SA Water debt is secured by way of first ranking charge over all real property in relation to which water services have been provided, the enforcement rights are imperfect.

One debt is a charge over everything but land; the other is over only land and not anything else.

This is a situation that has not emerged through any intention of Parliament but instead has only become apparent when rights are considered as a whole.

Some of the enforcement mechanisms available to the State, such as suspension and cancellation of the mining tenement leases, are effective general enforcement mechanisms in relation to mining tenements, however, in this specific circumstance exercising these rights would significantly impact the continuity of the steel works and the Whyalla community.

In essence, our enforcement rights fall at extremes – either insufficient to enable effective redress or so strong as to potentially operate against the continued viability of the Company's operations.

The Bill therefore seeks a minor amendment to the *Whyalla Steel Works Act 1958* to ensure the State has the appropriate rights and powers to act on these debts, in a manner that protects the continued operations of the Whyalla steel works. Specifically, it would avoid the risk that the State cannot use the powers under the Corporations Act of the Commonwealth so as to maximise the chances of the Company, or as much as possible of its business, continuing in existence.

The amendment creates a first ranking charge over all property of the Company for any amount owed by the Company to the Crown or an agency or instrumentality of the Crown, securing payment of the amount owed.

The charge is presently enforceable by the Minister for Energy and Mining, as the Minister to whom the Act is committed under the Bill.

Importantly, various enforcement mechanisms that enable the State to act on the debts owed in a manner that is consistent with the objective of protecting the continued operation of the Whyalla steel works are provided for in the Bill.

It is important to note that these changes do not apply to mining tenures more generally nor do they modify the general law in relation to how the State recovers debts.

These changes only apply to debts owed in respect of the entity operating under the Indenture.

This is appropriate–the indenture has granted special rights and privileges in exchange for investment and the payment of royalties. Given there has been neither investment, nor payment of royalties, the State should have available to it remedies commensurate with the rights and privileges granted.

We are not seeking these amendments for the purpose of placing repayment of our debt above other suppliers. We strongly believe that GFG should pay all its creditors, not just the State of South Australia.

A further challenge that has been highlighted by the current circumstances affecting the GFG Alliance and the Whyalla steel works is the lack of transparency provided to the State regarding this State strategic asset.

The Bill seeks to rectify this by requiring the Company to submit annual audited financial reports to the Minister and enabling the Minister to seek documents or information from the Company by written notice.

To contribute to assurances to the State that the Whyalla steel works are being appropriately operated and maintained, the Bill requires the Company to provide greater transparency of risks and actual disruptions to the steelworks operations. Furthermore, the Company must also facilitate access for persons designated by the Minister to Company works or facilities for inspection and reporting purposes.

At the end of the day, if the steelworks had been appropriately managed, the enforcement and information gathering powers contained in this Bill would not have been necessary to introduce.

I need to emphasise that the Act and Indenture does not contemplate the Whyalla steelworks ceasing operations, indeed there is an implicit assumption of their ongoing operation.

The State also does not see an end of steel making in Whyalla. The Company has access to significant magnetite ore reserves, suitable for the transformation of the Whyalla operations to a green iron and steel hub.

This Bill will provide the State with better visibility of this State strategic infrastructure into the future.

It also enables the State to act on debts owed in a manner consistent with securing the securing the immediate future of the Whyalla Steel Works and moving towards a sustainable long-term future.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Whyalla Steel Works Act 1958*

3—Insertion of sections 3A, 3B and 3C

This clause inserts new sections as follows:

3A—Charge on property

The proposed section creates a charge over all property of the Company securing payment of amounts owed to the Crown or an agency or instrumentality of the Crown by the Company. The proposed section further sets out various matters in relation to the effect, terms and conditions of the charge.

3B—Charge declared to be a statutory interest

The proposed section provides that a charge of a kind created pursuant to section 3A is declared to be a statutory interest to which section 73(2) of the *Personal Property Securities Act 2009* of the Commonwealth applies.

3C—Provision of reports and information etc

The proposed section:

- requires the Company to provide certain reports, information and documents to the Minister in a manner and in circumstances set out in the provision;
- requires the Company to notify the Minister in writing as soon as practicable after becoming aware of planned or unplanned significant disruptions, or a risk of significant disruption, of relevant Company works or facilities;
- allows the Minister to issue guidelines to the Company specifying the kinds of events that will constitute planned or unplanned significant disruptions or a risk or significant disruption, to relevant Company works or facilities;
- requires the Company to facilitate access to relevant Company works and facilities by persons designated by the Minister for the purposes of inspection and reporting to the Minister in accordance with the proposed section;

- creates an offence with a maximum penalty of $1,000,000 if the Company refuses or fails to comply with a requirement under the proposed section;
- creates an offence with a maximum penalty of $1,000,000 or 2 years imprisonment if a person makes a statement that is false or misleading in a material particular (whether by reason of the inclusion or omission of any particular) in any document, information or answer given under the proposed section;
- provides that information provided under the proposed section is not liable to disclosure under the *Freedom of Information Act 1991*.

I thank members for their consideration of this bill and look forward to its rapid committee stage and assent.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

Bill taken through committee without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (11:07): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ANIMAL WELFARE BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 18 February 2025.)

The Hon. S.L. GAME (11:08): I rise to comment on the government's Animal Welfare Bill 2024, which is designed to increase legal protection for all species of animals and reflects current community expectations regarding the need to uphold an appropriate standard of treatment for all animals and to impose consequences for those who breach these standards. Owners must provide animals with appropriate food, water and living conditions, and must take measures to prevent or minimise harm. Breaching these requirements is an offence, which is both appropriate and in accordance with the basic standards of care.

It will also be an aggravated offence to intentionally or recklessly cause harm or death of an animal, with increased fines and terms of imprisonment. Cruelty towards animals is an offensive act that warrants substantial penalties to not only punish the offender but send a message to the community that such behaviour will not be tolerated in a civilised society.

While the bill updates the definition of 'animal' to include fish, its purpose is to address the cruel practices of harvesting shark fins and stingray tails, and exempt aquaculture and fishing activities from constituting an offence. These are sensible, balanced measures, and I thank the minister for acting to protect our animals.

I would also like to express my support for the honourable member Nicola Centofanti's amendment to clause 11 of the bill, which excludes regulations being made that prohibit the installation of virtual fencing systems. This amendment is appropriate as it protects farmers and others living on rural properties from being captured under the new offences.

We must do all we can to protect our animals, but we must also ensure that through this desire to protect we do not infringe on the humane and ethical activities conducted by those who need to impose restrictions on animals in the course of operating their livelihood. I note that I will also be supporting the amendments by the Hon. Frank Pangallo.

The Hon. M. EL DANNAWI (11:10): I rise to speak in support of the Animal Welfare Bill 2024. The Malinauskas Labor government made an election commitment to reform the Animal Welfare Act, to modernise and bring it in line with both scientific advancements and community

expectations. Considering the previous act dates back to 1985, this update is long overdue. I welcome the changes included in this bill. They are sensible and, more importantly, they are humane. I will speak briefly today about some of the changes.

The new bill better acknowledges the fact that animals experience feelings, both positive, such as joy, and negative, such as fear. It does so through new provisions such as duty of care. The new duty of care provisions proactively require owners to provide appropriate food, water and living conditions in line with contemporary standards. This will allow authorities to address neglect of an animal before it is actively harmed and is entirely in line with the way our community thinks and feels about animal welfare.

The bill also provides increased abilities to administer and enforce the act, so that people who do not meet animal welfare requirements can be held to account, cruelty can be prevented and welfare can be promoted. This bill includes a number of updates to assist the RSPCA in managing the animal welfare inspectorate. The range of tools available in this legislation include interim orders, notices to comply and enforceable undertakings.

The 2024-25 state budget also provided an extra $16.4 million over four years to RSPCA SA to deliver animal welfare compliance activities. This is in addition to the $1 million provided to the organisation over four years by the Malinauskas government upon its election. The bill also strengthens penalties for mistreatment. It includes fines of up to $250,000 or 10 years in jail for people who mistreat animals. The new penalties will be a significant increase on the current maximum fine of $50,000 or four years in jail for the aggravated ill-treatment of an animal.

The bill also proactively prevents harm by addressing interstate offenders coming into South Australia through the recognition of interstate animal welfare orders. The bill broadens the definition of an animal to include fish. This is consistent not only with the scientific evidence demonstrating that fish are sentient but brings South Australia into line with the rest of the nation. Fishing and aquaculture will not be affected. Fishing practices will still be carried out in compliance with the relevant legislation, namely, the Fisheries Management Act 2007 and the Aquaculture Act 2001.

The bill also improves regulation, oversight and transparency of the research and teaching sector, which enables greater accountability and addresses community concerns. The Australian code for the care and use of animals for scientific purposes, which researchers must abide by, also covers the use of cuttlefish, squid and octopus.

The bill also modernises the governance and administrative provisions for the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee, to ensure that animal welfare advice is coming from a transparent and diverse group. This is just a brief overview of the changes included in this bill. How we care for animals reflects who we are as a society. It is absolutely essential that animals are given adequate legislative protection that is modern and reflective of our society's expectations, standards and beliefs. I commend the bill to the chamber.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (11:14): I rise to speak in favour of the Animal Welfare Bill 2024. The Malinauskas Labor government made an election commitment to update the Animal Welfare Act to modernise animal welfare laws so they are consistent with contemporary practices, science and community expectations. Very often a society is judged on how we treat the most vulnerable in our society, and this would also include animals.

The bill does a number of key things. It updates the purpose and includes objects in the act to better explain why the law exists and to help readers interpret its intent. It better acknowledges that animals experience feelings both positive, such as pleasure, and negative, such as pain and fear. It broadens the definition of 'animals' so that more types of animals are covered by the law. The exclusion of fish has been removed and cephalopods, such as squid, octopus and cuttlefish, are included in the context for scientific purposes.

The bill introduces a duty of care provision to create a positive requirement to provide a minimum level of protection. It improves regulation, oversight and transparency of the research and teaching sector, which enables greater accountability and addresses community concerns. It increases the ability to administer and enforce the act so that people who do not meet animal welfare requirements can be held to account, cruelty can be prevented and welfare can be promoted. The

bill contemporises the governance and administration provisions for the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee to ensure that animal welfare advice comes from a transparent and diverse group.

Regarding the inspectorate and penalties for abuse, the bill includes a number of updates to assist the RSPCA in managing the animal welfare inspectorate. The range of tools available in this legislation will make its enforcement much more effective, swift and animal focused. Tools, such as interim orders, notice to comply and enforceable undertakings, are modern ways to achieve outcomes that are tailored to their circumstances.

The 2024-25 budget also provided for an extra $16.4 million over four years to RSPCA SA to deliver animal welfare compliance activities. This is in addition to the $1 million provided to the organisation over four years by the Malinauskas government upon its election. The bill includes fines of up to $250,000 or 10 years' jail for people who mistreat animals and follows extensive community consultation that showed widespread support for the changes. The new penalties will be a significant increase on the current maximum fine of $50,000 or four years in jail for the aggravated ill treatment of animals. The bill also proactively prevents harm by addressing interstate offenders coming into South Australia through the recognition of interstate animal welfare orders.

The new duty of care provision proactively obliges owners to provide appropriate food, water and living conditions. Eight out of 10 respondents supported this provision during the consultation process. This provision allows authorities to address neglect before an animal is harmed. This means RSPCA SA can talk to owners about better looking after their animals without having to wait for the animal to be harmed and without having to lay cruelty charges.

The inclusion of fish within the definition of animal brings South Australia into line with the rest of the nation. Fishing and aquaculture will not be affected. Fishing practices will still be carried out in compliance with the relevant legislation, namely the Fisheries Management Act 2007 and the Aquaculture Act 2001. The 'Australian code for the care and use of animals for scientific purposes', which researchers must abide by, covers the use of cuttlefish, squid and octopus. I support the legislation.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (11:18): I rise very briefly to speak on the bill, and I will keep my remarks brief. Overall, I support the bill, but my main focus in terms of the discussions that I had with government was particularly around an issue that has been canvassed now a few times in this place, namely clause 14—Exemption of fishing activities. This effectively means that recreational, traditional or commercial fishing activities will be exempt from the provisions of this bill to the extent also that they are covered by other relevant pieces of legislation, including agriculture and fisheries management acts.

That was a very welcome move on the part of stakeholders, who did have some concerns initially when they saw this piece of legislation about the potential impact it would have on that recreational, traditional or commercial fishing activities space. So that is certainly a welcome addition to this legislation.

As other members have noted, the bill does capture the three species that have been identified, all of which were referred to as cephalopoda—which, for those who do not know, means 'head and feet' in Greek. It refers to those organisms whose tentacles (rather than feet) are actually attached to their head. Of course, that is limited to scientific purposes only.

I do note that in those briefings I was trying to establish, on behalf of those stakeholders, which activities would actually be caught in the provisions of the act, and I will give a couple of examples which I think are worthy of keeping in mind. A proposal for a nightclub with a tank that would feature a shark could be captured under this legislation, and there has been such a proposal in South Australia. From memory, I think the proposal for a shark was subsequently replaced with a proposal for a live 'mermaid'. I do not know which piece of legislation that ought to have fallen under, but I certainly think it should have been captured somewhere.

There was also a very famous case in Japan of a claw machine that was used to catch lobsters. People put money in the claw machine and they could try to catch a live lobster. Those sorts of activities are the sorts of activities that I think all of us would agree are very ethically questionable, and that could fall within the remit of this piece of legislation.

From a stakeholder perspective, the feedback I had is that this was a welcome inclusion and one the sector was comfortable with, certainly for the sectors I consulted with. I do note that there is no mention of crustaceans in there, and I have asked those questions at briefings as well. It was canvassed in the consultation that took place, and I think it would likely form the basis of a much broader debate, given the mixed views in terms of including crustaceans. This is a good first step, and everyone is satisfied that we have the balance right in terms of exemptions for those fishing activities versus the welfare of animals.

I also note that I did ask those questions of the government in terms of ones that are captured. I am sure there would be some questions asked by our restaurants that serve live seafood—and we have plenty of them in this state. You go in and can pick a fish, you can pick a crayfish, you can pick whatever it is from a tank, a mud crab, and have it cooked then and there for you. One of the logical responses given to me was that it is in the best interests of those outlets to treat that animal as humanely as possible because the quality of the product is ultimately what people are paying that high price for, and the quality of the product is only maintained if it is killed in a humane way.

That is a space I will continue to watch. I have told the government I will continue to watch that space, because it is one worthy of keeping an eye on. It would be captured by existing mechanisms, whereby we are walking in and looking at other practices that restaurants and so forth are partaking in, but I do not know what the government intends to do in terms of awareness amongst those restaurants of those products that they keep being now captured in this legislation. Overall, I am satisfied with those provisions.

The other provisions I will speak to very briefly, which I am surprised to say the government did not make a focal point of during the briefing that I had with them. Something that did not spring to mind immediately until we took a closer look at the bill was the regulation-making powers—those contained specifically in clause 9 of the bill—which relate to prohibited activities. Subclause (1) provides that 'A person must not take part in a prohibited activity.'

Subclause (5) then goes on to describe what a prohibited activity is. It includes things like animal fighting, live baiting, selling or supplying an animal to a person for the purpose of the animal being used for live baiting or animal fights, and keeping or preparing an animal for the purpose of using the animal in an activity for those preceding purposes. The last subclause, 5(f), provides:

> (f) any other act or activity of the kind prescribed by the regulations (after consultation undertaken in compliance with section 78(4) to be a prohibited activity.

That is where I have a bit of a sticking point with this legislation, and it may be for different reasons to others in this place. I have certainly spoken in this place—I do not know how many times now—about the fact that we use regulation-making powers to the extent that we do to make new laws. Something like 95 per cent, 97 per cent—I do not know what the record is now—of the laws that we pass in this state are actually done via regulation and other instruments.

They are instruments that this parliament has very little oversight and scrutiny of. Anyone who has served on the Legislative Review Committee—I am looking at you, the Hon. Mr Martin—can speak to that with some authority. It is where we see the bulk of the laws that are made that impact us every single day. So I think it was entirely inappropriate and in fact quite cheeky of the government to not raise that issue with us when we had this briefing, and obviously that then becomes a vehicle for banning duck hunting and other forms of hunting.

Whatever your position is on hunting—and the purpose of my contribution today is not really to take a position either way—we all know this is a very vexed political issue. It is an issue that comes up at every election, it is an issue that lots of people have lots of things to say about. I think there is a little bit of mischief to treat it in this way, rather than to introduce a piece of legislation in here and decide, based on the numbers, whether we will or will not allow hunting or duck hunting. Certainly, there would be an expectation, as there is with greyhound racing, as there is with jumps racing, that that is something that this parliament overall would have a say on.

The only way that we are going to find out about regulations that ban—well, I am sure the duck hunters and other hunters, quail hunters, will find out very quickly. Despite the fact that there is

consultation required, it is a very easy mechanism for the minister to use to simply ban something that she and everyone knows in here is absolutely politically vexed and divided.

We do not all share the same views on those practices and, with an election in the wings next year, I am sure lots of voters have a view on whether or not we should ban hunting irrespective of which side of the argument you sit on. So I do not think it follows that we should have a regulation-making power that enables the government of the day—and in this particular instance, this government—to ban an activity that is as politically divisive and vexed as this one. You can, as I said, have your own views about whether you support hunting or not, but that is the political reality of that issue.

On that basis—and I do note that my amendment deals specifically with duck hunting, but there are amendments that deal with hunting overall—I would apply the same logic in terms of hunting. It is a discussion and a debate that we should have in this place, just like we have done with jumps racing and just like we have done with greyhound racing. Effectively, for any government of the day, unless the hunters are out there bringing this to your attention, there is almost zero chance than anyone in this chamber or the other would know when such a regulation is introduced, and that is attributed to the sheer and vast number of regulations that we make each and every year that bypass the normal lawmaking process.

With those words, I do still intend to move my amendment and I do intend to divide on that amendment in terms of getting a clear picture of where we sit. I note that there is another amendment that deals with hunting more broadly and I would like a clear picture of where we sit on those amendments. With those words, overall, I indicate my support for this bill.

In closing, I will say one thing, though, and it is completely unrelated to this issue. I did say to the advisers when I looked at the extent and the work that had gone into this piece of legislation—and I know I will probably be criticised for saying this, but we have all talked a lot about the important role that animals play, their health, their welfare and the importance of that. When I looked at some of the provisions in this bill, my words to the advisers who briefed me were, 'Perhaps someone should pick up this sort of model, with some of the pretty strong provisions in it, and pass it over to their colleagues in other portfolios (namely, child protection) and perhaps look at the importance, quite rightly, that we place on the welfare of animals in this state and take a leaf out of that book when it comes to child protection in this state.'

There is a lot of detail in this piece of legislation and a lot of thought and principle and policy which, if only it were replicated in other areas, would not just serve well for the animals of our state but our most vulnerable children in this state. I leave you with that. I look forward to the committee stage debate and the progress of the amendments that have been flagged to this bill.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (11:32): The community supports high animal welfare standards. This bill is intending to improve those standards. Farmers support high animal welfare standards. Farmers particularly have an interest because on those rare occasions when bad practices occur, it impacts the perceptions of the entire industry. I have been very pleased with the level of interest from the agricultural sectors in the Animal Welfare Bill and have a lot of confidence that there is broad support for the majority of the bill.

I would like to particularly address one aspect, which is an intended amendment from the Hon. Ms Centofanti which has been lodged, and that is in regard to virtual fencing. I have previously spoken in parliament about my support for virtual fencing that is based on new and existing robust scientific research. There has been a SARDI trial program which commenced in March 2022 and which is now completed, and preliminary findings have not indicated an adverse animal welfare impact from the use of virtual fencing in livestock. Further, evidence through commercial use and previous research programs throughout Australia indicates that virtual fencing may enhance animal welfare outcomes in cattle through improved monitoring and pasture management.

The SARDI trial program allowed for primary producers across the state to use virtual fencing under a research permit, strengthening and supporting the success of early adoption if the technology becomes available for use in South Australia. During the trial program a total of six field trials were undertaken across the state, focusing on assessing the animal welfare impacts of virtual

fencing, including specific uses such as commercial exclusion and rotational grazing. These trials built on research completed in other states which also have not highlighted negative welfare impacts on cattle.

SARDI's trial program built upon existing research without replicating it, addressing gaps in understanding welfare impacts under real-world beef, cattle and sheep production conditions. The SARDI trial program has provided stronger evidence that virtual fencing, when applied as per best practice recommendations, is effective and safe for use in adult beef cattle in southern and pastoral beef systems. Further, according to my advice, broadly speaking the benefits of virtual fencing include improved grazing management, increased animal monitoring, reduced labour and environmental protection.

While the SARDI research also identified that commercial virtual fencing products are effective at containing sheep in a range of scenarios, the findings from the trial program indicate the need for further development in the technology before it can be deemed safe for use in sheep commercially. A final report into the research is due over the coming months, which will be provided to the Department for Environment and Water before being published in scientific journals.

The Hon. Ms Centofanti indicated that if the government was able to make a commitment to including the use of virtual fencing in the regulations then she would be willing to withdraw her amendment. I am pleased to say that the government can give that undertaking. Once the new Animal Welfare Bill has passed parliament the government will draft regulations to enable virtual fencing and put them out for public consultation.

It is also of interest that in 2024 the national Animal Welfare Task Group (AWTG) also agreed to develop an Australian animal welfare guide for virtual fencing as the preferred approach for harmonisation. The guide is currently being drafted, following consultation and input from a stakeholder reference group made up of key scientists, industry groups, the RSPCA and veterinary representatives. I think there is benefit in having national consistency; however, if there is undue delay in such guidelines being developed then we would not wish to wait an unduly long time for those. I will speak more to the particular amendment if it is progressed in the committee stage.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (11:37): I want to thank all members for their contributions and look forward to the committee stage.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I have some questions that probably relate more specifically to clause 76(1). I am in your hands.

The CHAIR: How about you put your questions down, and it will give the minister the opportunity to respond when we get to that—some forward notice?

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I am very happy to. Just by way of background, in 2020 the Marshall Liberal government implemented the Summary Offences (Trespass on Primary Production Premises) Amendment Bill, which obviously passed all stages, and we have some concerns about how the addition of clause 76(1) will impact section 17 of the Summary Offences Act, which is that relating to trespass on primary production premises. Specifically, my question is that, in relation to 76(1), is a person entering a property unlawfully, whether it is trespass or break and enter, to gain information on animal welfare issues, immune to prosecution if a report of alleged contravention is successfully progressed?

Again, in relation to 76(1), is an owner preventing access to their property by another person an act of hindering another person in making a report? Again, in relation to 76(1), if a person commits a crime in gaining access to document an animal welfare issue, are they protected from prosecution regardless of the animal welfare outcome or only if an animal welfare breach is found? If a person

has committed a crime to gain access to animal welfare information, whether it is trespass or break and enter, is their information admissible? If someone tries to stop a person from committing the crime of unlawfully trespassing on a primary production premise, is that someone obstructing a report of alleged contraventions?

The CHAIR: So you will answer at the appropriate clause.

Clause passed.

Clause 2 passed.

Clause 3.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Franks–1]—

Page 5, lines 9 and 10 [clause 3, definition of *animal*, (b)]—Delete 'if it is being supplied, kept or used for scientific purposes'

What these amendments do—and I will anticipate the other two amendments that I have at this clause—is broaden the definition of 'animals' to include cephalopods (octopuses, squid and cuttlefish) and Decapoda crustaceans—which I must say is a word I had not heard before—(lobsters, prawns and crabs).

As I flagged in my second reading contribution, the Greens do not understand why, with the exception of if they were being experimented on for scientific purposes, we have stopped our expansion of the definition of 'animals' to include fish, which brings us finally into the 21st century as a jurisdiction. I must say that other jurisdictions right around the country have had fish in their animal welfare laws for decades, so we are hardly leading the way here, but it is good to see us coming up to the mark. But we still have exceptions made for those cephalopods and Decapoda crustaceans, so my amendments would remove that exemption.

We love our octopus and cuttlefish and certainly we have a cuttlefish protection zone in this state. We find it quite curious that the animal welfare act of our state does not offer them similar levels of protection. I commend the amendment.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I rise to indicate that the government opposes the amendment. My advice is that this has been carefully considered. My advice is that the evidence is there to support the inclusion of fish, but it is not clear that the evidence is there for the inclusion of the further things that the honourable member has outlined.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: What evidence was used to ascertain the inclusion of fish that was not present for the inclusion of cephalopods and crustaceans?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I do not have a specific study to hand but my advice is we do not have the conclusive research to support it at this stage.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Why then was, in the original bill, the inclusion of cephalopods and crustaceans anticipated? Surely, there must be evidence to hand that occurred if it was then dropped from the original consultation process and excised out from the inclusion of fish.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is we asked the question and it was through the public consultation that we have landed where we are.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Did not the public consultation actually not excise crustaceans and cephalopods, and was it not in fact the cabinet that made this particular position?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The honourable member would not be surprised that I am not going to go into anything that does or does not happen in cabinet.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Please point to the public consultation that advocated for this particular government position, which is actually out of step with the public consultation.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I will be happy to take that on notice and see what can be provided to the honourable member.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I indicate that I think I might have made my point, I hope. I understand what the numbers will be but I certainly hope that the government will take this particular issue on notice, as they experiment upon these particular creatures, with them included under the Animal Welfare Act, but, under the Animal Welfare Act more broadly, they are still waiting for apparent evidence that they should have been included—evidence that they have not been able to point to with their particular position in this debate and I think will probably be found to be wanting.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Is this 1 or 2?

The CHAIR: I am about to put the first amendment.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I indicate it is not my intention, given they will be consequential, to then persist with the argument that is in amendments Nos 2 and 3. While I have been advised I cannot move all three at this point, I would imagine it is a consequential and indicative position if people are not going to entertain this argument. So if the Hon. Ms Bonaros wishes to raise something about the other two amendments, now might be the time to do it.

The CHAIR: The Hon. Ms Franks, I am advised that at this time you can also move amendments Nos 2 and 3.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: That is what I asked at the beginning, Chair.

The CHAIR: The Hon. Ms Franks, I know that you are correct and we are wrong.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Oh, good lord.

The CHAIR: I appreciate you indulging us. It has been an interesting morning, and I might not be at my best.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I move:

Amendment No 2 [Franks–1]—

Page 5, after line 10 [clause 3, definition of *animal*]—After paragraph (b) insert:

(ba) a crustacean of the order *decapoda*; or

Amendment No 3 [Franks–1]—

Page 5, lines 11 and 12 [clause 3, definition of *animal*, (c)]—Delete 'or a prescribed animal kept or used in prescribed circumstances'

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Just for the purposes of the public record, I know the member and I have a mutual passion for octopus in particular. They are indeed the most intelligent creature on earth. If you are from my background, they are also one of the world's best delicacies, which is terrible. It is a terrible dilemma: they are intelligent and they are very tasty. But, in all seriousness, I understand what the member has articulated but my position is to support the government. The feedback certainly I had was that, given that this was a new measure in South Australia, there was no appetite amongst the sectors that I spoke to to broaden it even further, and that is certainly what these amendments would do, and on that basis I will not be supporting the amendments.

Amendments negatived.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I move:

Amendment No 4 [Franks–1]—

Page 5, after line 16—After definition of *animal ethics committee* insert:

Animal Welfare Advisory Committee means the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee established under section 15;

This defines the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee. Given that promoting animal welfare outcomes are implicit objectives of the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee, the Greens believe that this piece of legislation should reflect that. The Animal Welfare Advisory Committee should be an expert animal welfare committee, not a representative committee, so our amendments will go to ensure that not only is industry represented but those who have expertise in animal welfare are actually part of this particular advisory committee, noting that in a further amendment another of the Greens' objectives—for an independent office of animal welfare—as similarly been rejected so far by government.

I note that often what we have here is the fox in charge of the hen house: those who have a vested interest providing advice that is not necessarily purely animal welfare but often industry driven or profit driven. If we are to get real about having a proper Animal Welfare Act, our Animal Welfare Advisory Committee should reflect that and that is what the Greens amendment goes to.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: It is the government's view that the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee is already defined in section 15, so this is an unnecessary amendment.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: When did the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee meet in the last year?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that it has not met in the last year.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Is the minister concerned that the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee has not met in the last year, given that we are literally debating a very important piece of legislation that reforms the Animal Welfare Act and the minister has a number of animal welfare considerations, including such things as consideration of a duck hunting season and the like? Is it of concern that the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee has not even met in the last year?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is there has not been anything specific to take to the committee.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Did the government perhaps consider referring the excising of cephalopods and crustations from the act, something the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee might have taken on board to provide that scientific evidence that so far has been able to be produced on that particular issue?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that the advisory committee saw the draft instructions quite some time ago and did not make any specific comments about it.

Amendment negatived.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I move:

Amendment No 5 [Franks–1]—

Page 5, after line 25—After definition of *enforceable undertaking* insert:

> *glue trap* means a trap that uses glue, adhesive material or any similar viscid substance as the mode of capture to trap an animal;

This is at clause 3 as well and defines glue traps to be added as a prohibited item. Certainly glue traps were unknown to me, but glue traps have strong adhesive and, when the animal passes over the trap, they become stuck. This causes the animals to die slowly and painfully, with suffering typically lasting several days. Non-target species include birds and reptiles, who are often found stuck on these inhumane devices.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The government does not support this amendment.

Amendment negatived.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I move:

Amendment No 6 [Franks–1]—

Page 6, after line 15—After definition of *serious harm* insert:

> *steel-jawed trap* means a trap that has jaws that are made of steel, iron or other metal and that are designed to spring together and trap an animal when a leg or other part of the animal's body comes into contact with, or is placed between, the jaws, but does not include a soft-jawed trap (that is, a trap with steel jaws that are offset and padded).

This includes, after the definition of 'serious harm' steel-jawed traps and provides a definition of that and seeks to have them listed as a prohibited item again. This will prohibit the use or possession of steel-jawed traps and snares. Evidence shows that these are inhumane and there are far more humane traps on the market that could be used instead. Certainly, this is an opportunity, I would have thought, for the government to be banning or prohibiting items of cruelty.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The government does not support this amendment.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 4 passed.

Clause 5.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I move:

Amendment No 7 [Franks–1]—

Page 6, after line 24 [clause 5(2)]—After the present contents of subclause (2) insert:

Note—

For enforcement of this duty, see section 6.

This refers to a duty of care enforcement to be required.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: It is the government's view that this is an unnecessary additional amendment, and we will not be supporting it.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 6.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I move:

Amendment No 8 [Franks–1]—

Page 6, after line 34—Before subclause (1) insert:

(a1) In determining whether the owner of an animal has properly discharged the duty of care owed under section 5(2), the animal's welfare is to be assessed using the Five Domains Model and applying any relevant minimum care standards developed by the Independent Office of Animal Welfare.

(b1) Failure to comply with the duty of care does not, of itself, constitute an offence, but compliance with the duty may be enforced by the issuing of an animal welfare notice, notice to comply or enforceable undertaking (and any such animal welfare notice, notice to comply or enforceable undertaking must specify requirements that are consistent with the Five Domains Model and with any relevant minimum care standards developed by the Independent Office of Animal Welfare).

This I will take to be indicative of the support of the committee of the council for an independent office of animal welfare because it provides for the Five Domains Model of animal welfare to be used as a framework for their duty of care provisions.

While there are a number of amendments that I have here about an independent office of animal welfare within our bureaucracy, which is something that has been long called for by those in the animal sector, I note that the ALP at a federal level have actually taken to election promises to develop an independent office of animal welfare, reflecting in particular in regard to the live export trade the inadequacy of our bureaucracy when it comes to those aforementioned conflicts of interest between industry and animal welfare in the advice and the application and administration of our laws that is provided for governments and ministers of the day.

The Greens think that this is a really good opportunity for the establishment of an independent regulatory body to provide oversight and coordination of animal welfare. In fact, an independent office of animal welfare is essential for this act to properly function. Such a statutory body would be accountable to the minister and covered by the South Australian Ombudsman, and subject to FOI legislation.

While I would hope that such a move would be welcomed in the chamber—I can do the numbers and see that it will not—I understand that it is an incredibly well-supported concept in the community. We cannot have the fox in charge of the henhouse. Departments like PIRSA must not be allowed to go unchallenged when they are industry driven and profits driven at the expense of animal welfare, and live export has been a classic example of that.

We have just heard that the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee has not met in the last year, and you have to really wonder whether or not there is a priority within government and the bureaucracy for elevating animal welfare expertise. That is why the Greens will continue to advocate

for the voiceless and put this idea on the agenda, and we are really deeply disappointed that the government has not taken this opportunity.

It was a very strong part of the consultation as well. Many submissions were made in support of an independent office of animal welfare. It is quite an extraordinary situation where you have departments that are conflicted in their advice in their internal bureaucracy, and this independent office of animal welfare would go a long way to improving not just our decision-making and the advice to the minister but, in fact, the administration of these really important laws.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The government will not be supporting modifying the duty of care and applying a model to assessment, removing the offence and the entwining provision with the independent office of animal welfare. The government's position is the duty of care as drafted is a proactive requirement that has been designed to meet the expectations of the community and articulate the expectations of those who are owners of animals.

Amendment negatived.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I move:

Amendment No 9 [Franks–1]—

Page 7, after line 12—After the present contents of subclause (4) insert:

Note—

See section 74 for requirements relating to prescribed codes of practice.

(5) In this section—

Five Domains Model means the *Five Domains Model of Animal Welfare* developed by Professor David Mellor and Dr Cam Reid (as updated from time to time).

This defines the Five Domains model again, but here with regard to codes of practice. So the arguments remain the same. I understand that the numbers are not with me today in this council, but certainly this bill that we are debating right now was the golden opportunity to take this leadership. I hope future parliaments will consider it more favourably than is being done today.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The government will not be supporting this amendment.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 7.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I move:

Amendment No 10 [Franks–1]—

Page 8, after line 10 [clause 7(4)]—After paragraph (c) insert:

(ca) terrifies, torments or abuses the animal; or

(cb) treats the animal in a manner that is likely cause harm to, or the death of, the animal; or

(cc) tethers the animal in a manner that causes, or is likely to cause, unnecessary harm or pain to the animal, or tethers the animal for an unreasonable length of time without access to food, water or shelter; or

This expands the definition of ill treatment in line with the RSPCA's advocacy that asked to recognise the Five Domains model and its application with regard to psychological aspects of ill treatment and treatment likely to cause illness or death. Of course, it includes inappropriate tethering and for an inappropriate time. This has been an oversight in the bill so far and has been raised in my consultations with the RSPCA. I would hope that the government would look favourably on it and at least provide some clarification as to whether it intends to act on these issues. With that, I commend the amendment.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I rise to indicate that the government will not be supporting the amendment. My advice is that the definition of harm in both the current legislation and the bill already includes distress, and it is my advice that modifying the definition would not provide additional clarity to this matter.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 8 passed.

Clause 9.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I move:

Amendment No 11 [Franks–1]—

Page 11, after line 16 [clause 9(5)]—After paragraph (c) insert:

(ca) recreational duck hunting;

(cb) surgical artificial insemination of greyhounds;

(cc) forced swim tests;

(cd) forced inhalation tests;

(ce) causing or permitting the use of a glue trap;

(cf) causing or permitting the use of a steel-jawed trap;

(cg) causing or permitting the use of fruit netting with a mesh size larger than 5 mm by 5 mm at full stretch;

(ch) transporting or racing an animal, or using an animal for entertainment, in temperatures exceeding 35°C (except with the approval, or under the supervision or direction, of a veterinarian);

This amendment adds a list of prohibited activities and seeks to ensure that they are, in the future, prohibited.

I have previously raised the issue of both the steel-jawed traps and the glue traps in this debate, and indicated why I think they are cruel. The surgical artificial insemination of greyhounds has been specifically recommended by the Ashton review to be prohibited in this state, and this would have been a great opportunity for the Malinauskas government to keep its promise to implement each and every one of the recommendations of the Ashton review, which includes prohibiting the surgical artificial insemination of greyhounds.

While there are moves afoot at a national level, we know that in South Australia there have been recordings of those involved in the greyhound racing industry saying that they will fight that particular recommendation and they will not accept it. Those have been provided through the exposure of a parliamentary committee, most specifically the Budget and Finance Committee of this parliament. So we cannot trust the industry to do that for itself. We continue to let that industry marginally regulate itself, and this is a prime opportunity to implement what the Malinauskas government promised would be implemented.

Members of the council may not be aware of why I have added 'causing or permitting the use of fruit netting with a mesh size larger than 5mm x 5mm at full stretch'. That is actually a piece of equipment that is banned in other jurisdictions, and with good reason. Small fruit bats often get caught in netting of that particular size, and other jurisdictions have taken the lead in banning netting of that size. I understand there have been moves here to ensure it is not up for sale, but by putting it in the law we would be taking those good intentions and making them purposeful. You need only spend 20 minutes with any animal rescuer to hear the horror stories of what that particular sized netting does to those animals.

Finally, one would have thought that transporting and racing an animal or using an animal for entertainment in temperatures above 35ºC without specific approvals, that include from a veterinarian, should be a no-brainer. Certainly, the heat policies, for example, of greyhound racing have been applied at their own discretion in the past, and only in the last year, under public pressure, did they stop racing those dogs in extreme heat conditions. As the planet warms those extreme heat conditions will become more and more common, and it is only logical that our laws should keep up with that. I commend the amendment.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I rise to indicate that the government will not be supporting the amendment. My advice is that the bill creates a powerful instrument to prohibit an activity through

regulations, and that if the bill passes parliament the government intends to draft regulations and put them out for public consultation to get feedback from stakeholders.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Does that mean that the Malinauskas government has backed away from its promise to prohibit surgical artificial insemination of greyhounds in this state, which it has previously promised to do and which was a well-researched product of the Ashton review?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I do not have information in relation to that particular matter but I will certainly pass it on to the minister responsible.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: The government has promised that will happen, that prohibition of surgical artificial insemination would happen. Should the minister not be more certain of the answer to that particular question rather than having to take it on notice and check if that is still the Malinauskas government position?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: As I said, I do not have the information to hand, but I will certainly pass that on to the minister responsible.

The committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes 2
Noes.....19
Majority 17

AYES

Franks, T.A. (teller)	Simms, R.A.	

NOES

Bonaros, C.	Bourke, E.S.	Centofanti, N.J.
El Dannawi, M.	Game, S.L.	Girolamo, H.M.
Hanson, J.E.	Henderson, L.A.	Hood, B.R.
Hood, D.G.E.	Hunter, I.K.	Lee, J.S.
Lensink, J.M.A.	Maher, K.J. (teller)	Martin, R.B.
Ngo, T.T.	Pangallo, F.	Scriven, C.M.
Wortley, R.P.		

Amendment thus negatived.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I move:

Amendment No 12 [Franks–1]—

Page 11, after line 38—After subclause (7) insert:

(7a) If a person who engages in trialling, training or racing of greyhounds is found in possession of an animal that is reasonably capable of being used for the purpose of live baiting, the person will be presumed to be engaging in live baiting in the absence of proof to the contrary (and the burden of establishing proof to the contrary lies with the person).

This amendment prohibits those involved in the greyhound industry from also concurrently keeping small animals that could be used for live baiting. It is a practice and a prohibition that applies elsewhere in Australia, and it has been introduced for good reason; that is, because we know that live baiting continued to exist in this industry despite decades and decades of denials, only exposed by undercover operations, and undercover operations now made unlawful because in this country we seem to punish those who expose the cruelty rather than those who commit the cruelty.

We know that the co-location of small animals within greyhound racing premises and trainers is something that is indicative that live baiting may be occurring. Surely it is a small price to pay for those who wish to be involved in the greyhound racing industry to assure the public, the community and, indeed, this parliament that live baiting is not occurring as they say. With that, I commend the amendment.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The government will not be supporting the amendment. My advice is that we do not support reversing the onus of proof.

Amendment negatived.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Bonaros–1]—

Page 11, after line 38—After subclause (7) insert:

(7a) Regulations made for the purposes of this Act must not prohibit duck hunting.

I have already spoken to the amendment during my second reading contribution. I will not repeat everything I have said; I think we get the general gist of this. I note that there is another amendment which seeks to do, effectively, the same across all forms of hunting. Underlying this amendment is the fact that I would hope—I am really hopeful—that even if these amendments do not pass, they would not be used now or in the future to deal with what I have described previously as something that is, indeed, a very vexed political issue, something that is very divisive amongst community members and something that ought to be the subject of thorough debate in this parliament.

I have also spoken about the fact that we have a mountain of legislation that is now making its way into our law books via regulation-making powers and instruments with very little scrutiny and oversight of this parliament. Certainly, even if it is not the intent of the government to use this regulation-making power to ban something like duck hunting, that might be this government's view, but it opens the door. I do not think that is a good lawmaking practice and it is certainly indicative of the fact that we should be keeping a close eye on the sheer volume of regulations that are being made in this jurisdiction and the impact that they have on communities.

This amendment, as I said, is limited to duck hunting. I note what the honourable Leader of the Opposition has said during her contribution that whilst the opposition supports the intent, perhaps for similar or the same reasons, the preference is to support the amendment which deals with hunting more broadly. I accept that. I will, though, move the amendment regardless in an effort to highlight to the government the importance of dealing with this particular issue—namely duck hunting—through the appropriate mechanisms available to us, ensuring all the scrutiny, transparency and rigour that one would expect when it comes to debating that issue.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Pangallo–1]—

Page 11, after line 38—After subclause (7) insert:

(7a) Regulations made for the purposes of this Act must not prohibit the activity of hunting.

This amendment takes the matter a lot further than my colleague the Hon. Connie Bonaros has taken it. While she only concentrates on duck hunting, there are also other types of hunting that should be covered in this legislation, namely quail hunting. So that was omitted in the honourable member's amendment, but I am saying it should be extended further.

As I said in my speech last night, I suspect that while there are some very good aspects of this legislation in protecting animal welfare I also am highly suspicious that it is a Trojan Horse for some of the minister's own pet topics that she wants to see eliminated along with what the Greens also want to see eliminated. It is not just duck hunting but probably other forms of hunting—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Greyhound racing. We know that if the Greens have their way—it is their policy nationally—they also want to get rid of horse racing, which would have a—

The Hon. R.A. Simms: Absolutely.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Well, you are on a loser there, the Hon. Robert Simms. Horse racing is important—

The Hon. T.A. Franks: Many people are on a loser. You don't like gambling, except if it involves cruelty to animals.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Well, horse racing employs many people in this state and also in this country, and it would be a travesty if that ever eventuated. Anyway, regardless of that, as I said yesterday there was a comprehensive study undertaken by a select committee into duck hunting and quail hunting. It provided a report to the parliament with a number of recommendations. Among them, of course, was that duck hunting not be banned but that there be some further controls on that activity.

My understanding from groups involved with duck hunting during the recent duck hunting season is that there was a lot of compliance and the members of various associations were very mindful of the requirements and their obligations when carrying out their recreational activity and have also been very observant of what had gone on to ensure that hunters were doing the right thing.

Saying that, I will say that I will oppose the honourable member's amendment, even though it partly covers what I am doing, and I hope other members will support my amendment.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Before we proceed on the amendments, I would like to put a question to the government if I can. My question is whether there has indeed been any discussion or thoughts about using these regulation-making powers to ban hunting or duck hunting more specifically.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that the answer to that is no.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Just on from that then, given this government's position on the issue of hunting now, if it were to be reconsidered in the future is it the government's intention indeed to introduce a special purpose piece of legislation to deal with that issue, or is that something that we do not know?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: That is not dealt with in this bill at all. The hunting of animals in South Australia is regulated under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972, and we do not propose to regulate it under this act.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Currently the minister has the ability to declare a duck hunting season each year based usually on purportedly environmental conditions and indeed not based on whether or not it is cruel. Does the minister have to come to parliament to debate those declarations of that season each year?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is, no, it does not.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Why not? There is an argument here that we should debate the banning of duck hunting season and the minister has the ability, does she or he not, to declare certain species each year not on the menu for duck hunting season. Where is that debate occurring and why is the parliament not having it every year?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that there is a process the department runs every year and it provides advice to the minister.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Is there a head for power for that declaration-making ability by the minister?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is the power for that exists not under this legislation but under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Further to that, has that legislation—and I am sure this can be answered positively—which allows those declarations to be made, been through the parliamentary process when it was introduced?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: If there is legislation that has passed it necessarily means it has been through a parliamentary process; however, I will say that an act in 1972 was even before I was born.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: What consideration is given to animal cruelty in the current declaration of a duck hunting season each year?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for her question. I do not have information or advice in relation to that because it is under a different legislative scheme than what we are debating here today.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: The select committee that looked into this issue of this particular council made recommendations that cruelty to animals be a consideration of duck hunting season declarations each year. Why have those been ignored? Further, is the minister aware that that committee had two members, one a former minister and one myself, who recommended that duck hunting be banned into the future and that in fact would have been numbers reflective of the majority of this council?

That committee that has now been touted as somehow the bastion of our current democratically decided position on duck hunting, which was a select committee that was stacked out with people who were pro duck hunting and was not necessarily reflective of the numbers in the council as they stand—so, democracy—recommended that cruelty be a consideration in the declaration of duck hunting season declarations, so why is that not here in this bill and why has that recommendation from that committee not been enacted?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for—I am guessing, as the host of Q&A today—that comment rather than a question, mostly. I was not a member of that committee, but, as I have answered in a previous question, the scheme that regulates duck hunting is under a different act than what we are dealing with today.

The Hon. C. Bonaros' amendment negatived.

The committee divided on the Hon. F. Pangallo's amendment:

Ayes 10
Noes.....11
Majority 1

AYES

Bonaros, C.	Centofanti, N.J.	Game, S.L.
Girolamo, H.M.	Henderson, L.A.	Hood, B.R.
Hood, D.G.E.	Lee, J.S.	Lensink, J.M.A.
Pangallo, F. (teller)		

NOES

Bourke, E.S.	El Dannawi, M.	Franks, T.A.
Hanson, J.E.	Hunter, I.K.	Maher, K.J. (teller)
Martin, R.B.	Ngo, T.T.	Scriven, C.M.
Simms, R.A.	Wortley, R.P.	

Amendment thus negatived.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I move:

Amendment No 13 [Franks–1]—

Page 12, after line 1 [clause 9(8)]—Before definition of *live baiting* insert:

forced inhalation test means a test or activity conducted for scientific purposes in which an animal is forced to inhale smoke by—

(a) the placement of the animal in an instrument of restraint; and

(b) the administration of smoke directly to the animal's nose or head;

forced swim test means a test or activity conducted for scientific purposes in which an animal, other than a fish or other aquatic animal, is placed in water and forced to swim by virtue of being unable to escape or stand, but does not include an activity that has the effect, or likely effect, of protecting or promoting the welfare of the animal on which the research is carried out;

Note—

For example, hydrotherapy does not constitute a forced swim test.

This amendment, at clause 9, inserts a definition of the forced inhalation test, which is also referred to as the forced swim test. The forced inhalation test means a test or activity conducted for scientific purposes in which an animal is forced to inhale smoke by (a) the placement of the animal in an instrument of restraint, and (b) the administration of smoke directly to the animal's nose or head.

A forced swim test means a test or activity conducted for scientific purposes in which an animal, other than a fish or other aquatic animal, is placed in water and forced to swim by virtue of being unable to escape or stand, but does not include an activity that has the effect, or likely effect, of protecting or promoting the welfare of the animal on which the research is carried out. But, for example, hydrotherapy does not constitute a forced swim test. Again, this is another example of animal cruelty that we should be prohibiting in this piece of legislation with this opportunity that we have before us, so I commend the amendment to the council.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I rise to indicate, similarly with other amendments of a similar nature with these sorts of specifics, that the government will not be supporting this amendment.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 10.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I move:

Amendment No 14 [Franks–1]—

Page 12, after line 33 [clause 10(2)]—After paragraph (d) insert:

(da) a glue trap;

(db) a steel-jawed trap;

(dc) a flank strap;

(dd) a spur with a sharpened or fixed rowel;

(de) a pronged collar;

This amendment, at clause 10, inserts additional lists of prohibited items. These include a glue trap, a steel-jawed trap, a flank strap, but also a spur with a sharpened or fixed rowel, or a pronged collar. They are semi-consequential in that I have previously sought to include the glue trap and steel-jawed trap, but this also goes to those other additional items. I also move:

Amendment No 15 [Franks–1]—

Page 12, after line 41—After subclause (3) insert:

(4) In this section—

pronged collar means a collar, designed for use on animals, that consists of a series of links or segments with prongs, teeth or blunted open ends turned towards the animal's neck so that, when the collar is tightened, it pinches the skin around the animal's neck.

This amendment, at clause 10, defines 'pronged collar', which means a collar designed for use on animals that consists of a series of links or segments with prongs, teeth or blunted open ends turned towards the animal's neck so that when the collar is tightened it pinches the skin around the animal's neck. I commend both amendments.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that the government will not support the honourable member's amendments.

Amendments negatived; clause passed.

New clause 10A.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I move:

Amendment No 16 [Franks–1]—

Page 13, before line 1—After clause 10 insert:

10A—Possession of animals by certain persons prohibited

(1) A person who has been convicted of a serious animal welfare offence must not, without the approval of the Minister, have any animal in their possession or control.

Maximum penalty:

(a) in the case of a body corporate—$250,000;

(b) in the case of an individual—$50,000.

Expiation fee: $1,500.

(2) In this section—

serious animal welfare offence, in relation to a person, means—

(a) any offence against this Part for which the person was sentenced to a term of imprisonment (whether or not that sentence was suspended); or

(b) an offence of a kind prescribed by the regulations.

This prohibits people convicted of serious animal welfare offences from owning animals. I note that it is similar to amendment No. 2 of the government, so I seek some clarity with regard to my progressing this one.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I hope this provides enough clarity: whilst we do not support this amendment, the government has introduced an amendment that requires courts to apply a prohibition for aggravated offences where requested.

New clause negatived.

Clause 11.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Before I move the amendments standing in my name I have some questions of the Attorney on this clause. There is some concern about timing in regard to the drafting of regulations, particularly around the ability of livestock producers to utilise virtual fencing. Can the minister outline the timeline for drafting consultation and tabling of the regulations? We now have the Minister for Primary Industries—we have done a swap.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I indicate that, following discussions with the Minister for Environment in the other place, I can confirm that the intention is for regulations to be drafted this year.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I appreciate the minister clarifying the drafting. Can she also then take me through the timeline in terms of consultation and then, finally, tabling of those regulations?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: That would be done in the most efficient manner possible, as is usually the case. The intention of the government is the regulations for this act more broadly, but we are particularly talking about virtual fencing, can proceed as expeditiously as possible.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Given we do not have a more specific timeline in regard to the drafting of the regulations, I move:

Amendment No 1 [Centofanti–1]—

Page 13, after line 7—Insert:

(1a) Regulations made for the purposes of this Act must not prohibit a person from placing on any animal or using an electrical device that is part of a virtual fencing system, provided that the device and system are used in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions.

Amendment No 2 [Centofanti–1]—

Page 13, after line 16 [clause 11(2)]—Insert:

virtual fencing system means an electrical system used to confine or control animals whereby the fenceline is a non-physical boundary that is enforced by giving the animal a warning cue followed by an electrical shock, administered by a device worn by the animal.

These amendments Nos 1 and 2 are consequential, so with your indulgence I will move both and speak to both together. In so doing, I will make a change in terms of amendment No. 2, to substitute the word 'animals' for 'livestock', so it will read 'virtual fencing system means an electrical system used to confine or control livestock whereby the fenceline is a non-physical boundary that is enforced by giving the livestock a warning cue followed by an electrical shock, administered by a device worn by the livestock'. I note the minister's concern about the use of the term 'animal', and I agree. It was not my intention that it be drafted so broadly, hence I seek to use the word 'livestock'.

As per my second reading speech, this amendment simply legislates the use of virtual fencing for commercial purposes in South Australia for livestock but, importantly, where used in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions, and I think that is a very important addition to this amendment.

I do not particularly propose to reventilate the reasons for this amendment, as I have outlined those thoroughly in my second reading speech, simply to say that we have had seven years of peer review research, which clearly shows that virtual fencing is indeed safe for use in cattle, particularly—obviously—when used in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions. With that, I move my amendment.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am very disappointed that the honourable member has reneged on the commitment she made yesterday, which was that if the government was to make a public commitment in this place which will enable the use of virtual fencing through the associated drafted regulations that she would be open to withdrawing her amendment. The government has made that commitment, and yet this amendment, albeit in a slightly amended form, is proceeding.

The government will not be supporting the amendment. By inserting 'livestock' instead of 'animals' that does overcome the issues that had been raised that, for example, shock collars for dogs could have been captured within the proposed amendment. The honourable member also refers to a body of research in regard to virtual fencing. According to my advice, it is true that that exists for cattle, and I outlined in my second reading speech information in regard to the SARDI trials; however, this amendment would also involve virtual fencing for sheep and indeed other creatures that are considered livestock.

As I mentioned in my second reading speech in regard to sheep, the SARDI research identified that the commercial virtual fencing products are effective at containing sheep in a range of scenarios, but there is a need for further development in the technology before it can be deemed safe for use in sheep commercially. I also have a number of questions that I would like to ask the honourable member. What other animals, what other livestock, would be captured by her proposed amendment in its amended form?

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I appreciate the minister's comments; however, I did state in my second reading speech that I would consider withdrawing my amendment. Given the questions that I asked around the timing of the drafting of those regulations, I think there needs to be an appreciation that industry does not want to see a delay in the use of technology. They have had delays in the use of this technology for years now, and South Australian farmers have already been behind other states in not having this technology available. They are concerned, and we as the opposition are concerned, that it could be another 12 months, 18 months, two years, until these regulations are actually tabled and enacted, hence the opposition putting forward this amendment to ensure that it is legislated for.

It is also my understanding that given the devices and systems must be used in accordance with manufacturer's instructions, as per my amendment, until a commercial device is available for sheep, or indeed any other livestock, then they would not be able to be utilised, as they would not fall under those manufacturer's instructions, and this is in regard to any species, indeed any breed.

It is also important to note that it is actually in regard to a weight range of those species and breeds. For instance, in terms of cattle, some devices cannot be used for cattle that are under, say, 200 kilograms. The manufacturer's instructions already outline what species, what breed, what kilogram they can be used for and, as per my amendment, it would need to fall under those manufacturer's instructions.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Can the honourable member outline what would prevent the making of homemade devices? Given the broad nature of this proposed amendment, it does not appear to me to preclude that occurring, in which case there would be no manufacturer's instructions and animal welfare would therefore not be taken into account necessarily.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Again, walking through my amendment, we are talking about an electrical device that is used in accordance with manufacturer's instructions. Certainly, anything that is used outside of that would not fall within this amendment and hence would be subjected to any other provision under this legislation.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: My advice is that this amendment as drafted, even in the amended form, does not prevent the making of a homemade device, in which case it would not be captured in terms of manufacturer's instructions. I think that really does speak to why it is important to have the provisions that we are talking about enacted through regulation. Regulation enables there to be consultation and to ensure that there are not unintended consequences, which clearly there may be from this amendment.

For example, the definition of livestock includes bees in our state, and under the previous Livestock Act bees were included. I do not think the honourable member intends that there should be such devices used for bees, yet potentially her amendment is drafted in such a way as to open up that possibility.

I would also like to reference another query that has, I think, been mentioned in one of the second reading contributions, and that is in regard to the development of the national guidelines. Again, having consulted with the Minister for Environment in the other place, I can confirm that it is not the intention of the government to wait to proceed with regulations on virtual fencing until after the national guidelines have been developed. I think the concerns around an undue delay are not founded. Consequently, the government will not be supporting this amendment.

The committee divided on the amendments:

Ayes 10
Noes.....11
Majority 1

AYES

Bonaros, C.	Centofanti, N.J. (teller)	Game, S.L.
Girolamo, H.M.	Henderson, L.A.	Hood, B.R.
Hood, D.G.E.	Lee, J.S.	Lensink, J.M.A.
Pangallo, F.		

NOES

Bourke, E.S.	El Dannawi, M.	Franks, T.A.
Hanson, J.E.	Hunter, I.K.	Maher, K.J.
Martin, R.B.	Ngo, T.T.	Scriven, C.M. (teller)
Simms, R.A.	Wortley, R.P.	

Amendments thus negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 12 to 14 passed.

New clauses 14A to 14I.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I move:

Amendment No 17 [Franks–1]—

Page 15, after line 10—After clause 14 insert:

Part 2A—Independent Office of Animal Welfare

14A—Interpretation

In this Part—

Chief Animal Welfare Officer means the person appointed under section 14E;

Office means the Independent Office for Animal Welfare established under section 14C;

State's animal welfare laws means the following:

(a) this Act;

(b) the *Dog and Cat Management Act 1995;*

(c) the *Livestock Act 1997*;

(d) any other Act or law relating to the prevention of cruelty to, or the welfare of, animals in the State;

State's animal welfare codes, requirements and standards means codes of conduct, requirements and standards applicable to industries and dealing with matters relating to the prevention of cruelty to, or the welfare of, animals in the State.

14B—Objects

The objects of this Part are—

(a) to promote knowledge of animal welfare issues; and

(b) to improve animal welfare outcomes; and

(c) to ensure the State's animal welfare codes, requirements and standards are independently reviewed and developed having regard to—

(i) contemporary scientific knowledge about animal welfare; and

(ii) advances in technology; and

(iii) community expectations and values; and

(d) to ensure the independent review of the administration and enforcement of the State's animal welfare laws.

14C—Independent Office of Animal Welfare

(1) The *Independent Office of Animal Welfare* is established as a body corporate.

(2) The Office has the following functions:

(a) reviewing and monitoring, including conducting inquiries, commissioning research and preparing reports on, the following:

(i) the State's animal welfare laws (including compliance with, and the enforcement and effectiveness of, the State's animal welfare laws);

(ii) the State's animal welfare codes, requirements and standards;

(iii) the treatment of animals in a particular industry or sector, including (without limitation) greyhound racing, horse racing, agriculture and medical and scientific research;

(iv) the possible harmonisation of the State's animal welfare laws with similar laws of the Commonwealth, other States and the Territories;

(b) developing minimum care standards for specific classes of animals to assist in determining whether or not an owner's duty of care is being properly discharged in respect of such an animal;

(c) liaising with bodies responsible for national policies and guidelines;

(d) providing advice to Ministers who are responsible for administering the State's animal welfare laws;

(e) such other functions as are conferred by this Act or prescribed by the regulations.

(3) Except as provided under this Act or any other Act, the Office is not subject to Ministerial direction in the performance of its functions.

14D—Staff

(1) The Office will consist of—

(a) the Chief Animal Welfare Officer (who will be the principal officer of the Office); and

(b) persons engaged by the Office on terms and conditions determined by the Office; and

(c) persons employed in the Public Service of the State and assigned to assist the Office.

(2) Persons engaged by the Office are not Public Service employees but are to be taken to be public sector employees, employed by the Office, for the purposes of the *Public Sector (Honesty and Accountability) Act 1995* and section 74 of the *Public Sector Act 2009*.

(3) While a Public Service employee is assigned to the Office, directions given to the employee by the Chief Animal Welfare Officer prevail over directions given to the employee by the chief executive of the administrative unit of the Public Service in which the employee is employed to the extent of any inconsistency.

14E—Chief Animal Welfare Officer

(1) The Minister must appoint a person as the Chief Animal Welfare Officer on the recommendation of a majority of the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee.

(2) The Chief Animal Welfare Officer will be appointed for a term not exceeding 3 years and on conditions determined by the Minister and, at the end of a term of appointment, will be eligible for reappointment.

(3) The appointment of the Chief Animal Welfare Officer may be terminated by the Minister on the ground that the Chief Animal Welfare Officer—

(a) has been guilty of misconduct; or

(b) has been convicted of an offence punishable by imprisonment; or

(c) has become bankrupt or has applied to take the benefit of a law for the relief of insolvent debtors; or

(d) has been disqualified from managing corporations under Chapter 2D Part 2D.6 of the *Corporations Act 2001* of the Commonwealth; or

(e) has, because of mental or physical incapacity, failed to carry out duties of the position satisfactorily; or

(f) is incompetent or has neglected the duties of the position.

(4) The appointment of the Chief Animal Welfare Officer is terminated if the Chief Animal Welfare Officer—

(a) becomes a member, or a candidate for election as a member, of the Parliament of a State or the Commonwealth or a Legislative Assembly of a Territory of the Commonwealth; or

(b) is sentenced to imprisonment for an offence.

(5) The Chief Animal Welfare Officer may resign by written notice to the Minister of not less than 3 months (or such shorter period as is accepted by the Minister).

14F—Appointment of acting Chief Animal Welfare Officer

(1) The Minister may appoint a person to act as the Chief Animal Welfare Officer during any period for which—

(a) no person is for the time being appointed as the Chief Animal Welfare Officer; or

(b) the Chief Animal Welfare Officer is absent from, or unable to discharge, official duties.

(2) The terms and conditions of appointment of the person appointed to act as the Chief Animal Welfare Officer will be determined by the Minister.

14G—Honesty and accountability

The Chief Animal Welfare Officer and any other person appointed to act as the Chief Animal Welfare Officer are senior officials for the purposes of the *Public Sector (Honesty and Accountability) Act 1995*.

14H—Delegation

(1) Subject to this section, the Office and the Chief Animal Welfare Officer may delegate any of their functions under this or any other Act.

(2) A delegation under this section—

(a) must be in writing; and

(b) may be conditional or unconditional; and

(c) is revocable at will; and

(d) does not prevent the delegator from acting in any matter.

(3) A function delegated under this section may, if the instrument of delegation so provides, be further delegated.

14I—Annual report

(1) The Office must, on or before 30 September in each year, prepare and deliver to the Minister a report on the operations of the Office during the previous financial year.

(2) The Minister must, within 12 sitting days after receiving a report under this section, cause a copy of the report to be laid before both Houses of Parliament.

This creates an independent office of animal welfare and outlines its objects, function and staff, including a chief animal welfare officer, and its roles and responsibilities, including procedures for their appointment, reporting and delegation powers.

I do so because the previous amendment presupposed this with the duty of care provisions, but this provides that amendment for posterity, for one day when we finally see an independent office for animal welfare in this state. Unfortunately, it will not be today, but I do hope it will be soon.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for her amendment—and the commentary from the cheap seats—but the government will not be supporting this amendment.

New clauses negatived.

Clause 15.

The CHAIR: There are amendments in the name of the Hon. Ms Franks and the Attorney-General. We will deal with the Hon. Ms Franks first.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I move:

Amendment No 18 [Franks–1]—

Page 15, lines 13 to 15 [clause 15(1)]—Delete subclause (1) and substitute:

(1) The Minister—

(a) must establish an Animal Welfare Advisory Committee; and

(b) may establish such other committees as the Minister thinks fit.

This amendment mandates establishing an animal welfare advisory council and other committees if required. I can see the numbers and I know that I am not going to get very far today but, again, I commend the amendment to the council in the hope that goodwill and a commitment to ending animal cruelty and better advice might prevail.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: In speaking to the Hon. Tammy Franks' amendment I will also speak to my amendment, for the benefit of the committee. The amendment I will be putting forward is in relation to the fact that the bill creates, for the first time, an animal welfare fund to capture licence fees, fines and penalties so that they can be put back into supporting and promoting animal welfare and outcomes.

Through the amendment I will put forward to clause 15(9), the bill provides that a committee such as the animal advisory committee or a convened panel will provide advice to the minister on the disbursements of any such funds.

Amendment negatived.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I will not be proceeding with my amendments Nos 26 and 27. We are not quite there yet, but I will not be proceeding with those. I move:

Amendment No 19 [Franks–1]—

Page 15, line 22 to page 16, line 2 [clause 15(3)]—Delete subclause (3) and substitute:

(3) The Animal Welfare Advisory Committee established by the Minister under this Part must consist of 12 members appointed by the Minister, of whom—

(a) 3 members representing non-government animal welfare organisations;

(b) 2 members representing approved charitable organisations;

(c) 2 members who are scientists with expertise in animal welfare;

(d) 1 member representing a consumer rights organisation;

(e) 1 member representing—

(i) commercial breeders, sellers or purchasers of animals; or

(ii) commercial producers or purchasers of animal products;

(f) 1 member representing the Minister;

(g) 1 member representing local councils;

(h) 1 member with expertise in ethics as it relates to animal welfare.

This amends the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee to explicitly reflect animal welfare focus with expert animal welfare representation, outweighing industry representation.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I indicate that the government will not be supporting this amendment. I am advised the intention of it is to move to a skills-based rather than a representative committee.

Amendment negatived.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I move:

Amendment No 20 [Franks–1]—

Page 16, after line 9—After subclause (7) insert:

(7a) Each member of the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee must, in accordance with any requirements set out in the regulations, complete training related to the Five Domains Model (within the meaning of section 6) and the use of non-animal alternatives.

(7b) The Animal Welfare Advisory Committee must have accurate minutes kept of its meetings (which must, if a decision of the Committee is not supported unanimously, include details of any dissenting views of a member of the Committee).

This would mandate AWAC members to undergo training in the Five Domains animal welfare model and also mandate that minutes would have to be kept of meetings, including details of any dissenting views of committee members. We have just heard from the government that they are going for a skills base not representative base, so perhaps a little training would not go astray, and certainly keeping minutes and recording decisions of the committee would be much appreciated by those in the community.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that the keeping of minutes is something that already occurs. My advice is, in relation to training, that there are a number of models that may be considered in relation to any training that might be undertaken.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Do those minutes include details of any dissenting views by committee members, noting that it has been the experience of committee members put on this who are vastly outweighed when they are representing perhaps the RSPCA and the like—animal welfare

voices or AWL and the like—that when they vote their dissent is not appropriately recorded? Will that happen in the future?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that would be captured by the minutes.

Amendment negatived.

The CHAIR: The Hon. Ms Franks, is amendment No. 21 consequential?

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Chair, amendment No. 21 and, at this point, amendment No. 22 are consequential, and I can see the numbers.

The CHAIR: Attorney, we are at your amendment No. 1.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I move the amendment standing in my name for the reasons I outlined momentarily ago:

Amendment No 1 [AboriginalAff–1]—

Page 16, after line 17 [clause 15(9)]—After paragraph (a) insert:

(aa) to provide advice to the Minister in relation to the disbursement of the Animal Welfare Fund;

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I indicate that the opposition are in support of the government's amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 16 passed.

New clause 16A.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I move:

Amendment No 23 [Franks–1]—

Page 16, after line 39—After clause 16 insert:

16A—Annual report

(1) The Animal Welfare Advisory Committee must, on or before 30 September in each year, prepare and deliver to the Minister a report on the operations of the Committee during the previous financial year.

(2) The Minister must, within 12 sitting days after receiving a report under this section, cause a copy of the report to be laid before both Houses of Parliament.

New clause 16A would require an annual report from the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee, which must on or before 30 September in each year be prepared and delivered to the minister to report on the operations of the committee during the previous financial year, and then to be tabled by that minister within 12 sitting days after that receipt and to be laid on the table of both houses of parliament.

This, put simply, requires annual reports from a body that we are putting a lot of faith in, and now have given some funding power to, to actually report so that, should they not meet again for an entire year, we might well know about it and, should they have decisions, we would be able to see who was advising what, where and when.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for bringing this amendment to the chamber. My advice is that there are requirements that are followed in relation to reporting, so it is the government's view that this is unnecessary.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: In the drafting of this bill, the government had not actually afforded this particular body some of the powers that they have just given them in the previous amendment moved by the government. Do they now not think perhaps that might change their attitude to requiring an annual report to be more transparently provided?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is there are a lot of requirements that do go to the requirement for reporting.

New clause negatived.

Clauses 17 to 32 passed.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:17.

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:18): I bring up the 57th report of the committee, 2022-25.

Report received and read.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs (Hon. K.J. Maher)—

Capital City Committee—Report, 2023-24
Determination of the Remuneration Tribunal No. 19 of 2024—Remuneration of Auditor-General, Electoral Commissioner, Deputy Electoral Commissioner, and Health and Community Services Complaints Commissioner
Report of the Remuneration Tribunal No. 19 of 2024—2024 Review of Remuneration of Auditor-General, Electoral Commission, Deputy Electoral Commissioner & Health and Community Services Complaints Commissioner

Ministerial Statement

WHYALLA STEELWORKS

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:20): I have a ministerial statement to make that mirrors a ministerial statement made by the Premier earlier, before their question time, regarding the Whyalla Steelworks. As I said, this ministerial statement has been made in another place by the Premier, but I will repeat it here for the benefit of members.

Today, the Malinauskas Labor government has taken strong and immediate action to secure the long-term future of the Whyalla Steelworks by placing the business's owner into administration. GFG is no longer running the steelworks.

The state has appointed KordaMentha as the administrator of OneSteel Manufacturing Pty Ltd under section 436C of the Corporations Act 2001. OneSteel is part of the GFG corporate group and is the legal entity that owns and operates the Whyalla Steelworks and associated mines. During this period of administration, the administrator investigates options, including sale of the business, with the ambition of delivering the best outcome for creditors and continued operation of the steelworks.

The administrators will be able to trade on and pay all debts incurred during the period of administration. This means, critically, that workers and contractors will be paid. KordaMentha has advised the state government that it intends to appoint experienced Australian steelmaker BlueScope to act as a special adviser to assist in the operation of the steelworks during administration.

The state government took the decision to place OneSteel into administration after losing confidence in the financial capability of GFG to pay its bills as and when they fall due. The government has equally lost confidence in GFG's ability to secure the funding needed for the ongoing operation of the steelworks. The government gave GFG every opportunity to make good on its promises and to bring creditors back into terms. It has failed to do so.

The government has received expert advice from its Steel Task Force that a continuation of the status quo and a lack of investment risks the steelworks deteriorating to the point where creditors will be impacted even further and where it will be difficult, if not impossible, to turn the operation around. In light of this advice, the state government has acted decisively and expeditiously.

The appointment of the administrator was facilitated by an urgent and minor change to the Whyalla Steel Works Act 1958, which passed state parliament this morning. I would like to take this opportunity to thank all my parliamentary colleagues for supporting this legislation and making sure it passed quickly. The parliament was today operating for team South Australia, and I want to thank all members for getting this done.

This amendment makes GFG's existing debts to the state government apply as a charge across all, rather than some, of the real property of OneSteel and makes them readily enforceable. The legislation, which is specific to the Whyalla Steelworks, also imposes new transparency obligations on its owner. Early and proactive steps will be taken by the state government and the administrator to stabilise operations and explore a possible sale to a new owner in a way that keeps the assets together and the steelworks operational.

Whyalla is critical to sovereign Australian steel. It is one of only two Australian steelworks, produces 75 per cent of Australian structural steel and is the only domestic producer of long steel products. Steel from Whyalla is how Australia can build and maintain its infrastructure, whether it is railways, high-rise towers, housing, windfarms, transmission lines, bridges, defence assets or hospitals.

Whyalla steel is present in big infrastructure projects, from Optus Stadium in Perth to the Western Sydney Airport terminal and rail link, to the Cross River Rail project in Brisbane. Without Whyalla steel, Australia would rely on steel from overseas amid a deteriorating strategic environment and a national housing crisis.

For months, the government has been carefully planning a strategy to address the challenges unfolding at the Whyalla Steelworks. Later today, the Premier will be travelling to Whyalla where he expects to make further announcements about the government's steadfast commitment to support the people of Whyalla and deliver the industrial transformation required to realise the economic opportunity in Upper Spencer Gulf.

Question Time

BUSHFIRE PROTOCOLS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Emergency Services regarding bushfire protocols.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Yesterday in this place, the Hon. Ben Hood asked a question regarding protocols between CFS teams, farm fire units and Department for Environment and Water rangers. A member of the Wilmington community, after listening to question time yesterday, has reached out to the opposition and said:

> Tell the Minister it's not good enough we aren't allowed to get in and deal with fires early, but have to wait for Adelaide people to come up and assess it, by which time it's expanded into goat territory. It's larger and harder to deal with; and sometimes those from Adelaide aren't aware of the gully winds which can take the fire further faster and then you have it out of control.

In 'Lessons from the Island—An independent review of the fires that burnt across Kangaroo Island during December 2019-February 2020', produced by the state government and the CFS in conjunction with C3 Resilience, it states:

> The fire response in a wilderness area is guided by the Wilderness Code of Management (DEH 2004) developed in accordance with s. 12 of the Wilderness Protection Act 1992 (SA). The Code limits the fire response to those activities that will not diminish the wilderness values.

And it recommends, 'Consider making it a formal joint operational policy between SA CFS and DEW.' So my questions to the Minister for Emergency Services are:

1. Does the minister support the recommendation of the independent review?

2. Is the minister aware of any current formal joint operational policy between South Australian CFS and DEW and, if not, will she commit to considering and subsequently implementing the recommendation within this current term of government?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:26): I thank the honourable member for her question. I am advised there is no law which allows national park staff to refuse the CFS access to a national park. I am also advised that the CFS has a legislative right to enter any and all properties during a fire.

I am also advised that, in an operational sense, national park firefighters form part of the CFS chain of command and are directed by the CFS in responding. I am further advised there was no order given by the CFS restricting access to the national park.

I am also advised there is no CFS policy restricting access to national parks or use of heavy machinery. I am further advised that bulldozers were used where needed alongside sufficient back-burning and retardant being dropped wherever was needed during the fire process in Wilmington. I am also advised this was all done in accordance with the operational requirements.

BUSHFIRE PROTOCOLS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:27): Supplementary: if that is the advice that has been given to the minister, will she seek to consult with the Wilmington community, particularly those in farm firefighting units and the CFS, to ensure that she gets both sides of the story?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:28): As I advised the chamber, I was in Wilmington and based myself where all the volunteers were coming to refill, to get some food, before going back out on their next rotation.

I have also had many conversations with the Region 4 community in regard to CFS volunteers and also the members that are based in the Region 4 headquarters. There is an incident control room that is based in the Region 4 headquarters in Port Augusta and that is where a lot of the information is delivered to the local community. This is what I am advised.

I also went to the Port Augusta headquarters when I was on my way to Wilmington to see the incredible work that they undertake—the mapping that is put into place to make sure that everyone is on the same page.

I really do appreciate, as a country kid myself, that it is not a nice feeling when there is a fire breaking out in your local area. But there is a really big importance that there is that central control—and, as I said, that was based in Port Augusta—with locals being able to participate in that information, as far as I am aware, of what is happening, and being mapped and coordinating that message back to the ground.

BUSHFIRE PROTOCOLS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:29): Final supplementary: therefore, does the minister agree that local CFS members and farm fire units with intimate local knowledge should be part of the decision-making process in regard to fire containment in their home regions, even if it does involve public land?

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: She has already answered that.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:29): I feel I have answered it. A lot of communication is happening. There are a lot of units on the ground during a fire, as you would be aware. I am always happy to take on feedback. As I have said to many members within the Region 4, I want to hear what worked and what didn't work. My door is open. I really do want to hear the feedback.

So if you do have particular concerns that are being raised with you, I would really encourage you to have that conversation with me outside this chamber as well. I would love to hear from them directly as well. That is why I went to Wilmington: to listen to those stories, to learn, because keeping our community safe is paramount.

SARDI FISH DEATHS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries about fish deaths at the SARDI site at West Beach.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: The minister gave an answer to a question in this place on 6 February that confirmed that she was aware that there had been damage to one of the pipes in the saltwater intake to the SARDI facility at West Beach. She said, and I quote:

> I have been made aware that there is potentially some damage to one of the pipes. That, of course, is part of the analysis of the situation at West Beach, and in terms of maintenance and so on, that is part of the ongoing approach that has been taken.

My questions to the minister are:

1. Can the minister explain to the chamber the nature of the damage to the inlet pipe?

2. Can the minister explain to the chamber when the inlet structure was last assessed by the department as part of maintenance prior to the damage being detected by the private company?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:31): I thank the honourable member for her question. I am happy to take it on notice and bring back a response.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Supplementary, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: No.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Okay.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable Leader of the Opposition, your third question.

TOMATO BROWN RUGOSE FRUIT VIRUS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries on the topic of the tomato brown rugose virus.

Leave granted.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Last sitting week, I asked the minister a supplementary question, which she took on notice, in regard to why it took multiple months for the government to appoint an assessor for the process of owner reimbursement costs for SA Tomato Pty Ltd, which has been forced to cease trading due to section 9 quarantine orders. The minister returned an answer yesterday, which stated:

> …my department has been taking steps since the early stages of the response to support this business in the assessment of these costs in order to make that process as efficient as possible.

She then spoke about her department engaging and ensuring, but did not talk about concrete action to provide this business with its entitled compensation. My questions to the minister are:

1. What actionable steps has the minister or her department taken to ensure SA Tomato Pty Ltd will receive the full amount payable under the agreed national framework?

2. When will the business actually see the funds owed?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:33): I thank the honourable member for her question. As was mentioned, there was a process which involved obtaining national agreement in terms of the response plan. The response plan includes a number of matters, including cost reimbursement, where that is applicable.

There is a form which can be used to apply for compensation, which has been made available I think on the PIRSA website—although if that's not the situation I am happy to correct the record—and that is the process that needs to begin.

The assessment process is obviously done by an independent assessor and then the process continues. It is important, however, that any person or business applying for such an action is able to quantify what are their losses and provide appropriate evidence. That is all part of the process that must occur before any compensation can be paid, if compensation is payable.

TOMATO BROWN RUGOSE FRUIT VIRUS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:34): Supplementary: given that it is the opposition's advice that that is indeed what this company has done, when will the company actually see the funds owed?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:35): I think the honourable member may need to check the details of her advice. In terms of specifics around what a company may or may not have applied for, I don't think that is appropriate for public discussion.

ABORIGINAL LAW STUDENT MENTORING PROGRAM

The Hon. M. EL DANNAWI (14:35): My question is to the Attorney-General. Will the Attorney-General inform the council on the 2024 Aboriginal Law Student Mentoring Program and its continued success?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:35): I thank the honourable member for her question. I am most glad to inform the council on the continuing success of the Aboriginal Law Student Mentoring Program. Since 2004, the Aboriginal Law Student Mentoring Program has been providing invaluable support to Aboriginal law students across South Australia. With around 30 students and 50 mentors each year, this initiative plays a crucial role in ensuring that aspiring Aboriginal legal professionals not only succeed academically but also transition confidently into the legal profession.

The journey to becoming a lawyer can be challenging, but the Aboriginal Law Student Mentoring Program ensures no student walks this path alone. Through one-on-one mentorship students are connected with legal professionals who offer guidance, networking opportunities, work experience and general support. These mentors in turn often gain as much as they give learning through those they mentor, strengthening their commitment to a diverse and inclusive legal profession.

Beyond mentoring, the Aboriginal Legal Student Mentoring Program provides a range of career-building opportunities. Students participate in networking events, where they engage with judges, lawyers and university staff in a supporting environment. Programs like Week with a Judge allow students to shadow legal professionals in courtrooms, offering firsthand insights into legal practice.

Through scholarships, internships and clerkships facilitated by the program sponsors, students can gain crucial industry experience that helps them enter the profession with confidence. The legal profession needs more Aboriginal voices, voices that can carry the strength of the culture, the wisdom of leaders before them and their determination to create a fairer and more just society. Every mentor, sponsor and supporter plays a crucial role in making this happen. I look forward to being able to update the chamber on the continuing success of this program.

CODE BLACK CALLS

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:37): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister for Health, a question about hospital Code Black calls.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: A report by *The Advertiser* from 14 February found that Code Black calls for security help from frightened health workers have increased drastically, with SA Health staff calling for urgent security help an average of 40 times every day. In the Limestone Coast, calls for help rocketed from just seven in 2021 to 159 last year, while in Yorke and Northern they soared from 45 to 211 and in Eyre and Far North they went from 27 to 73. In total, Code Black calls rose from 12,990 in 2021 to 14,816 in 2024. My questions to the Leader of the Government are:

1. What new strategy will the government be implementing to ensure the safety of hospital and health workers across the state?

2. Given that a large proportion of the increase in Code Black calls are from regional hospitals, what actions will the government be undertaking to specifically address the unique issues and challenges faced by regional hospitals and healthcare providers?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:39): I thank the honourable member for her questions. I will refer them to the Minister for Health in another place and bring back an answer for her.

KANGAROO ISLAND KOALAS

The Hon. S.L. GAME (14:39): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Attorney-General, representing the environment minister, regarding plague proportions of koalas on Kangaroo Island.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.L. GAME: Kangaroo Island Mayor, Michael Pengilly, recently told local ABC Adelaide that Kangaroo Island summer bushfires of 2019-20 reduced koala numbers to about 10,000 but, since then, the numbers have increased back to approximately 20,000. He said the island is unable to sustain this population and, as a result, native vegetation is rapidly being destroyed, and koalas moving east across the island in search of food will soon begin starving.

A conservation group recently announced it would set up a 530-hectare koala sanctuary on Kangaroo Island; however, the mayor says this will do little to address the problem as the animals will eat out the blue gum plantation. During that same media segment, a spokesperson for the National Parks and Wildlife Service conservation group said no active population controls had been conducted on the island's koalas since 2019.

Over 200,000 tourists visit Kangaroo Island each year, with an estimated 60 per cent of those visitors from Europe. My questions to the environment minister are:

1. Will the government acknowledge that Kangaroo Island has a koala plague problem, and that action needs to be taken, including the consideration of a culling program before even more of the island's native vegetation is destroyed?

2. Does the government concede that previous attempts to control this problem by successive South Australian state governments haven't worked?

3. Does the government also concede that this failure to take effective long-term action in the past has been due in part to fear of negative feedback from the Greens and other conservation groups?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:41): I will be most pleased to take those extensive questions on notice, refer them to a minister in another place, and bring back a reply to the honourable member.

TOMATO BROWN RUGOSE FRUIT VIRUS

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:41): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development on the topic of tomato brown rugose fruit virus.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: The PIRSA tomato brown rugose fruit virus webpage shows a dashboard with a number of tests in the queue, the expected wait time in business days, and the total number of samples tested. While this is a commendable initiative, the results on the dashboard don't reflect the experience that tomato growers have shared with the opposition. For instance, on 7 January, the dashboard claimed a waiting time of four business days, when one grower told the opposition that at that stage they had been waiting for over four weeks. My questions for the minister are:

1. How often is the dashboard updated by the government?

2. Is the dashboard in real time and, if not, why not?

3. How does the minister reconcile the difference between claims of the efficiency of testing for brown rugose virus on the dashboard and the real-life experience of growers in the field?

4. If the dashboard is not posting accurate data, what value is it adding for growers?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:42): I thank the honourable member for her questions. My advice is that the dashboard is updated daily in terms of business days, so Monday to Friday. It reflects those tests that are for market access, so predominantly Western Australia and Queensland. My advice is that it is accurate. Obviously, if there are concerns around that, I am happy to have specific details.

I note that the honourable member refers to 7 January. If she would like to provide the specific details of the grower who apparently hadn't received tests in the time that was stated, I am happy to follow that up and see if that can be clarified.

PARLIAMENTARY FRIENDS OF FORESTRY

The Hon. T.T. NGO (14:43): My question is to the Minister for Forest Industries. Can the minister tell the council about the recent Parliamentary Friends of Forestry event held here in Parliament House?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:43): I thank the honourable member for his question. Hopefully members in this place are aware that during the last sitting week the annual Parliamentary Friends of Forestry event was held here in Parliament House. It was a great opportunity to bring together members of the forest industry and parliamentarians in a bipartisan or, indeed, multipartisan manner to raise awareness of the industry.

I would like to thank the co-chairs of the Parliamentary Friends of Forestry group—the Hon. Reggie Martin and the Hon. Nicola Centofanti—for the work done to ensure that the event was a success. I would also like to thank Nathan Paine, Tammy Auld and Haley Welch from the South Australian Forest Products Association for their roles in the event.

I also want to place on the record my thanks to the large number of forest industry representatives who made the trip from Mount Gambier to Adelaide to attend the event, including Tammy Auld, John Forster, Adrian Flowers, Odette Lubbe, Darren Sheldon, Bed Edser, Simon Angove, Jessica Douglas, Charlene Riley and Professor Jeff Morrell, the newly appointed director of the Forestry Centre of Excellence.

The state government is very conscious of the significant contribution the industry provides to the South Australian economy, contributing approximately $3 billion to the South Australian economy each year and employing approximately 21,000 people directly and indirectly.

Sixty per cent of Australia's agricultural timbers, such as poles, posts and fencing, and 48 per cent of Australia's packaging and industrial-grade timber comes from the South Australian forest industry.

Many members will recall the gift bag that was distributed to members of both the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly to mark the event and to highlight the significant role the forest industry plays on a daily basis in everyone's lives. The bag included a toilet roll; a cheese board made of wood—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Not made of cheese—a paper bag containing fruit, and thank you to the produce market for the fruit; a bottle of wine, which of course had a label made of paper; an egg carton which, as well as the carton itself, reflected that wood shavings are used for the chickens that obviously lay the eggs; a miniature pallet; and a large shopping bag made of paper.

It was particularly interesting to hear the information around the pallets. Of course, we all know that timber pallets are in use, but pretty much every product that we use has utilised a pallet in some part of its production and transport.

The Hon. E.S. Bourke: Are they meant to be a coaster?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The little miniature pallet, I hear the Hon. Emily Bourke ask if it is to be a coaster, and I would certainly suggest that that is an excellent use. Perhaps we could all have them sitting here instead of our little red coasters for our glasses of water as a constant daily reminder of the importance of the forest industry. I would certainly be in favour of that occurring.

I am sure all members would agree that we all consume or use something to do with the forest industry I would say at least once a day. All of these products are reliant on the forest industry.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Or possibly more, but we won't go into those details. While some may have the perception that the forest industry is simply producing timber for housing, incredibly important as that is, the reality is we use timber-related products on a daily basis. This is evidence of the crucial role that the timber industry plays in our state.

The parliamentary friends event was a wonderful opportunity to highlight both the importance of the industry but also the impact that it has on our day-to-day life. All of this underpins why the state government has made a significant contribution to the forest industry since coming to government. This includes:

- $16 million over 10 years for the Forestry Centre of Excellence to allow long-term research and development capability and certainty to the forest industry in South Australia;
- providing $2 million over three years to develop a forest products domestic manufacturing and infrastructure master plan, including a focus on future skills needs;
- in terms of fire towers, providing $2.34 million to replace fire towers with new technologies, such as camera technology to provide a landscape-level fire detection program to protect key forest assets and the communities that surround them;
- $450,000 to Tree Breeding Australia to support the construction of a new research facility in Mount Gambier; and
- a partnership with the South Australian Forest Products Association for the new forest and timber industries career campaign, called 'This Is Wood Work', a powerful tool promoting career pathways and job options within the timber industries.

It was also great to see Parliament House lit up in green on the evening to acknowledge the event. I am sorry to my Greens colleagues here; it was in honour of the forestry industry rather than your party. I thank the Speaker of the House of Assembly for facilitating this. I look forward to continuing to speak in this place about the state government's ongoing investment and support of the incredibly important forest industry in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

FOREST INDUSTRY

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:49): Supplementary: when will the minister be formally responding to the report of the select committee into forestry tabled in this parliament last sitting week?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Honourable Leader of the Opposition, we will go through *Hansard* together tomorrow at some stage and you can correct me if you can find any relevance—

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: To forestry?

The PRESIDENT: No, to the select committee. It is very naughty.

PRISONS, IVF TREATMENT

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:49): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Correctional Services questions about IVF treatment in prisons.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: It has been reported that a convicted drug lord and domestic violence offender in Victoria has been allowed to access IVF treatment whilst in prison. This follows other reports of an individual sentenced for murder being able to access IVF treatment late last year, again in Melbourne. Both cases have sparked outrage from victims interstate, so much so that in that jurisdiction some major IVF providers refused to provide such treatment in the latter instance reference. My questions to the minister are:

1. What, if any, policies exist here in SA when it comes to IVF treatment for convicted criminals?

2. Have similar requests been made here in our prisons amongst convicted criminals for IVF treatment; if so, how many?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:51): I thank the honourable member for her question. I am advised that the Department for Correctional Services aims to provide prisoners with a comparable level of health care to that found in the general community. I am further advised that IVF treatments are not considered by the Department for Correctional Services to fall within the category of an essential health service. I have also been advised that considering this, it has not been the practice of DCS to approve requests for IVF in the past.

METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (14:51): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Emergency Services a question regarding the Metropolitan Fire Service.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD: The opposition has sighted, through a freedom of information request, a business case developed by the full-time staff of the Mount Gambier MFS station which has been sent up the MFS chain of command that calls to implement a single appliance, 24-hour full-time staffing model for Mount Gambier. The business case outlines several key benefits to the local community, including:

- a 150 per cent increase in full-time coverage, ensuring faster response times to emergencies;
- a projected increase in the percentage of incidents attended with 11 minutes from 76 per cent to 95 per cent, aligning Mount Gambier with similar regional centres like Port Pirie;

- that a full-time staffed 24/7 station would save seven minutes per call on average to respond (as the minister would be aware, a house fire can cause complete destruction of the area of one room every four minutes);
- the enhanced ability to support other emergency services, including the CFS and SAAS;
- reduced property damage and risk to life through quicker fire suppression and emergency response; and
- cost savings through a more efficient staffing model, with the total wage cost for full-time staffing estimated at approximately $250,000 per year.

My questions to the minister are

1. Has the minister been provided with a copy of, and has she read, the business case?

2. Has the minister spoken with the full-time MFS staff at Mount Gambier regarding the need for a full-time 24/7 MFS station?

3. Will the minister support the calls from the opposition and the Independent member for Mount Gambier, Troy Bell, to fund and implement a full-time staffed 24/7 MFS station in Mount Gambier?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:53): Apologies; I just want to seek clarification at the beginning. When the honourable member said that a freedom of information request was put forward, who was that request put forward to?

The Hon. B.R. HOOD: To the MFS.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: Was it was put forward to the MFS directly, to the local brigade—

The Hon. B.R. HOOD: No; to the MFS of South Australia.

The PRESIDENT: I understand you are trying to get some clarification, minister, but we are not having a conversation. So minister, answer, and if the Hon. Mr Hood needs to ask a supplementary he can. Please give your answer.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: Thank you. I would have to seek clarification whether that business case was put forward to the government before I can respond to what is in that business case referred to. However, as I have outlined previously, I am happy to have those conversations.

I have reached out to the MFS to find time, and I have allocated time, to go to Mount Gambier to have these conversations. I have made that public statement that I would be having those conversations with them. I am new to this role and I am trying to get my head around all the different services and brigades, and the MFS as well. So I am absolutely happy to have those conversations with them but, particularly in regard to their costings, have a look at what those costings actually look like. My understanding is it's not as simple as saying let's just go to 24/7—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The opposition front bench and the Hon. Mr Hunter—

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: The concerns that were raised yesterday—

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: Sorry, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: No—go, please; now that we have some silence.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: Concerns that were raised yesterday were following comments made on radio heightening fear that there was not a 24/7 MFS service available in Mount Gambier, which I am advised is not correct. There is a 24/7 MFS service available in Mount Gambier. As the

member would know, there is the career firefighter, who is available through the day, and in the evening the retained firefighters are put on to support in the evening.

My understanding is that the Mount Gambier MFS station should be very proud of what they have been able to achieve so far. They not only are under the timeframe but exceed the national timeframes that are put forward in responding to an emergency. They do an incredible effort, one that they should be very proud of. As I have said, I am happy to have those conversations, but I don't like the idea of putting fear out there that there isn't a service available when there is one.

PREMIER'S PLATE

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:56): My question is to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. Will the minister inform the council about the recent winner of the Premier's Plate at the Premier's Plate ladies' race day at Morphettville racecourse?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:56): I thank the honourable member for his question. It was a pleasure to join many from the thoroughbred racing community at the recent Premier's Plate Women in Sports day. I believe a number of our members from this chamber were there: the Hon. Heidi Girolamo and the Hon. Ben Hood.

With over 4,000 individuals employed and approximately $500 million injected into South Australia's economy, the racing industry is vital and our government is proud to support it. We know that racing fosters a connection between people from all walks of life, building a sense of belonging for many and connecting communities together. I understand the industry in South Australia is made up of about 8,200 participants, volunteers and employees, and sustains around 3,400 full-time equivalent jobs across direct and indirect employment.

For those who were not able to make it to the meet that day, it was apprentice jockey Alana Livesey who won the Premier's Plate aboard Wild Imagination, who had been trained by David Page. Alana is part of the world-class Apprentice Academy SA, run by Racing SA, which provides aspiring jockeys with education and training. Ruby Mayers is the Apprentice Academy talent manager and it is run by no other than the great Clare Lindop, who is the training and development officer at Racing SA.

The Apprentice Academy SA currently trains 22 apprentices; 10 of these are metro-licensed apprentices. Last week, I had the pleasure of having an early morning tour of the Morphettville racecourse along with Nick Bawden, CEO of Racing SA, as well as Ruby and, of course, Clare. It was wonderful to have the opportunity to walk into the racecourse to observe track work under the guidance of the jockeys and the track work riders, including the recent winner, Alana. It was a pleasure also to walk through the stables and meet many of the members of the team who are up before the sun to help prepare the horses and their riders.

Once again, I thank the Racing SA team, and in particular Clare, Ruby and Nick for their time, and I again congratulate apprentice jockey Alana and trainer David Page on their recent win.

WOMEN IN SPORTS RACE DAYS

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:58): Supplementary: will the Premier be in attendance at future Women in Sports racing days?

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: I am just wondering why the Premier wasn't there.

The PRESIDENT: You can answer if you choose to.

The Hon. E.S. Bourke: Well, I am not his diary manager.

NUCLEAR SAFETY

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:59): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Minister for Emergency Services on emergency services planning for nuclear submarines.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: The South Australian government has released a Submarine Construction Yard Environmental Impact Statement and that process is currently out for consultation until 17 March this year. This EIS process has a YourSAy webpage, a PlanSA webpage and a proponent's Australian Naval Infrastructure (ANI) page that promotes the three ASA drop-in sessions over 19 to 22 February.

The EIS claims there is no risk to people or the environment of radiation exposure from nuclear-powered propulsion systems or onsite testing of nuclear sub reactors at Osborne. The EIS social impact assessment concludes there are 'no significant effects' on community wellbeing and no danger to people or property across an 'immediately impacted community' who live or work in North Haven, Largs Bay and Semaphore, or in the wider community within Greater Adelaide.

These claims fail to recognise the effects and impacts of potential nuclear submarine reactor accidents, which actually currently require evacuation zone planning. In fact, the word 'evacuation' only appears three times in the 400-page EIS and that is all to do with floods, not reactor risks. Even a visit by a nuclear-powered submarine to a port in our nation currently requires emergency response planning that sets evacuation zones for potential nuclear reactor accidents. Therefore, my questions to the minister are:

1. At what point will consultation be done, not just with the community but with emergency services workers, first responders, about what will happen should there be any form of nuclear accident?

2. Has the minister made herself familiar with the ARPANSA document 'The 2000 reference accident used to assess the suitability of Australian ports for visits by nuclear powered warships'?

3. What will be done to accommodate workers—depending on their sex or other status—in terms of a nuclear accident in this process?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:01): I thank the member for her question. I will have to get a briefing on this myself—it hasn't been raised necessarily just yet—but I do understand that the Chief Officer of the MFS, Jeff Swann, presented an overview of UK submarine operations to the South Australian nuclear-powered warship committee on 11 April 2024, and that there is work that has already been undertaken in that space because of those discussions. I am happy to get a briefing on that.

NUCLEAR SAFETY

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:02): Supplementary: will the minister meet with the unions representing emergency services workers on this issue?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:02): I have met with the unions and I will continue to meet with the unions.

NUCLEAR SAFETY

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:02): Which unions has the minister met and discussed this issue with, in her consultations, and did they express any disappointment that they weren't included in the public consultation process?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Ms Franks—alright, you are on your feet, minister.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:03): As I said, I am happy to get a further briefing about this matter, but I have been meeting with unions in regard to my portfolio areas and I will continue to meet with the unions that cover my portfolio areas.

VICARIOUS LIABILITY

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON (15:03): My question is to the Attorney-General regarding vicarious liability. Can the minister please provide an update to the chamber on what was decided or discussed at the Standing Council of Attorneys-General meeting regarding vicarious liability stemming from the Bird v DP High Court decision?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:03): I thank the honourable member for her question. At the end of last year there was a meeting of the Standing Council of Attorneys-General where this was first raised. I think, from memory—but I will double-check—Victoria are leading work in providing further papers. We haven't had our first meeting of that standing council for this year. I can't remember the date, but it is coming up soon.

VICARIOUS LIABILITY

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON (15:04): Supplementary: stemming from conversations had at the Standing Council of Attorneys-General meeting, is the government here exploring legislative reform?

The PRESIDENT: Are you going to ask a supplementary question—

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON: I just asked it.

The PRESIDENT: 'Stemming from'. That is not a—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:04): To help with the proceedings of question time, sir, I gather the question is: is the government considering any legislative change? If that is the question, then we are considering.

This isn't a simple area, and that is why the Standing Council of Attorneys-General have taken it up. There was a recommendation in the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse that recommended changes be made so that the akin-to-employment relationship is captured and organisations are held liable for that. I think it was recommendation 93 that specifically recommended that that be a prospective measure and not a retrospective measure. I think it was 2022.

South Australia is one of a number of jurisdictions that have made that change as recommended by the royal commission to make sure people who are in akin-to-employment relationships are captured and that institution is held legally responsible. But as I said, recommendation 93 of the royal commission contemplated whether that should be made retrospective, and the royal commission recommended it not be made retrospective.

The Bird v DP matter has thrown complexities in and caused a consideration about whether it ought to be made retrospective. There are significant consequences in doing so, and the consequences of that are what the standing council is looking at.

NORTHERN COMMUNITY LEGAL SERVICE

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:56): My question is to the Attorney-General regarding the Northern Community Legal Service. Will the Attorney-General inform the council about the opening of the new office of the Northern Community Legal Service?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:06): I thank the honourable member for his question and his interest in community legal services. It was a privilege recently to celebrate the opening of the new premise for the Northern Community Legal Service at the end of last year.

The Northern Community Legal Service began back in 1989 as the Para Districts Community Legal Service, with a steering committee made up of people working in the northern communities who recognised the need for free legal assistance in the area. The service was first officially

established in 1990, and since then it has helped thousands of disadvantaged and vulnerable South Australians in the northern suburbs and the Mid North area gain access to justice.

Every day the dedicated legal team provides critical assistance to individuals and families who might otherwise fall through the cracks of the justice system. Whether it is offering advice on tenancy disputes, guiding someone through the complexities of family law or standing beside a vulnerable person as they face legal challenges, the impact of this work cannot be overstated.

It was a pleasure to join the Northern Community Service Legal team to celebrate the launch of their new office in Salisbury. I want to take this opportunity to commend the management, staff and volunteers at the Northern Community Legal Service. Their efforts often go unseen by many, but they are deeply felt by the individuals and families whose lives they change. They do more than provide legal advice; they offer comfort and empowerment to people to move forward.

Congratulations to all again who were involved in the planning, transition and opening of the new office. It is not only a milestone for the organisation but a significant step forward for the communities across the northern suburbs, ensuring better access to justice, advocacy and support.

FRUIT FLY

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:07): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Primary Industries another question about the current fruit fly outbreaks in Adelaide threatening the livelihoods of our major apple, pear and strawberry producers in the Adelaide Hills.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Since raising the issue with the minister yesterday, my phone has been running hot with tales of woe from Hills producers frustrated with the lack of understanding and sympathy from heavy-handed PIRSA officers. Those officers may well have learnt that from the minister, if her response to my question in this place yesterday was anything to go by. The minister's response lacked compassion for the plight of the growers, that could send them broke. She didn't acknowledge their predicament. Her only interest was in reading the prepared script on the national protocols and having her hands tied by them.

What these growers want to see and what the minister should be doing is fighting to help these growers, not sitting on her hands while they suffer the consequences of bureaucratic madness. My question to the minister, which is the same one I asked yesterday that she didn't answer, is:

1. Why are growers allowed to give away fruit in the imposed restriction zones but aren't allowed to sell their produce in these zones?

2. Why can't growers accept unspecified donations from loyal customers sympathetic to their plight?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:09): I thank the honourable member for his question. He appears to be advocating that we remove ourselves from the national protocols for fruit fly. The consequence of such an action would be devastating for our fruit and vegetable industries here in South Australia. I think it is entirely reasonable to acknowledge the difficulty that fruit growers are going through, and I certainly have done so. As I mentioned, I met with the association just last week. It is incredibly difficult when there are outbreaks of fruit fly as of course the Riverland has been experiencing for some time.

I am not quite sure what the honourable member is asking for when he says 'fighting to help the growers'. Surely, preventing the further spread of fruit fly is the best thing we can do to support our growers. Surely, fighting the spread of fruit fly is the best thing we can do for all our primary producers who might be affected. Surely, preventing as far as possible the further spread of fruit fly is something we should all be united in doing.

If a grower wants to move fruit contrary to the protocols, why on earth would the honourable member be advocating that that should be supported or enabled? It really is quite difficult to understand what the honourable member is asking for. The protocols are in place and that is why I shared in detail yesterday with the honourable member what the protocols are to protect our pest

free status, to protect our fruit fly free status that we have here in South Australia, and to protect our fruit and vegetable industries.

FRUIT FLY

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:11): Supplementary: clearly the minister is just kicking the pear can down the road. She has not answered my question.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Pangallo—

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: The question was—

The PRESIDENT: —you have to start with the supplementary question. There is no preamble and there is no commentary. Just ask it.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Okay. The question was: can the minister explain why growers are allowed to give away fruit in the imposed restriction zones but are not allowed to sell their produce in these zones? Why can't growers accept unspecified donations from loyal customers sympathetic to their plight? Furthermore, I did not say that I wanted the national protocols abolished. I asked whether she would look at making changes.

The PRESIDENT: I give in. Minister.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:12): As I said yesterday, and I would have thought was fairly clear from the wording of national protocol, a state minister cannot change a national protocol. What a state minister can do is advocate, as I have done. What a state minister can do is enable and authorise the department to advocate on a national level. All of this has occurred.

When it comes to movement within zones, I would encourage members here who have an interest, as well as any growers, to go to the PIRSA website. Certainly, they are welcome to contact the hotline as well to get further advice to see what is allowed. But we need to remember that restrictions on movement are to stop the spread of fruit fly. Surely, we all want to stop the spread of fruit fly. It's in no-one's interests to enable a further spread of fruit fly, so I would encourage everyone to become familiar with what the requirements are and if it's unclear to reach out to PIRSA for further advice.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Supplementary.

The PRESIDENT: Supplementary question arising from the original answer, and this will be the last one because I really want to move on.

FRUIT FLY

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:13): Can the minister inform the chamber whether the national protocols allow for the movement of donated or giveaway fruit within red zones or across suspension zones?

The PRESIDENT: Minister, a brief answer, please.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:13): I am happy to take that on notice and provide a specific response.

The Hon. N.J. Centofanti interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Dennis Hood doesn't need your encouragement, leader.

The Hon. N.J. Centofanti interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

BAIL VIOLATIONS

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:14): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking questions of the Attorney-General regarding bail violations in South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: Recently, members would be aware that *The Advertiser* reported that it has discovered a secret online Nazi group chat whereby accounts in the names of senior National Socialist Network figures from that network appear to be communicating despite specific bail conditions ruling that out.

Although the former group chats on the Telegram program that they are using ceased operating following the bail conditions being imposed by the magistrate, following the investigations by *The Advertiser*—and kudos to them for discovering this—the investigations have found that a new Telegram chat subsequently emerged featuring accounts using pseudonyms of the various members. To put it simply: the point is that the chats appear to have continued in breach of the specific bail conditions. My questions to the Attorney are:

1. How has adherence to the bail conditions by these members been monitored—and if the Attorney doesn't want to answer on the specific case more generally, does the Attorney have confidence that these methods are adequate in light of the evidence that has been found by *The Advertiser*?

2. What action has been taken by the state government in response to the discoveries made by *The Advertiser*, and what are they going to do to fix it?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:15): I thank the honourable member for his questions and his ongoing and sustained interest in community safety in South Australia. There are a number of elements to the questions that he has asked, in particular in relation to a couple of recent incidents we saw in South Australia.

I do acknowledge that we have not seen examples of the frequency and the extremism of behaviour we have seen interstate, but we did see earlier this year a couple of examples of those who espouse views of intolerance and hatred towards others that are completely at odds with the views of nearly all South Australians in what is a pretty tolerant and multicultural society.

This parliament has taken a pretty strong stance. We have banned things like the public display of Nazi symbols and Nazi salutes, and I understand that some of the actions that we saw last month saw those laws being used and people arrested for those sorts of behaviours. We are very clear as a parliament and I think as a society that this sort of behaviour won't be tolerated and is unacceptable.

The other parts to the question relate largely to making sure that when there are conditions placed on any person, particularly bail conditions about how people communicate with each other, how enforceable is it and what authorities do to enforce that. The law enforcement authorities are very proactive in monitoring these sorts of groups. They work very closely with their federal counterparts in monitoring these sorts of groups. But it is true that technology changes and evolves rapidly and that law enforcement agencies adapt to those circumstances.

We have seen very successfully in recent history law enforcement agencies from around the world using technology, particularly with the many Ironside arrests that have been made—with the AN0M tech messaging technology law enforcement were able to use to investigate and make those arrests. But it is an ever-developing field. Law enforcement agencies have shown a very strong ability to be able to adapt, to be able to change what they do as technology changes and emerges, but technology is changing more rapidly as time progresses so it is something law enforcement agencies are continuing to adapt to. I think that was one of the questions.

I have confidence in our law enforcement agencies, in what they do and how they go about detecting and monitoring breaches of the law, and breaches of bail conditions are breaches of the law.

BAIL VIOLATIONS

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:18): Supplementary: I thank the Attorney for his answer. Is the Attorney concerned or would he like to comment on the fact that this appears to have been discovered by a news outlet rather than by the relevant authorities?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:18): I think the honourable member would understand that I am not going to comment on a particular case that may well be subject to further investigation, but certainly it is the case that law enforcement come by information in a whole variety of ways, whether they be tip-offs from others or whether others have seen or detected something. I have every confidence that they do what they can to keep up with evolving technologies—as I say, as we saw with the AN0M messaging app—and then enforce the laws as they stand.

CONNECTING COMMUNITIES EVENTS PROGRAM

The Hon. M. EL DANNAWI (15:19): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Would the minister update the chamber about the Connecting Communities Events program announced as part of the government's drought support package last year?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:19): I thank the honourable member for her question. As members in this chamber would be aware, the government is currently administering a drought support package, announced last November. The package offers a range of assistance to primary producers in South Australia affected by drought. I am extremely pleased to report on how this initiative has been taken up thus far by our farming communities, indicating that the support package is hitting the mark, whilst of course also acknowledging that farming communities and individual farm businesses continue to experience very challenging conditions.

The state government's drought support package includes the following measures: $5 million for the on-farm drought infrastructure rebate scheme, which provides rebates of up to $5,000 to cover 75 per cent of the total cost of infrastructure activities that either assist in the management of dry conditions or increase preparedness for drought. Some examples of projects that may be funded include the setting up of stock containment areas, the purchase and installation of water systems for irrigation, or the adoption of technologies for drought management.

We have allocated $2 million to assist charities to cover the costs to transport donated fodder to assist farmers with feeding livestock. This rebate has been well subscribed by various charities, which have been doing charity hay runs over the last couple of months, with the support of the government. Of note were the Australia Day hay runs by Aussie Hay Runners and Need for Feed, as I think I spoke about in the last sitting week.

We also allocated an additional $1 million for additional health and wellbeing support through family and business mentors and rural financial counsellors. This is particularly important as drought conditions can have a very detrimental impact on mental health in farming communities, and the government wants to ensure that support is available.

Finally, we set up the Connecting Communities Events program, which provides grants for industry, community, not-for-profit, local government and incorporated groups to host events that foster social connections, provide wellbeing support, share experiences and reinforce the unity and the strength of rural areas.

I am very pleased to acknowledge some of the very notable events that have been held with the support of funding from the Connecting Communities Events Grant. One was the event held on 14 December 2024 at Victoria Park in Jamestown. It was hosted by the Jamestown Apex Club and was called '24 Drought—Resilience at its Best'. It was a free community event, I am advised, with activities for all ages, live entertainment and free meals provided by Smokin Grillers, which I understand do tasty barbeque treats.

I am advised that the event focused on 'strengthening community resilience by fostering a supportive environment focused on mental health, wellbeing and drought assistance'. I am told the event included interactive sessions, which ran from 4.30 to 6pm, and there were three concurrent sessions to choose from: cheese, champagne and chitchat; fun and games for kids, being laser tag, jumping castles, face painting and train rides; and finally, B&B, which was held in the shearing shed, with large games and live entertainment.

From 6.30 onwards the communal meal was served, followed by live entertainment from local artists, with the footy clubroom serving as a movie theatre for children with beanbags, popcorn and fairy floss. There were 900 attendees on the day, and by all accounts the event was a very big success. It really aligned very well with the spirit of the government's community events grant, bringing families and communities together, with activities to appeal to everyone, with mental health and wellbeing support available on the night.

My department, PIRSA, is also partnering with Primary Producers SA to run an event to screen *Just a Farmer* in April to raise funds for the Rural Business Support Relief Fund. The movie follows the main character, Alison, a recently widowed mother of two who is left to care for her father-in-law, who is struggling with alcoholism, and for her to attempt to turn around the failing family farm. The movie sheds light on the mental health struggles within Australian farming communities, which may often not be spoken about.

PIRSA has received a large number of applications for the Connecting Communities Events Grant by community groups, and I look forward to the rollout of further community events in the coming months.

LIV GOLF

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:24): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question without notice to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing on the topic of LIV Golf and the Adelaide Parklands.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Yesterday, I asked the minister about the proposal to move LIV Golf to the North Adelaide Golf Course within the Parklands. At this stage, there is no publicly available information on the scope of the proposal or potential changes that might be required to legislation impacting on the Parklands, nor is there any information on how this plan will impact the community and the local council. In her response to my question, the minister suggested I, and I quote, knock on the Premier's door and have a conversation about the plans. I indicated that I would, of course, revisit the issue. My questions to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing therefore are:

1. Has the minister now had an opportunity to have a briefing from the Premier on this proposal for the redevelopment of the golf course on the Parklands?

2. Can the minister provide more detail on what is envisaged? In particular, will there be permanent fencing around the course; how many trees will be removed; will the fee structure remain the same for the golf course, or will those using the golf course be forced to pay a higher fee; and if the minister hasn't sought a briefing from the Premier, will she seek a briefing from the Hon. Connie Bonaros or the Hon. Sarah Game, because they seem to know all about it?

The Hon. C. Bonaros interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:25): I will be disappointed if we don't finish question time the same way tomorrow.

The Hon. C. Bonaros interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: As I said yesterday, I don't think it would be appropriate for me to be responding on behalf of any honourable member in this chamber about conversations that they may or may not be having. As I stated yesterday, LIV Golf is a significant major event in South Australia, one that brings many into our community and has great benefit for not only our local businesses but for future rising sporting stars to be able to be a part of something.

I know the Premier has had conversations with the council. I know there have been indications that there could be legislative requirement changes, but that is also not a certainty. This is very early in the development stages—very, very early. It was only just on the weekend that this

commitment was made, so it is early times. I really do encourage—I am happy to organise a briefing with myself and to get more information about this for the honourable member, if that is what he would so desire.

Matters of Interest

WHYALLA STEELWORKS

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:27): Unless you live under a rock, you would know by now that GFG is no longer running the Whyalla Steelworks and the associated mines. I am on record when it comes to manufacturing: we need to make it here and we need to make it well. Certainly today has a sense of deja vu for me—if it does not for anyone else here—as someone who has previously been involved with administrations in Whyalla. It certainly would have a sense of deja vu for everybody who lives and works in the town of Whyalla and surrounds.

The South Australian government has stepped in. The steelworks is now in the hands of an administrator. What does that mean? The point of that is to continue operations and to explore a possible sale to a new owner. That is a very significant step, and not one that we take lightly. This is really all about the long-term future of Whyalla. There is a huge economic opportunity for the Upper Spencer Gulf, and we have to make sure that that is realised.

During the administration it is very clear—and it is important that we make clear—that workers and contractors will continue to do their job and will continue to be paid, with the benefit of a government guarantee. KordaMentha is the administrator, a very experienced administrator, one that I have worked with in the past, with a solid track record of ably operating the Whyalla Steelworks.

Early and proactive steps will be taken by this government, the state government, and the administrator to stabilise operations and to explore a possible sale to a new owner in a way that, very importantly, keeps the assets together and keeps the steelworks operational.

Whyalla is fundamentally critical to Australian steel. It is one of only two Australian steelworks. It produces 75 per cent of Australia's structural steel, and it is the only domestic producer of long-steel products. Steel from Whyalla is how Australia is able to build things. What kind of things? Well, we can build and maintain infrastructure, like railways, high-rise towers, housing, wind farms, transmission, bridges, defence, hospitals—you name it, Australian steel can be in it.

Whyalla steel is present in big infrastructure projects, from the Optus Stadium in Perth to the Western Sydney Airport, the Rail Link to the Cross River Rail project in Brisbane. Without Whyalla steel Australia would rely on steel from overseas amid a deteriorating strategic environment and indeed a national housing crisis.

I have been on record before as quoting that the simple truth is that if you want to play a relevant role on the international stage and you cannot make complex things you will walk away empty handed, and if you cannot make complex things you cannot respond effectively to a crisis, be it a pandemic, a military incursion or global warming. This is not an ideological matter, it is a practical one. If the mining sector collapses or if there is a trade war and China stops taking our agricultural products, then what?

That was said 10 years ago, and boy howdy is that not relevant today? It is my belief when it comes to manufacturing that it is not like other sectors. If you look at pharmaceuticals, that is a sector. If you look at agriculture, that is a sector. You can look at mining and that is a sector. Manufacturing is a capability, and the more manufacturing you have the more capable you are. In a world that has so many crises going on right now that affect working people in this country, it has never been more important that we have the capability provided by manufacturing to be able to respond to those crises.

It has never been more important that steps, like we are seeing today, are taken to make sure we can continue to do exactly that. This will not be the last step taken in regard to what we are seeing in Whyalla. In fact, I know right now that the Premier will be winging his way to Whyalla to make further announcements about how we are going to support the people who live and work there. This is a huge step we have taken today. I really hope to see everyone get behind it and everyone support it. Let's make sure that we continue to make it here and make it well.

AUSTRALIAN SOCCER

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:32): For those of you who did not notice, last week a hurricane, a tornado, a whirlwind—I do not know quite how to describe it—ripped into Adelaide, spanning from West Beach to Oakden. I do not know how anybody could have possibly missed it but, for those who did, that tornado was led by child soccer ball breaker Mary B, her president Michael, and their posse of soccer players, parents, coaches and supporters from the Victorian Fawkner Soccer Club, who were here at the invitation of our amazing and equally impressive and talented Adelaide City Football Club for a preseason soccer tournament.

I am not sure Angelo and Ricky from AFC knew what they were getting into, but I have to say it was hard not to get caught up in what turned out to be an absolutely awesome weekend of soccer fun between the two clubs. The relationship between Fawkner and Adelaide City dates back some 25 years, and the two clubs share strikingly similar origins of dedicated post-war Italian immigrants with a passion for football looking to create a community hub and a shared sense of belonging.

The longstanding connection between the two was reignited last October as Fawkner hosted travelling Adelaide City under 15 boys' and girls' teams for a friendly match at the club's ground 30 minutes north of the Melbourne CBD. I have had the pleasure of visiting that club in Melbourne several times now, and I am truly impressed with the inclusive community spirit of the club. Partnerships like this highlight the powerful impact of local community sporting groups in terms of getting young people active and healthy whilst maintaining a shared sense of cultural origins, identity and engagement with their broader communities. Both clubs are absolutely fantastic examples of progressive sporting clubs committed to using their rich legacies and influence to empower participation in sport, especially female participation in sport in both cases.

Fawkner is particularly proud of its dedication to inclusivity and equality, having developed an extensive guide to their soccer program, established as a means of creating a welcoming and supportive environment for women to thrive in sport. The club staff provided much more eloquent reasoning that I ever could about the adoption of their program, stating:

> The addition of the Women's Soccer Program at Fawkner…has been a transformative chapter in the club's storied history since 1967. By embracing gender diversity and providing a platform for women to excel in soccer, the club has strengthened its ties to the community, contributed to the advancement of women's sports, and cemented [its] legacy as a progressive and inclusive sporting institution.

There can be no doubt that we have seen a social and societal shift in terms of Australia's engagement with women's sport in particular. We have all watched our Matildas with glee—at least those of us who follow soccer—but it is hard not to get caught up in all that hype. To see clubs like Fawkner and Adelaide continue to support initiatives that aim not just to bring the numbers closer together but also to increase the size of their female participation is genuinely worthy of praise.

Of course, it would be remiss of me not to reflect on what has been a similarly stellar history for Adelaide City in SA, a club that has singlehandedly produced the third most Socceroos of any original NFL club—some 55 Socceroos from memory—with alumni including the much-venerated John Aloisi, whose name, I know, will serve to conjure up some of the happiest memories for supporters of soccer in Australia.

A visit to the club's trophy room exemplifies just how long and rich a history they have, and it was great to be there when the first ever trophy between the two clubs was taken out of that cupboard and dusted off for this most recent tournament.

We have spent a lot of time talking about the positives of sport, about getting kids off devices. Clearly, I always speak to things because they have a point, and clubs like these need our support. They cannot do it alone. If we truly want to help our kids get off devices and out of their homes doing things that are healthy, playing sport, then we absolutely need to be doing everything we can to support the initiatives and good work of clubs like Adelaide FC here and Fawkner FC in Victoria.

CIVICS AND CITIZENSHIP STUDENT RESULTS

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON (15:37): I rise today to speak about the alarming deterioration in Australian students' civics and citizenship proficiency. According to exam results released

yesterday, in 2024 students performed worse than in any other year since the Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA) began testing in 2004.

Whilst this news is concerning, what is worse is that South Australian students have ranked among the worst in the nation for basic understanding of civics. These results show how the Albanese government is failing young Australians when it comes to education. According to ACARA's media release, there has been a significant decline in the percentage of students achieving a proficient standard in civics and citizenship, with only 28 per cent of year 10 students meeting the standard in 2024 compared to 38 per cent during the last testing cycle in 2019.

The Advertiser reported that only 38 per cent of year 6 students in South Australia managed to achieve the national proficiency standard or higher. This was a fall from 43 per cent in 2019 and 55 per cent in 2016. That number was even lower in the older cohort, with just 19 per cent of year 10 students achieving the national proficiency standard or higher, falling from 29 per cent in 2019 and 34 per cent in 2016. It was the second worst rate in the country, coming just above the Northern Territory.

These abysmal results have exposed a worrying trend that is going from bad to worse. The writing has been on the wall, and calls to address this issue are not new. Not only has there been a failure to course correct, but the decline in test results has rapidly accelerated in the last five years. ACARA's 2024 test results represent the last of a long line of wake-up calls that young Australians are failing to grasp fundamental principles underlying our democracy and institutions. Students are leaving school without the essential values, knowledge and skills needed to uphold our system of governance and way of life.

In a world where ideological conflicts persist, it is more crucial than ever for young Australians to understand the historical significance of democratic values, the key characteristics of our government and their impact on our national identity. We must prioritise fostering critical thinking in the next generation, ensuring they are articulate, engaged and informed about the decisions that shape their futures. A healthy democracy depends on informed and active citizens who question, who challenge and who hold leaders to account.

Civics education must be given the attention it deserves to strengthen our democratic institutions and empower students to become active, informed citizens—citizens who understand the impact of political decisions on their lives and can make well-informed choices about who should lead their communities. The strength of Australian democracy relies on future generations embracing its core principles. It is essential that we preserve the rich legacy entrusted to us by those who came before us, many of whom made sacrifices to protect our freedoms.

Democracy is not a given; it is a system that requires constant vigilance, participation and protection. History has shown that even stable democracies can erode when people become complacent, disengaged or take their freedoms for granted. The rights and liberties we enjoy today can just as easily be lost if we fail to uphold them. May we never forget that the price of freedom is eternal vigilance, and may we never take our democracy for granted.

NUCLEAR POWER

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (15:41): I would like to talk today about federal opposition leader Peter Dutton's nuclear power delusion. It is a delusion that took 18 months to announce and, frankly, it was not a particularly good announcement, even after that time. There was not a great deal of modelling done, there was no legal path examined and, most importantly, the costings are incredibly, incredibly rubbery.

The federal Coalition's nuclear policy is self-labelled as a cheaper, cleaner and more consistent energy plan, but in reality it is none of those things at all. In their announcement, the Coalition said Australian taxpayers and businesses will save up to 44 per cent on their energy bills with nuclear energy. That is another delusion—a big one. There is a series of articles by RenewEconomy, which actually tells us why those costings are not worth the paper they are printed on. Four big accounting tricks, they say, have been used in these calculations, and I refer to RenewEconomy dated Wednesday 19 February 2025.

The first of those points states it does not reflect the real cost of building nuclear, and the Liberal Party's costing assumes a cost for nuclear power plants 'which is around half what nuclear reactors have actually cost to build'. It only considers electricity costs while ignoring the cost of petrol and gas in calculating the cost of the Liberal Party's announcement, but it does include the cost of petrol and gas when it calculates the price for Labor's electricity policy. It is a little bit difficult to understand how you could take it out of one and put it into the other and still have a relatively safe costing proposal. Point 3 states:

> Tries to hide the cost of replacing old coal power stations with nuclear to outside the time period covered by the costing. The costing only includes costs incurred between 2025 and 2051…

Anything beyond that point is absolutely ignored by the costing documents. It further states:

> Under the costing of the Liberal-National Party's scenario they've pushed most of the costs of replacing old coal power stations to outside the 2025-2051 time period.

It also assumes that climate change is not an important and urgent problem. The people who costed it for the Liberal Party said quite clearly that there is available economic data that could take into consideration the future cost of climate change, but they have decided to ignore it in the costing paper that they did for the Liberals.

Acting President, you do not have to actually take RenewEconomy or even me as a veritable font of information on this, because we can actually turn to Senator Matt Canavan, a former cabinet minister and leading climate change denying voice, from the Coalition's right flank. He does not like renewable energy, but he believes his colleagues are not serious about nuclear energy. Matt Canavan said it 'ain't the cheapest form of power' and that Dutton is promoting it 'because it fixes a political issue for us'.

You can turn to Christopher Pyne—from the Liberals' moderate wing, fast diminishing though it is, and a senior minister under three Liberal prime ministers—writing in Nine newspapers last month. I am advised that he argued compellingly that a nuclear power plant would never be commissioned if the opposition was elected but, in what he described as good news for Dutton, suggested it was unlikely this reality would dawn on most people before the election. Cynicism has never been something people have accused Chris Pyne of, but I have to say that he speaks a real truth when he talks about the Dutton Liberal opposition never actually wanting to deliver on its energy plan.

One big problem I see with the nuclear delusion that Peter Dutton has put forward, however, is that it actively assumes that nuclear power plants are running consistently to, as he says, provide base load, which means they are pushing energy into the grid constantly all the time, which means they have to turn off rooftop solar so that it is not overloading the grid. Quite frankly, about two-thirds of Australians have rooftop solar or are intending to install solar plus batteries down the track. They have invested their own money in putting solar on their roofs and now they are going to be told by the Liberal Party at a national level, 'Vote for us and we'll turn off your solar and you won't get any roof rebates back into the grid.'

A number of people on some of the old rebate schemes are getting quite a bit in return for their investment in rooftop solar. Those of us who came to it later are getting less. Nonetheless, we are getting refunds for the electricity we push back into the grid. The Liberals are telling us they are going to stop that, they are going to make us pay higher electricity prices for nuclear energy and they are going to stop us using rooftop solar and getting our rebate. I think that is one delusion going far too far.

REGIONAL CHILDCARE SERVICES

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:46): I rise today to speak about the childcare crisis facing regional South Australian families and communities. We know that children develop confidence and build invaluable skills in their first five years of life and that high-quality early learning gives children the best possible start. Lack of access to child care in regional South Australia is stifling the economic development and potential of our regional communities and hampering the wellbeing of children and families across much of our state.

A childcare desert is defined as a populated area where there are more than three children competing for every childcare place. Data from Victoria University's Mitchell Institute shows that 21 per cent of South Australia is considered a childcare desert, with many families in regional areas having virtually no access to child care at all. For example, the Mitchell Institute's data shows that on Eyre Peninsula there are 0.2 childcare places per child, meaning that there are five children for every one childcare place available. Families in Loxton and surrounds face almost endless waiting lists for child care, with 0.02 places per child, which is equal to 50 children per available childcare place.

The challenges faced by regional communities are very concerning. Parents are forced to drive long distances to drop off their children at care centres, have to rely on family and friends to provide care, or simply have to step back from their work and careers to care for their children. It should not be forgotten that women are predominantly impacted by childcare shortages, with data showing that areas with lower access to child care also have lower levels of workforce participation for women who have a child aged under five years.

In December last year, 23 councils across South Australia came together to form the Regional Childcare Desert Advocacy Project, calling for equitable access to childcare services in regional and remote areas of our state. The project has launched a social media campaign to highlight the critical childcare shortage across most of our regions and the flow-on impacts this has for families, businesses and communities.

I would like to briefly share some of the stories that have been highlighted in this campaign to demonstrate this wide-reaching issue. Verity, from Orroroo, has three children under six and cannot return to full-time teaching, with only a visiting care service and limited hours in her town. She constantly has to turn down requests for relief teaching work and says that she feels isolated and misses the interaction she gets from work.

Jessica is a paramedic from Cummins who drives to Port Lincoln for work. Jessica had to wait over two years for a childcare place and even then was only offered one day a week. She said returning to work full-time after having two children, now aged three and six, had been impossible and finding carers to help out is a constant juggle.

Gabby is a nurse based on Eyre Peninsula but had to give up regular shifts because there was no child care available. She can now only work on weekends or during school holidays when family members can help. She and many other health professionals are desperately needed but are forced to take a step back from their work due to the lack of childcare options.

While child care is predominantly under the federal jurisdiction, there are pathways for the state government to do more to support regional families and increase access in these so-called deserts. The state government delivers rural care programs to provide care for children in communities with limited options. The RCDAP is calling for increased funding for the rural care program run by the state government to enable more places in these settings.

The government has also recently provided funding of $500,000 towards a new early learning centre in Naracoorte through the Thriving Regions—Enabling Infrastructure Program. This is a fantastic initiative that could be replicated in other areas where the childcare needs of the community are simply not being met.

I wish to thank the 23 councils involved in the Regional Childcare Desert Advocacy Project, and everyone who has participated. I am looking forward to seeing more support from the state government that can make a significant difference in the lives of children and families across our state.

MIGRANT WOMEN

The Hon. M. EL DANNAWI (15:51): Last Thursday, I had the pleasure of hosting an Arabic-speaking women's group from the Multicultural Communities Council of South Australia for a leadership workshop and tour of the parliament. The participants were newly arrived migrant women from the Middle East, particularly Lebanon, Syria, Jordan and Egypt.

Moving to a new country to start a new life is not an easy decision. It takes courage and sacrifice. In some cases, the individual is left with no other choice but to flee their homeland for safety

and a better future. As I reflect back on my journey as a newly arrived migrant and draw on my experience, I can relate to their enthusiasm but also to their concerns about what the future will look like, so to be able to share with them my journey and give them a glimpse of hope or empowerment was an absolute privilege.

Bringing different groups into the parliament, showing them around and talking to them about what we do here is one of my favourite parts of my job, and this group was particularly special to me. I said in my first speech in this place that migrants have a lot to offer this country, but in return we must make sure they have the opportunity to reach their full potential. This is something I will continue to speak about and advocate for.

The participants I met last week are all professionals in their fields of study and hold years of experience. They are eager to fully participate in the economic and social life and to contribute to the new land they will now call home. These women, these professionals, deserve a chance at working in their field of expertise, not in jobs that just help them make ends meet.

The day started with a tour of the parliament, exploring the halls and the two chambers, and was followed by a presentation explaining the government system in Australia and a robust discussion about what leadership means to us. At every stage of the tour I was inspired by their curiosity, intelligence and desire to learn about our system in Australia.

The process of migration can be alienating and new migrants arrive in Australia with their own personal experience of government in their home country. It is important that these groups understand that this parliament is the people's house and that includes them. They have a place here, as do all South Australians.

I want to take a moment to thank and acknowledge the education team here at parliament, whose work has ensured that we have information about our system available in over 30 different languages. I also want to take this opportunity to congratulate MCCSA on their Flourishing in Australia program, which I believe is making a real difference in the lives of new migrants, and I wish them all the best for the rest of their program.

I would also like to take this opportunity to wish all these intelligent, wonderful women all the best in the settlement process. I have no doubt they will overcome any challenge they will face and flourish in every aspect of their life, be it personal or professional.

STATE CORONER'S OFFICE

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:54): What I am about to reveal will shock South Australians and it must lead to an urgent investigation into the egregious conduct inside the office of the South Australian Coroner. It starts with the tragedy and travesty of South Australia's forgotten man. You would never have heard of Steven John Maple, who also went by the alias of Steven Burns. He was a son, a brother, a lost, tortured and troubled soul for most of his adult life, leaving him estranged from his family who had done all they could to help him. There is a sister, Michelle Gibson, living in Perth and an elderly father, Rodney, in the Riverland.

Steven lived a meagre existence in the government-run Barwell apartment housing complex. He was well known to police through his challenges with mental health and alcohol and substance abuse, a loner who was often seen wandering the streets and was under a significant NDIS care package of more than $300,000. Despite his circumstances, he did have family who still cared for him. After all, Steven was a human being, one who lost his way in life through no fault of his own.

It is shameful and a disgrace that South Australia Police, the Coroner's office, the Public Trustee, the NDIS and his providers did not care about Steven when he died. He was found heavily intoxicated by his carer, collapsed on a Norwood street, on 15 November 2023, clutching a bottle of iced coffee and a bottle of vodka, with some possessions. His carer took him back to his Glenside unit. He was found dead in his bed the following day. An ambulance that was called never came.

What followed next is a scandalous case study in incompetence, carelessness and system failure by all those agencies. It highlights the very serious problems with the Coroner's office and the way it is handling cases of deceased persons. Just how many other Steven Maple cases are there?

In Steven's case, it took more than nine months for his next of kin, his father, to be notified of his passing, even though the authorities knew who he was. The Coroner's office lied to the family about that and other information they had collected. Steven's father was initially told by police that his remains had been buried. Then he was told the remains were still in a forensic science unit morgue. He wanted to view his son's body. They told him and his sister, Michelle, they could not because decomposition was so bad that the remains were mouldy and unidentifiable. It distressingly compounded their grief. They asked to see photographs of Steven taken at the external examination when he died, but they were told there were not any. Michelle says the red flags went up. How could they be sure the remains were even Steven's given the conflicting information they had received?

There were unexplained anomalies with Steven's toxicology report and whether a full autopsy was carried out. Michelle turned detective to uncover the truth about what really had happened. She requested further DNA testing to prove to the funeral director that the remains to be collected were his. Again, bureaucratic obstacles were placed in her way, raising suspicion even further of a cover-up and bungling.

An independent laboratory Michelle wanted to use needed more samples—a piece of femur, a tooth and hair and nail clippings. The deputy manager of the Coroner's Court told her that no Forensic Science SA staff were trained or qualified to remove teeth or acquire DNA samples from teeth—incredulous.

The family refuses to collect him until they are convinced they belong to their loved one. Meanwhile, the Coroner's office is bullying the family to remove them or they will hand them to the Public Trustee. This threat has caused the family such great distress that this week they backed down and she was told they would facilitate further DNA testing with an independent laboratory.

They want answers, the truth, from all the agencies, including the NDIS, which needs to explain how they cared for Steven and how his considerable amount of money was spent. In desperation, Michelle wrote a lengthy letter to me seeking my assistance. I seek leave to table that letter and supporting documents.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: She closes with this plea:

We simply want the truth and we want to lay Steven to rest…now. He has been treated in death as he was in life. This is so very disrespectful.

Bills

HERITAGE PLACES (GREAT AUSTRALIAN BIGHT) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:00): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Heritage Places Act 1993 and to make related amendment to the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:01): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Australia is known for its beautiful and unique natural landscapes. From the Snowy Mountains, the Tablelands, the Great Ocean Road to the Red Centre, we really do have it all. One of these iconic Australian landscapes is the Great Australian Bight. It is where the desert meets the sea on the Yerkala Mirning country, and I want to acknowledge that First Nations people have cared for that land and sea country for over 65,000 years.

Containing one of the most pristine ocean environments left on earth and the longest continual sea cliffs—some 120 metres high—the Bight is a critical habitat for countless species and it holds sacred whale dreaming stories for the Mirning people. It is estimated that 85 per cent of the species that call the Great Australian Bight home are found nowhere else on earth. The Bight is a vital carving and gathering area for endangered southern right whales who gather there in winter,

and it can offer incredible whale watching from June to October. Once hunted to the brink of extinction, the whales are protected and their numbers are increasing.

Australian sea lions, also once hunted to the verge of extinction, find refuge in the Bight. Eighty per cent of the population live in the Bight. They dive for fish, squid, rock lobster and small sharks and rays. They rest and raise their young on the flat rocks that line the coast. These sea lions will swim up to five days with no rest to get to the Great Australian Bight. Leafy sea dragons shelter in kelp forests of the Great Southern Reef and camouflage as drifting seaweed. There are 36 species of dolphins and whales that can be found in the Bight. Imagine seeing a whole pod of dolphins playing in the waves or up to a hundred whales at once.

Along the coast, there is ancient rock art and caves that are sacred places for First Nations people. The Bight sustains wild fisheries and aquaculture industries that are worth around $440 million per year and a regional tourism industry worth $1.2 billion per year. But this is all under threat from oil exploration. The Great Australian Bight Alliance has noted that:

> The threats posed by opening the Bight to oil exploration are unacceptable. Not only is there potential for a catastrophic oil spill, the poorly understood effects of seismic testing, strike risk and noise pollution from drilling and boat traffic, and increased pollution have the potential to fundamentally disrupt this unique marine environment.

Industrialisation in the Bight is putting all that beauty at risk. There has been modelling done to show the potential impacts of an oil spill. I would encourage members to find this map for themselves on the Great Australian Bight Alliance's website. It shows the potential for an oil spill to contaminate the entire coast of South Australia, southern Western Australia, and reaching as far as Phillip Island in Victoria and the western coast of Tasmania. Of course, the biggest risk is the coastline along the Bight, including the iconic Bunda Cliffs.

Imagine almost every single beach in South Australia covered in oil. The impacts are not only felt by the unique ecosystems along these coasts but also right across our economy. It would be catastrophic for small coastal towns that rely on the Bight for their tourism, and this is what we are risking if we allow oil drilling in the Bight, which is why we need to protect the Bight in whatever ways we can.

There has been a long-running campaign for the Great Australian Bight to be put forward for consideration for World Heritage listing, and the Greens have been proud to be part of that campaign for many years now. Back when drilling on the Great Australian Bight was in prospect during my time in the federal parliament, I worked with Senator Nick Xenophon to establish a parliamentary inquiry into drilling in the Bight so that we could highlight the risks associated with that.

Earlier this month in the federal parliament, my federal colleague Senator Sarah Hanson-Young introduced a bill that would require the federal environment minister to nominate the Bight for consideration for World Heritage protection. This would protect this South Australian icon from oil and gas drilling forever. More than two-thirds of South Australians oppose drilling in the Bight, including the traditional owners.

I understand the South Australian government have previously indicated their support to the federal government for the Bight being submitted for World Heritage listing. I welcome that, but this is an opportunity for the Malinauskas government to put their money where their mouth is. We need to see state listing, we need to see national listing and then of course we need to see world listing of this iconic site.

Members will know that I am a strong advocate for adding iconic spaces such as this on to the heritage list. I have another bill before parliament that would add the Adelaide Parklands to the State Heritage Register. This was passed some time ago by this parliament. It was supported by the Labor Party when they were in opposition. When they found themselves back in government, they welched on that commitment, and I urge them to back listing for the Adelaide Parklands and of course the Great Australian Bight.

The bill I am introducing today would see the areas of the Bight that fall under state jurisdiction listed as a state heritage area. While the federal government continues to drag its heels for World Heritage listing, this bill offers the protection that we can have at a state level and would give the state government an opportunity to really show their support for the Bight. What a wonderful

thing it would be if we saw Premier Malinauskas listing the Bight in South Australia, if we saw Prime Minister Albanese—because God help us all if Peter Dutton ever finds his way into The Lodge in terms of what that means for the environment. It is my hope that we never see the Hon. Peter Dutton getting anywhere near The Lodge as he would be a disaster for our environment and our economy.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: It is my hope that what we see is Prime Minister Albanese and Premier Malinauskas working together to list the Great Australian Bight and to ensure that it gets the protection it deserves.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. I.K. Hunter.

Motions

HYDROGEN POWER PLANT

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (16:08): I move:

1. That a select committee be established to inquire into the government's election promise to deliver a hydrogen power plant, with particular reference to:
   - (a) major commitments within the Hydrogen Jobs Plan, including, but not limited to, the generators, hydrogen electrolysers, storage options;
   - (b) costings of key elements of the Hydrogen Jobs Plan, including operational and capital costs;
   - (c) timeline of the deliverables identified within the Hydrogen Jobs Plan, including current progress;
   - (d) the quantity, price and timing of hydrogen required to supply industry, and the viability of any alternative sources of energy;
   - (e) what is the best use of hydrogen produced by electrolysis, if any, at this stage of its development;
   - (f) investigating the challenges hydrogen power projects across Australia, and the world, are experiencing;
   - (g) what is the full cost and activities undertaken by the Office for Hydrogen Power SA; and
   - (h) any other related matters.
2. That this council permits the select committee to authorise the disclosure or publication, as it sees fit, of any evidence or documents presented to the committee prior to such evidence being presented to the council.

I rise today to call for the establishment of a select committee to investigate the government's election promise to deliver a hydrogen power plan. This is not just about one project; it is about accountability, about transparency and about ensuring that South Australians are not paying the price for a government's mismanagement and a broken promise.

This was a flagship commitment of the Malinauskas Labor government during the 2022 state election—one of two major commitments, both of which they are failing on. The hydrogen plan was sold to South Australians as a game changer: lower power prices, economic growth and a bright future in renewable energy. Instead, it has become a costly farce. Labor's only energy policy from the last state election has now been exposed as little more than an expensive vanity project of the Premier.

We are deeply concerned about the money that has already been spent on this project. Millions of taxpayer dollars have been poured into bureaucrats' salaries, feasibility studies and overseas trips, yet there has been no tangible progress. The government promised an 8 per cent reduction in power prices. Instead, South Australians are struggling with some of the highest electricity prices in the nation. They promised the project would be delivered by 2025, yet here we are in 2025 and there has barely been a shovel in the ground. People are beginning to question if

South Australian green hydrogen will ever actually happen, despite an inflated agency, the Office of Hydrogen Power South Australia.

We are not alone in our concerns. Across the world, hydrogen projects are failing to stack up. It is becoming increasingly clear that this government has dropped the ball on Whyalla whilst continuing to push their fanciful hydrogen election commitment at the expense of real, immediate energy solutions. This select committee is necessary because after six months of questioning this government has failed to provide answers. Forty-five questions remain unanswered from the September 2024 Budget and Finance Committee hearing. If the government have nothing to hide, then they should have absolutely no issue with this parliamentary inquiry. The select committee will investigate:

- the major commitments within the Hydrogen Jobs Plan, including generators, electrolysers, and storage options;
- the costings—both operational and capital—of this project;
- the timeline for deliverables and the current progress;
- the quantity, price and viability of hydrogen supply;
- the challenges faced by hydrogen power projects across Australia and the world; and
- the full costs and activities of the Office of Hydrogen Power South Australia.

This is about getting to the truth. The people of South Australia deserve transparency on how their money is being spent. Let me be clear: this is not about Whyalla. Everyone in this chamber understands the importance of maintaining Australia's sovereignty in steel manufacturing. The real issue here is that this government has tied the fortunes of Whyalla to a hydrogen dream that is now quickly turning into a nightmare. They promised one thing before the election and are now scrambling to shift blame and avoid scrutiny. Meanwhile, businesses and contractors in Whyalla are being left in the lurch.

If they truly care about the future of Whyalla, it is absolutely critical that the government commit to this select committee. We cannot allow this farce to continue. This government must be held accountable, and that is why we are introducing this motion to establish a committee as swiftly as possible, and we do hope we have government support on this committee. It is time to shine a light on this hydrogen hoax and ensure that South Australians get the answers that they deserve. I commend this motion to the chamber.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. I.K. Hunter.

MORAL TEACHINGS

The Hon. S.L. GAME (16:12): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises that parents are in charge of the moral and ethical teachings of children;
2. With regard to moral and ethical teachings, notes there is growing dissatisfaction within the community about overreach by government and schools, and concerns that too much power has been handed over to government and schools;
3. Acknowledges that issues around gender fluidity should be absent from school curriculums; and
4. Calls on the Minister for Education to guarantee that topics like incest and bestiality are never again delivered as part of an SA school curriculum, as was seen at Renmark High School last year.

The state government recently released its list of three approved service providers that are charged with the responsibility of delivering sex education programs in public schools in 2025. Included on this list was SHINE SA, which previously delivered the ill-fated Safe Schools program in South Australia.

The government's announcement of its approved service providers included a reassurance that what happened at Renmark High School last year 'can't happen again'. To refresh members' memories, in March last year a class of year 9 students were exposed to concepts like bestiality and

incest during a sexual education class. These girls' parents were not notified about the session's content beforehand. They were blindsided by it. The session upset some of the children and, naturally, some of the parents.

As I said in Riverland media last week, the Education and Children's Services (Parental Primacy) Amendment Bill introduced to this chamber last year would prevent a repeat of that outrageous incident at Renmark High School. My bill would ensure that parents and families remain responsible for imparting core values such as morals and ethics on developing minds, and that teachers stick to teaching the facts.

It would also ensure that curricula, syllabuses, and courses of instruction at all levels of schooling are free of gender fluidity teaching, given this doctrine is not 'evidence-based', to quote one of the terms used by the education minister last week. This bill completely removes gender fluidity from the curriculum in South Australian schools. This is not a right-wing view; this is a responsible view and the position, I believe, of the overwhelming majority who currently feel browbeaten into keeping quiet on the matter.

A 2024 *Advertiser* poll showed overwhelming support for this bill, with 80 to 90 per cent of the over 600 respondents agreeing that parents should be in charge of guiding their children on these moral and ethical matters. If a child is feeling confused about their sex, let the school be guided by their parents.

It is wrong that the current system allows parents to be excluded from these discussions and for the school to take control. Let children be who they are. Why are we encouraging children to think about what sort of sex partner they might be and who they might want to have sex with at this age? This is not the role of schools. Schools need to focus on engendering ambition and developing confidence in our young people.

We do have a sex confusion pandemic occurring in our schools, and that is what parents and principles are telling me in confidence. I have heard from many South Australian parents who are deeply concerned about what is being taught to their children. Now more than ever people are starting to stand up and question what they have been told to accept, rebelling against this government overreach. Those pushing their political ideology and agenda have no place in our schools.

My bill requires schools to consult with parents before sex education courses are delivered, essentially moving away from a system that ignores family values. The government claims this approved provider system is a new approach aimed at preventing a repeat of the 2024 incident. That is not good enough for the vast majority of sensible, caring parents. Words and promises that these providers have gone through a rigorous process before being selected fail to restore parents' confidence in the system. They and their children deserve better and stronger measures.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. I.K. Hunter.

Bills

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (HEALTH AND SAFETY DUTIES) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. S.L. GAME (16:16): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Local Government Act 1999. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. S.L. GAME (16:17): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I rise in an attempt to restore democracy to South Australian councils. I do this by addressing the misuse of section 75G of the Local Government Act, which has seen the Lord Mayor of Adelaide and others of authority within local government quote 'health and safety' to ban people from speaking, to effectively gag them. This is part of a wider phenomenon, often cunningly accompanied by words like 'misinformation' and 'disinformation' that is nothing more than Big Brother's attempt to silence voices of dissent, that is, people who disagree with the establishment's accepted viewpoint.

Recent history shows that a number of South Australian councils have been making decisions that fail to reflect their community's views. I believe my amendments will allow councillors right across the state to have more of a say, better represent their communities and ensure councils are less likely to be dominated by mayors or other elected members with strong political leanings. These amendments may be specific, but they also aim to strike a long-overdue blow for freedom of speech in the local government sector.

The amendments to section 75G of the Local Government Act 1999 that I put forward today relate to the abuse and misuse of the health and safety trope, which is now being wielded as a blunt weapon to mute councillors merely attempting to do what they were elected to do: represent the views of their communities and ratepayers. In short, I wish to change the act to ensure councillors can speak up and speak out without fear of being physically removed from council chambers and therefore having their constituents' voices silenced by improper use of regulation 29.

In November last year, this regulation 29 tactic was deployed on Adelaide City Councillor Henry Davis, who was removed from the chamber for trying to defend the interests of small businesses in the Adelaide CBD. Using his allocated three minutes of speaking time—yes, a whole three minutes—Councillor Davis attempted to outline the concerns small business operators had about the impact of increased parking restrictions and the loss of parking spaces across the Adelaide CBD. Councillor Davis was speaking directly and clearly, in plain terms and with purpose; the kind of language and delivery that gets things done and which is commonplace in outcome-given workplaces.

How the following few minutes played out was extraordinary, and deeply concerning. I have watched the uncut video in its entirety, and I urge all members present to do likewise. I have since learned that a similar sequence of events has happened previously within Adelaide City Council. Clearly, Adelaide City Council Lord Mayor Jane Lomax-Smith has a deep-seated resentment of Councillor Davis, who was attempting to speak about his interactions with CBD traders.

This exchange—which was supposed to be a speech, minus any back-and-forth—ultimately led to Councillor Davis being forced to leave the chamber, unable to complete his response. His crime? Apparently his words and his delivery somehow represented a threat to the health and safety of those elected members present. This is not a joke.

In highlighting the views of Adelaide CBD traders he had spoken to, Councillor Davis was decreed by Dr Lomax-Smith, and enough of her fellow elected members, to be a threat to their health and safety. In reality, the mayor simply disliked the home truths that Councillor Davis was delivering to the chamber, his difference of opinion.

During the exchange that led to him being ejected from the building, Councillor Davis tried to reason with the Lord Mayor, and at no stage raised his voice nor used threatening or offensive language. In speaking to a motion about consulting with traders about car parking, Councillor Davis said:

> Issuing fines and making parking inconvenient doesn't just hurt businesses, it deters people from enjoying everything the city has to offer.

He urged the council to 'support your local businesses before it's too late'. Shortly afterwards, while attempting to continue speaking about the traders and their concerns, Councillor Davis was interrupted by the Lord Mayor, who warned that he was 'veering away from the motion'. Councillor Davis replied, 'You know what the motion is? It's about businesses being disrespected.' The Lord Mayor replied, 'Councillor, please don't lecture me.'

On it went, until Councillor Davis finally said, 'I know you don't want to hear it. I know other members don't want to hear it,' and then he was gone. As mentioned, this blatant misuse of section 75G under the existing Health and Safety Regulations means that Dr Lomax-Smith and others in positions of authority within local government can quote 'health and safety' to ban people from speaking.

Another recent example of this health and safety trope being weaponised against free speech occurred at the Yorke Peninsula Council, where police officer and elected member Councillor Adam Meyer was suspended for one month from council, without pay, for speaking his mind.

Councillor Meyer was also found to have breached health and safety regulations by sending emails to staffers. These emails were apparently, 'inappropriate, accusatory and/or antagonistic', however it has emerged that Councillor Meyer was merely requesting documents about the construction of a local road on private property. The local ratepayers' association has suggested that claims about employee health were used to deflect scrutiny of council operations.

Meanwhile, in the Adelaide Hills, One Nation candidate for the Mount Barker Council, Rebecca Hewett, was recently shut down in the council chambers after unsuccessfully attempting—on six occasions—to move a motion outlining community concern about council paying for a Sorry Day event on Australia Day. The incident came after Councillor Hewett created a Facebook poll asking the community if it supported council funding of the event on 26 January, with 85 per cent of respondents voting against the move.

Mayor David Leach requested her to 'immediately' take her poll down. Ms Hewett attempted to address the matter (including the mayor's order and the results of the poll) in the council chamber, leading to her effectively being silenced and the community's view going unheard.

Since these recent incidents my office has received other anecdotal examples of councillors being shut down, of councillors being unable to air the voices of ratepayers and community members. As members present would realise, this is bad for democracy. Further, in Councillor Davis's case, to have a democratically elected politician thrown out of council indefinitely, with the scarce requirement of just two letters, then facing legal action if they attempt to return, is scandalous.

The changes I have drafted would help prevent this dictatorial power from being exercised and shift responsibility for these decisions to an independent body, the Behavioural Standards Panel. Under subsection 4b the ability to suspend a councillor, or prevent them from carrying out their duties, would need to be based on credible evidence, rather than be at the whim of, in this case, a potentially spiteful mayor intent on stifling free speech.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Point of order: the honourable member has made a number of comments regarding the Lord Mayor of Adelaide which negatively impugn her character, and I see it being a breach of the standing orders.

The PRESIDENT: I am not inclined to support your point of order, but I will look at it. The Hon. Ms Game, if you could get to the substance of what your bill represents and then we will adjourn and move on.

The Hon. S.L. GAME: My amendments state that a direction to remove a councillor from the chamber or stop them from carrying out their duties cannot be given, and I quote:

> …merely on the ground of a member having engaged in political criticism, debate or disagreement with a council or council employee on policy or governance issues—unless the direction is based on credible evidence of harassment, threats, criminal or similar conduct…that gives rise to the health and safety of another member or employee of the council.

This is nothing but basic common sense. Clearly, Councillor Davis did not even come close to threatening anyone's health and safety, except perhaps affecting his own blood pressure. If any of the elected members feel unsafe due to robust debate and the contest of ideas, they have no place inside a council chamber.

I have built a number of checks and balances into these amendments, including the local government minister ensuring that complaints that might lead to a councillor being suspended are referred to the Behavioural Standards Panel, and that the councillor in question is given a chance to respond and that the response is considered within 10 business days, not shoved on the backburner as a further delaying tactic.

I consider this to be a matter of principle, and a straightforward one at that. At a time when the South Australian public's perception of councils has dipped to a low mark, we need to be seen to be ensuring that democracy is still alive at the grassroots level of government. Allowing political mayors to smite dissidents and run their own personal agendas is no way to rebuild that trust. There needs to be accountability, and that needs to be shifted in part to the local government minister whose responsibilities include ensuring the sector operates appropriately.

Therefore, I call on this chamber to support this amendment, help protect democracy at the local government level in South Australia and ensure that the voices of community members and long-suffering ratepayers are heard.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. I.K. Hunter.

Motions

WEST BEACH MARINE LIFE DEATHS

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. N.J. Centofanti:

That this council—

1. Notes the multiple and significant deaths of larvae and oyster spat at South Australia Research and Development Institute (West Beach) facility in October and November 2024;

2. Recognises also the significant deaths of both barramundi fingerlings and broodstock from an adjacent private business during the same period;

3. Notes that the operational phase of the Labor government's Adelaide Beach Management Review Implementation Project began on 3 October and ended on 30 November;

4. Acknowledges that internal pathology testing revealed no pathological explanation for the deaths; and

5. Calls on the Minister for Primary Industries to appoint an independent investigator to thoroughly examine all aspects of the fish deaths, including the private business and SARDI facility inlet pipe location, and any possible seawater quality impacts.

(Continued from 5 February 2025.)

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:27): I rise very briefly to indicate that we will be supporting this motion. The Greens certainly endorse the need for transparency and independence when it comes to ensuring that science, rather than sectional interests, guides our decision-making. It has certainly been something that we have raised questions about as well and we would like to see some answers for. This is a reasonably commonsense, straightforward motion that calls for that independent inquiry, and to take the politics out of the debate we think would be quite useful. With that, I commend the motion.

It has just come to my attention that there is a government amendment to this motion, so I would like to continue my comments given that I have not been replaced by another speaker. I note that the government, which gave us a lecture on Monday afternoon about circulating amendments well before we get to debate them, has circulated an amendment.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Alright.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I indicate that the Greens will not be supporting that particular amendment and note the lack of due process, that all members other than the government benches were given by the Government Whip on Monday afternoon.

I reiterate: contrary to the government's claims, there has been no evidence of a thorough investigation into fish mortalities. We have not been given any confirmation, and it certainly has not been an independent investigation. I think it is not only outrageous that the government has procedurally thrown in an amendment at the last minute but that the amendment in itself stands as unworthy of any support.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:29): I am not down to speak on this motion, but I will to indicate my support for the motion—and my opposition to the amendments—and everything that the Hon. Tammy Franks said.

The PRESIDENT: So really it was, 'What she said.'

The Hon. S.L. GAME (16:29): I rise in support of the Hon. Nicola Centofanti's motion for the Minister for Primary Industries to appoint an independent investigator to examine the significant marine life deaths during October and November at the South Australian Research and Development

Institute facility at West Beach and adjacent private businesses. I wholeheartedly agree with the honourable member that this is a matter of significant public interest, given the impact on marine ecosystems as well as the economic loss to private businesses and industry.

With no clear reason provided regarding the specific cause of these deaths, it is essential that an independent investigation be established to determine the possible causes and to hold parties accountable for any actions taken that directly contributed to this incident. The fact that these deaths remain unexplained should concern all South Australians. With laboratory reports obtained under FOI indicating the absence of any obvious pathogen, combined with suggestions that some type of 'unknown toxic insult' has occurred, the community and associated industry deserve a thorough investigation.

In the absence of any inquiry, the ongoing implication that the government's dredging trial at West Beach had a role in these deaths will continue. Consequently, it is a matter of urgency that these legitimate questions and concerns be appropriately resolved to satisfy all South Australians that the government has done all it can to discover the cause or causes behind this incident, even if this process of discovery implicates their own actions in this unprecedented death of marine life. With that, I support the honourable member's motion and commitment to the ongoing health of our marine ecosystems and the viability of commercial and recreational fisheries.

The Hon. T.T. NGO (16:31): I move to amend the motion as follows:

Leave out paragraph 5 and insert new paragraphs as follows:

5. Acknowledges the thorough investigation into the fish mortalities by SARDI has shown no direct evidence of being linked to dredging activity; and

6. Acknowledges the world class science and research conducted by SARDI and its aquatic sciences team who led the review into this event.

I want to start by acknowledging the credibility and professionalism of the science and research capability of SARDI. In fact, I am aware that many SARDI studies are published in scientific journals and undergo independent reviews to ensure their validity and accuracy. I have been informed that SARDI has a very good operational relationship with the private business that is co-located at their facility. In addition to this, I have also been informed that there have been no complaints about the work that SARDI has undertaken in relation to the fish mortality event or their investigation into it.

The state government further acknowledges that both internal and external pathology testing has shown no pathological explanation for the deaths. I am also told that SARDI's review of the incident has found no direct evidence between dredging and the fish mortalities that have occurred at the South Australian Aquatic Sciences Centre.

SARDI had every reason to ensure a proper investigation was carried out, as they were impacted by the fish mortalities through their snapper restocking program, a program in which they take great pride. The state government continues to work across agencies to understand the causes and to minimise the risk of any recurrence and has worked closely with the private business that has been impacted with the aim of ensuring that they can resume operations within their sites.

Finally, the calls from the mover of this motion for an independent review are unnecessary at this point. By amending this motion the state government is declaring its strong support for the world-class science and research capabilities at SARDI, and I hope honourable members support the amendment.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (16:35): Can I first thank the Hon. Tammy Franks, the Hon. Connie Bonaros and the Hon. Sarah Game for speaking in favour of this motion. I also want to acknowledge the Hon. Tung Ngo's contribution and sympathise that he drew the short straw.

The deaths of the fish and oyster stock at this facility have been extremely costly and will have a lasting impact. In monetary terms the cost alone is estimated in the tens of millions of dollars, and in terms of time the loss of POMS-resistant oyster spat is a massive setback after five years of research. Of course, the loss of juvenile snapper is also a major setback for the restocking program.

The private company located in this facility has also been affected, but can I say, too, so have the skilled and hardworking SARDI researchers. I absolutely appreciate and acknowledge the world-class science and research conducted at SARDI, but the member's amendment completely changes the intent of this motion, which is to ensure an inquiry is independent of government. SARDI is the state government's principal research institute, and whilst it has some highly skilled and experienced researchers the reality is that it is part of the Department of Primary Industries and Regions and therefore is not truly independent in the sense of the word.

So it will not come as any surprise that the opposition will not be supporting the amendment, and I am extremely encouraged that parliamentary colleagues feel the same way. It is absolutely critical that the government perform an independent investigation into these significant fish deaths. Government departments should not investigate themselves, nor should they investigate each other. In the interests of transparency and to prevent a recurrence of this loss it is imperative that it is investigated fully and that the investigation is carried out by an independent entity. With that, I commend the motion to the chamber.

Amendment negatived; motion carried.

MULTICULTURAL COMMUNITIES COUNCIL OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. J.S. LEE (16:39): I move:

That this council—

1. Congratulates the Multicultural Communities Council of South Australia (MCCSA) for reaching the significant milestone of its 50th anniversary in 2025;

2. Recognises MCCSA has been supporting migrant communities and people from culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) backgrounds since it was established in 1995 and that its foundations were laid in 1975;

3. Acknowledges that MCCSA is the peak organisation representing more than 120 multicultural organisations and delivers a wide range of programs to increase the capacity of its member organisations and advocate for the needs and aspirations of CALD organisations, communities and individuals;

4. Thanks the MCCSA Patron, the Hon. Hieu Van Le AC; Chairperson, Miriam Cocking; Chief Executive Officer, Helena Kyriazopoulos OAM; executive team members; board members; staff; and supporters for their dedication and contributions to serving and empowering the diverse multicultural community in South Australia; and

5. Commends MCCSA for its significant contributions toward enhancing multiculturalism and interculturalism in our state and for supporting all people from CALD backgrounds to realise their potential as active contributors to the economic, political, social and cultural life of South Australia.

It is a great honour to move this motion to congratulate the Multicultural Communities Council of South Australia on reaching the remarkable milestone of its 50th anniversary in 2025. For over 50 years, as a peak body for culturally and linguistically diverse communities, the MCCSA has continuously worked towards building an equitable, cohesive and thriving multicultural South Australia through its comprehensive support programs and by representing more than 120 multicultural organisations.

As a first-generation migrant, I experienced firsthand what it was like for my family and I to settle in Australia. Many honourable members may not realise that I did not speak much English at all when I first arrived in Australia in 1979, and I went to a special intensive English language centre to learn English before attending a mainstream school.

It certainly was not easy for me and my family trying to integrate into the new society and I fully understand how it can be overwhelming and intimidating for new arrivals and migrants when it comes to adapting to the new Australian way of life, reconciling the differences in culture, language and tradition and trying to find that sense of belonging, developing confidence to be a part of the South Australian community. As the longest continuing serving member of parliament in multicultural affairs, I have a deep appreciation of MCCSA work because I have seen firsthand the impact it has for multicultural development in South Australia.

I would like to extend my congratulations and thanks to the current and past leadership of the MCCSA. The Hon. Hieu Van Le AC, former Governor of South Australia, serves as the MCCSA's patron and brings with him a wealth of knowledge, compassion and lived experience as a refugee and a champion of multiculturalism across South Australia. Having also previously served as the chair of the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission, the Hon. Hieu Van Le works alongside the MCC executive board, headed by the chairperson, Miriam Cocking.

The wonderful Miriam, whom I have had the pleasure to work with over the last 15 years, is doing an amazing job. Her selfless dedication and her longstanding relationship with MCCSA are highly respected. She has been serving the council in various capacities since 1983 and served as its chairperson since 2015. Heartfelt congratulations to Miriam for celebrating her 10th anniversary this year as MCCSA chairperson.

Throughout her career, Miriam has served on numerous boards and committees as a multicultural advocate in education, health care and aged care. She has also served as the first culturally and linguistically diverse ambassador for Carers SA and has previously been the chair of the MCCSA Women's Council. Through her unwavering passion and dedication, Miriam has always advocated for equitable access to resources and appropriate services for both emerging and established multicultural communities.

I would also like to place my special thanks and acknowledge the other executive board members including Dr Ian Harmstorf OAM, Deputy Chairperson; Silvio Iadarola, Treasurer; Gosia Skalban OAM; Patrizia Kadis, Manju Khadka, Suren Edgar, Ranielson Santana and Nasir Hussain. These community leaders all bring valuable skills and knowledge to MCCSA. I convey my appreciation to them for their tireless support and great work.

I also want to acknowledge CEO, Helena Kyriazopoulos OAM. I have known Helena very well and worked with her closely over a decade. I found her to be an inclusive leader who leads a diverse group of staff and volunteers in the operation of MCCSA programs and towards accomplishing its vision. Helena has over 30 years of experience in the multicultural sector and extensive board experience, having also worked at the Council on the Ageing, Aged Rights Advocacy Service and Mental Health Foundation Australia.

Helena has worked for many years as the secretariat for Alzheimer's Australia, National Cross Cultural Dementia Network, and has used her experience in this role to shape the way in which health services are delivered to culturally and linguistically diverse communities. Helena has also undertaken social research in the areas of CALD carer and ageing needs.

The board and staff of MCCSA not only play an important role in the work they do with the council but many of them also participate in boards and committees for many other organisations. Currently, MCCSA staff sit on 25 other boards and committees across South Australia, including in areas of aged care, health, education, social services, arts and sports. I commend them for their excellent contribution.

While the MCCSA is celebrating its golden jubilee this year, leading up to its 50th anniversary on 21 November, its roots can be traced back to over 75 years ago. I have spoken on other occasions—in May 2023 as well as in July 2019—about MCCSA. I think some of their history has already been recorded, so I will not be repeating it here today.

MCCSA initially operated from Gawler Place before establishing its long-term home at 113 Gilbert Street in Adelaide's CBD, where it continues to serve the community. Over the years, MCCSA has grown significantly, now representing over 120 multicultural organisations and more than 85 per cent of South Australia's CALD population. MCCSA runs numerous programs addressing specific community needs, often in areas where the government recognises that a community organisation such as MCCSA can be more effective.

Their critical work balances practical support with advocacy, ensuring the government understands the evolving needs of both recent arrivals and long-established migrant communities, including ageing members. The multicultural hub acts as a commercial meeting place for many of the community projects that MCCSA runs, including social support groups, the Men's Council, the Women's Council and the Community Connections program.

MCCSA also runs specialised programs to assist those who are most vulnerable within the multicultural community, including those with disabilities, children and young people, and elderly people. Many of these programs, while organised and managed by the staff at MCCSA, could not have existed without the dedication of its strong and diverse volunteer base.

According to their 2023-24 impact report, MCCSA employs the help of 170 volunteers. I want to take this opportunity to thank all of the volunteers for their amazing work, their compassionate work to helping others to access government services and also for being able to speak the languages and understand the culture of many migrants and multicultural communities.

There is always something happening at MCCSA. The hardworking and capable team runs fantastic programs and events throughout the year. I certainly look forward to seeing what other special events will be held this year in celebration of their 50th anniversary. Once again, I express my heartfelt congratulations and special thanks to MCCSA for their significant contribution towards enhancing multiculturalism and interculturalism in our state and for supporting all people from CALD backgrounds to realise their potential as active contributors to the economic, political, social and cultural life of South Australia. With those remarks, I wholeheartedly commend the motion.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. M. El Dannawi.

INTERNATIONAL MOTHER LANGUAGE DAY

The Hon. M. EL DANNAWI (16:49): I move:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges that International Mother Language Day is celebrated annually on 21 February.
2. Notes that International Mother Language Day aims to:
   (a) celebrate linguistic diversity;
   (b) promote the protection of linguistic rights as fundamental/universal human rights;
   (c) emphasise the importance of multilingualism; and
   (d) bring awareness to languages at risk of disappearance.
3. Recognises that language is an essential part of cultural identity, expression and wellbeing in a multicultural society.
4. Understands that language maintenance for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples is a platform for empowerment and intergenerational cultural sharing.
5. Expresses its commitment to encourage multilingual education in South Australia, particularly through the state government's $4 million commitment to community language schools, as a means of enriching our society and inspiring understanding, belonging and dialogue as well as socioeconomic mobility.

I rise today to speak about International Mother Language Day. Mother Language Day is held on 21 February every year to celebrate linguistic diversity in our society. It promotes linguistic rights as fundamental rights and emphasises the importance of multilingualism.

It is held on this day to commemorate the tragic killings of students in Bangladesh in 1952. At this time, Bangladesh was still a part of East Pakistan, and in 1948 the government of Pakistan declared Urdu to be the only national language, even though there were large Bengali-speaking majorities in East and West Pakistan. The Bengali Language Movement fought to have Bengali recognised as an official language of the country. Students at the University of Dhaka organised huge rallies, and on 21 February 1952 police opened fire on one of these rallies, killing five students and injuring many others.

This represents a rare and tragic circumstance, where people sacrificed their lives for their mother tongue, though it is far from the only time in history that people have suffered or been killed for speaking their own language. In 1999, UNESCO declared 21 February to be International Mother Language Day, which makes this Friday the 25th anniversary.

This day provides a good reminder to all South Australians, no matter where they come from, that they have a right to speak and celebrate their own heritage languages. Language is one of

humanity's greatest and most complex inventions. It is a unique skill to our species and has shaped the development of society, the way we think about the world and the way our brains develop. It is the primary means through which knowledge is transferred and culture is preserved. Simply put, your language is part of who you are. It is at the very core of what it means to be human.

Members in this place have heard me speak many times about how Australia is proudly a multicultural country. We cannot celebrate culture without celebrating language. In the last census, 24.8 per cent of the Australian population identified their household as speaking a language other than English. In South Australia we understand the importance of language, and this is part of why we are so proud of our almost 100 community language schools that teach a total of 47 languages after hours.

Community language schools play a crucial role in preserving cultural heritage and fostering a bond between young learners and the languages spoken by the parents or grandparents. We should once again applaud the Malinauskas government's $4 million investment in language education to ensure that our youngest multicultural Australians will be supported to learn their family's mother language.

Helping members of our diverse communities maintain and strengthen their language affords them many cognitive, social and even health benefits. The ability to communicate with your grandparents and other family members in their home language is something that is extremely important to many families. Speaking the same language as elder generations of the family, who experienced the migration journey before you, allows for the passing of knowledge and culture. In particular, for children and second-generation migrants, speaking their language deepens their understanding of themselves and the world around them, and strengthens their connections with extended family outside Australia.

It is not only our multicultural Australians who benefit from learning another language. Numerous studies have found a clear relationship between multilingualism and children's intelligence. Cognitive empathy is also linked to the use of multiple languages. In my opinion this is because learning a language is not only about learning sounds or grammar, it is about learning customs, cultures and ways of thinking; it is about learning how to see the world through someone else's eyes.

Although English serves for education, trade and employment and is our main language in Australia, we need to prepare our children and equip them with the language skills they need to live in a globalised world, as well as help them develop the necessary sensitivity towards the cultural and linguistic needs of others. I can tell you from experience that it can be hard to negotiate between two languages and express what you intend to convey. The language barrier is one of the most daunting challenges that new migrants face when coming to Australia. As a truly multicultural society, we must make it easier, not harder, for people to speak their mother language in addition to English.

One of the key aims of International Mother Language Day is to encourage the preservation and protection of all languages, particularly those at risk of disappearance. You cannot speak about the preservation and protection of language in Australia without discussing the Indigenous languages of Australia. Long before there was any migration to Australia, there was already spectacular linguistic diversity.

According to the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, over 250 languages and 800 dialects are estimated to have been spoken before colonisation. The third National Indigenous Languages Survey conducted in 2019 found that 123 Indigenous languages were in use or being revived in Australia today, and 109 of these are considered in danger, and all of them under threat. The survey found that only 12 traditional languages are still being acquired by children as a first language.

Past government policies saw Indigenous people moved onto missions and children removed from families, severing the transmission of language and culture. In many communities, the intergenerational link between native speakers was broken, and children had little or no knowledge of their first languages. In other cases, the threat of being removed from family meant that language was kept hidden.

Many people consider the eradication of a language to be a key component to ethnic cleansing and cultural genocide. This sort of profound loss of language is exactly what International Mother Language Day wishes to draw attention to, but this day also brings attention to the fight to maintain, revive, and reclaim language. It is thanks to the passionate efforts of Indigenous people, scholars and advocates that we have language reconstruction and revival programs in Australia.

I want to acknowledge in particular the Kaurna language reconstruction movement in South Australia. The Kaurna language of the Adelaide Plains faded from use in the 1860s when speaking it was forbidden by white Australians. Up until recently, the closest thing to a dictionary of Kaurna words was a document written by German missionaries from the 1830s. However, the Kaurna people would not have called their language dead; they would have only called it 'sleeping'. Since the nineties there has been an active effort to reconstruct Kaurna and bring it back into regular use. The Kaurna language has become a way by which people can further the struggle for recognition, reconciliation and liberation.

I have also seen the results of these reconstruction efforts firsthand as a former early childhood educator in the community sector. In my centre, and in many centres in South Australia, we ensured that children had familiarity with Kaurna phrases and words as an essential part of children's learning. I would like to finish with this quote from Warlpiri artist Theresa Napurrurla Ross:

> If our language survives, we survive. Our language keeps us strong. It's always kept us strong.

I commend the motion to the chamber.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. D.G.E. Hood.

Parliamentary Committees

SELECT COMMITTEE ON WATER SUPPLY NEEDS OF EYRE PENINSULA

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. N.J. Centofanti:

That the report of the select committee be noted.

(Continued from 27 November 2024.)

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (16:58): I would like to thank those honourable members who have spoken on this important report and the important work of the Select Committee on Water Supply Needs of Eyre Peninsula. It is widely recognised that urgent measures are required to address the water security issue on Eyre Peninsula. Whilst it is important to find solutions soon, it is important to get it right.

It was for this reason a parliamentary committee was established to investigate the issue, and the recommendations of that committee were clear: that the government should consider an alternate site other than Billy Lights Point, and I do hope to see this report fully supported and to pass parliament shortly. I do hope that in doing so the minister in charge of SA Water will take heed of this important recommendation. The recommendations are in line with the community and industry sentiment, and the government cannot and should not ignore this report. With that, I commend the report to the chamber.

Motion carried.

Motions

KANGAROO MANAGEMENT

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. N.J. Centofanti:

That this council—

1. Recognises that:

   (a) from 2022-2023, Red Kangaroo population estimates in South Australia rose 24 per cent to 2.019 million—33 per cent above the 20-year rolling average;

   (b) it is approximated that there are over 40 million kangaroos in Australia and, without adequate, sustainable harvest measures in place, kangaroo numbers can grow to

unsustainable levels as changes to the Australian landscape since European settlement have provided conditions which facilitate population booms;

(c) excessive kangaroo populations can negatively impact habitat structure, environmental rehabilitation efforts and native ecosystems, while also detrimentally affecting our national agricultural industry;

(d) the animals themselves are placed at greater risk as kangaroo populations can outgrow their food sources, causing many to starve to death;

(e) kangaroo and wallaby commercial management is highly regulated and a sustainable industry, with harvests playing a critical role in kangaroo management in South Australia;

(f) commercial management supports an industry worth around $200 million annually, including sales for kangaroo meat and the manufacture of high-quality products; and

(g) a regulated and evidence-based approach to commercial harvesting benefits the:

(i) environment;

(ii) economy;

(iii) agricultural sector; and

(iv) the long-term welfare of kangaroos and wallabies.

2. Notes:

(a) the introduction of the misleadingly named Kangaroo Protection Bill 2024 in the United States Senate; and

(b) that this bill would, if enacted, have negative environmental, economic and kangaroo welfare outcomes in South Australia.

3. Calls on the government to:

(a) recognise that the Kangaroo Protection Bill 2024 before the United States Senate will negatively impact on the South Australian export economy;

(b) urge the federal government to formally encourage the United States Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works to reject the bill; and

(c) promote and advocate our kangaroo export industry, particularly in the United States.

(Continued from 27 November 2024.)

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:00): I will make this one brief as well. The Greens will not be supporting this motion; I imagine it will come as no surprise to the mover. We also note that it should be waiting for the Natural Resources Committee, which is imminently about to commence an inquiry into the commercial kangaroo management of this state. Certainly, while it may be of the opposition's mind that we should be telling foreign jurisdictions what pieces of legislation they should pass or reject, I should imagine that the Greens in the United States would have a similar position that indeed all policy positions should be science based. I would hope that in the future our kangaroo harvesting will encompass better scientific rigour.

I note as well the important work done in New South Wales into this issue, which exposed the lies of this industry, which exposed the dodgy, rubbery figures that are used to justify kangaroo harvests or culling for commercial purposes. Where the dollar speaks, often science and integrity loses out. If people who are consumers are voting with their feet and literally with their soccer boots by boycotting kangaroo products on the basis of cruelty, then who are we to stand in the way of that freedom of choice. I would have thought a party that believed in consumer choice would have understood that. With that, I look forward to the Natural Resources Committee inquiry into this very important issue.

The Hon. T.T. NGO (17:02): I rise to speak on the Hon. Nicola Centofanti's motion on behalf of the government. This motion correctly notes that the red kangaroo population grew by 33 per cent from 2022 to 2023, reaching 2.019 million kangaroos. In 2024, this population further increased to 2.97 million kangaroos. According to the federal government's Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water, there were 35.3 million kangaroos in the combined surveyed areas of New South Wales, Queensland, Victoria, WA and South Australia.

The 2024 kangaroo population estimate in South Australia is 5.2 million kangaroos, marking a 33 per cent increase from the 2023 population estimate of around 3.9 million. Kangaroo numbers south of the dog fence have increased due to the changes in land management, including the exclusion of dingos, the establishment of additional water points and the expansion of pasture. Some honourable members may not know where the dog fence is, but the dog fence starts in Queensland near the Darling Downs region, running through New South Wales near Broken Hill and ending in South Australia near Eyre Peninsula.

When kangaroo populations increase they can become overabundant, causing adverse impacts on South Australia's ecosystems, human activities, and public safety due to increased traffic accidents, and on the welfare of individual animals, in particular during times with dry weather conditions. To mitigate these impacts, it is important for landholders to proactively manage kangaroo populations on their land, and the commercial kangaroo harvest provides a tool for landholders to manage kangaroos effectively on their properties.

Aerial surveys of kangaroo populations in South Australia have been conducted annually since 1978. These regular surveys are used to inform the quota for commercial harvesting. Kangaroos are protected by the National Parks and Wildlife Act, and the commercial harvesting of kangaroos must be done by accredited kangaroo field processors. The techniques used must be compliant with the National Code of Practice for the Humane Shooting of Kangaroos and Wallabies for Commercial Purposes.

The commercial quota for the kangaroo harvest is set at 10 per cent to 20 per cent of the estimated population size, depending on the species and based on a conservative population estimate. This ensures a sustainable measurement of kangaroos in South Australia and balances conservation, economic and animal welfare factors. However, it should be noted that while the quota is set to be sustainable, the decision regarding how much of the quota will be taken is still a commercial one.

The harvest rate across the state normally sits at approximately 15 per cent to 20 per cent of the total quota. It is not quite 100 per cent, there is roughly 80 per cent less there. The South Australian Commercial Kangaroo Management Plan details how the department will ensure that the harvest remains sustainable. To ensure that the best science is used, the management plan is reviewed every five years.

The South Australian Commercial Kangaroo Management Plan 2025-2029 went through two public consultation periods, the first involving the national parks and wildlife approval process in June to September 2024, and the second being a 20-business-day consultation under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act between 16 October and 14 November 2024. The department reviewed feedback from both, and made minor changes to the plan, which was then approved by the SA Minister for Climate, Environment and Water on 9 December 2024 and the Australian government Minister for the Environment and Water on 18 December 2024.

In recent years, the value of kangaroo meat exports to the US has fluctuated from a peak of $1.1 million in 2021 down to $13,000 in 2023. Between 2021 and 2023 the US export market made up about 4 per cent of Australia's kangaroo meat export market value. As members can see, it is a very small amount.

Our kangaroo products, primarily meat and leather, go to 60 international markets, including several Asian countries as well as throughout the European Union. The Australian Wild Game Industry Council also advocates for the industry to overseas governments and markets.

The industry supports approximately 3,000 jobs, with kangaroo leather being highly valued for its strength and lightness. Australia's kangaroo exports come with the added benefits of reducing agriculture damage and also lowering the number of road accidents involving kangaroos on regional roads. On that note, I thank the honourable member for bringing this motion to the chamber.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (17:09): I thank honourable members for their contributions—the Hon. Tammy Franks and the Hon. Tung Ngo—and I appreciate the government's support for this motion. South Australia's kangaroo export industry plays a crucial role in ensuring the sustainability of kangaroo populations, and the South Australian industry

operates within a strict regulatory framework that helps to manage kangaroo populations responsibly preventing overpopulation and its associated environmental risks.

By unfairly targeting this sustainable and economically significant sector, the US Senate Kangaroo Protection Bill threatens not only regional communities and the agricultural industry but also the long-term welfare and balance of kangaroo populations. It is therefore essential that the parliament and the government send a strong message to the US that we oppose the Kangaroo Protection Bill, and that we support our industry, uphold responsible wildlife management and ensure the continued sustainability of kangaroo populations. With that, I commend the motion to the chamber.

Motion carried.

THE HEADSTONE PROJECT

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. N.J. Centofanti:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges the importance of providing due recognition to those who served in World War I, and that The Headstone Project gives that recognition, respect and a sense of closure to World War I veterans' families;

2. Calls on the Malinauskas Labor government to support our fallen soldiers and provide funding to The Headstone Project at the requested amount of $75,000 guaranteed for three years; and

3. Calls on the Malinauskas Labor government to petition the Albanese federal government to reverse its previous decision and agree to grant The Headstone Project S.A. 'Deductible Gift Recipient' status.

(Continued from 13 November 2024.)

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (17:10): I rise briefly, but with some passion, to support the Hon. Nicola Centofanti's motion urging this council to do a number of things but specifically to acknowledge both the importance of providing due recognition to those who served in World War I and the fact that The Headstone Project offers this recognition; further, to call on the Malinauskas Labor government to support our fallen soldiers and provide funding to the project at the requested amount of just $75,000 for three years; and, further, to call on the Malinauskas Labor government to petition the Albanese federal government to reverse its decision—I think a terrible decision—to deny The Headstone Project South Australia of the deductible gift recipient status, which will cost the federal government virtually nothing. It has been done, I think, entirely incorrectly.

The Headstone Project was first established in Tasmania back in 2011 and is an entirely voluntary operation dedicated to locating and ensuring all Australian veterans who served overseas during those very dark days of World War I have their final resting places marked appropriately—and who would not want that? The Headstone Project's volunteer investigators confirm gravesites, research veterans' military and family history and then they seek to locate living relatives or descendants of the fallen soldier. Comprehensive reports are subsequently compiled and, once all inquiries are completed and cemetery authority and government requirements are completed and complied with, gravesites are marked with a prescribed military headstone and plaques that duly acknowledge the veterans' service to our nation. This is the least we can do.

The Headstone Project has been operating in our state since 2016 and is solely dependent on raising funds through various government and non-government grants—as I said, very small amounts they are anyway—donations from corporations, companies and individuals and, of course, sponsorships in-kind of goods and services. From 2018 until last year, The Headstone Project SA received recurrent annual funding via two three-year funding agreements (six years in total), and it was indeed disappointing to learn that this funding would cease when Labor released its most recent state budget. It is also very disheartening that this organisation was declined, as I mentioned a moment ago, the deductible gift recipient status by the federal Labor government, which would have been no doubt of considerable assistance to this very well-meaning and, I think, deserving charity.

It is a solemn reality that many South Australian veterans were laid to rest in unmarked graves in many places throughout the world. These were men and women who served valiantly and selflessly for the freedoms that we enjoy today, yet their final resting places remain anonymous

without the honour befitting their sacrifice to our nation. The Headstone Project rightly seeks to correct this, and I support it wholeheartedly.

As the Hon. Ms Centofanti mentioned when introducing her motion, it is estimated there could be as many as 2,500 World War I diggers from South Australia buried across other jurisdictions, with approximately 680 resting in unmarked graves. There is clearly a need for The Headstone Project to continue its very worthy work of ensuring that those who served our nation are afforded the dignity, recognition and respect that they deserve, and also to provide their families and loved ones with a sense of closure and with appropriate respect.

This matter is certainly of importance to me and my own family, as members would know, given my father was in the Australian Army for just over two decades and served actively in Vietnam in 1968, notably during the famous Battle of Coral, where he was awarded citations for gallantry for this and other battles he fought in. My father, fortunately, returned home physically unharmed, but the reality of war is that there are many servicemen and, of course, servicewomen who simply do not.

I therefore sincerely commend The Headstone Project for its commitment and efforts to honour the fallen, and I urge both the state and federal Labor governments to support its endeavours however possible and appropriate and to reconsider their current position. It is certainly Liberal Party policy to reinstate the funding that Labor discontinued if it is elected at the next election. I strongly support this motion.

The Hon. S.L. GAME (17:15): I rise briefly to support the Hon. Nicola Centofanti's motion to recognise the important work of The Headstone Project. The volunteers at The Headstone Project are doing an amazing job working to recover the identity of forgotten veterans. I have long advocated for our veterans and, personally, find the vision of The Headstone Project to be deeply inspiring. Those who gave their lives in service of our great nation deserve to be remembered and honoured. Their stories need to be preserved for future generations.

Last year, I started the parliamentary friends of veterans group to raise awareness and support for veterans. We are honoured to be welcoming John Brownlie, co-founder of The Headstone Project, as one of our guest speakers at our upcoming parliamentary friends of veterans event on 18 March. The Headstone Project deserves all the support we can give them and I commend them wholeheartedly for their tireless efforts.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. I.K. Hunter.

Bills

BIRTHS, DEATHS AND MARRIAGES REGISTRATION (BIRTH CERTIFICATES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (17:16): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I rise to speak on the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration (Birth Certificates) Amendment Bill 2024. Same-sex parented families are a permanent and increasingly prevalent part of Australian society. Indeed, according to the 2021 census, 17.3 per cent of the 78,425 same-sex couples who live together throughout Australia are couples who have children. This represents an increase from 14.8 per cent—so nearly 15 per cent—at the 2016 census.

The birth registration of children is a basic and necessary measure which ensures the overall protection of children and ensures their right to an identity. It is important in providing evidence of a person's status in the particular state of their birth. It is the starting point at which the private individual presents their public face to the world. It is for these reasons that the Convention on the Rights of the Child requires that a child shall be registered immediately after their birth.

My office was recently contacted by a same-sex couple who were seeking to have both their names listed on their son's birth certificate as mother. They sought advice from the Births, Deaths and Marriages office and were informed that:

The Family Relationships Act 1975 provides—

(1) A woman who gives birth to a child is, for the purposes of the law of the State, the mother of the child (whether the child was conceived by the fertilisation of an ovum taken from that woman or another woman).

(2) If—

(a) a woman becomes pregnant in consequence of a fertilisation procedure; and

(b) the ovum used for the purposes of the procedure was taken from another woman,

then, for the purposes of the law of the State, the woman from whom the ovum was taken will be taken not to be the mother of any child born as a result of the pregnancy.

(3) If a woman who is legally married or in a qualifying relationship undergoes, with the consent of her spouse or partner (as the case requires), a fertilisation procedure in consequence of which she becomes pregnant, then, for the purposes of the law of the State, the spouse or partner—

(a) will be conclusively presumed to have caused the pregnancy; and

(b) will be taken to be—

(i) in the case of a male spouse or partner—the father; or

(ii) in any other case—a co-parent,

of any child born as a result of the pregnancy.

In other words, what this means is that under current state law only the birth mother can be registered as a mother and her partner can only be registered as a co-parent. You can understand, I am sure, Mr President, why this would be troubling for many same-sex parents who want to have their status as parents appropriately recognised on the birth certificate—in this case, the case that was raised with me, the status of both parents as mothers. The child does not have a birth mother and co-parent; they want to have the fact that they have two mothers recognised on the birth certificate so that their family dynamic can be appropriately recognised.

The reality is that same-sex parents do not wish to be viewed differently by their children, the state or anyone else. Both parents are, in effect, mothers to their children or fathers to their children and should be recognised as such should they wish. If the child were to be born in the Australian Capital Territory or Western Australia then birth registration processes allow for the registration of same-sex parents on their child's birth certificate, providing them with the option of describing each parent as a mother or a parent.

Indeed, members will know that I had the privilege of being a donor dad to two beautiful children. Those children were both born in the ACT, so their mothers are both recognised appropriately on their birth certificate, but were the children to be born in South Australia they would not have access to those same provisions under the act. What this bill seeks to do is to provide each parent with the option of describing themselves as either a mother, father or parent on their child's birth certificate.

Protecting the best interests of a child is one of the most important principles of international law. Indeed, it is a topic we discuss often in this place. It is fundamental to the Convention on the Rights of the Child. In particular, the convention provides that states must take all appropriate measures to ensure that a child is protected from all forms of discrimination based on the status of their parents, and that includes the sexual orientation or gender identity of their parents.

Appropriately recognising the status of parents on a birth certificate also ensures that children know their parents and are able to form relationships with both of their parents in a way that is legally recognised and socially recognised. This applies to all children, whether or not their parents are of the same sex. Having both mothers or both fathers named as parents on the child's birth certificate ensures there is a presumption in favour of parentage, and this provides for both parents to have full and equal parental responsibilities for the child.

This year, our state is celebrating an important milestone: 50 years since the decriminalisation of homosexuality in our state. Indeed, this parliament has worked together over the last five decades to embark on significant LGBTI law reform, reforms that have had a very positive impact in terms of changing our society and improving the lives of people like myself—out and proud

gay men. I think this is a very small change but one that would be welcome by many same-sex couples who have children and rainbow families across the state. It is high time this simple change was made in South Australia to bring our state into line with other jurisdictions. I urge all members of this place to support this simple change.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. I.K. Hunter.

PUBLIC FINANCE AND AUDIT (FOSSIL FUEL SPONSORSHIPS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 October 2024.)

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (17:23): I rise to speak on the Public Finance and Audit (Fossil Fuel Sponsorships) Amendment Bill, and in so doing I want to commend the leadership of my colleague the Hon. Tammy Franks, who has put this forward and who really, I think, has belled the cat on some of the very concerning associations between some of our state's big events and fossil fuel companies. It is of serious concern to the Greens to see fossil fuel companies being able to hijack sporting events as a way of earning their social licence and one example of this that is, of course, of great concern to the Greens is the Tour Down Under.

The Tour Down Under showcases South Australia to the world and there is no question that it is a boost to our local economy. It has the added benefits of promoting healthy lifestyles and sustainable modes of transport, yet the Tour Down Under's major naming rights partner since 2010 has been Santos, a fossil fuel company.

It is appalling that a major cycling event, which should be about strengthening our state's green credentials, is being sponsored by a fuel company—a polluting fossil fuel company. We know that fossil fuels are not just bad for our environment—and the Tour Down Under is actually about promoting green transport—but are also bad for community health. Again, the Tour Down Under is about promoting active transport and promoting cycling.

This association is of serious concern and Santos' sponsorship of this high-profile event buys considerable social licence. It allows the company to greenwash its polluting activities and paint itself as being community minded. Indeed, this is an issue that I raised during my time on the Adelaide City Council. It has been a long-term issue of concern for the Greens. Surely, the South Australian Tourism Commission can find an alternative sponsor for this event. Why does it have to be Santos? It is not appropriate.

An Australian Conservation Foundation report revealed back in 2018 that 19 gas projects and facilities in Australia accounted for 81 million tonnes of climate pollution. Santos is part of that. Add this to the emissions from gas-fired power stations and our role as the world's leading exporter of liquefied natural gas and it is clear that Australian gas is a major driver of climate disruption.

In October of 2018, the IPCC special report warned that to keep global warming under 1.5° we must end our reliance on fossil fuels as quickly as possible. Expansion of the gas industry is simply incompatible with this target. Why on earth is the Tour Down Under, our state's premier green event, being powered by Santos in this way? Why are we allowing that brand association?

I urge the Malinauskas government to think differently about this. This is an opportunity for the government to put their money where their mouth is and to actually urge partnerships that are going to further the South Australian brand. Dumping fossil fuel sponsorship would show real climate leadership and I know that the government is keen for South Australia to host the COP. If they are serious about that, can they really justify having this association with Santos? Are they really serious about having the COP in SA when Santos is the major sponsor of the Tour Down Under? That is a joke.

They really have to put their money where their mouth is. A state that prides itself on its environmental and renewable energy credentials should be a leader in ending fossil fuel sponsors and this would set a precedent for other jurisdictions in Australia and across the world. Industries that are fuelling the climate crisis should have no place in sports.

This is not just an issue for us in South Australia. In the UK, several arts institutions have dumped fossil fuel sponsors, including the Tate, the Royal Shakespeare Company, the National Theatre and the National Galleries of Scotland. The Edinburgh Science Festival has also imposed a blanket ban on sponsorship deals with fossil fuel companies. In Western Australia there is now growing public pressure for Fringe World to end its sponsorship with Woodside and for the Perth Festival to dump Chevron.

One has to question why fossil fuel companies are so desperate to associate themselves with popular events. They are doing it because we know that they are losing social licence. They are doing it because they know that the jig is up, that people across our country are recognising that we are in the middle of a climate crisis and that we have to do something, and no amount of airbrushing and corporate spin is going to change that reality.

Another reason for South Australia to disassociate with fossil fuel companies is the direct impact that global heating is already having on the Tour Down Under, which will only be intensified as the climate crisis worsens. In 2020, the Vicious Cycle report, which was commissioned by the Australian Conservation Foundation, revealed the impact of the climate emergency on cycling, and in particular on the Tour Down Under. It concluded that the impact of climate change on the event and on the sport in general is already evident, with extreme heat threatening the safety of participants and resulting in race disruptions—and, of course, all South Australians have been dealing with extreme heat and record temperatures over February.

Held in mid-summer in a state that is highly vulnerable to climate impact, such as heatwaves and bushfires, the future of the Tour Down Under is being, ironically, threatened by fossil fuel companies like Santos. These are the companies that are driving the climate crisis and these are the sorts of companies that are making events like the Tour Down Under less viable and sustainable into the future.

I should say, of course, that the Tour Down Under is not the only event to have questionable associations. Who could forget LIV Golf? I was not one of the members clamouring to join the Premier at his press conference on the weekend, and that is because LIV Golf, the tournament, is backed by Saudi Arabia and its public investment fund. The tournament has been widely criticised because of the Saudi government's appalling record on human rights but also its direct ties to the fossil fuel industry—the oil industry.

Saudi Arabia, largely through the public investment fund, has spent billions of dollars on sportswashing by funding sporting tournaments, events like LIV Golf, to distract from its dire catalogue of human rights abuse. I will not cover that ground today because that is beyond the scope of this bill but it is worth noting while the public investment fund is not itself an oil company, its finances are substantially drawn from the major stake in Saudi Aramco, the national oil company of Saudi Arabia.

In February 2022, Saudi Arabia's crown prince transferred about 4 per cent of Aramco shares, worth about $80 billion, into the public investment fund, which he also chairs, so that is of significant concern.

The PRESIDENT: I thought you were not going to go down this path.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Sorry?

The PRESIDENT: I thought you were not going to go down this path because it is not relevant to the current bill we are talking about—

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Well, the issue of human rights—

The PRESIDENT: —which I very much appreciated at the time, but it did not last long.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Mr President, the issue of human rights may not be directly related to the bill but the relationship between fossil fuels and the Saudi government is worth highlighting, along with the myriad human rights abuses that their—

The Hon. T.A. Franks: That's why they need to sportswash.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: That is right. As the honourable member has pointed out, this is why—

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Franks, interjections are out of order.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: —companies like this seek to associate themselves with those that have some level of popularity: so that they can gain favour, so that they can build some level of social licence. According to the Climate Accountability Institute, the oil and gas produced by Aramco, linked to the Saudi government and LIV Golf, was responsible for roughly 4.8 per cent of global emissions in 2018, and about 4.3 per cent of total atmospheric accumulation since 1965. That is the largest of any single firm.

It is estimated that in 2019, Saudi Aramco plans to produce and sell the equivalent of 27 billion tonnes of carbon dioxide between 2018 and 2030. This is an enormous amount, equivalent to 4.7 per cent of the total carbon budget that the IPCC estimated the entire world had left in 2018 for a 50 per cent chance of meeting the Paris Agreement's 1.5° goal.

These are the companies the Malinauskas Labor government is rolling out the red carpet to, without any consideration about human rights, without any consideration of the terrible effects on our climate and on our state brand. Let's not forget that some years ago now one of the first acts of the Malinauskas government was to declare a climate emergency here in this place. I remember that debate, and the Greens welcomed that. But, emergency requires action. It is time for the Malinauskas government to show some leadership here and to dump Santos and to dump this association with fossil fuel companies, and to ensure that our state's big events have sponsors that appropriately reflect the values of our state and our mission to take the climate crisis seriously.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (17:35): I rise to speak on this bill, and it should not be a surprise that I will be opposing the bill. Seriously, the Greens live in absolute fantasy land when it comes to issues like fossil fuel, coal, gas and whatever. They have no concept of what would happen to our economy, even the world economy, when you try to do away with coal or gas. What will happen, of course, if this ever happened or eventuated, is that the cost of your power bills will go smack through the roof. It is quite clear that renewables—wind and solar—will not be enough to provide the energy needs of this country 24/7. It is intermittent power. It has to blow, the sun has to shine and it is not 24/7.

We will be having gas for years to come because it has to be part of our energy mix if we are to have dispatchable power and power that can ensure that industry continues, that domestic use will not be affected, that there will not be blackouts that people have to endure because the renewables cannot even provide those.

The Hon. T.A. Franks: Coal is called brownouts.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Brownouts—whatever—but they will be blackouts. We know that other countries are now having to go back to coal, gas and nuclear. Should the Coalition be fortunate enough to win power and if they press ahead with their plans for nuclear power plants, the first of which will be built at Port Augusta, what are the Greens going to do then? They just whinge and want to shut down an opportunity for Australia to be sustainable when it comes to its energy needs.

Federal Labor at the moment under the current energy minister will probably send this country broke if Labor end up returning. They want to spend billions upon billions on more wind turbines and other renewable energy and try to rid the country of coal and gas, when it is quite clear that we are going to be reliant on those fossil fuels for years to come.

There is no way we will ever do away with those because, if you do that, your economy will suffer, industry will suffer, consumers will suffer, because it will just put up the cost of power—simple as that. It is just one of those crazy, ideological dreams of the Greens, who really do not even take into consideration the miniscule amount of carbon dioxide produced in Australia compared with the world—I think it is less than 1 per cent of the total emissions. Nowhere did I hear the Hon. Rob Simms talk about pollution and the use of fossil fuels that are causing most of the damage to our climate. He has not mentioned China. Did you mention China?

The Hon. R.A. Simms: It wasn't relevant.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: It is very relevant because they are the ones—and also India, because China is the one that also buys our coal and burns it and causes damage to the environment but, no, they do not mention them. It is all about the small amount that we burn off, which is outrageous. I would like to invite the Hon. Robert Simms one day—not me, but I hope the Hon. Tom Koutsantonis will one day invite the Hon. Rob Simms and the Hon. Tammy Franks to take a trip to Moomba and the Santos gasworks up there and have a look at the fantastic initiative they have incorporated there. It is a multibillion dollar investment in carbon capture. They have spent a hell of a lot of money in technology that is designed to reduce carbon emissions. It is incredible technology, and it is working.

Briefly, I think the Hon. Russell Wortley was up there with me when we went a couple of years ago. I think we were all very impressed at what it is going to do. What it does is when they burn off gas or whatever, they capture that and then it gets pumped back into the disused wells and, so far, apparently it is very effective. You have to give credit to Santos for putting billions of dollars into that research and development and getting that carbon capture program underway.

It irks me when I see the Greens attack a great South Australian company like Santos, and what Santos has contributed to the state and our economy, and will continue to do so. You have the Greens who want to shut them down which is just absolutely outrageous. It is incredible. I welcome their sponsorship of major events because I do not see the renewable companies putting any money into sport sponsorship, putting it into community projects either in the metropolitan area or in the regions. A couple of weeks ago—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: You don't, do you?

The PRESIDENT: Order! Stay focused.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: They do not put money into their communities, these renewable energy companies, these energy generators. I was in Burra a couple of weeks ago and then in Port Augusta and elsewhere where there are massive wind farms built on either Crown land or council land, and they do not even pay rates. They do not even contribute anything to the community and yet the hundreds of millions of dollars in profit that they generate do not go back to the community; they go offshore in profits. These renewable energy companies do not really have the interests of South Australians or their communities at heart.

As I said, Santos is a proud South Australian company that gives back to its community and will continue to give back to its community. I do not need to say not only how important it is but what a very successful event the Tour Down Under is and has been because of the sponsorship that is derived from Santos. Who will fill the breach? The Greens have not even suggested where the money will come from if you lose that significant sort of sponsorship. Who is going to put that money in? Are the Greens going to do that? It is just outrageous.

Again, it shows you the corporate generosity of a company like Santos putting back into the South Australian community. We are always going to have gas, we are always going to be cooking with gas. I hate to see the day when I cannot use my Q barbecue because I cannot buy any gas, because the cost of gas will go through the roof. It is already very expensive.

There being a disturbance in the gallery:

The PRESIDENT: The gallery will remain silent, or you will leave, okay? The Hon. Mr Pangallo, I am sure you are about to conclude.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: As I said previously, gas and coal will continue to be part of Australia's energy mix because we require that reliability. The problem with these people who are opposed to fossil fuels is: what alternative will we have? Are you going to continue building and erecting ugly wind turbines and solar farms that can only operate intermittently when either the wind blows or the sun shines? We need to have 24/7 dispatchable power. We are going to have to be relying on gas, coal and oil for years to come. To try to get rid of it will result in a big hit to our economy. It will result in higher power bills.

I want to see the Greens go to the federal election, and also the state election, with this preposterous idea that fossil fuels should be banned, that we should not have them, and how they will answer the questions of: 'What happens when our power bills go through the roof?' They are already incredibly high, and it is hurting many families out there with cost-of-living pressures and having to absorb other costs on top of having to pay for exorbitant power bills, almost the highest power bills anywhere in the world. Again, this is created because of these large energy companies that have set up renewable energy projects that are sucking investments, sucking money out of our community and sending it offshore.

It was emphasised to me by the Mayor of Goyder when I was up there a couple of weeks ago just how local communities are being fleeced by renewable energy companies. I have no objection to having renewable energy, but it is not going to be the be-all and end-all of meeting our energy needs. You are going to have to have gas, oil and coal for years and years to come.

With that, I think I will finish up by saying that sponsorships from companies like Santos—great South Australian companies—are always welcome because they are putting money back into their communities, and not only in big events, like we see with the Tour Down Under, but also small community groups and other sporting organisations that benefit from their generosity and also benefit from what they put into the Australian economy and the South Australian economy. With that, I will be opposing the bill.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (17:48): I rise on behalf of the Hon. Heidi Girolamo, and of the opposition, as the lead speaker on this side, to express our firm opposition—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. B.R. HOOD: Do not worry, Ian. It is brief. It is brief to oppose the Public Finance and Audit (Fossil Fuel Sponsorships) Amendment Bill 2024, a piece of legislation introduced by the Hon. Tammy Franks from the Greens. This bill seeks to ban fossil fuel companies from sponsoring public events, including art festivals, sporting events and similar gatherings. The consequences of such legislation would be detrimental to our communities, to the economy, and it sets a dangerous precedent.

It is crucial to understand that fossil fuels remain an essential component of modern life. They are not merely an energy source, they are integral to the production of materials that sustain our society. To demonise the companies that are involved in fossil fuels that are sponsoring these great events in South Australia, the companies that provide the energy materials to support our hospitals and transportation systems and infrastructure, is not only unfair but also short-sighted. They are major employers. They are contributors to local and national economies. By attempting to exclude them from participating in public events through sponsorship bans, we are undermining the critical economic role they play in our communities.

I love the Tour Down Under. I have supported it ever since it came to our great state and loved getting on a bike and tearing around at the community events as well. I am happy for Santos to continue to allow that to be happening in South Australia, and I am very happy to see it continue.

The proposed bill would have far-reaching consequences beyond major events like the Tour Down Under. By restricting sponsorship from fossil fuel companies, we would reduce the amount of private investment flowing into community sports and public events. I certainly urge my colleagues in this house to reject this bill for the benefit of all South Australians.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (17:50): I, too, will be brief—even briefer than the Hon. Mr Hood. The Hon. Robert Simms almost had me with his impassioned contribution, but then he got onto the matter of the bill and he lost me completely. The government will not be supporting the bill today.

The Tour Down Under is a key event for South Australia. The 2024 event injected $87.2 million into the state's economy, attracted 38,000 interstate and overseas visitors and created the equivalent of 530 full-time jobs. The Tour Down Under has now delivered a staggering $1 billion towards the South Australian economy over the last 25 years. Our tourism and events industries have endured a particularly challenging period since the pandemic, with the collapse of many commercial and community events seen across Australia. We know how important major sponsors are to ensuring the continuation of major events.

Santos' sponsorship was mentioned by the Hon. Mr Simms. They have sponsored the TDU since 2010 and supported very strongly the milestones such as the expansion of the women's race and the launch of the domestic television broadcast. Sustainability is an important focus for the Tour Down Under. The event's management team continues to strengthen sustainability measures and encourages host councils, suppliers and partners to do the same regardless of who the sponsor of the event is. They do that anyway.

The government is taking strong action already to address climate change and grow our renewable energy sector. The government does this regardless of who sponsors the Tour Down Under. We will do all that we can to advance sustainability in practice and the shift to renewables, which is already underway and powering ahead under the leadership of the Malinauskas Labor government.

I will just finish with this, the Hon. Mr Simms, who fears that there is not enough leadership from government on renewables: the Rann Labor government led on renewables in this state and this country. The Weatherill Labor government led on renewables in this state and this country. The Malinauskas Labor government is doing even more. We will lead this state and this country into the renewable future, and we will remove fossil fuels eventually from the entire energy sector, but it will take time. It will not be done overnight. I think the bill before us today seeks to do something for the Greens to put out a media release but would do nothing for sustainability and nothing for renewables in this state.

The Hon. S.L. GAME (17:52): I rise briefly to oppose the Hon. Tammy Franks' Public Finance and Audit (Fossil Fuel Sponsorships) Amendment Bill. This bill is essentially an ideologically driven attempt to cancel corporations, who the Greens have defined as 'fossil fuel corporations', from sponsoring arts and sporting events. Unfortunately, the Greens appear to be stuck in the dream of net zero and 100 per cent renewables by 2030, which is understandable given the zealotry displayed by the federal energy minister Chris Bowen and recent indications from the Premier that South Australia wishes to host COP31 in 2027.

But the world is gradually waking up to the dream of net zero, and the people of South Australia are losing their patience with endlessly subsidising renewable energy, which is not surprising given that Australian taxpayers have already invested $29 billion over the past 10 years in pursuit of the dream of net zero. What do we have to show for it? How much has this $29 billion investment reduced our emissions? What about the price of our electricity? We were told that renewables would reduce electricity prices, but have they? In fact, it is quite the opposite. As of March 2024, Australia had the highest electricity price for households in the Asia-Pacific region, and according to the latest report of the Australian Energy Regulator, South Australia had the highest quarterly electricity price increase in the country.

The climate emergency that was declared back in 2022 has now been surpassed by an energy and cost-of-living emergency. Only this week, the Australian Energy Market Operator warned that east coast gas supply needs to be carefully managed to support peak electricity demand periods in summer, particularly in Victoria. This means that Victoria will be hoarding its electricity and gas, which means a shortage for South Australian consumers, due to our dependence on coal-fired electricity from Victoria. Put simply, when the sun does not shine and wind does not blow, we rely on Victoria for our electricity supply.

It is also important to note that the shift away from renewables and the net zero dream is moving very fast, with only days ago BP announcing it is scrapping its net zero targets and refocusing on hydrocarbons to life investor returns. Shell USA has also announced it is pausing its investment in renewables, despite this move costing the corporation US$1 billion.

On top of all this, the world's biggest coal consumer and emitter of climate-warming greenhouse gases, China, has announced a spike in new coal-fired power projects since 2023, due to the country's overwhelming need to produce more cheap and efficient energy supplies. With this, I urge the state and national leaders to wake up and address the energy crisis in this country and avoid ideologically driven policies like this proposal by the Greens.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:55): I would like to thank those speakers who made a contribution and put their views on the record with regard to the Public Finance and Audit (Fossil

Fuel Sponsorships) Amendment Bill 2024. I thought I would repeat the title of the bill, because I am not sure that most of the contributions were actually about the bill, which is two pages, defines fossil fuel sponsorship and then provides that money not be applied in association with fossil fuel sponsorship:

(1) Money must not be issued or applied from a public account for the purposes of providing funding to an event—

that is public funding, state public funding, the people of South Australia's funding, not the fossil fuel companies' funding—

if a prescribed fossil fuel entity or a fossil fuel is to be promoted (whether as a naming rights sponsor or otherwise) at or by the event, or by or on behalf of the event organisers, under a sponsorship agreement (however described).

Do you know what? The bill actually does not stop the money being taken, although I would like to see that too. It just stops the sportswashing and the greenwashing of the fossil fuel companies, which actually benefit from the state dime, or in fact the state tens of million of dollars, every single time.

We actually do not know how much state money goes into some of our major events in this state. We talk about the Tour Down Under. It used to be sponsored by a winery. We talk about the Adelaide 500, and who knows who sponsors it this year, because everyone still calls it the Clipsal, which shows the power of naming rights.

While I thank the members who contributed—the Hon. Ian Hunter, the Hon. Ben Hood, the Hon. Rob Simms and the Hon. Frank Pangallo—I do question whether the Hon. Frank Pangallo looked very hard. He claimed one thing that was actually related to the bill, but there were a lot of things not related to the bill. One thing he claimed was that he does not see renewable companies sponsoring major events.

Well, he did not look very far, because it is quite well known that Tennis Australia—which of course is a member of the UN Sports for Climate Action Framework, a quite extensive network right across the world—is now sponsored by Pacific Blue. Do you know why? Because they dumped Santos as a sponsor.

So I am not sure how far the Hon. Frank Pangallo looked, but certainly Pacific Blue, Australia's only 100 per cent renewable energy generator and retailer, now powers the Australian Open and is the official renewable energy partner of the Australian Open and Tennis Australia. So there we go; there is one example. We might be living in fantasyland, according to the Hon. Frank Pangallo, but I have to say there was a simple fact right in front of his face and he did not see it.

Also, Pacific Blue sponsors Netball Australia, the Melbourne City Football Club and my old home team from New South Wales, the Sydney City Roosters, which will remain East's Easter win forever, despite what happened back in the day of their title being changed. They are sponsored by BYD, which is an EV manufacturer. Back in the day, I would never have seen that coming, that my old rugby team would be sponsored by an EV manufacturer, but there we are; it is 2025 and the times change and the community changes.

This bill is important because when I was a child I remembered the Benson & Hedges World Cup, and I remembered the Virginia Slims cigarette company sponsoring the women's tennis. I know that those messages were sent by those companies, those lethal companies associating themselves with sport, into my mind as a child to have that feel-good factor. To this day I still associate those sports with those cigarette companies.

We know fossil fuels are far more deadly than cigarettes. But do you know what? My daughter will never associate sports with cigarettes, because our government stood for something. It stood on principle, recognised the dangers and cut those sponsorships. This bill does not even go that far. It simply says, 'We are not going to give you public money to help you sportswash your way out of your sullied [quite rightly so] reputations.'

We know we are in a climate emergency. This parliament, I am glad, has recognised and declared a climate emergency. While the numbers seem pretty shaky, if we would have that vote here again I suspect that, with the Greens and the Labor government, we would just hold that particular view.

Yes, a declared climate emergency does require action. There is a clear link between fossil fuel companies seeking to sportswash and greenwash their way out of any complicity and responsibility for the climate crisis, and we have to stop letting them get away with it. Clearly there are other people who are willing to step into these roles. I have just given you a few examples, but there are literally, from the United Nations down and indeed the Secretary-General down, hundreds of companies, hundreds of individual sporting entities and fields, that have moved away from fossil fuels. It is time that the South Australian Malinauskas government did the same. If we are serious about hosting COP, then it is a cop-out not to do so.

Really, are we going to have a Santos-sponsored COP31? Will we have any credibility on the world stage? I say that not as a joke, because actually Santos did sponsor a stall at a previous COP, and that was associated with Australia and it sullied our nation's reputation at that COP. In fact, it would go some way to stopping us—quite rightly, I think—from hosting a COP with any credibility.

We do not want fossil fuel companies having the ability to use public money to greenwash their way out of the mess that they have created. In fact, Santos in 2019-20 alone was responsible for approximately 28.6 tonnes of CO_2 equivalent being emitted into our atmosphere from the end use of the gas they supplied. They like to call it natural gas, and we know that is a marketing ploy as well. It is approximately 95 per cent methane, which, for the record, is 80 times more potent than carbon dioxide.

I have to say that I could talk about LIV Golf, and I note that the Hon. Rob Simms did. The hypocrisy of allowing LIV Golf and allowing the Saudi fund to actually sportswash their reputation with our money is not lost on me. The reality is that they have not even given us that much money for the privilege of sportswashing their way out of their quite rightly sullied reputation. They needed us more than we needed them, and here we are now, seeing people just falling over themselves to stand by the great white shonk and to buy into something that, as I say, is an utter cop-out on the world stage.

I understand that time is growing close to what would normally be the dinner break, so I will wrap it up. I do want to thank my staff members, in particular Joanna Wells, for working on this campaign. I also thank Belinda Noble and her team, who do extraordinary work in Australia and across the globe, and Fossil Free SA here locally, some of whom have not only written, phoned and emailed but have taken to the streets and will not only sit in our galleries but will spread the word of what they heard today about some climate denialism going on in this place. And do you know what? That climate denialism is emboldened by a government that says one thing, that declares a climate emergency, that says it is a great leader in renewables, but is happy to let fossil fuel companies sportswash their way with South Australians' money.

The council divided on the second reading:

Ayes 2
Noes.....15
Majority 13

AYES

Franks, T.A. (teller)	Simms, R.A.

NOES

Bourke, E.S.	Centofanti, N.J.	El Dannawi, M.
Hanson, J.E.	Henderson, L.A.	Hood, B.R.
Hood, D.G.E.	Hunter, I.K.	Lee, J.S.
Lensink, J.M.A.	Maher, K.J. (teller)	Ngo, T.T.
Pangallo, F.	Scriven, C.M.	Wortley, R.P.

Second reading thus negatived.

There being a disturbance in the gallery:

The PRESIDENT: Get them out! Get out, get out! If you can't behave yourself, don't come. Out! Show courtesy and leave—out!

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Point of order in relation to that disturbance.

The PRESIDENT: What is your point of order, the Hon. Mr Pangallo?

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I am going to ask that the President actually take action against those persons in the gallery.

The PRESIDENT: I have cleared the gallery. The debate is completed. We are on to item No. 57.

Motions

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN ITALIAN ASSOCIATION ANNIVERSARY

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. J.S. Lee:

That this council—

1. Congratulates the South Australian Italian Association (SAIA) on reaching its remarkable 75th anniversary in 2024;

2. Recognises the proud history and contributions of the SAIA as a community hub which preserves and promotes Italian culture, services and experiences in partnership with the wider Italian community of South Australia;

3. Acknowledges the outstanding contributions of founding members, community leaders, current and past presidents, committee members, volunteers and supporters who have carried on the legacy of the founding members in serving the Italian community and enriching our multicultural society in South Australia;

4. Commends the SAIA for creating the prestigious recognition programme, namely the SAIA Excellence Awards, which aims to promote and perpetuate the Italian-South Australian heritage and celebrate the extraordinary accomplishments of individuals or organisations in the South Australian community;

5. Acknowledges the pioneering and entrepreneurial spirits of the Italian community and pays tribute to the outstanding contributions that first-generations and subsequent generations of Italian migrants have made and continue to make to our resilient and dynamic multicultural society; and

6. Reflects on the achievements and vision of the SAIA as a centre for all, helping to connect South Australian Italians to their cultural heritage, fostering strong business and cultural ties between South Australia and Italy and delivering 75 years of dedicated service to the Italian community in South Australia.

(Continued from 27 November 2024.)

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON (18:10): I rise today to briefly indicate the opposition's support and indicate that I will be the lead speaker on behalf of the opposition. In doing so, I take the opportunity to congratulate the South Australian Italian Association on its outstanding 75th anniversary in 2024.

The South Australian Italian Association (SAIA) has established the prestigious SAIA Excellence Awards, a program that celebrates the remarkable achievements of individuals and organisations, while promoting the Italian heritage in South Australia. These awards underscore the SAIA's commitment to honouring the accomplishments of its members and nurturing the next generation of leaders within the South Australian Italian community. For over seven decades, the SAIA has been a pillar of community service preserving Italian culture and enriching our multicultural society in South Australia.

In supporting this motion today, I acknowledge the contributions of the founding members, community leaders, current and past presidents, committee members, volunteers and supporters who have carried on the legacy of the founding members in serving the Italian community, enriching our multicultural community in South Australia. Volunteers are the lifeblood of our community and the invaluable contributions of many individuals in the multicultural community are no different.

I also briefly touch on the contribution of the Hon. Frank Pangallo in supporting the Hon. Jing Lee's motion where he spoke of the resilience of the South Australian Italian community, something that remains true today. The South Australian Italian community has made a significant contribution to our state across numerous sectors and there is no doubt that their work ethic, drive and determination are some of the key reasons for that success.

In concluding, I extend my heartfelt congratulations to SAIA and all who have contributed to its legacy in providing many South Australian Italians with connection to their cultural roots by fostering strong cultural and business ties with South Australia and Italy.

Motion carried.

BULGARIANS' EDUCATIONAL AND FRIENDLY SOCIETY

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. J.S. Lee:

That this council—

1. Congratulates the Bulgarians' Educational and Friendly Society (BEFS) on reaching its remarkable 75th anniversary in September 2024;

2. Recognises that BEFS has been the hub of the Bulgarian community in Adelaide since the organisation was established in 1949, promoting and preserving Bulgarian cultural heritage and providing a sense of belonging and fellowship for its members;

3. Notes that the Bulgarian community has an enduring historical connection with Fulham Gardens, Seaton, Henley Beach, Grange, and surrounding areas, with many Bulgarian migrants having settled and established market gardens in the area and later building the Bulgarian Club Hall on Tapleys Hill Road by hand;

4. Acknowledges the outstanding contributions of founding members, community leaders, current and past presidents, committee members, volunteers and supporters for their dedicated service to the Bulgarian community for more than seven decades;

5. Commends BEFS for enriching our multicultural society through a range of programs and services such as the St Petka Bulgarian Orthodox Church, the Bulgarian Ethnic Radio Program, the Bulgarian Ethnic School, the Kitka dance group, and through hosting annual cultural celebrations such as the 'Zdravei' Festival; and

6. Reflects on the many achievements and legacy of BEFS over the past 75 years and wishes the society and members of the Bulgarian community every success in the years ahead.

(Continued from 27 November 2024.)

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON (18:12): I rise briefly to support the Hon. Jing Lee's motion. As the lead speaker on behalf of the opposition, I take the opportunity to congratulate the Bulgarians' Educational and Friendly Society on its remarkable 75th anniversary celebrated in September 2024.

For decades, BEFS has been a cornerstone of cultural preservation, education and community cohesion. It has provided invaluable opportunities for Bulgarian Australians to connect with their heritage, learning the language, exploring Bulgaria's rich history and celebrating cherished traditions.

Through the Bulgarian Ethnic School, the society offers dedicated language courses, ensuring that younger generations can maintain a strong connection to their roots. Beyond language education, BEFS organises cultural workshops, seminars and lectures that deepen understanding of Bulgarian history, literature and the arts.

The society actively collaborates with local schools and educational institutions, fostering cross-cultural exchange and lifelong learning. Its commitment to strengthening the Bulgarian community is further demonstrated through regular social events and close engagement with the Bulgarian Eastern Orthodox Church.

Among its many contributions, the society has been instrumental in organising community events, including the popular Zdravei Bulgarian Festival. This festival provides the opportunity to celebrate Bulgarian culture through dance, food, crafts and performing arts.

I also take this moment to commend the broader Bulgarian community in South Australia for its invaluable contributions to our state. Through entrepreneurship and active community

involvement, Bulgarian Australians have enriched our local economy and strengthened our social fabric. Once again, I congratulate BEFS on their milestone. Its legacy is a testament to the strength of cultural heritage and community spirit in bringing people together.

Motion carried.

At 18:15 the council adjourned until Thursday 20 February 2025 at 11:00.