LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, 5 June 2025

The PRESIDENT (Hon. T.J. Stephens) took the chair at 11:00 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) (11:01): I move:

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

Motion carried.

The PRESIDENT: I note the absolute majority.

Bills

SUPPLY BILL 2025

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 June 2025.)

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (11:02): I rise today to speak on the Supply Bill before us, emphasising that it is critically important in ensuring the continued operation of government. This convention of supporting the Supply Bill is one that we staunchly uphold in this place. Today, we are asked to support this bill to continue the supply of resources and confidence to deliver the services our state requires from this government. These services are critical for our state.

I do want to take this opportunity to highlight the irony or, better yet, some may say, the hypocrisy of this government which, without batting an eyelid, ask on the one hand for the supply of funds to deliver government services and, on the other, deny the very supply that our communities in rural and regional South Australia require to continue producing the food and fibre our state and nation relies upon.

They would like us to open the gates of supply to government services, yet all this week in this chamber they have refused to open the gate to the supply that our farmers need, whether it be genuine recognition through financial support or fair and timely decisions. They preach resilience at struggling communities and families, acknowledging the toll on mental health, and yet refuse to commit financial support, all the while continuing to overspend across nearly every budget line, excusing it as necessary. The hypocrisy is plain.

This government finds hundreds of millions of dollars to host sporting events and concerts to put South Australia on the map, while ignoring the backbone industries that built the map in the first place: our small businesses and primary producers. Without them, there will be no-one left who can afford to attend these events.

We are seeing record numbers of businesses collapsing across the state. As reported, recent ASIC data shows us that 449 South Australian companies entered external administration in 2024, a significant increase from 224 in 2023 and 153 in 2022. This marks the largest increase in mainland Australia over the past three years. The food and accommodation industries saw the highest insolvencies, with construction also heavily impacted. We have seen the tomato industry of

South Australia gutted in one brutal punch, the wine industry on its knees, and financial pressures compressing every household in this state, with the cost of living at levels not seen in generations.

What of energy? The government of South Australia has led the people of this state down what is possibly one of the biggest hoaxes in history; that is, the hydrogen hoax, which commits the future of energy and industry in this state to an energy plan and infrastructure that no longer exists and that never truly existed. It was a plan that was abolished at the first opportunity they found. In their commitment to bind the people of South Australia to the expenses, both owed and future, of the Whyalla Steelworks, by stealth they chose to dump the promise they made to the next generations of South Australians that would create the energy of the future.

The government's decision to scrap hydrogen fits perfectly with its new tagline: all debt and no delivery. Yet here we are again, just as we stood here one year ago, highlighting failures in health, housing, cost of living, regional investment and support for small business—failures that were acknowledged but never addressed. Once again the government arrives, asking for our support to keep the lights on while South Australians ask when their needs will finally be met.

Last year, we called for action on ramping. It has only worsened. We called for housing reform, including meaningful stamp duty relief and accelerated construction timelines, but the government dragged its feet and housing starts are falling. We asked for proper road and infrastructure funding across regional South Australia, but flood-affected communities are still waiting. The Truro freight route and countless bridge and jetty upgrades remain in limbo. We urged support for our fishers, our farmers, our winemakers and our primary producers who are being hit by federal decisions and state inactions alike. Instead, the government responded with silence or excuses. We demanded payroll tax reform, apprentice and trainee exemptions and practical support for small business, and still there is nothing but talk.

Will we support the Supply Bill and uphold the convention? Of course we will, because we respect the institutions of government even when this government does not. But South Australians deserve more than empty rituals. They deserve action. They deserve a government that delivers supply not just to itself but to the people it serves.

Will this government commit to supplying the people of South Australia with the relief they need? Will this government commit to delivering on its promise to fix ramping? Will it commit to delivering on housing, on health, on regional roads and on real economic resilience? This budget must be more than theatre. It must deliver, or this government will be remembered not for what it supplied but for what it withheld.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (11:08): I briefly rise to speak on this Supply Bill and, of course, indicate our support for it to ensure that the government services continue to flow in this state. In preparing to make my brief contribution today, I decided to go back and have a little bit of a look at what I said last year. It surprised me that I could transpose that exact bit of *Hansard* from then to now because, quite simply, nothing has changed, most especially in the regions. I am just going to touch on a couple of things there.

Public transport in the regions is something that I have spoken about at length in this place in calling on the government to uphold their election commitment to ensure that we have a public transport review in a regional context, which is something that was promised before 2022. It is something that should have happened in July last year but then got kicked down the road to December last year and which now has only just begun. I am sure there will not be any money to increase our public transport offering in the regions, simply because we have had a review that was promised and that was kicked down the road and is only happening now, to conveniently be able to rely on saying, 'Well, we are doing the review so we are not going to put any money into the budget just yet. We will wait to see what that review has to say.'

That review should have been done. It should have been completed by now, because when the regions, such as Mount Gambier, a city of some 30,000 people, have a public transport system which is not even capable of moving 3,000 people around it is pretty damning on this government which has been in power for 20 of the last 24 years.

The Greater Adelaide Freight Bypass is something that many on this side have been calling for and championing. We have put our commitment to the public of $210 million, along with the federal Coalition wanting to invest $840 million at the federal election just gone. We have seen a commitment from the Albanese government of half a billion dollars, but we have not seen or heard anything from this government on what is a vital piece of infrastructure for South Australia, to ensure that we can get heavy trucks off Port and Cross roads for safety, for productivity and for efficiency, so that our great road transport industry can continue to do the work that it needs to do in this state, being able to bypass the South Eastern Freeway and, indeed, our suburban streets in Adelaide. Adelaide is the only capital city that still has a freight route going all the way through it. Will we see money in this budget for the Greater Adelaide Freight Bypass? I am unsure.

On Monday, I had a Zoom call with the fantastic community reference group for radiotherapy, a group of volunteers who have been calling out for radiotherapy services in the Limestone Coast for a number of years, people who drove around the Limestone Coast collecting signatures to tell this government, 'This is what we want.' Some 16,000 people are asking for radiotherapy in the regions. Both federal governments, Liberal and Labor, committed $4.2 million to do this work, and yet now we have seen that $4.2 million repurposed into other areas, into Mount Gambier hospital.

An insignificant amount of money from the state government could have been given to this project to see it happen: $1 million a year is really all we would have needed and for the health minister to request from his federal counterparts that the Limestone Coast and Mount Gambier be considered an area of need, to then unlock more money for those providers who provide radiotherapy to be able to upgrade their machinery, their LINAC machines, every eight years. We did not see that request going from the minister. We have seen this government rely on a feasibility study that says, for some reason, that radiotherapy is not feasible in an area that services some 70,000 to 80,000 people, yet in Griffith, in Mildura and in Warrnambool it does stack up, with very similar populations and in fact fewer people to actually utilise that radiotherapy.

My heart breaks for the people who have to do a 10-hour round trip to Adelaide for six weeks, doing 15-minute radiotherapy treatments and being away from their family, or having to drive to Warrnambool to do it. It is so disappointing when we see hundreds of millions of dollars spent on advertising by this government, yet $1 million a year is all it would take to have radiotherapy in the regions. It is something that we will continue to fight for. It is something that the Liberal opposition is committed to, should we form government in 2026.

I also note that the Mount Gambier saleyards, which has been wanting some investment from the federal government to ensure that that generational project can happen, has again been refused federally. I have to question what this state government is doing to champion that project. Obviously not enough, because we saw no money being directed to the saleyards, three times in a row now. Saleyards are not just places where farmers can go to sell their stock and make a bit of cash. They are places where farmers get together, have a chat and talk about what is going on. They are places that help our regional people's wellbeing and their mental health. If we do lose our saleyards, especially ones like Mount Gambier, it will be a terrible, terrible thing.

That leads me to the drought. I really want to thank and put on the record the tremendous work that my colleague the Hon. Nicola Centofanti has done in this space. She is the one who is listening to the farmers on the ground, who are saying they are not seeing the support they desperately need making it to them. Yet somehow I read in the paper today that the Treasurer is almost blaming the fact that they have had to put money into the drought for why we have seen a decrease in surplus and there will not be so much more money flushing around.

If we do not have farmers we do not have food, and I can tell you what: if that happens, we are all stuffed. We need our farmers. We need to make sure that these people are getting the support they need on the ground urgently and not just piecemeal money that is good for a photo opportunity for the PM and the Premier, who then just jet off somewhere else.

It is heartbreaking to have to be in a community where farmers and regional people are at the end of their tether and see no other option but just to give up. It is personal. It is not fair. It is heartbreaking and we have to see more from this government for our regions, for our farmers across health, across public transport, across education, because we cannot be second-class citizens

because of our postcode. It pains me that this speech is just like last year's and, hell, it will probably be very similar next year as well.

We want to see more investment in the regions. We want to see the regions being taken care of. We want to see an end to a $2 billion road backlog. We want to see the regions being put front and centre by this government. I can tell you what: with people like my colleague Nicola Centofanti and her team behind her, all of us will be championing the regions and will be fighting as hard as we possibly can to make sure we get what we deserve.

The PRESIDENT: Before I call the Hon. Dennis Hood, can I just remind members that this is about supply and supply in the Public Service. It is not a budget speech, so make sure your speeches are tied back to supply.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (11:17): I rise to speak on this bill, which of course the opposition will support given its passage is fundamental to enabling the functions of government to continue in the period between the Appropriation Bill being introduced and then passed at the start of the next financial year.

I take this opportunity to briefly reflect upon the significant cost-of-living challenges and the impact that the Supply Bill can and may have on that and indeed its impact on the Appropriation Bill as well. It is important to note, of course, that South Australians have been facing very significant cost-of-living pressures in recent times. I will also look to address some of the budget measures that the opposition firmly believe should be adopted by the current government to provide much-needed financial relief to the residents of our state with respect to opportunities that exist with this bill and the upcoming budget bill.

Housing affordability is arguably of utmost concern to the majority of South Australians, with our state unfortunately lagging behind on five key indicators that are compounding the housing crisis in South Australia. According to Demographia, Adelaide is the sixth least affordable city to buy a home in the world and the second least affordable in Australia. The ANZ CoreLogic Housing Affordability Report reveals that Adelaide is the least affordable of any of Australia's capital cities in which to rent a home as well, and the Australian Bureau of Statistics has found that South Australia is the poorest state in the country on a household income basis per person. These are significant weights around the necks of South Australians.

BuildSkills Australia claims that South Australia will be some 47,000 workers short in the construction, property and water industries by 2035. Also, according to the Housing Industry Association no less than $237,000 of the cost to purchase a new house and land package is directed towards state fees and taxes—some $237,000, which is extraordinary.

The opposition is undoubtedly pleased that the state government has finally moved to ease the restrictive residential growth boundaries that Labor itself had initially put in place some time ago, but we were disappointed that it blocked our amendments, which would have provided further reasonable options for additional land development equivalent to 10,000 homes. Instead of working in a bipartisan manner to achieve this by supporting sensible measures, the government has focused on land releases that are unlikely to help in actually seeing any residents move into them for this entire decade.

Stamp duty on established homes also continues to be a significant barrier for first-home buyers trying to enter the property market in our state, with latest figures showing a median-priced house in metropolitan Adelaide comes with a stamp duty bill close to $50,000. The opposition has been calling on the current Labor government to introduce a $10,000 reduction on stamp duty for established homes for eligible first-home buyers, a reasonable initiative that Labor has to this stage refused to adopt, despite the government collecting record stamp duty revenue. There is an opportunity to do that, and this bill would provide that opportunity.

South Australia is the only state in our nation that fails to offer any form of stamp duty relief for first-home buyers purchasing established homes—the only state in the nation. At a time when median house prices in Adelaide have skyrocketed and, according to some measurements at least, are now approaching $1 million (other figures have them well into $800,000), this type of reprieve—that is, a reduction in stamp duty—is desperately needed on established homes. The government

stamp duty exemptions for all newly built homes is welcome, but it does not go far enough, as many South Australians who cannot afford to build a home are naturally seeking to purchase a more modest existing dwelling—for example, a townhouse or unit.

We note with interest that the Labor government adopted a key Liberal policy to fast-track apprenticeships, as announced by the opposition in December last year. The opposition outlined its detailed seven-point plan to address the critical shortage of skilled workers at that time, and strongly urged the government to adopt those crucial measures. Although it is a welcome development that Labor chose to take up this initiative, we are encouraging it to execute our entire strategy, which includes: three-year apprenticeships where appropriate; boosting group training; guaranteed funding for construction training; mentors for apprentices and their supervisors; payroll tax exemptions for trainees and apprentices; lifting the status of apprenticeships by bringing WorldSkills to Adelaide; and better career counselling and VET programs in all our schools. This bill provides that opportunity.

The latest data has revealed an 8.2 per cent drop in apprentices in training for the September 2024 quarter compared to the same period in 2023, and that fewer people now are actually undertaking training in our state than has been the case previously. This is of great concern. South Australia desperately requires more tradespeople and trainees across a wide range of industries, as I think all of us would understand. Unless the government takes a targeted approach on this matter to reverse this decline in skills, the skills crisis will continue to worsen and so, too, will the impact on housing.

In addition, South Australians have been hit with ever-exorbitant, ever-increasing power bills. Labor has failed to deliver its only energy-related policy promise at the last election. The state Labor government has spent the last three years focusing on its hydrogen power project, but it has now been shelved, as we know, leaving households and businesses with record-high electricity bills.

In fact, since the first AER default market offer report under the Malinauskas government in 2021, South Australians have seen their power bills rise by some $747, or approximately 36 per cent. This effectively means that South Australians are now paying more for electricity than those living in Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane, which is an additional financial strain that families and businesses across our state have to contend with and, as I said, we already have the lowest per capita income.

Further, South Australians are missing out on a key cost-of-living boost, with the Labor government refusing to provide subsidies for home solar batteries. The state opposition has been calling for the government to reinstate the Liberal's Home Battery Rebate Scheme that would save South Australians thousands of dollars and slash power bills. Most other states already have a similar scheme in existence, which homebuyers can take advantage of, or they can do so in conjunction with the federal government's 30 per cent subsidy. Not only would our policy save households thousands in up-front costs, but it would also assist in decreasing peak demand with fewer houses needing to be on the grid at one time which, of course, will ultimately drive down prices and take pressure off the grid.

In addition to our cost-of-living measures, and in the middle of a cost-of-living crisis, to support struggling small businesses the Liberals have continued to implore the state government to increase the payroll tax threshold from $1.5 million to $2.1 million, as is our policy. Payroll tax has a direct and very significant impact on the profitability of small businesses, and every possible measure should be implemented to not only ensure existing small businesses can thrive but to encourage the establishment of new businesses without the burden of significant payroll tax around their neck.

As members are well aware, small businesses comprise no less than 98 per cent of all businesses registered in our state and employ over 300,000 South Australians. This accounts for 40 per cent of our total workforce, and we simply cannot afford to take the risk of these companies becoming increasingly less viable. Payroll tax plays a role in that, and the threshold must be increased as per our policy.

It was revealed through questions on notice from the Department of Treasury and Finance Budget and Finance Committee hearing recently that, at the end of January 2025, there were approximately 55,000 customers who have a combined outstanding debt of $62.9 million with SA Water that is now past their due date; that is, they are late in their payments. This is indicative of just how badly South Australians are struggling during this cost-of-living crisis. The opposition

consequently has called on the state government to immediately reverse the water bill price hike of 3.5 per cent above the CPI. We see no reason for this.

The last thing South Australians need right now is higher fees and charges in excess of inflation especially, and hardworking families should not have to foot the extra $85 that that 3.5 per cent equates to. Small business owners actually have to stump up a whopping $348 extra annually for their water usage. This is unreasonable in these difficult times with the cost-of-living crisis. The former Liberal government slashed water bills by more than $200 on average for households, and approximately $1,350 for small businesses, and Labor, who promised there would be no new taxes when they won government about three years ago, should remember this, follow suit and remove this increase above CPI.

What the South Australian community really needs is relief to ease the spiralling cost of living and the cost of doing business in South Australia. The budget and the Supply Bill can form part of that. Alarmingly, in addition, our state debt is expected to hit almost $41 billion by 2026-27, is forecast to reach $46 billion by 2027-28, and there is some speculation, some concern, that it could reach $50 billion by the end of this decade. This is a very extraordinary level of debt, it is unprecedented debt in South Australia, and the opposition I think is rightly concerned that more revenue-raising measures need to be put in place, but not in such a way that they hinder the operation of business, that they make housing less affordable, that they make our electricity bills more expensive and that they make water bills more expensive.

There must be a way for the government to look at this situation in a holistic manner so that businesses and households do not get hit, but benefits South Australians during a very difficult time with cost-of-living pressures.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (11:27): I welcome the opportunity to speak on the government's Supply Bill. As is, of course, the convention in this place, I will be supporting it. I think it is fair to say the Supply Bill reflects the priorities of this Labor government, and the priorities I think are lacking; the vision is lacking when it comes to providing sufficient focus on cost of living.

One of the areas that I have spoken about extensively in the parliament over the last four years that I have been here is the failure to take sufficient action on spiralling rent prices. Yesterday, I spoke about the need for Labor to finally support a rent freeze to provide some relief to renters who are doing it tough at the moment and yet we still see no leadership from the Labor government when it comes to rent prices.

Another area that I think has been neglected by Labor is public transport. We are not seeing that get the focus it requires. Where is the funding for regional rail? Rather than pumping billions and billions of dollars into the north-south corridor project, federal and state money, where is the money being put in to transform our transport system in South Australia to provide more options to commuters so that they are not forced to take a car in to work? Where is the investment in regional public transport? Where is the focus on reducing public transport fares?

While other states, like Queensland for instance, have rolled out 50¢ public transport fares, which have resulted in a significant increase in public transport users, SA Labor have hiked up public transport fares, and South Australians are now paying the highest public transport fees in the nation. Labor should instead be committing to rolling out 50¢ public transport fees. That would save South Australian commuters, on average, close to $3,000 a year for families. That is a significant saving. That is more money in the hip pocket of families, it reduces congestion on our roads and, importantly, it reduces carbon emissions at this time of climate crisis. I urge the Labor government to finally take some action on that.

Where is the action on power prices? The Labor Party took to the last election a plan for green hydrogen. We know that the devil is always in the detail with these plans, and what they put to this parliament was actually a pathway for more dirty gas and blue hydrogen. When the Greens tried to scrutinise it, that was shut down by the Labor government working in concert with a few members of the crossbench to prevent this proposal from getting the scrutiny it deserves. We know now, of course, that that plan has blown up in Labor's face, and they have totally abandoned it.

What comes next in terms of a proposal to reduce power bills? When the Labor government came to office, they scrapped the subsidy scheme for home batteries and for solar. Those schemes had actually been multiparty schemes in South Australia. They were supported by the previous Marshall government as well and I recognise that, yet when Tom Koutsantonis—

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Tom Koutsantonis.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: —the Hon. Tom Koutsantonis, Minister for Energy, returned to the government benches, he took swift action to junk those subsidies. He claimed at the time that it was some form of middle-class welfare. What has the Labor government come up with to replace those schemes? Where is the investment in alternatives to reduce our reliance on fossil fuels? What Labor should be doing is rolling out a battery incentive scheme to plug the gaps of the federal investment—which, of course, I welcome—and continue to offer solar subsidies, but particularly targeted at low income earners who are doing it tough and who are struggling with soaring electricity bills.

Where is the action in our health system? I recognise that the Labor government has invested a significant amount of money in health over this term, and I know that Minister Picton is committed to trying to get the health crisis under control, and I understand that this is a challenging area, but at the same time, ramping continues to skyrocket out of control, and the recommendations of the Ambulance Employees Association have still not been implemented in full.

We also have South Australian pensioners paying the highest fees for ambulance call-outs in the country. We know that every other state has provided free ambulance cover to pensioners; why won't the government do so? Also, where is the leadership on things like access to vital medications, things like the HIV prevention medication PrEP? We have a small population in South Australia; we could make that free so that we could finally eliminate HIV in our state and significantly reduce the risk of transmission.

Where also is the leadership from this Labor government on ending the harm caused by pokies? The Labor government continues to rake in hundreds of millions of dollars of pokies revenue. We know that poker machines literally trade off human misery. We also know that for every dollar of revenue that comes in, the state ends up paying an additional $1.20 in support services to deal with the social harms that flow from gambling. It is morally wrong that so much of our state budget is reliant on revenue from poker machines.

It is morally wrong. It is reprehensible. That is money that is being drawn from vulnerable South Australians. It is money that is being made off these machines that literally destroy lives. Over the years, I have met with many constituents who have lost everything as a result of these machines, yet the argument from the government seems to be that these machines bring in a lot of revenue, therefore we have to keep them. I find that morally wrong, and I think most South Australians would agree with the Greens that now is the time for us to get rid of pokies and to have a long-term plan to get our state off pokies.

The Hon. C. Bonaros: Just the Greens?

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I recognise other members have been talking about it, too, and they will have an opportunity to talk as well. Once again, in this Supply Bill, there is not the leadership that is needed to deal with this critical question. Where is the leadership from Labor on gambling revenue? The government will say it cannot take action on pokies, it cannot fund some of the things that I have talked about in my speech. Well, budgets are about choices. I know that the government is going to be handing down a budget later today, and that will reflect its choices, but this Supply Bill also reflects the priorities of the Labor government.

What is clear is that rather than providing the funding for the services that we need—in terms of ensuring that an ambulance is there when you need it and you are not going to have to pay through the teeth to get one, investing in the public housing that we need, breaking our state's reliance on gambling revenue—instead, what the Labor government is doing is shelling out millions and millions of dollars of subsidies to fossil fuels. Indeed, over the last four years, there have been $100 million worth of subsidies to the fossil fuel industry. That is money that should be invested in dealing with the effects of climate change, invested in dealing with the cost-of-living crisis, providing the services that we all need.

We have also seen this Labor government fail to take action in terms of getting corporations to pay their fair share of tax. When the Weatherill government was in office, they rolled out a plan for a big bank levy that would have brought in hundreds of millions of dollars a year. That was killed off here in the parliament as a result of a ridiculous scare campaign that was waged by vested interests, and some of the crossbenchers in this place at the time caved in to that vested interests campaign. I thought that was very disappointing. I urge the Labor government to support a big bank levy so that we can get more revenue for the services that we need and to help the government in making the right choices.

We do not have to be reliant on gambling revenue, for instance, in order to bankroll public services. I find that suggestion morally reprehensible. I hope that, as we head towards the next election, we see some action from the Labor government on these important matters. Luckily, the Greens are here—the Green is here—to continue to push the government to take action on these issues. I will continue to do so between now and the next election and look forward to being joined by hopefully a few other members this time next year.

The Hon. J.S. LEE (11:38): I rise today to speak on the Supply Bill 2025. The Supply Bill is essential to ensure the continued operation of government, enabling government to access necessary funds until the Appropriation Bill. To uphold the convention and respect for the work of our public sector, I will be supporting the Supply Bill to ensure that payments can continue to the Public Service, government departments and vital ongoing programs.

However, I will use this opportunity to highlight a number of areas where I believe the government can do more, can do better, to support our community and enable business and industry to grow our economy. Easing the cost-of-living burden on individuals and families remains a key priority for me and should be for the government as well. It is an issue that is continually raised with me by community members across South Australia.

I had the privilege to be on the Select Committee on Grocery Pricing in South Australia last year, where we heard from a wide range of witnesses and conducted a number of site visits with the Hon. Robert Simms across metropolitan and regional South Australia. From this evidence, the committee found that there is a lack of transparency around grocery pricing in South Australia and that this is a factor contributing to high prices, which are placing increased pressure on South Australian families.

I once again highlight the recommendations made by the select committee and urge the government to seriously consider implementing budget measures, such as providing additional cost-of-living relief, additional support to charities and support agencies that provide access to low cost food, and the potential for a payroll tax exemption for fresh produce businesses and primary production food businesses to reduce costs to industry and encourage competition.

On the topic of payroll tax, GPs already run on very thin margins and cannot absorb increasing costs, such as the government's new payroll tax, which came into effect on 1 July 2024. The rising cost of GP visits means more South Australians are turning away from making appointments, leading to increased pressure on emergency departments and worse health outcomes for patients.

While the government argues that a payroll tax exemption on bulk-billed services is meant to be an incentive for GPs to bulk-bill more patients, the reality is that bulk-billing rates are decreasing and average South Australians are paying more at each visit. The government must address this issue when handing down its budget this afternoon and abolish the GP payroll tax and make GP visits more affordable, to reduce pressure on ramping and on our hospital system.

While on the topic of payroll tax reform, I believe the government can go further. Our current payroll tax system is not fair and does not adequately take into account the growing financial pressures on small and medium-sized businesses due to national wage increases, increased superannuation rates and WorkCover insurance. Many small businesses are now facing substantial increases in weekly payroll costs and are forced to make difficult decisions about pricing, staffing and service delivery.

I have heard from countless business owners who tell me that payroll tax is a key consideration when deciding whether they should take on new staff, and that it seriously hinders their ability and ambition to grow and contribute to our state's economy. I urge the Labor government to review the state payroll tax system, raise the payroll tax threshold for small business and ensure that we can support decent wages for workers and the sustainability of small business across South Australia.

In my continual engagement with stakeholders and industry leaders, another issue that is raised with me time and again is that of crime and community safety. Just this week, I have given notice of a motion highlighting the growing impact that crime and antisocial behaviour is having on South Australian businesses, particularly within the hotel and hospitality sector. The increasing frequency and violence of organised and repeat offenders targeting bottle shops and licensed venues and exposure of hospitality staff to abuse and unsafe working conditions is unacceptable. This Supply Bill has not dealt with any of these issues. I note that the Australian Hotels Association is calling on the state government to:

- introduce stronger legal consequences for repeat and violent offenders targeting licensed venues;
- investigate the implementation of exclusion orders or similar legal tools to prevent re-entry by known offenders; and
- provide financial support to hospitality venues for crime prevention infrastructure, following the example set by other jurisdictions.

I urge the government to consider these proposals from the hotel industry to help address crime and increase worker and community safety.

I have also spoken recently about a number of fantastic programs addressing skills shortages in key industries across our state, such as the BuildConnect program, pioneered by Master Builders SA in partnership with government. Business and industry sectors across South Australia are crying out for more workers in construction, engineering, IT, even space and defence while, at the same time, we have thousands of skilled migrants already living in South Australia who are underemployed and not working in their chosen career.

This program connects skilled migrants with job opportunities that match their experience and qualifications, providing case management, mentoring and transition services that are customised and aimed at creating greater outcomes for both workers and businesses. These pilot programs are showing great potential to get people into jobs, but they need long-term funding to scale up and sustain their impact.

For instance, there are around 2,500 international students enrolled in building and construction courses in South Australia, with many eager to stay, to live and to work in our state, but are often unable to put their qualifications to good use in an industry that desperately needs them. I call on the state government to create post-study opportunities and job-ready programs that help us to retain the brightest minds and talent in South Australia, and work with the federal government to ensure visa and residency pathways align with our skills needs.

I want to finally turn my attention to regional child care. I want to briefly touch on this issue because it greatly impacts our regional economies and communities, stifling the economic development and potential of regional South Australian communities, and is also hampering the wellbeing of children and families across much of our state.

Critical childcare shortages across most of our regions are forcing parents to drive long distances to drop their children at childcare centres, relying on family and friends to provide care, or having to step back from their work and careers altogether to care for their children. The flow-on impacts for families, businesses and communities should not be underestimated. The Regional Childcare Desert Advocacy Project has called for increased funding for the state government's Rural Care Program to expand the program to more regional and remote communities with limited childcare options. I echo these calls and hope to also see funding allocated for regional early learning infrastructure in the state government's budget announcement this afternoon because it is currently missing from the Supply Bill.

From my engagement with constituents from all walks of life, from all cultures, industries, businesses and backgrounds, it is clear that addressing the challenges of the cost of living, providing better access to quality health care, education and social services, supporting industries and initiatives to grow our economy, and building a safe and inclusive economy are the key priorities we must focus on as elected representatives, and should be priorities for this government.

I am committed to putting our community first and will always continue to take every opportunity to speak about government priorities. Today, I commend the bill and call on the government to help build our state's prosperity.

The Hon. T.T. NGO (11:48): I rise to speak on the 2025 Supply Bill, a bill to keep our hospitals, schools, roads and community services running until the 2025-26 budget is passed. Today, I want to focus on housing, a topic that is often talked about. This is one of the most widely talked about concerns of South Australians and Australians. Labor's ambitious goal to boost residential land supply will pave the way for close to 40,000 new residential homes across the state as part of its plan called A Better Housing Future, and the current pipeline of residential rezoning.

The government is on track to deliver the biggest investment in public housing in decades. The South Australian Housing Trust is committed to building 1,635 new and replacement public rental homes through a range of programs and projects. We are also modernising and updating 3,500 homes, which includes 350 homes benefiting from major upgrades and another 3,000 having major maintenance undertaken.

These initiatives include our election commitments and other commitments to invest an extra $232.7 million to build 573 homes, including 445 new homes under the Public Housing Improvement Program and 128 new homes through A Better Housing Future funding. To date, construction of 227 homes under these two programs has been completed, and another 346 are under construction. By 2026, 1,000 affordable homes will be built for purchase, with at least 500 properties listed for sale each year through HomeSeeker SA. This will bring the dream of home ownership back into reality for young professionals, families and new migrants.

Affordability is at the heart of Labor's housing initiatives. For first-home buyers, the government has abolished stamp duty on all new dwellings, regardless of what they cost. On top of that we have retained the $15,000 First Home Owner Grant, saving buyers tens of thousands of dollars. For renters, Labor has introduced several critical protections to give a greater sense of housing security, and we have reduced the bond threshold, which has saved tenants up to $1,600 in up-front costs. Other programs that we are working on to provide more homes for our most vulnerable include $115 million over four years to secure the work of nine homelessness alliances and $6 million for the Hutt St Centre, Catherine House and Vinnies to increase beds and outreach.

Labor's Housing Roadmap success rests on innovative reforms. The Infrastructure Coordination Group aligns planning with essential services like roads, public transport and schools, ensuring developments are sustainable. A record $1.5 billion investment in water infrastructure helped to facilitate the approval of 1,333 new allotments from Angle Vale to Noarlunga Downs; this is part of a $3.3 billion SA Water central works capital program going through to 2028.

New legislation, including the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act, has streamlined approvals, earning South Australia the Business Council of Australia's top ranking for planning efficiency. To address workforce shortages and ensure the building of homes is sustained, the government is creating 2,000 new construction jobs and expanding training programs.

Labor also had the foresight to fund a pilot program, called BuildConnect, with Master Builders SA, which the Hon. Jing Lee just outlined. This fast-tracks new migrants into construction jobs. It was reported this week in the media that residential building work in SA grew by an exceptional 22.9 per cent compared with last year, with new detached houses up 22.6 per cent and new apartment/unit building up 27.9 per cent.

The Supply Bill keeps these reforms moving and, most importantly, sustains the programs that are helping our most vulnerable during these tough times. The Labor Malinauskas government has addressed structural problems not symptoms, and we are starting to see the result. I therefore commend the 2025 Supply Bill to the chamber.

The Hon. M. EL DANNAWI (11:54): I rise to indicate my support for the Supply Bill. This bill allows the continued provision of public services in South Australia. It also offers a great opportunity to reflect on the work of this government. I am proud to be part of a Labor government that takes a holistic approach to the wellbeing of our citizens. I am proud to be a member of a government that is focused on supporting families, communities and people to realise their full potential.

That journey begins in the early years, and this government has committed wholeheartedly to implementing the recommendations of the Royal Commission into Early Childhood Education and Care. Implementing these recommendations is not just about building infrastructure and workforce; it is about changing how we think about the role of educators and about children's learning. This government committed to the task of implementing universal access to three-year-old preschool, which will begin its rollout with long daycare services from next year.

To support this rollout, we have made a number of key investments in the early childhood sector. The Flying Start Infrastructure Grants program invests $40 million over four years to support the building of new or expanded facilities where they are needed. We are establishing integrated hubs across the state, linking essential services for families who need it the most. By 2032, a total of 20 hubs will be operating across the state, bringing preschool together with other health, wellbeing and education offerings. Our Early Childhood Workforce Strategy is a comprehensive plan to build and grow a strong and valued workforce. This government has provided funding to find, attract, upskill and retain staff into this critical industry.

Reaching our full potential in life requires support beyond the early years. To this end, I am particularly proud of this government's focus on preventative health. Last year, we consolidated key prevention functions into a single agency, with the Preventive Health SA Bill, recognising its role as a crucial area of health policy. Around 38 per cent of Australians are impacted by health issues that could have been prevented if exposure to risk factors, including obesity, smoking, alcohol and drugs, was reduced. Preventive Health SA will improve health equity across future generations by supporting South Australians to make healthy choices about the way they live. As we all know, prevention is better than cure.

This government has worked hard in the last three years to improve the lives not just of South Australians today but of future South Australians. We have backed up our intent with significant investment, planning and infrastructure to set up the conditions for future prosperity. We want this state to be the best state to be born in, to raise a child in, and to live and work in, but we also need it to be a good state to be in should you fall sick, face a crisis or need to care for ageing parents or other family members. I look forward to the upcoming budget and to seeing this Malinauskas government announce further initiatives to support future and current South Australians in reaching their full potential.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (11:58): I rise to speak in support of the Supply Bill, which will give the government the funds necessary to continue the business of good governance. Good governance is something which the Labor government over many, many years has been responsible for. I go out to very many forums, committees and the like, and I am embarrassed at the praise that people give our current Treasurer, the Treasurer of our generation. It is sometimes humbling to know that we have a Treasurer as highly respected as the Hon. Stephen Mullighan.

While conservatives have for generations argued against Labor's economics, not even they could question the government's economic record. Not only does this Labor government get things done; we do it while sticking to a responsible budget. We actually get roads built. After decades of delays because of the enormity of the exercise we did something about South Road. It is a work in progress, but the finishing post is within sight. When completed, it will be the best end-to-end road system of any Australian capital city. We are fixing the problems where Grange Road meets Holbrooks Road and East Avenue, and we are constructing the Majors Road interchange. That is $210 million spent on essential roadworks while employing 330 people.

We also got the hospital built. Despite the opposition saying we did not need a new hospital, we acted on the advice of experts, including doctors, nurses and engineers, that the old Royal Adelaide Hospital was past its use-by date and was actually making people sick. We also

factored in the economic reality that it is in fact often cheaper to build something new than to renovate something old. We all remember that the vision the Liberals had for the Royal Adelaide Hospital was to knock out a few walls and give it a paint job. That was about the depth of their vision for the health care of this state.

We also made the most of one of the world's great sporting arenas and actually improved the wonderful Adelaide Oval. Short-sighted people argued against the redevelopment. They said it was spending too much money just to hold a footy match or a cricket test. That was a very short-sighted argument. The redevelopment gave the Adelaide CBD a much-needed shot in the arm and created huge interest in city dining, entertainment and culture. It was a massive boost for this city's economy.

Of course, Adelaide Oval is the home of the Gather Round. Imagine having five of the nine Gather Round matches at West Lakes and then trying to encourage the many thousands of interstate and overseas visitors to go out on the town after the match. You do not have to imagine, because we simply would not have got the Gather Round in the first place.

That is what we have done, but there is always more to do. The Labor government has completed—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: Mr President, if they want to have a conversation, they should go outside and enjoy it and do it in peace.

The PRESIDENT: I am pleased, the Hon. Mr Wortley, that you can make a speech and be the President at the same time. You are exceptional.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: No, I am just giving advice to the President, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: Okay. Let's listen to the Hon. Mr Wortley.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: The Labor government is committed to improving and expanding TAFE so it gives more people the opportunity to gain better skills in areas previously not fully supported. Careers in construction, early childhood education and even defence will be supported so we give young people the best opportunity to enter these fields, which in turn gives South Australia the best outcomes.

Labor has created planning reforms to build new housing developments 18 months faster. We are addressing the housing shortage by getting new homes built, from Two Wells in the north to Onkaparinga Heights in the south.

Keeping the state running means people can get on with their work without worrying where the next mortgage or rent payment is coming from. Since Labor came to office we have created 40,000 full-time jobs. South Australia has one million people in the workforce for the first time ever. Exports are at record highs. The two highest ever figures for exports have been in the past two years, both surpassing $17 billion.

We need the Supply Bill passed to get real things done. It is a very simple and sensible way of avoiding unnecessary hardship or letting things stall for no good reason. It allows us to continue doing a lot of essential work, including the ongoing construction of the Torrens to Darlington roadworks and the construction of the new Women's and Children's Hospital.

Having access to $7.6 billion from the consolidated account for public service to the state allows us to get work done while paying the wages of our government workers. We can debate the budget in a healthy, democratic manner, but until it is passed we need to keep South Australia moving fast.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (12:04): I rise to speak on the Supply Bill. I might start with one of the areas we have heard a bit about today. Given some of the other contributions we have heard, we know that supply is very important to this state—and I will keep referencing supply throughout the course of my contribution for that reason—but I cannot help but start with payroll tax. Without payroll tax, we do not have supply, but so scared is this Treasurer of lifting the lid on payroll tax that

he has completely dismissed and ignored the will of this chamber and refused to allow an independent inquiry into payroll tax.

Even worse than that, and in so doing, he has refused to turn his attention to the incentives that we could be implementing to ease the pressures on small and medium businesses in this state and provide more money for supply. Unless he intends to make a very welcome announcement this afternoon, that is, frankly, a slap in the face to every single business that is struggling to keep their doors open. It is over $5 million a day that those businesses contribute to those state coffers that we rely on for supply. This government has refused, and continues to refuse, to look at things that could help them grow and prosper.

I should not need to have to remind the Premier and the Treasurer that these businesses are paying payroll tax, regardless of whether they are generating a profit. We have just seen another wage increase that will further exacerbate that pain. Payroll tax is not, as the Premier has described, 'just a tax on jobs'; it is a cash cow for government that they simply cannot wean themselves from.

This government does talk the talk about the economic drivers. We have heard many contributions today about economic growth and the sorts of things that contribute to supply and ensuring we have the funds for supply. It talks about the things it is committed to strengthening, namely, job growth and investment in the state, but it ignores the great big elephant in the room crippling those same drivers. You cannot grow business and expand your workforce if you cannot afford the payroll tax debt that comes with. Despite the government's rhetoric, it remains the single largest factor holding businesses back from employing more people in this state.

I cannot recall a single time when the Treasurer has come out and said anything remotely promising about payroll tax, let alone anything that would signal relief for those same small and medium businesses, and of course the exact same thing can be said in relation to poker machine taxes and gambling taxes. If you are relying on payroll tax, gambling tax and land tax to keep supply going, then you have a problem. A billion dollars from poker machines outside of the Casino is nothing to be proud of; it is reprehensible. Again, the level of resistance from government to consider reform is, frankly, like pulling teeth.

I do support many of the proposals the government puts forward in this place, like many of us, but they are making it harder and harder to do so in the face of, frankly, their pigheadedness and stubbornness when it comes to those two issues. When it comes to payroll tax, when it comes to gambling tax and when it comes to land tax—the egg the Premier says we cannot unscramble—it is not through lack of trying. I have not just talked about poker machines in this place and the impact they have on our community, I have given this place every single opportunity to do something meaningful about it, year in, year out.

My memory is actually long enough to remember a time when the Greens had to backflip from a terrible decision they made around ATMs on poker machines in this state, and I am pretty realistic when it comes to the reforms that are needed in this place centred on harm minimisation. I know the idea of getting rid of poker machines, while very appealing to all of us, is something that makes the Treasurer shake in his boots, but that does not mean we cannot do something like New South Wales and Tasmania. It does not mean we cannot have a crack.

I have to say that given the reliance on those taxes in this state, which is not a good thing, the proposals that I have heard from the Greens are about as pie in the sky today as they were in 2018, especially when you have real meaningful reforms you could be moving that would actually make a dent without impacting supply for those people who feel the pain of those machines each and every day. In order to have supply we have to have money—we all know that, we get the general gist—but that cannot come at the expense of small and medium businesses, it cannot come at the expense of people losing their livelihoods to poker machines and it cannot come at the expense of landowners being treated as cash cows.

For the record—and I did not speak on this yesterday—I do not support proposals like taxing people on their vacant land, I do not support penalising people who have managed to acquire a property and generate a little extra income for themselves through short-term rentals, because they are facing the same pressures as everybody else, and that is something we seem to forget. The person who offers their place on a short-term rental accommodation basis is also struggling in the

same way that every other small and medium business is struggling, the same way all the families that we have talked about today are struggling. They are also trying to pay their highest electricity bill in the nation, they are also trying to put food on the table for their families, and they are also trying to send their kids to school.

Targeting those people who cannot afford to be targeted—and we should not be targeting—is not the answer. Frankly, that is not how you deal with the housing shortage in this state, that is absolutely not how you deal with the housing shortage, and it certainly is not how you deal with the fact that we now live in the second most expensive city in the world and people cannot afford homes here anymore. Aside from that, and we are focusing on homes, people are struggling to put food on their table and pay their electricity bill, let alone their rent.

Each morning, I drive past three buildings: Puddle Jumpers, Foodbank and OzHarvest. I can tell you I do the same in the evening when I go home, and the queues are getting longer and longer. People are standing there, waiting for goods to take back to their families and to their kids to be able to eat that night. Were it not for services and charities like that, the likelihood is they would not have anything to eat that night. Parents are foregoing meals to make sure that their kids are actually fed.

More than 32 per cent of Australian households are experiencing food insecurity. In 2023, Foodbank reported that 255,000 South Australian homes struggled to put food on the table, 150,000 experienced food insecurity—that is 42,000 up from the previous year—and 50 per cent of food insecure family households are in paid work; they are actually working. We are not just talking about a demographic of people who are unemployed. We seem to lose sight of that: we are talking about one particular demographic. When we talk about the creep effect of payroll tax, the exact same creep effect applies within food insecurity and people who cannot afford their utilities, food and rent anymore. It is getting more and more expensive and people simply cannot afford it anymore.

KickStart are dealing with kids who are feeling the brunt of this each and every day. We now rely on KickStart to deliver 60,000 breakfasts and 10,000 lunches a week in South Australia across 360 schools, and 2,000 period products every month to those same schools. We need to get real about those problems—real problems that are confronting people each and every day. These are our neighbours and they are our communities. They are those living in our ageing populations, in our retirement villages. It does not matter what age you are and what suburb you live in anymore, people are struggling. But we do not address that by refusing to budge on things like payroll tax and gambling tax that only serve to exacerbate the problem. It does not fix it, and it certainly does not help us keep on top of supply in this state.

If you want to know why we have so many kids in child protection, if you want to know why we have so many kids in juvenile detention, if you want to know why crime rates are the way they are, if you want to know how we set up a system that leads kids on a one-way trajectory to adult detention, then you need to start looking at all these issues holistically because they are not isolated. Child protection is not isolated from juvenile detention. Juvenile detention is not isolated from adult detention. Mental health is not isolated from detention in either setting.

None of these things are isolated from poverty. None of these things are isolated from food insecurity. None of these things are isolated from small and medium businesses going under. I have a business and, over the Christmas break, I counted the number of cars that were using their car park to live in. I think we reached five at one point. That was the maximum number of cars. It started with one and a tent and it resulted in about five or six all over the same period.

They were lucky that it was a bit of a remote block and the neighbours that were businesses did not mind, but these are not people who are not doing their bit; these are people who are saying, 'We just cannot afford to live here anymore.' That should be front and centre of our minds, not only when we consider the Supply Bill but when we consider the budget this afternoon and every other piece of legislation that we pass through this place, and every other policy that we implement that affects and impacts all South Australians and all of our communities.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (12:16): I thank all members for their very wideranging contributions on this matter and look forward to the committee stage.

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) (12:18): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

DOG AND CAT MANAGEMENT (BREEDER REFORMS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 June 2025.)

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (12:19): I rise today to speak on behalf of the opposition in support of the Dog and Cat Management (Breeder Reforms) Amendment Bill 2024. This bill represents a timely and necessary update to South Australia's animal welfare and public safety laws, particularly in response to increasing community concern over irresponsible breeding practices, the rise in dangerous dog incidents, and inconsistencies with national approaches to companion animal management.

As legislators, we have a duty to strike the right balance between responsible pet ownership, public safety and the protection of animals from cruelty and exploitation. This bill makes progress towards that goal. One of the most important reforms in this bill is the significant increase in penalties for serious dog attacks. The current maximum fine of $2,500 is simply out of step with community expectations and the traumatic consequences these incidents can have on victims and their families, both human and animal.

This bill will raise the maximum penalty to $25,000 for serious attacks and up to $50,000 where a dog was already subject to a dangerous dog order. These reforms send a clear message that owners must take full responsibility for the control of their animals, especially when prior warnings have been issued. The opposition welcomes this much-needed strengthening of deterrents and the alignment of penalties with community standards.

We also support the introduction of a breeder licensing scheme designed to target unscrupulous large-scale breeding operations that put profit above animal welfare. The measures in this bill, including strict licensing conditions, limits on the number of female breeding animals and litters and mandatory reporting, represent a clear step towards stamping out puppy farming in this state. We are pleased to see provisions that allow for breeder licences to be suspended or cancelled and that prohibit those convicted of relevant animal welfare offences from operating breeding businesses. This scheme, when properly enforced, will improve welfare outcomes and give South Australians greater confidence that pets are being bred ethically, not in squalid conditions.

The opposition does not oppose the changes to the composition of the Dog and Cat Management Board from nine members to seven as long as the board retains the appropriate skills mix and experience to deliver its mandate effectively. The revised annual reporting date of 31 October is a pragmatic adjustment to improve alignment with departmental timelines. We also welcome reforms that give councils greater flexibility to incorporate dog and cat management plans into their broader operational strategies, reflecting a more integrated approach to local government planning.

The introduction of a new wandering dog order to better manage dogs that regularly escape from their properties is a logical and measured tool that complements existing control mechanisms. Removing the outdated requirement for muzzles on retired racing greyhounds is consistent with national trends and will help reduce barriers to adoption. As a veterinarian for 15 years, greyhounds

are gentle, intelligent dogs, and this change aligns with our broader goal of promoting rehoming and responsible pet ownership.

The opposition has considered the amendments put forward by the Hon. Ms Franks and the Attorney-General. In regard to the Hon. Ms Franks' amendments, while we acknowledge the spirit of her proposals, particularly around public consultation and breeder limits, we hold the view that mandatory public consultation on all changes to standards and guidelines would overly constrain the board and limit its ability to respond flexibly to emerging issues. Prescribing exact breeding numbers in legislation is unnecessarily rigid. These are matters better left to regulations, guided by contemporary animal welfare advice and industry consultation.

The proposed prohibition of surgical artificial insemination is more appropriately dealt with under the Veterinary Services Act 2023, where such procedures can be evaluated by veterinary professionals within a scientific and ethical framework. Accordingly, the opposition does not support the Franks amendments in their current form, but we do leave room for discretion should the government support a modified approach to significant public consultation requirements.

In relation to the government's own amendments, we support their inclusion. They are informed by consultation with local government and the recent cat management review, and they offer sensible, measured improvements. Providing authorised officers the ability to issue directions without requiring an offence is a practical enforcement tool. Clarifying control order language, including for barking dogs, improves legal certainty. Updating cat control provisions to ensure unowned cats can be managed on Crown land and in national parks addresses longstanding concerns, particularly for environmental protection. Aligning penalty provisions nationally is a rational move that improves consistency across jurisdictions.

I do want to place on the record, though, that we, the opposition, were somewhat surprised that this bill did not go further on long overdue cat management reform. This was an opportunity for the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water, the Hon. Susan Close, to put her money where her mouth is. As the then opposition, she was a vocal critic of the former Liberal government for not acting decisively enough on the issue of stray and feral cats, particularly regarding their environmental impact and the cost burden placed on councils. Yet, now in government, she has failed to deliver the bold reforms that she once called for.

This bill was a clear opportunity to implement a consistent and enforceable framework for cat control across South Australia, but particularly in metropolitan Adelaide, with things including containment policies and support for local government. Instead, we are left with a piecemeal amendment package that tinkers at the edges, whilst ignoring the broader problem.

In saying that, the Liberal opposition supports the Dog and Cat Management (Breeder Reforms) Amendment Bill 2024 and again, as I outlined earlier, the majority of the government amendments. As a party we remain committed to upholding public safety and promoting ethical science-based animal management policy in South Australia and we welcome the bill's focus on responsible ownership, stronger deterrence and improved animal welfare outcomes. I commend the bill to the house.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (12:26): I rise briefly to speak in support of this bill, but in doing so I have some good stuff to say and some not so good stuff to say about this proposal. The not so good stuff is the stuff that the Hon. Nicola Centofanti has just referred to around cat management. I have taken a cursory glance back in time to 2016, when the minister introduced a bill to amend the Dog and Cat Management Act, aiming to contemporise and implement solutions to dog and cat management that reflect communities' views. That was 2016, and the minister goes on to provide those. The issue of cats—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. C. BONAROS: That was Minister Close at the time, 2016. I am going to get to the interim period in a moment. So in 2016, that was Minister Close who introduced that bill. Of course, in 2018 we had an election and so there was a four-year period in between where lots of commitments were stated about what we were going to do about cats in particular. We do not have the same problems around dogs. The dog stuff everyone supports, but the cats is where it gets

challenging. There were a number of commitments when, four years later Labor came back into government.

From 2019 I have the cat management plan for South Australia, which talks through the sorts of things that we would like to see done, which is all the subject of consultation with the minister. In 2020, there was a debate in this place. I remember the Hon. Ms Bourke telling me not to bring it to a vote because there was an LGA meeting that night. I think she told me that in confidence, but we are here now amongst friends.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I do not remember what was happening, but there was an RSPCA piece of correspondence put to me in 2020 saying, 'Please don't disallow those cat by-laws.' We had lots of cat by-laws. Do members remember the *Notice Paper*? I am sure the Clerk remembers the *Notice Paper* being full of by-laws that were the subject of disallowance motions. In 2023, and this applies today as much as it did then—certainly we have been waiting some time now for these review outcomes—I said:

> Anyone who knows anything about the Legislative Review Committee knows that I wholeheartedly welcome the Dog and Cat Management Act review—although I have not read it yet...

I had not read it. I had just received it and I had hoped that it addressed longstanding issues that the committee had had to deal with in terms of cat and dog management in this jurisdiction, something that had consumed way too much of the time of that committee because of by-law-making processes over many, many years.

I think everyone has been waiting patiently from 2023 for that review to come out in the hope that it does something to address this issue going forward. The Legislative Review Committee has received more correspondence and submissions on cats than any other single issue in this state. That is fact. Every single time we have a Legislative Review Committee, bar one or two exceptions, we consider the issue of cats. I am going to speak out of turn and say that at the last meeting I said, 'I'm not dealing with cats anymore because if Minister Close can't deal with cats, I don't see why we should.'

The whole idea of having a statewide review on cats was to ensure that we adopted a statewide solution on cats. Here we are now, fast-forward—and I do have a contribution from 2023 from the Hon. Justin Hanson, which again points to the government's position on this issue. We are talking about the reviews that are coming, we are talking about the commitments this government is giving, and we are dealing with cats. The good news is the dogs, the bad news is the cats. But here we are now in June 2025, and everything that I have said applies as much today as it applied then.

Sadly, we have missed this opportunity to deal with cats. I, for one, will not be dealing with cats in the Legislative Review Committee anymore. I refuse to do so because it is not that committee's function to find a solution to the issue of cats. The minister has gone on the record time and time again and said that we need a statewide solution, and I hasten to say that her own department is just as frustrated about this. It is taking too long.

Cats, just for the record, do not understand boundaries. They do not understand that if you are on this side of the street you are in one council area, but if you cross the road you are in another council area. They do not understand that if you are on this side of the street one set of rules applies to you, but if you cross the road, you silly cat, another set of rules applies to you. That is at the heart of the problem around cats.

I feel like I am going to die waiting for cat reforms. Luckily, I do not own cats, so I am not going to be eaten by a bunch of cats, feral or otherwise, that chew on the human remains of a lonely, old Connie who dies alone in her house. I am not suggesting that is what happens to lonely, old women with cats, but—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. C. BONAROS: It could be a dog, but I am suggesting that the time has well and truly come. These changes, just from 2016, if we are going to be serious—we were having these

discussions well before 2016, but 2016 was the year when we were really going to get things into line. It is 2025 and we have been through all the reviews we have had to. I know there are people in the department who are doing their level best. I understand that this is not an easy issue to address, but it cannot be that hard. We have resolved some pretty big issues in this place. We dealt with the Whyalla Steelworks, for God's sake, and we are still trying to figure out how to deal with cats.

That is the part of the bill that I am not happy with. I remain hopeful that I will not die alone in a home amongst cats before we see some meaningful reforms in this area. That is all I am going to say about cats. That is my whinge. To get onto something that I am happy about with this bill, though—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I do not like cats, for the record. I have said this; it is my disclaimer to every—

The Hon. K.J. Maher: There's 2.3 per cent of the vote gone.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: No, can I just say that I am allergic to cats. They give me hives, so that is why I do not like them. My son loves them.

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Now he is making me speak a little bit more. I do have a disclaimer—

The PRESIDENT: Stop badgering the speaker.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I will say that my inbox is full of emails from cat lovers all the time. Every time I meet them, I say to them, 'Do you realise I don't like cats that much because they give me hives and they make me itch?' and they say, 'For someone who dislikes cats you do a very good job of representing our views.' So I will keep those people on side, thank you, Attorney-General.

Now I move on to another animal that I do love, and that is dogs. In 2024, in relation to IGP (Internationale Gebrauchshundepruefung), I wrote to seek some meetings with the minister responsible. IGP is a form of dog sport training. Initially, it was included as one of the features of this bill. I have worked closely with the individuals who work in this area and tried very hard to ensure that they are indeed exempt from some of the provisions that are in here.

I will take this opportunity to mention Dr Sanne Pedersen of the Working German Shepherd & Dogsport Clubs of Australasia; Mr Phil Triantafillou, president of Working Dog Federation of Australia; and Mr Matthew Heyman, president of Adelaide Sportdog Club Inc., who first raised this issue with me and who I advocated with in relation to ensuring that these dogs were not included in the realm of issues that we are canvassing here.

I had the good fortune of going out and being allowed to see how this dog sport works in practice—I had one dog bite onto the leather grip on my arm. They are exceptionally talented animals, so I am very pleased that the minister, on 3 September 2024, wrote to me. I seek leave to table that letter, indicating that the dog sport in question, the IGP dog sport, will be excluded from the definition of an attack-trained dog, because they are not attack dogs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I note that instead we all agreed that there would obviously be guidelines for councils for consideration of the relevant history of dogs involved in attacks, which can be recorded. So if there is a dog attack and the dog in question happens to be an IGP-trained dog—we do not anticipate that it will be but if it happens to be—that will be duly recorded so that we can actually keep track of dog attacks and ensure that there is not an increased risk of IGP-trained dogs being involved in these sorts of attacks.

I have not had a single case raised with me in which one of these dogs has been involved in an attack. The bottom line is, as I said: people actually invest a lot of money in these dogs, a lot of money. They treat them as family members and they are very well looked after and very well trained, but they are certainly not trained to be attack dogs.

So I am pleased with that outcome, exceptionally pleased, and I am very thankful to the minister and her department for taking this issue on board, for sitting and listening to the representations that have been made and for ultimately excluding these dogs from the remit of this bill as it was originally drafted.

I do note that Victoria is also looking at this issue and, I think, patiently looking to this bill passing in South Australia before they consider similar reforms in their jurisdiction in relation to their animal welfare laws or their dog and cat management laws, or whatever they are debating at the moment, but specifically in relation to the treatment of IGP dogs and ensuring that they are appropriately labelled as what they are.

With those words, I thank the minister for all her collaboration and good work on this bill and, in my instance, particularly for the work on the IGP side of things. I hope she will not let me die alone in the house before the further cat reforms become a reality!

The Hon. J.S. LEE (12:39): I rise to speak in support of the Dog and Cat Management (Breeder Reforms) Amendment Bill 2024, a bill that represents a significant and commendable step forward in our state's approach to animal welfare and responsible pet ownership. This legislation responds to strong community expectations that we do more to prevent unethical breeding practices, eliminate so-called puppy factories and ensure that animals bred in this state are raised in humane, safe and regulated environments.

The introduction of mandatory breeder licensing, strengthened compliance measures and reinforced desexing requirements are all welcome reforms that reflect the values of a society that cares deeply about the welfare of its animals. I acknowledge the strong support this bill received in the other place. The government has tabled amendments that clarify key provisions and strengthen the bill's intent. These changes reflect the feedback of stakeholders and demonstrate a willingness to listen and refine the legislation to ensure it is both effective and enforceable.

I also wish to express my support for the amendments tabled by the Hon. Tammy Franks. These amendments, I believe, provide important additional safeguards by defining the number of breeding animals a person may keep under a licence, limiting the number of litters a breeding animal can produce and prohibiting the artificial insemination of dogs and cats for breeding purposes. These are thoughtful and principled amendments that reflect the concerns of animal welfare advocates and the broader community. They help ensure that breeding practices remain ethical, humane and focused on the wellbeing of the animals involved, not simply on maximising output or profit.

During the debate in the other place, many personal stories were shared. These stories are not just anecdotes, they are reflections of the bond between people and their pets, and they underscore the importance of ensuring that every animal has a chance to live a safe and cared-for life. I love dogs. I do not love cats as much as the Hon. Michelle Lensink, but all the animals that came into my family's life have provided a lot of joy, care, love and support that we all need a little bit more of sometimes.

While I support the bill and the amendments, I believe it is important to place on the record several broader concerns that remain relevant as we move towards implementation. There is a likelihood that increased compliance costs for breeders will be passed on to consumers, making pets less affordable and potentially driving some towards unregulated or unethical sources. This could, ironically, undermine the very welfare outcomes the bill seeks to achieve. The bill's reinforcement of mandatory desexing is a positive measure, but we must acknowledge that for some, particularly in rural and low income communities, this may present a financial or logistical burden.

Without accessible support or subsidies, we risk creating barriers to compliance for those who are otherwise responsible pet owners. These concerns are echoed by the Local Government Association of South Australia, which has made a detailed submission on this bill. The bill does not address the ongoing lack of a statewide framework for managing stray and unidentified cats, as was called for by the Local Government Association of South Australia.

Councils remain without adequate resources, and shelters such as the RSPCA and AWL are often only able to assist if the animal is injured. This leaves many healthy unidentifiable cats in a legal and welfare grey zone. Of particular concern is a provision allowing for the destruction of cats

in prescribed areas without the need for identification, as detailed in the government's amendment No. 5 [AG-1]. While this may be intended to manage feral populations, the reality is that owned cats, particularly those not microchipped or whose details are not up to date, could be at risk of being destroyed. This is a deeply distressing prospect for pet owners and raises serious ethical questions about how we distinguish between feral, stray and domestic animals in practice.

Furthermore, local government authorities are being asked to take on expanded responsibilities under this bill, particularly in enforcement and community education, without any additional funding or structural support. This places councils in a difficult position. They are expected to deliver more with less while managing growing community expectations around animal welfare.

I also wish to acknowledge the concerns raised by the LGA. In its submission the LGA has rightly pointed out the need to maintain a clear distinction between animal management and animal welfare. Councils should not be expected to enforce welfare compliance without appropriate authority or funding. The LGA has also called for statewide cat management laws to ensure consistency and fairness, particularly for regional councils. Additionally, the submission highlights a loophole in microchipping and desexing regulations that undermines the integrity of the Dogs and Cats Online system, an issue that deserves urgent attention. These are practical, constructive recommendations that should inform the implementation phase of this legislation.

I support the intent and direction of this bill. I commend both the government and the Hon. Tammy Franks for their considered amendments. These reforms are necessary and welcome, and I also believe that it is our duty to ensure that their implementation is monitored closely and that the concerns raised by stakeholders and community today are not forgotten. I look forward to seeing these reforms implemented in a way that reflects the compassion and care our community expects. With those remarks, I commend the bill.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (12:46): I rise today to support the Dog and Cat Management (Breeder Reforms) Amendment Bill 2024 and to flag that I will also be introducing some amendments that give this bill some real teeth to stop what all sides of politics have acknowledged are the cruel and inhumane puppy factories, these kennels of shame that we all stand here and condemn.

However, while this bill has multiple aims and I agree with most if not all of them in spirit, I differ very much regarding the exact letter of the law that is being proposed here in the bill today. The bill proposes, of course, a breeder licensing scheme that requires adherence to a 'strict' set of standards—I am not sure how strict those standards are—to limit the number of fertile female dogs a breeder may own and cap the number of litters a mother dog may have across her life. I will have more to say about that later.

Mandatory reporting will be required for each litter and licensing requirements will be toughened. That is welcome. No longer will an interstate operator convicted of animal welfare offences be allowed to simply shift across a border and resume their vile operations—again, a welcome move. Fines will be increased to up to $10,000 for breeding animals without a licence or contravening the terms and conditions put on those licences.

Licences will also be able to be suspended or cancelled if and when required, another welcome change. Also, there is a significant strengthening of the penalties for dog attacks and for dogs who have been allowed to wander. While we all love our companion animals, we have a duty and responsibility to ensure that they are safe and protected from cars or attacks from other dogs and that they do not cause a menace and threaten or harm other animals, other species and indeed humans, especially children, who are often the most vulnerable to dog attacks purely because of their size and the fact that they are often at eye and teeth level.

Instead of a maximum $2,500 fine, serious injuries or death caused by dog attacks will now be up to $25,000 or up to $50,000 from $10,000 if that dog was already known to be dangerous and the subject of a dangerous dog order. There is simply no excuse for allowing your dog to roam and attack other dogs, animals or people.

New wandering dog orders will be introduced to address dogs that continually escape and wander, and these will impact on owners as well, including giving directions for steps to be taken to

secure dogs and to attend training if required. These changes send a very strong message, and I applaud that message.

The bill makes amendments to some technical aspects of the act to provide new definitions and to streamline the operations of the act. The number of members of the Dog and Cat Management Board will be reduced from nine to seven, and the reporting deadline will be adjusted to line up with other reporting schedules as well.

The online registration scheme Dogs and Cats Online (DACO) will be enhanced, and a particular provision will be made to allow for information sharing from that database, especially when there is a risk of harm occurring. The bill will further allow councils to streamline their management of dog and cat management and integrate it into their ongoing planning undertaken to simplify matters and make things easier for consumers and companion animal owners.

One of the changes I certainly applaud, which is very long overdue, is the change in the requirement for retired ex-racing greyhounds to have to be muzzled in public. This is consistent with other states and is supported by the evidence that ex-racing greyhounds who have since been adopted and have a suitable temperament are not a risk to other dogs or to people. It will reduce some of those remaining barriers to the adoption of these beautiful animals.

I have no issue with those sensible and needed reforms, but I do take issue with the government's major election promise that is in this legislation, namely, prior to the election, when in opposition, the now Malinauskas government promised to take action to ban puppy factories. Two years after their election promise to shut down puppy farms or puppy factories, the government has finally brought legislation to this place. It is now well over three years since that promise was made that we debate it here in this house; however, what we have before us is a half-hearted attempt to prevent the scourge of puppy factories and intensive puppy breeding.

While I commend the government for making a commitment and so publicly consulting on the bill, it is important we critically evaluate the government's undertakings and call out the rhetoric when it is revealed. While on the surface the government's promises to take action on animal welfare issues within the dog breeding industry sound good, the devil is again in the detail. Labor's election promise noted:

> A glaring example of intolerable cruelty is the puppy factories where female dogs are forced to breed year after year and are kept in cages all their lives, crammed in filthy conditions.
>
> Labor will eradicate puppy factories and will prevent any such operations setting up in South Australia.

The promises went on:

> A Malinauskas Labor government will:
>
> - Ensure standards governing commercial breeding of companion animals in South Australia are at least as strict as any jurisdiction in the nation so there is no incentive for unscrupulous operators to move here to establish their cruel operations.

Furthermore, they stated they would:

- Introduce a cap on dog numbers in commercial breeding facilities and a limit on how many litters a dog can have.
- Introduce a limit on the number of breeding females in commercial kennels to be no more than the most strict state in Australia.

Rather than being the strictest state in Australia, we have aspired to be average, and it is underwhelming when you look into the detail. It is interesting that these promises are no longer available online and they have been removed, although I do thank the Liberals for their website that keeps track of those promises. I printed them out at the time and have a folder in my office should anyone like a copy. But we do know the internet never forgets as well, and the Wayback Machine is a very useful thing.

I do acknowledge that a limit to the number of fertile female dogs was put in place in 2022, but the reality is that far from stopping intensive puppy breeding factories, that limit allows up to 50 fertile female mother dogs per breeder—50 per breeder. This is far and away beyond what is considered appropriate by the experts in animal welfare, including Animals Australia and the RSPCA,

a hardworking charity that must time and time again be at the coalface of investigating and prosecuting those people who cruelly mistreat or neglect animals.

Sadly, far from stopping puppy factories, this bill actually gives the green light for unscrupulous and greedy breeders to exploit up to 50 dogs at any one time and profit from the misery they create as they pump out litter after litter until they are worn out or discarded. The government bill would see breeders allowed to have up to 50 female dogs, meaning that breeder could produce literally hundreds of puppies every year for profit. Puppies need love and puppies need care, and there is no way a breeder—a cottage rather than a factory breeder—can adequately care for and appropriately socialise that many dogs: literally hundreds of dogs each year under the current proposal in this bill. As Animals Australia CEO, Glenys Oogjes, noted in her correspondence of 19 March this year, 2025:

> Dogs are unique in their need for positive social interaction, stimulation and exercise and young puppies are especially vulnerable if such interaction is not provided during their formative first months at a facility. What has become clear from the evidence gathered by animal welfare groups over recent years is that large scale puppy farms even when operating legally cannot provide for the individual needs of the dogs.

So this breeder reform legislation is important, and it is the best opportunity that we will have to really make a difference to the lives of those mother dogs, their puppies and their eventual owners and those families.

My amendments would make this legislation truly fit for purpose, truly keep the promise that was made to the South Australian people and force the government to get real about their promise to stop these cruel puppy factories. My amendments would limit the number of dogs an individual breeder can have down from 50 to 10. It will follow expert veterinarian opinion and limit the number of litters to four per dog instead of five and it will ensure the out-of-date standards and guidelines can be reviewed and publicly consulted on.

The breeder reform bill that we have here today before this council is a perfect opportunity to get the government to follow through on one of the Ashton inquiry key recommendations—that greyhound inquiry by Mr Ashton—to ban cruel surgical artificial insemination. It is highly invasive, unethical and causes significant pain to female dogs. It is illegal already in some EU countries, including Norway, Sweden and the Netherlands, and it was banned in the UK way back in 2019.

Greyhounds Australasia has committed to its own ban by 2026, but we in South Australia should not be waiting that long. It was a review recommendation of the Ashton report, fully accepted by the government. I understand the government will have something to say with regard to the movements in South Australia of Greyhound Racing SA, but the dogs should not have to wait until people and organisations are doing this of their own volition when we have an opportunity here now in this debate, like those other parliaments have done, to ban this cruel practice.

The bill, of course, provides the perfect opportunity to take action now. While this is particularly pertinent to South Australia's greyhounds, it is not just confined to that breed. It is particularly problematic when used on flat-faced breeds, such as French bulldogs. These dogs face high risk for anaesthesia due to their constricted airways. The rationale—a belief that it generates large litters—has actually been debunked by studies, including a nine-year study from New Zealand of 1,146 dogs that showed no difference in the whelping rates of this process, while other studies confirm that risks to dogs are much higher than when conventional artificial insemination is utilised, a much more common and much safer procedure that is widely used worldwide, including, of course, in humans.

Surgical artificial insemination is a complex and potentially dangerous procedure that involves anaesthetising a female dog, cutting through the abdomen and into the uterus, to then inject semen directly into that uterus. The procedure is highly invasive and presents an unacceptable level of risk to dogs. Greyhounds are particularly at risk due to their enhanced susceptibility to the effects of anaesthetic and a breed-specific tendency to be at greater risk of blood clotting failures if they suffer a bleed related to that surgery. While the practice has become common, in part due to the belief that it leads to these larger litters, alternative measures, such as transcervical insemination, are widely used with a much lower risk of side effects or complications, and the dogs remain fully conscious and do not require surgery.

We have laws in this state that ban the eating of dogs and cats. We have privileged these particular companion animals, because that is the standard that the South Australian community expects. While perhaps the banning of eating the cats and eating the dogs was a portent of a rejection of Trump-style politics way back in the day by a former Attorney-General, I hope that we can lead the way again on this piece of legislation when it comes to cats and dogs.

Accordingly, I urge members of this council to consider and hopefully support the amendments that I put forward to the Dog and Cat Management (Breeder Reforms) Amendment Bill 2024 to guarantee that our South Australian laws do the job that we promised the public we would do: meet community expectations that animal welfare is first and foremost the priority, not maximising profits, not supporting greed when it comes to breed, and stopping puppy factories once and for all.

In conclusion, I would like to thank the minister's office and, in particular, Emily Gore, her adviser, as well as the Dog and Cat Management Board for their support and briefings, as well as stakeholders such as Animals Australia, the Coalition for Protection of Greyhounds and the RSPCA in particular, and my staff member Jamnes Danenberg, who has put a lot of work into both this bill and into consultation on the amendments that I put before this council.

This was a Malinauskas government election promise. We are making good on that promise now. At the time, the promise was to be at least the best in the country—equal to whatever was the best in the country. At the time of the promise, the debate in Victoria was in fact for a limit to 10 of those dogs. During the parliamentary process and during other political machinations, that number went up to 50. So here today we have a number of 50 that is presented in this piece of legislation as the least worst. We can do better; we can aspire higher.

Since that debate, New South Wales has now had a debate and has a number of 20. South Australia can lead here and go with the original Victorian aspiration of 10, which abides not only by animal welfare standards and the ability to have properly socialised and treated puppies, as well as less cruelty for their mothers, but indeed would fit the community expectation of what the Premier meant when he made that promise to truly ban puppy factories.

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

Sitting suspended from 13:01 to 14:15.

Question Time

SHEEP AND GOAT ELECTRONIC IDENTIFICATION

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:16): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries on sheep and goat eID rebates.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: The sheep and goat eID tag rebate is a 50 per cent rebate up to a cap of 95¢ (GST exclusive) for NLIS-accredited eID tags purchased between 1 January 2023 and 30 June 2025 and consequently is set to end at the end of this month. In the government's drought package, $4.5 million was announced to support producers in adopting electronic identification systems for sheep and farmed goats. Many farmers have suggested that extending the eID tag rebate post 30 June would be one practical way of providing some relief for farmers through the drought. My questions to the minister are:

1. Does the $4.5 million eID announcement as part of the drought package include the extension of the eID tag rebate post June 30?

2. If so, how much of these funds will be utilised for the extension of that rebate; and if not, what are these funds being used for?

3. Can the minister commit to the chamber that she will continue the eID tag rebate program post 30 June for an additional two years to help our farmers dealing with the dire nature of the drought?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:18): I thank the honourable member for her question. The topic of eID, the tag rebates and other aspects of eID, has of course been a constant now for some time, including within the last couple of months. I have had meetings particularly with peak bodies in regard to what will be best for the farmers, for the livestock owners, in terms of the future direction and use of those funds for eID. I look forward to being able to further update the chamber in the near future.

SHEEP AND GOAT ELECTRONIC IDENTIFICATION

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): Supplementary: given the fact that the minister announced as part of the drought package $4.5 million for sheep and goat eID, can the minister outline to the chamber what that funding will be used for?

The PRESIDENT: I am not sure it came from the original answer. I just remind members that, when they are asking a supplementary question, it is a question—there's no explanation leading into the question. So if it does not start with 'what', 'why', 'when', 'how', it is not a supplementary question.

SOUTH COAST ALGAL BLOOM

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking questions of the Minister for Primary Industries on the harmful algal bloom in South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: The harmful algal bloom event, as we are all aware, has had a severe and ongoing impact, particularly on commercial fishers, and especially for those operating out of Kangaroo Island and the Yorke Peninsula, as well as sections of the aquaculture industry. Many have seen their income fall to zero in the last two months, with no ability to fish and no alternative revenue stream.

Whilst industry welcomes the inclusion of fishers in the Rural Business Support $1,500 hardship funding, following advocacy efforts from industry leaders, it is the opposition's understanding that the fishing industry remains ineligible for any Farm Household Allowance currently. Given the scale of the economic impact caused by the harmful algal bloom event, my questions to the minister are:

1. Has the minister or her office had any communication from the fishing industry groups or from individual fishers in this state seeking fee waivers for those businesses impacted by the harmful algal bloom?

2. Will the minister waive or defer PIRSA fees for those impacted by the harmful algal bloom in the commercial fishing industry and the aquaculture industry?

3. Has the minister advocated to the federal government for the inclusion of commercial fishers and the aquaculture industry in the Farm Household Allowance scheme?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:21): I thank the honourable member for her question. In regard to the harmful algal bloom, there have been a wide variety of impacts—different impacts across different areas of the state. That is why it has really been considered on a case-by-case basis. In terms of fee waivers, I answered a similar question, asked, if I remember correctly, by the Hon. Connie Bonaros on Tuesday, when I said that at that time there hadn't been requests for fee waivers. However, in the last couple of days, I believe, correspondence has come into my office.

One of the things that has been part of the ongoing communications with affected industries has included Mr Gavin Begg from my department meeting this morning, if I remember correctly, with a number of producers and discussing some of the various aspects of the algal bloom, including taking on board whether any changes to fees may be appropriate.

SOUTH COAST ALGAL BLOOM

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): Supplementary arising from the answer: will the minister, given the correspondence that has come into her office from fishers in the last few days, waive and defer PIRSA fees for those impacted by the harmful algal bloom within the commercial fishing industry and the aquaculture industry?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:23): I just answered that.

SOUTH COAST ALGAL BLOOM

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:23): Supplementary arising from the original answer, very specifically: when the minister says a case-by-case basis, does she mean case-by-case basis for associations and individuals that have been impacted by the algal bloom outbreak?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:23): Associations don't pay fees in that way.

SOUTH COAST ALGAL BLOOM

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:24): Further supplementary: when the minister says that consideration will be given to fee waiver and/or compensation, does that include individuals who contact her about the same?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:24): Consideration will be given to requests from producers. I am not quite sure how it can be any more clear.

FORESTRY INDUSTRY

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development regarding forestry. Given it has been over four months since the report of the Select Committee on Matters Relating to the Timber Industry in the Limestone Coast and Other Regions of South Australia was tabled in this place, when will the minister and the government respond to that report and, in particular, the recommendations?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:25): I thank the honourable member for her question. If I remember correctly, a number of the recommendations referred to things that we were already doing and had undertaken, but we have been engaging with industry about those—from memory—very few that weren't aspects that were already under consideration or in fact had already been implemented.

INNAMINCKA FLOOD

The Hon. T.T. NGO (14:25): My question is to the Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services. Can the minister tell the council about her recent trip to Innamincka?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:25): I thank the honourable member for his question and his interest in the Innamincka community and the floods. We often hear in this chamber about the biggest, fastest and record-breaking events. Today, I again finding myself using these very words, but this time it is a record that is hard to comprehend until you see it.

Right now, a flood covering an area approximately half the size of Tasmania is moving across the Innamincka community and the surrounding stations and those communities. It is remarkable to be speaking about floods in South Australia at record levels in the middle of a drought. This flood wasn't caused by local rain but by water flows from across the border from an ex-tropical cyclone that hit Queensland weeks ago.

SES volunteers were deployed ahead of the waters arriving, many of them to places they have never been to before. But they went, as they always do, to help people in their time of need. Their early arrival meant that they could focus on prevention, constructing the DefenCell around the township of Innamincka. When I spoke with Travis and Laura, who had only taken over the

management of the Innamincka pub three weeks before the floodwaters came—it wasn't the best timing—they told me how tough it had been but also how it had brought their community together.

At its peak, I believe the arrival of SES crews more than doubled the local population. They built the DefenCell and coordinated aerial support and worked side by side with the local community. A sign of this appreciation is now hanging above the front bar of the Innamincka pub: a piece of the DefenCell that has been signed by the volunteers who helped to erect this DefenCell, an insurance policy for that local community. We know this is an important thing as it symbolises what the SES is about and how they support our local communities.

Black Hawk helicopters were on standby, a sight few will ever forget and a sight that is rare in the local community. They were used to airlift motorbikes so that station workers could move 2,600 head of cattle to higher ground—an economic muster worth, I believe and am advised, $6 million.

In visiting the region, it was impossible not to be captivated by the sheer scale of the flood, watching it crawl across the desert and into some of Australia's most iconic beef country and environmental landscapes like Lake Eyre. We stopped at Mungeranie to meet with local producers and listened to many people, including Sandra, who I have come to know well in recent weeks. It was a privilege to meet with her in her local community at the Mungerannie pub.

Members of key government departments joined us on this visit to hear, to learn and to understand more about these record-breaking floods. To Sandra, David, Tim, and the many station families who took the time to share their experiences, thank you. To Mack and Cindy, thank you for your warm welcome at the Mungerannie Hotel.

Later that evening, we joined the Innamincka community for a meal and a fireside chat. We heard stories of resilience and of hardship and about how proud they are of their community. This town has seen floods before, and markers around Innamincka record each of these floods. Now there is a new high-water mark, a new story etched into the landscape: 2025, the year the flood came again.

As a start, the Malinauskas government has worked with the Albanese government to activate freight subsidies through the disaster recovery management agreements. To Janett, Barney, Mick, Anthony and all who shared their time and stories: thank you. You have been heard.

CHILD PROTECTION

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:30): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Attorney-General on the topic of the Hyde review.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Following the 2022 deaths of a seven-year-old boy and an eight-year-old girl in separate incidents in the same DCP region, former Commissioner Mal Hyde was appointed to lead a review of child protection in South Australia. In November 2022, the Hyde review released 31 recommendations that were accepted in principle by the Malinauskas government. At the time of the release of those recommendations in November 2022, the Premier stated that the full Hyde review report itself was unable to be released, based on legal advice that it could jeopardise ongoing criminal investigations.

One year into the Malinauskas government, in March 2023 the Premier expressed his frustration to ABC journalist Stephanie Richards that he was still not able to release the Hyde report due to ongoing police investigations. Over three years into the Malinauskas government and at least 134 weeks after that report's recommendations were released, the South Australian public has still not seen the release of the full report.

My question without notice to the Attorney-General is: has the DPP received any briefs from SAPOL regarding possible criminal proceedings arising from the Hyde review? When does the government anticipate the release of this important report, promised 2½ years ago?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:31): I thank the honourable

member for her question. I will take it on notice and bring back a reply. I do remember that there were at least a couple of matters that were under investigation, and whether they are before the courts. I will find out what I am able to bring back to this chamber. I don't have information on me, but I do recall that there were some matters. I can't remember at what stage in the justice system they are up to, but I will seek an update for the honourable member.

CHILD PROTECTION

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:32): Supplementary: in taking that on notice, will the Attorney-General also bring back information on any cases that came before the courts that were dropped?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:32): Again, I am happy to do so, to the extent that I am able to bring back an answer.

REGIONAL BUSINESS CLOSURES

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:32): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development about regional business closures.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: On 3 June 2025, *The Advertiser* reported that the Seven Point Pork abattoir in Port Wakefield will close in January 2026, resulting in the loss of 270 jobs. JBS cited the facility's lack of viability following the withdrawal of a strategic partner. This closure follows the recent relocation of Balco's headquarters from Balaklava and comes amid ongoing drought conditions in the region. Local leaders have warned that the cost of doing business in regional South Australia is becoming unsustainable, with energy, freight and workforce costs all contributing to business closures. My questions to the minister are:

1. What specific steps is the government taking to reduce the cost of doing business in regional South Australia to prevent further closures like those I mentioned?

2. Has the government conducted a regional competitiveness review to understand why major employers are withdrawing from towns like Port Wakefield and Balaklava?

3. Will the minister commit to a regional industry assistance package to safeguard regional jobs and support businesses at risk of closure due to rising operational costs?

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. First of all, however, I think it's important to reiterate what I said in answer to a question about this particular matter yesterday, which is that the reason that has been provided for the mooted closure of JBS in January next year is essentially the loss of a customer. That is not about cost of doing business.

In terms of the various things that the Malinauskas Labor government has done to reduce costs to business, I would refer the honourable member to the various reports that we have had from independent bodies that have stated that South Australia is one of the best places to do business. That is something that the government is proud of but will, of course, continue to work on. So I think that it is important to differentiate the reason for this closure. I think that is quite different from the aspects that the honourable member is referring to.

LEGAL PROFESSION, HARASSMENT

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:35): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing questions to the Attorney-General regarding South Australia's judiciary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: A recent Equal Opportunity Commission report revealed that judges had perpetrated 22 per cent of bullying, 14 per cent of discrimination and 9 per cent of sexual harassment that took place in South Australia's courts for a period reported between 2021 and 2023. Further to this revelation, the commissioner has called for the overhaul of our state's judicial and magistrate appointment process, referring to it as, 'one of the least transparent in the nation'.

The equal opportunity commissioner is of the opinion that any judicial candidate must be subject to the scrutiny of an independent panel and proposes legislative amendments to enable the continuation of investigations into misconduct regardless of the resignation of a judge or magistrate. My questions for the Attorney are:

1. Does he agree that these numbers are unacceptable?

2. What actions has he taken so far?

3. How many times has he met with the equal opportunity commissioner to discuss these recommendations?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:36): I thank the honourable member for her questions. In relation to the second question, I meet very regularly with the equal opportunity commissioner in face-to-face meetings and have exceptionally regular contact, either by phone or in the building that we both work in, about matters in relation to this. I want to place on the record my appreciation for the work the Equal Opportunity Commission has done in relation to this report and a number of other reports looking at discrimination, harassment, and particularly the exceptionally successful We're Equal campaign that has rolled out across not-for-profits, businesses and government departments promoting equality.

In relation specifically to questions that the honourable member raised, I know that the respectful behaviours group, as I think it's called, within the judiciary, within the Courts Administration Authority, has been reinstigated, and funding has been provided from the Attorney-General's Department to do this. It is something that we take seriously and we take the recommendations seriously.

The honourable member mentioned in her question a recommendation that was in the last report about the ability for investigations into members of the judiciary to continue post resignation. As recently as, I think, the week before last or the week before that, discussions were held within my department about how you would give effect to that, and I have answered questions in here before about some of the intricacies and some of the competing principles in the ability to have investigations that go beyond a Judicial Conduct Commission investigation.

It is a very complex area, because of course once someone is no longer a member of a judiciary it is not clear how the Judicial Conduct Commissioner would actually have the jurisdiction to keep investigating, and if there was the ability to keep going if there would ever be any incentive whatsoever for someone to resign and take accountability for their actions. It is an issue that is under active consideration by government.

NATIONAL RECONCILIATION WEEK BREAKFAST

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:38): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Will the minister inform the council about South Australia's annual Reconciliation Week Breakfast?

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 his question. I would be most pleased to do so. Once again, it was an honour to attend the Adelaide 2025 National Reconciliation Week Breakfast held at the Convention Centre. As always, it was a both powerful and moving occasion with, once again, another record-breaking attendance of almost 3,000 people. I believe 2,940 people came into the Convention Centre at 7am on the Tuesday of Reconciliation Week, making it—as it has been for quite a number of years—the biggest event of its kind anywhere in Australia during Reconciliation Week.

This year's theme, 'Bridging now to next', reflects on the ongoing connection between the past, present and future, making a call to step forward together, look ahead and continue to push forward as past lessons guide us. It was a theme that resonated throughout the morning and invited those who attended to reflect on where we have been, where we are now and the kind of future we want to shape together.

The event formally commenced with, as always, a powerful welcome to Kaurna country by Jamie Goldsmith, who does his ancestors and particularly his late father, Stevie, very proud in

continuing a strong tradition of welcoming people to Kaurna country, as has happened for thousands of generations. Bianca Hunt was this year's MC. She is a Kamilaroi, Barkindji and Whadjuk woman and has cultivated skills in the media industry for over decade and did a fantastic job facilitating the early morning event.

This year's event was an impressive array of speakers and performers, who were deeply thought provoking. Each of the speaker's stories are often difficult to hear but important to share. In particular it was a privilege to hear from Dr Jenni Caruso, who provided reflections on National Sorry Day, which is held annually on 26 May, marking the anniversary of the tabling of the Bringing Them Home report in 1997. Dr Caruso spoke of the deep historical injustices, the loss and the pain that still linger today but also highlighted the resilience, pride and extraordinary strength of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and communities.

The keynote speech was delivered by Professor Jackie Huggins, a Bidjara, Birri Gubba and Juru central and north Queensland woman and a strong advocate for reconciliation over many, many decades, from last century through to this one. This has included as a member of the Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation, co-chair of Reconciliation Australia and currently co-patron of Reconciliation Queensland. Professor Huggins highlighted her journey in reconciliation and the milestones Australia has reached, her personal resonance with the theme 'Bridging now to next' and the importance of empowerment of Aboriginal women.

Attendees also had the pleasure of enjoying powerful performances from the Imbala dance group, the Iwiri choir and, absolutely bringing the house down at the end of the breakfast, Spinifex Gum. It was a great pleasure to once again speak as part of the breakfast on behalf of the government.

I would particularly like to pay tribute to the role of Reconciliation South Australia and its team for their unwavering leadership in often difficult circumstances. If the only thing the Reconciliation South Australia did every year was put on the breakfast, it would be quite a remarkable contribution. But of course, for the other more than 360 days a year, they do a remarkable job.

I would like to offer thanks to Reconciliation SA CEO, Jason Downs, and in particular co-chairs Helen Connolly, who will be ending a term of I think some eight years as a co-chair of Reconciliation South Australia, and Jeremy Johncock for all the great work they do, the time they give up and the momentum for this important organisation and movement.

SOUTH COAST ALGAL BLOOM

The Hon. S.L. GAME (14:42): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development regarding public health advice related to the state's algal bloom.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.L. GAME: It was reported in *The Advertiser* on 27 May that coastal GPs were dealing with a surge of illnesses believed to be linked to the state's algal bloom. The report, key points of which were repeated during a FIVEaa interview with Dr Emily Kirkpatrick, said the Royal College of GPs asked why SA Health had failed to give more comprehensive and visible public advice about the dangers in addition to specific advice to GPs about what they should be telling patients.

The SA Health website included warnings to avoid swimming, diving and accidentally ingesting water at some spots. The website also advised against eating dead fish and cockles but stated that fish and shellfish caught live were safe to eat. My questions to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development are:

1. Did the SA Shellfish Quality Assurance Program discover potentially dangerous brevetoxin, and was it the key factor behind PIRSA's recent decision to close the shellfish industry in some South Australian coastline areas?

2. What was done to protect the community from collecting and consuming impacted shellfish in these same areas and in surrounding areas?

3. If dead fish and cockles mentioned by SA Health died as a result of algal blooms, is the government guaranteeing that fish and shellfish caught live in these areas have been safe for human consumption, given many of them were likely dying or diseased?

4. Does the government consider PIRSA's issuing of precautions as a result of the SA Shellfish Quality Assurance Program testing results appropriate, or should the health messaging to recreational fishers and local communities about the potential harmful effects of ingesting brevetoxin have been stronger?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:45): I thank the honourable member for her question. First of all, we need to be very, very clear—and this is important for our export industries—95 per cent of licence holders for oysters are not affected whatsoever by the discovery of brevetoxins. It is a number of smaller producers in a very limited area: Stansbury, American River, Port Vincent and Coobowie harvest areas are closed due to brevetoxin detection.

The oysters need to remain in the water and they are also on licensed aquaculture sites until the area is reopened. Brevetoxin does not impact the viability of an oyster, so the oysters continue to grow and so on. I think that is a really important point to make. It is obviously unfortunate for those areas that have had the closures, but 95 per cent of South Australia's oyster growers are not impacted by the brevetoxins.

Harvesting closures are also not unusual as part of the quality assurance program known as SASQAP, so that is something that we are very, very conscious of here in South Australia. This is not political; this is our wonderful industry. Governments of both persuasions have always been very keen to ensure that we meet the highest of food safety standards. It is through meeting those food safety standards that we are able to obtain and retain the excellent international reputation that we have for clean, green seafood—among the best in the world.

In terms of the health advice, obviously whilst specific queries can be directed to the health minister, I do recall that in addition to the health advice that was available on websites—if I recall correctly—Professor Nicola Spurrier indicated that the Department for Health was doing some further outreach to GPs, particularly in those affected areas.

In terms of recreational fishers and so on, which I think the honourable member referred to—I am sorry it was quite a long question, so my apologies if I have missed anything out—the sort of advice that is given is pretty much what I think the honourable member outlined in her question, and is the case really at anytime, not just when there is an algal bloom, which is that you should not consume any sea creatures that are already dead when you catch them, because obviously they can start to deteriorate and cause a health issue.

SOUTH COAST ALGAL BLOOM

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:47): Supplementary: do the specific brevetoxins that have been identified include brevetoxin B or, if not, what brevetoxins are they?

The Hon. C.M. Scriven: I missed the middle bit.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: What are the types of brevetoxins? Do they include brevetoxin B? It is a repeat of my previous questions this week.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:48): I don't think I have the specifics of the type of brevetoxin. The honourable member indicated that she asked that question earlier in the week, so I assume that is one that I took on notice.

KANGAROO MANAGEMENT

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (14:48): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development about kangaroo management.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD: During the Premier's visit to Peterborough, he heard from farmers how huge populations of kangaroos were damaging scarce resources for livestock. $1.3 million was promised as part of the second tranche of drought relief that was announced in early April; however, when details of the program were made clear, it became evident that only four of the 17 kangaroo harvest regions were included in the program. Moreover, the regions that were most heavily impacted by kangaroo numbers were not included in the program. Farmers were told that a reduction in rainfall was not enough to warrant their inclusion. Thankfully, this decision was changed late in May, albeit seven weeks after the announcement of the package.

My questions to the minister are: why was the decision made to limit the kangaroo management program based on rainfall and not on the areas where the kangaroos were a problem, and why did it take so long to reverse this decision?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:49): I thank the honourable member for his question. There are a couple of inaccuracies within his question, but I am certainly happy to provide that clarification.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Help him out.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Always keen to help. As part of the state government's $73 million package for drought support, funding has been provided to reduce grazing pressure through the management of kangaroos. The program is providing incentives for professional field harvesters to remove kangaroos across the entire state. The amount that is being offered includes both an amount per kangaroo—one figure for kangaroos harvested for commercial reasons and another figure for kangaroos harvested for non-commercial reasons, which essentially means for animal welfare.

There are two very important problems with the overabundance of kangaroos in these areas. The first is the impact on farmers. Obviously, they are competing for feed and that is having a significant impact, but there is also the animal welfare issue in that many of the kangaroos are starving, which is never a good thing for people to see either. So it was important, when working with industry, peak bodies and farmers directly, to provide an amount both for non-commercially harvested kangaroos, and that will be $7 per kangaroo, and for commercially harvested kangaroos, and that figure will be $5. Permits always need to be issued and permits are available statewide. They could either be permits that landholders have received for non-commercially harvested kangaroos or permits that the government has issued for broader kangaroo harvest subregions.

In addition to that, the program is providing additional daily incentives to encourage field harvesters to work in areas where the number of kangaroos harvested are typically far below the annual quota allowed. That will pay a daily incentive to encourage harvesters to travel to those more remote regions. When I say 'remote', some of them are not remote in the usual sense of the word, it is simply that they are not the areas that normally have high levels of commercial harvest. The rate of the incentive is being scaled to provide higher incentives for field harvesters who are working in areas where the least quota has typically been harvested.

Industry provided a list of high priority areas. The intention of that was to try to target those areas because, as I said, a number of them had certainly not in recent years reached anywhere near the number that is allowed under the quota system, but it was never intended that other areas would be excluded. That was not the intention of the program, and I think the clarifications have ensured that that is now well known and communicated across our state.

KANGAROO MANAGEMENT

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:53): Supplementary: what is the amount of the incentive being paid for these field harvesters?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:53): You mean the daily amount that I referred to?

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I don't know how you are calculating it—so a daily amount or per head?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I mentioned the amount that was per kangaroo, so $5 for commercially harvested kangaroos and $7 for non-commercially harvested—so, if you like, those

where animal welfare is the driving reason for their harvesting. In addition to that, there is a daily incentive that I referred to and that is being scaled depending on the level of kangaroo numbers compared to the amount of harvesting that would normally occur.

I think it's also worth mentioning the reasons why we have such high numbers at the moment. We have had successive good seasons until recently. The subsequent drought conditions mean that there are high numbers of kangaroos, and they are now starving as well as causing severe impacts on crops, on pasture and, indeed, on native vegetation as well.

It is quite difficult to comprehend the scale of the mass mortality events that happen when droughts follow successive good seasons. Across drought-impacted parts of South Australia, it's commonplace to see thousands of kangaroos laying dead alongside dried-up dams and to see emaciated kangaroos nearby. I think this is an important program because it addresses those dual challenges, both of the impacts on farmers as well as the impacts on animal welfare.

KANGAROO MANAGEMENT

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:54): Supplementary: why did it take so long to clarify that the high-priority areas shouldn't be the only areas eligible?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:55): As I said, it was never the intention that any areas would be excluded.

STATE OF PRIMARY INDUSTRIES REPORT

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:55): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister inform the chamber about the More Than an Industry state of primary industries report for 2025?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:55): I thank the honourable member for his question. It was a pleasure for both the Premier and myself to present the 2025 state of primary industries report, called More Than an Industry, last Thursday at the 2025 PIRSA Industry Forum, with representatives across agriculture, fishing and forestry in attendance, for whom the report reflects the depth and breadth of their hard work and their incredible contribution to our state.

I was pleased that the federal Minister for Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries was also there and was able to address the forum. That, of course, was followed by a round table with the federal minister, as well as representatives of all the sector's peak bodies.

The report, commissioned by Primary Producers SA and prepared by ACIL Allen, was supported by the South Australian government through PIRSA. It is a comprehensive document that reflects upon the importance of food, wine and agribusiness to our state, not just through the lens of economic output, KPIs and FTEs but as part of our identity and way of South Australian life, playing a central role in all the lives of South Australians through the provision of food and fibre.

We are so incredibly fortunate to be surrounded by amazing waters, vineyards and farmlands, though we know the difficulty those who make their living from any of these go through at different times, which is why the state government has stood ready to assist in difficult periods and we will continue to do so.

The report, of course, dives deep into the specifics across our agriculture, fisheries and forestry industries and provides some, frankly, astonishing figures that highlight just how much our state relies on businesses of food, wine and agribusiness as an integral part of our economy. Indeed, I have often referred, as others have, to it being the backbone of our economy.

The sector recorded $17.1 billion in revenue in the latest report, with 76,000 full-time equivalent jobs, $8.6 billion of overseas exports and $4 billion in interstate exports, making up 49 per cent of South Australia's total merchandise exports. Food, wine and agribusiness make up 5.5 per cent of the state's gross state product, with 18,916 primary industry, food, beverage and fibre manufacturing businesses totalling 11½ per cent of all South Australian businesses.

The industries that make up the portfolio that I am incredibly fortunate to be the minister for are quite simply a powerhouse for employment and opportunity and the driving force behind our regional communities. All in the chamber, no doubt, are aware of the resilience of our regions, and the report highlights just how resilient the industries are that underpin those communities. The ability to diversify and value-add to production provides further opportunities in which our state has always taken a leading role, and this is set to continue.

Revenue from our state's primary industries has grown from $13.9 billion in 2014-15 to $17.1 billion in 2023-24, at an average annual growth of around 3 per cent. Export trade has risen by 53 per cent in the period since 2013-14.

Importantly, the report cast an eye to the future of our food, wine and agribusiness sectors, with the outlook largely positive as the state continues its trajectory of capitalising on emerging opportunities, creating new and enhanced sectors and technologies, expansion into high-value markets, and re-entry into the Chinese market, as well as the continued evolution of value-adding, productivity gains and efficiency. Of course, all this complements the sustainability across sectors in which we have always placed a very high value and which is recognised worldwide.

The report recognises the immense contribution of agricultural research and development in our state as a key driver of productivity and sustainability, with the Waite Research Institute and SARDI, along with the state's other leading tertiary institutions, playing a critical role in agriculture and fisheries science, food processing, biosecurity and adaptation to climate change. The report acknowledges our strengths and identifies the areas in which we can continue to improve.

We know that times are very difficult for many in our primary industries, notwithstanding the set of incredible numbers contained in the report showing just how important they are to our state. I thank Primary Producers SA and all the sectors that contribute to more than an industry. It is a comprehensive snapshot of where we are and where we can be, for which all South Australians can rightly be proud and appreciative.

SOUTH COAST ALGAL BLOOM

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:00): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development a question about the algal bloom.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: As was referred to a few moments ago, about a week ago it was reported that SA Health and Chief Public Health Officer, Professor Spurrier, would consult with GPs on the algal bloom crisis following revelations coastal GPs were dealing with a surge in algae-related illnesses and had not received support from SA Health. Yesterday, in response to a question in this place, the minister stated:

> We are advised, and the public health advice has been out there, that, if people, for example, have been walking along the beach where there is the foam and they have an allergic reaction on their skin, as long as they wash it off quickly it generally will not last for a long period of time. So the short answer is that there has been cross-sector work on all the aspects of algal bloom that we have information on.

A few moments ago, the minister referred again to the advice that has been issued by Professor Spurrier. My questions to the minister are:

1. Did the public health advice that she refers to in fact come about as a result of lobbying and complaints raised by the RACGP on behalf of its members?

2. Do PIRSA or SA Health's social media sites, which contain regular updates on these sorts of issues, contain any information regarding the algal bloom outbreak, including health advice?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:02): I thank the honourable member for her question. Some parts of her question relate to the Department for Health and therefore obviously are not something that I can make a direct comment on. What I can refer to, however, is that we had two round tables, or forums, the first one with local mayors. That included a number of agencies, both federal and state. We then had a more recent one with both mayors and MPs in areas affected by the algal bloom.

I know that there were updates issued. I believe there were some before that initial round table, but some of the feedback from there was that they needed to be better communicated. From memory, part of that was to indicate that having links on our sites, whether it be PIRSA, whether it be EPA or whether it be DEW, would be helpful, and my understanding is that that occurred.

SOUTH COAST ALGAL BLOOM

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:03): Supplementary: is the minister aware of lobbying and complaints by the RACGP directly regarding what was a lack of guidance from SA Health in relation to the outbreak?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:03): I have seen media reports.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN PRISONS

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:03): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services regarding detainees in South Australian prisons.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: Mr President, as you would recall, yesterday in question time I raised the matter of Mr Edwin James Hinrichsen, who, despite being a convicted murderer, was incarcerated in the low-security Cadell Training Centre. When this knowledge became public, he was subsequently, and I would argue not surprisingly, relocated to a more appropriate facility, being medium security. My question to minister is: are there any other convicted murderers being held in low-security facilities in South Australia and, if so, how many and why?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:04): As I mentioned yesterday, there is a review ongoing that has commenced into this particular matter that you raised. That review was ordered by the CE and, as you would expect, I expect to be kept updated on that and on how the review is progressing.

DCS determines where and when prisoners will be placed and, as was the case with this one, as I understand it, when you are a registered victim you are notified of transfers of prisoners. Whilst that review is being undertaken, we can take learnings from that in regard to what we could do differently. There is a formula, on my understanding, that is followed in regard to where prisoners are placed. In this instance we can learn a lot from it, and that is why this review is being undertaken.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN PRISONS

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:05): Supplementary: minister, when do you expect to receive the review?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:05): I believe I said yesterday that the review is expected to be completed by the end of June.

WHEELCHAIR RUGBY WORLD CHALLENGE

The Hon. M. EL DANNAWI (15:06): My question is to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. Will the minister inform the council about the recent Wheelchair Rugby World Challenge?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:06): I thank the honourable member for her question and interest in this topic. On Sunday, I had the absolute privilege of attending the finals day of the inaugural Wheelchair Rugby World Challenge to celebrate what a success this new competition has been. Our state was proud to play host to the world challenge and junior division as a brand new event for a sport that is growing at such a fast rate on a global scale.

To host national and global sporting events like the national championships and world challenge, which has featured teams from across the globe, is testament to the sporting powerhouse

South Australia has become in recent years. We are also excited to continue our support for national championships by hosting again next year, after a successful tournament in 2024. For this year's event it was also great to have the incredible support from Minister Koutsantonis from the other place and the Department for Infrastructure and Transport to help with inclusive transport options for this competition.

As part of this event, I understand Adelaide Metro had to deck out three buses, by removing the chairs from the bus, to help transport players, staff, referees, coaches, commentators and broadcasters to and from the airport to their accommodation and to the netball stadium where the event was held. Once again, I thank the minister and his team and the department for their coordination and commitment to creating inclusive options for this event.

In general, and for those who may not be aware, it is an incredibly exciting time for wheelchair rugby. I understand the federal government has committed $54.9 million in additional funding to parasport, partnering with Paralympics Australia and Australian Institute of Sport to deliver programs and support the para-athletes. As part of this, the South Australian Sports Institute (SASI) has also launched a dedicated parasport unit, and initially it will support athletes with disabilities on their pathway to elite competition.

Wheelchair rugby is very much part of this vision, as demonstrated by the Australian Steelers already benefiting from the world-class facilities and support at the new South Australian Sports Institute. We are only just beginning to see how the new South Australian Sports Institute can elevate our parasports, and the government is excited to build on this momentum across our high-performance sports.

Beyond this, the Malinauskas Labor government will contribute $1 million over four years to the Los Angeles 2028 Olympic and Paralympic Team Appeal, as part of this year's budget measures, providing support to local athletes across the four-year cycle leading into the games. The future is bright ahead for the parasports in South Australia, and events like the world challenge are testament to this growing future.

NORTH ADELAIDE GOLF COURSE

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:09): 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 the redevelopment of the Adelaide golf course.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Earlier today, I joined concerned members of the community on the steps of Parliament House to protest the Malinauskas government's moves to acquire more of the Adelaide Parklands. My question therefore to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing is: when will the minister commit to releasing the business case for the redevelopment of the Adelaide golf course, and will the minister table any draft legislation that may be required to enable this redevelopment so that the public can be consulted?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:10): I thank the member for his question and his ongoing interest in this particular matter. As I think has been highlighted in the chamber before, this really falls under the responsibility of the Premier in regard to it being a major event. I am happy to take on any further information and provide something back if it is available.

NORTH ADELAIDE GOLF COURSE

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:10): Supplementary question: given the minister's role as Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing—

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Simms, can you just stop for one sec. As a supplementary question you have to ask the supplementary question. You can't say 'given' and 'given' and explanation.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Has the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing been briefed by the Premier on this proposal, given it is so fundamental to her portfolio? If she hasn't been briefed, why not?

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Simms started well. The 'given' was after he had started to ask the question and there was reference to the Premier, so I will allow the supplementary question.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Stop it.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:11): Thank you for highlighting that I am the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. This is an important event for our state and as such we are working as the government—and the Premier is taking the lead on this particular project—and at a point where there is available information I look forward to sharing it with the member.

NORTH ADELAIDE GOLF COURSE

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:11): Supplementary: why hasn't the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing been briefed by the Premier on this matter?

The PRESIDENT: I think the minister has attempted to answer that question.

WILD DOG MANAGEMENT

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:12): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking questions of the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development on the subject of wild dogs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: In March this year, Livestock SA published concerns regarding—

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Attorney!

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Chuck him out, Mr President—after he tables the budget papers. In March this year, Livestock SA published concerns regarding the continued impact of wild dog protections in western Victoria, and the incursion of wild dogs into South Australia, primarily through the Ngarkat Conservation Park. Livestock SA members are telling them that wild dog and fox attacks and flock chases have increased due to the Victorian policy and due to ongoing dry conditions across southern and eastern Australia.

There have been and will continue to be attacks on livestock and on farm dogs, and there is certainly potential for attacks on other animals into the future. My questions to the Minister for Primary Industries are:

1. When was the last time the minister or her office received a briefing from the Cross Border Commissioner on any work regarding wild dog incursions into South Australia through the Ngarkat Conservation Park or similar wildlife corridors?

2. Does the minister share the concerns of Livestock SA and their membership regarding the increase in incursions of wild dogs and their impact?

3. What is the minister doing to advocate for appropriate policy with our Victorian neighbours—her colleagues—to stop these dreadful wild dog attacks?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:14): I thank the honourable member for her question. I discussed this matter with the Cross Border Commissioner last week. It's always good to catch up with Ms Saffin, who I think is doing an excellent job as the Cross Border Commissioner. She has

also, as indeed have I, been involved in many discussions with farmers who are affected by the change of policy in western Victoria.

I have advocated very strongly and indicated to the counterparts in Victoria that we have a very different view on the treatment of wild dogs. Obviously, our investment in the dog fence has been a huge investment and has enabled the appropriate recognition of the cultural importance of dingoes whilst still enabling much better management of wild dogs to be able to open up more areas to agriculture and to livestock, and that has been a very significant step forward in terms of some of those pastoral areas.

I had a meeting with the Victorian minister for agriculture as well as with the Victorian minister for the environment and was able to put South Australia's view very strongly, in addition to various correspondence that I have sent. It is fair to say that we have not been able to reach a position of agreement. My department has been working closely with industry, as well as attempting to work with the Victorian government at an officer level, around ways to improve the situation. Certainly, on the South Australian side of the border, we have increased resources to be able to assist with reducing the number of wild dogs.

I think there are a number of aspects around this that are particularly concerning. There is the economic impact of wild dogs, and that is significant in a time of drought that is perhaps felt even more than it would be at other times, but there is also the emotional impact when farmers go out and find, for example, newborn lambs that have been attacked by wild dogs, or ewes that have been attacked. It's actually quite distressing on an emotional level as well. So I will continue to advocate for what I consider to be a better approach to wild dog management, in concert with the various industry bodies and farmers.

Parliamentary Procedure

BUDGET PAPERS

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:17): I lay on the table the following budget papers:

Budget 2025-26—
- Paper 1—Budget Overview
- Paper 2—Budget Speech
- Paper 3—Budget Statement
- Paper 4—Agency Statements—Volume 1
- Paper 4—Agency Statements—Volume 2
- Paper 4—Agency Statements—Volume 3
- Paper 4—Agency Statements—Volume 4
- Paper 5—Budget Measures Statement

Bills

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (COERCIVE CONTROL) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

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 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.

Mr President, it is a great privilege to introduce the Criminal Law Consolidation (Coercive Control) Amendment Bill 2024.

This legislation represents years of work and significant consultation undertaken by the Government to develop this groundbreaking reform and I am honoured to introduce it to this place today.

Coercive control is an abusive, systematic and deliberate pattern of behaviour undertaken to impose the perpetrator's will on another person.

When coercive control is exercised, fear and intimidation is used to override another person's ability to act in accordance with their own wishes and best interests.

Perpetrators hurt, humiliate, demean, manipulate, intimidate, isolate, and terrify to achieve control of their victims. Many different kinds of abusive behaviours may be threaded together into a destructive web designed to entrap a person.

For too long, the criminal justice system has only been able to address individual incidents of or threats of physical violence. A serious assault or homicide might be preceded by a decade of abusive control. However, this control is only considered 'background' to the crime, and not a crime in and of itself.

For too long, because of the criminal law's focus on physical abuse, police have been severely limited in how they can help women subject to coercive control if physical violence is not involved.

Through the introduction of this Bill the Government intends to create a fundamental shift in the criminal justice response to domestic abuse. Coercive control will be recognised and treated as a serious crime.

This Bill will create a new offence in the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935* of the coercive control of a person with whom the defendant is, or has been, in an intimate relationship.

This offence will have a maximum penalty of seven years imprisonment.

The elements of the offence of coercive control will be that:

1. The defendant engages in a course of conduct consisting of behaviour that has, or a reasonable person would consider is likely to have, a controlling impact on another person; *and*

2. The defendant intends that course of conduct to have a controlling impact; *and*

3. The defendant is or was in a 'relationship' with the other person, meaning they are or previously were a married or engaged couple, domestic partners, or in an intimate couple relationship; *and*

4. A reasonable person would consider that the course of conduct would be likely to cause the other person physical or psychological harm.

The central element of the new offence is a course of conduct that has or is likely to have a 'controlling impact' on the person subject to it.

A 'controlling impact' means restricting a person's freedom—their freedom of movement, action, bodily autonomy, or their freedom to engage in the social, political, religious, cultural, educational, or economic activities of their choosing.

The person subject to the behaviour might be forbidden to work or to wear certain types of clothing. Their personal hygiene or food intake might be regulated.

They may be prevented from catching up with colleagues, isolated from their family and friends, forbidden to speak with anyone of a different gender.

They may be denied the choice as to what to do with their own money or their own body.

In coercive control, restriction may be achieved through various means, both physical and psychological. To make this clear, the Bill provides that a person may be considered to 'restrict' another person by either:

(a) Physical restriction;

(b) Verbal or psychological restriction;

(c) Removing the means by which a person is able to do something;

(d) Deception; *or*

(e) Any other behaviour that, directly or indirectly, significantly impairs the other person's ability to do something.

Examples in the Bill support this definition by illustrating the diverse ways in which a person might be restricted by their partner's behaviour.

This broad definition of 'restrict', and the list of examples, reflects what we heard from brave survivors during the consultation process about the breadth of tactics used in coercive, controlling relationships.

We often think of being 'restricted' as being physically unable to do something; this can be a tactic of coercive control.

However, what we heard from the sector and from survivors, is that the restriction is primarily psychological, achieved and maintained through the perpetrator creating an atmosphere of fear within the relationship. Victims of

coercive control live, day in, day out, with a relentless fear that serious consequences will occur if they do not conform to the perpetrator's wishes – consequences that go far beyond normal couple conflict.

They may not even know what might specifically happen as a consequence each time, but they know from painful experience that nothing good comes from disobeying the perpetrator.

Maybe they will be shaken or screamed at. Maybe they will be humiliated in front of friends or coworkers. Maybe aggression will be directed against their children or a pet. They might be stalked or monitored to ensure they are complying.

Physical violence or threats of physical violence may be a part of the control, but this is not a necessary element of this offence. Other kinds of abuse may have an equally controlling impact.

No method of control should be considered inherently less serious or less restrictive than another. The ultimate test is simply whether the person was, or reasonably could have been, 'restricted' in the circumstances.

In other words, was the person's free will significantly impaired when deciding whether and how to engage in a particular activity?

Judges and juries considering a charge of coercive control will need to consider how the alleged perpetrator's behaviours impacted the options open to the person being controlled and ask 'fundamentally, were the choices really theirs, or was their partner pulling the strings'?

Perhaps every time a person talks to a friend of a different gender, they will be subject to degrading verbal abuse or relentless harassment about whether they are having an affair, until – exhausted and defeated – they simply submit and stop trying to have friends of a different gender. No reasonable person would think that they have genuinely chosen this for themselves.

A coercive control charge is proposed to cover, not just one incident of controlling behaviour, but an entire 'course of conduct' that has a controlling impact.

'Course of conduct' is not defined in the Bill as it is not the intention to rigidly restrict the offence by requiring a minimum number of incidents or incidents occurring over a specific length of time. Each case should turn on its own facts.

However, I place on record commentary on what the requirement for a 'course of conduct' is intended to mean.

In the context of the coercive control offence, a 'course of conduct' primarily envisages conduct occurring on multiple occasions, with a sense of continuity and purpose between them – with the purpose being control.

It does not require the relevant conduct to occur every day or for the controlling impact to be the same on each occasion but a 'course of conduct' would require more than a few genuinely isolated incidents.

That being said, a break in time between overt conduct does not necessarily make incidents 'isolated'. It is important to recognise the long-lasting effects of the fear the perpetrator creates.

The perpetrator's pattern of behaviour instils serious fear that something *could* happen if the victim displeases the perpetrator, even in periods that to an outsider might look relatively 'peaceful'.

The Bill provides that whether a course of conduct has or could have a controlling impact must be determined by considering the totality of behaviours.

A judge or jury should not consider the likely impact and intent of each individual behaviour in isolation, but instead must consider the impact and intention of the behaviours as a whole and in combination with each other.

This acknowledges that the controlling impact of behaviours can be cumulative.

Repeated 'small' abuses can wear down a person's self-esteem and capacity to resist, like dripping water slowly carving away rock. Behaviour that would not be controlling as a one-off incident may be very controlling when repeated over and over again.

Similarly, it need not be proved that the defendant intended to have a directly controlling impact by each individual behaviour making up the course of conduct.

The judge or jury must consider whether the course of conduct overall was motivated by an intent to control.

The Bill provides that it must be shown that the controlling behaviour would likely cause physical or psychological harm including serious distress, anxiety, or fear. This provides a threshold of seriousness for the offence, which will act as a safeguard against perpetrator misidentification.

The Bill provides a defence to coercive control, which applies if the course of conduct was reasonable in all of the circumstances. This will account for exceptional cases in which it would be reasonable to restrict a spouse or partner.

It may be necessary for a person to bar another person from their home for either person's protection. It may be necessary to restrict contact with children if they may harm them. It may be necessary to restrict access to household funds if there is a risk they might excessively spend money on alcohol, drugs or gambling due to addiction.

The onus of proving reasonableness is on the defendant.

Once it has been proved by the prosecution that the defendant controlled their partner in a way that would likely cause physical or psychological harm, it is incumbent on the defendant to justify this course of conduct.

Mr Speaker, the proposed offence applies to any person in an intimate couple relationship (regardless of sex or gender identity).

This includes married or engaged couples, domestic partners, or other intimate couple relationships, former or current.

We acknowledge that coercive control occurs in other kinds of relationships—between siblings, carers, by children towards parents or by parents towards children, or even in non-family contexts.

However, this Bill focuses on intimate partner relationships in acknowledgement of the well-known and deeply concerning link between coercive control and intimate partner homicide.

The Bill will apply only to coercive control in intimate partner relationships to focus resources on this extremely high-risk area.

The Bill contains provisions to guide a court in sentencing a defendant for this offence.

As coercive control is a course of conduct offence, a criminal trial for the offence will likely involve a significant body of evidence about various ways in which the person was allegedly restricted.

In a jury trial, the jury will find the defendant guilty or not guilty, depending on whether they found beyond reasonable doubt that the person was restricted in at least one way that could cause physical or psychological harm.

However, the jury is not required to determine, nor enumerate, all the various kinds of restriction that they found proved beyond a reasonable doubt.

The Bill provides that the sentencing judge may sentence having regard to the general nature or character of the behaviour that they determine to have been proved beyond reasonable doubt.

This has been modelled on and intended to operate similarly to the sentencing provisions for the existing offence of sexual abuse of a child in section 50 of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*.

The Bill also contains a sentencing principle to recognise children affected by coercive control.

In consultation we heard that coercive control against an intimate partner significantly affects the physical and mental health of children and that they should be considered victims in their own right, rather than mere witnesses.

To acknowledge this, the Bill provides that, when sentencing a person for coercive control, the court must take into account the effect that the behaviour had on a child who witnessed or was otherwise affected by it.

This offence has been designed to operate alongside existing offences that may be charged in relation to abusive intimate partner relationships.

The Bill contains provisions allowing the same conduct to count as evidence of a standalone offence as well as be part of the course of conduct constituting coercive control.

A person may be convicted of both offences, in either the same or separate proceedings, despite the overlap of conduct.

This acknowledges that coercive control tactics used to frighten and intimidate the victim may also constitute a range of standalone offences that should be punished in their own right – such as animal abuse, reckless driving, threats to harm a child.

However, if a course of conduct constituting coercive control includes conduct that is the subject of other convictions, the court must take this into account in sentencing, to ensure the overall penalty for both convictions is proportionate to the totality of the conduct and the defendant is not punished twice for the same conduct.

The Bill mandates that a review of the offence must take place after the third and before the fourth anniversary of commencement. This will provide a valuable opportunity to review the first few years of operation to ensure that the offence is meeting the needs and expectations of the justice system, the wider community, and – most importantly – victim-survivors of domestic abuse.

Mr President, I offer deep appreciation to all who have invaluably contributed to developing this Bill, most notably the tireless work and advocacy of the Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic, Family and Sexual Violence.

I am also grateful to the Standing Council of Attorneys-General for the 'National Principles to Address Coercive Control in Family and Domestic Violence', which have been invaluable in developing this bill.

I commend the Bill to members and seek leave to insert the Explanation of Clauses into Hansard without my reading it.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*

3—Amendment of section 5AA—Aggravated offences

This clause adds a further circumstance in which 2 people will be taken to be *in a relationship* for the purposes of the aggravating circumstance set out in section 5AA(1)(g) of the principal Act.

4—Amendment of section 20A—Choking, suffocation or strangulation in a domestic setting

This clause adds a further circumstance in which 2 people will be taken to be *in a relationship* for the purposes of section 20A of the principal Act.

5—Insertion of Part 3 Division 7AAB

New Part 3 Division 7AAB is inserted:

Division 7AAB—Coercive control

20B—Interpretation

This clause sets out definitions for the purposes of the Division.

20C—Coercive control

This clause makes it a criminal offence to coercively control another person. In order to be found guilty of the offence, a person must engage in a course of conduct that consists of behaviour that has, or that a reasonable person would consider is likely to have, a controlling impact on another person with whom they are, or were, in a relationship. The person also must have intended by the course of conduct to have a controlling impact on the other person, and the course of conduct must be such that a reasonable person would consider it likely to cause the other person physical injury or psychological harm. It is a defence to a charge of coercive control for the defendant to prove that the course of conduct was reasonable in the circumstances.

This clause allows a defendant to be charged with, and convicted and sentenced for, an offence of coercive control and a different offence if behaviour that makes up part of the course of conduct alleged in proceedings for the coercive control offence also constitutes the elements of the different offence. This clause also sets out a number of matters relating to proceedings for an offence of coercive control.

20D—Review of Division

This clause requires a review of the Division to be undertaken after 3 but before 4 years after the commencement of the Division.

Schedule 1—Related amendments

Part 1—Amendment of *Evidence Act 1929*

1—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This clause makes the offence of coercive control a *serious offence against the person* for the purposes of the principal Act.

Part 2—Amendment of *Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) Act 2009*

2—Amendment of section 8—Meaning of abuse—domestic and non-domestic

This clause adds a further circumstance in which 2 people will be in a relationship in respect of the definition of *domestic abuse* for the purposes of the principal Act.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. D.G.E. Hood.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (HERITAGE) BILL

Second Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:19): 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 Government committed to introduce legislation to require that proposed demolition of State Heritage Places be subject to full public consultation and a public report from the South Australian Heritage Council (SAHC), and that the report is to be tabled in Parliament.

The commitment required the Department for Environment and Water to undertake a review of the existing legislative framework used to evaluate proposals for demolition of State Heritage Places and determine how it can be modified or supported by a new process that ultimately provides greater emphasis on the protection of these places from demolition and more transparency of decision making.

To achieve the Protect State Heritage Places' election commitment, the Statutes Amendment (Heritage) Bill 2025 was prepared.

The Statutes Amendment (Heritage) Bill 2025 outlines that on an application to demolish the whole of a State Heritage Place, the South Australian Heritage Council are to prepare a Report within a 10-week period; the report will assess the heritage significance of the place in accordance with section 16(1) of the Heritage Places Act 1993 (HP Act).

Additionally, the Statutes Amendment (Heritage) Bill 2025 requires:

- the SAHC to publish a copy of the report and invite public submission within a 4-week period;
- the SAHC to finalise the report within 4 weeks of the end of consultation and provide it to the Minister responsible for the HP Act; and
- the report to be laid before both Houses of Parliament within 5 sitting days of receipt.

A consequential legislative amendment to the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016* was drafted to:

- require that an application for consent to, or approval of, a development involving the demolition of the whole of a State heritage place be accompanied by a finalised report prepared by the SAHC.

The amendment to the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016* will alert a proponent, through the planning system, as to the need to apply for the report.

The government supports this bill and commends it to the house.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Heritage Places Act 1993*

3—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

4—Amendment of section 5A—Functions of the Council

5—Amendment of section 14—Content of Register

6—Amendment of section 18—Submissions etc in relation to provisional entries in Register and related designations

7—Amendment of section 24—Alteration of Register if place to be designated as place of local heritage value

8—Amendment of section 33—Effect of heritage agreement

9—Amendment of section 36—Damage or neglect

These clauses update obsolete references and terminology.

10—Insertion of section 37

This clause inserts new section 37 as follows:

37—Assessment of State Heritage Place

The proposed section sets out the process for a person considering undertaking development involving the demolition of the whole of a State Heritage Place to apply to the South Australian Heritage Council for a report in relation to the State Heritage Place. The section also sets out requirements in relation to the contents of the report, public consultation on the report and the publication of the report.

11—Amendment of section 38—No development orders

This clause updates an obsolete reference.

12—Amendment of section 45—Regulations

This clause makes several technical amendments to the existing general regulation making power in the Act.

13—Amendment of Schedule 2—Heritage agreement relating to Beechwood Garden

This clause updates an obsolete reference.

Part 3—Amendment of *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016*

14—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This amendment is technical.

15—Insertion of section 119A

This clause inserts new section 119A as follows:

119A—Requirement for application involving demolition of State heritage place

The proposed section requires an application in relation to a development involving the demolition of the whole of a State heritage place to be accompanied by a finalised report prepared by the South Australian Heritage Council.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. D.G.E. Hood.

BIODIVERSITY 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) (15:20): 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.

This Bill repeals the Native Vegetation Act and parts of the National Parks and Wildlife Act.

This fulfils the government's pre-election commitment to introduce a Biodiversity Act into Parliament in this term of government and make sure that conservation outcomes are fully integrated into how we all live sustainably and prosper for the long term.

It also respects Aboriginal South Australians in the management of land and respect for its ecosystems, recognising Aboriginal South Australians have been managing Country and living sustainably on our lands and waters for more than 65,000 years.

Why the Bill matters

Biodiversity is the foundation of life. Humans are not separate from the environment; we are a part of it. The food we eat, the air we breathe, the industries we depend on —they all rely on the delicate balance of nature.

Sadly, biodiversity loss is a crisis faced across the world.

The World Economic Forum Global Risks Report 2025 identified biodiversity loss and ecosystem collapse as the second highest long-term risk facing the globe—second only to extreme weather events.

This pattern is reflected at a state-level in South Australia. The 2023 State of the Environment Report found that South Australia's biodiversity is continuing to decline rapidly. Over 1,100 species of South Australian flora and fauna are listed as being at increased risk of extinction.

Extinction is not just about losing a single species. When a species disappears, the entire ecosystem is disrupted – the plants that depend on it, the animals that feed on it and even the microbes within it. Biodiversity loss is like removing threads from a web – eventually the entire system collapses.

Economic cost

The loss of biodiversity is not just an environmental issue; it is an economic risk.

More than 80 per cent of our exports and over one third of the state's employment depends on nature.

Industries like food, wine, tourism and agriculture all depend on healthy ecosystems.

Our major trading partners are setting ambitious biodiversity targets and many are linking environmental standards to trade and investment. If SA fails to act we risk being left behind in the global green economy.

Legacy of our past and challenge ahead

Since colonisation South Australia's environment has changed dramatically. Some changes have driven progress but others—habitat destruction, invasive species, pollution and unsustainable resource use—have harmed our ecosystems.

At the same time, the displacement of Aboriginal communities has not only impacted people, culture and heritage, but also weakened traditional land management practises that protected biodiversity for tens of thousands of years.

A business-as-usual approach is no longer an option. If we do nothing, the damage will become harder and more expensive, or even impossible, to reverse.

A new approach

Just as South Australia has led the way on climate action, committing to net zero emissions by 2050, we must now take the same ambitious approach to biodiversity.

That is why I stand before you today to speak in support of the Biodiversity Bill 2025—a crucial piece of legislation that will modernise and strengthen protections for South Australia's biodiversity to benefit us and our future generations.

Arresting biodiversity loss and capitalising on a nature positive, green future for South Australia involves two key actions; protecting what we have left and restoring what we have lost.

A Bill built on community input

These reforms have been the subject of extensive community engagement and input by key sector groups, government partners and Aboriginal representatives and I would like to thank everyone who has been involved in the journey.

The draft Bill was made available for public consultation between January and February 2025 and received a total of 1,249 responses.

Overall, the community indicated strong support for the objects and principles of the Act.

Bill Architecture

This Bill establishes a new framework for how we protect, restore and interact with biodiversity in South Australia.

It will consolidate biodiversity considerations, previously spread across several pieces of legislation.

This Bill brings together the Native Vegetation Act and key biodiversity provisions from the National Parks and Wildlife Act, ensuring that they work together to provide stronger, clearer protections for nature.

The Bill introduces significant improvements including:

- A new general duty ensuring that all South Australians play a role in protecting biodiversity
- Stronger native plant laws providing clearer regulations to safeguard native vegetation
- Tougher penalties to create stronger deterrence against environmental harm
- Critical habitat protections – by introducing a new process to identify and safeguard habitats vital for the survival of threatened species
- A new process for listing threatened species and threatened ecological communities, which aligns with other Australian jurisdictions and receives expert input from the scientific committee.

The Bill will also be supported by four committees; each appointed on the basis of their skills and expertise.

Objects and Principles

At the heart of this Bill, and enshrined in its objects, are two key pillars: we must protect the biodiversity that we have left and we must begin to restore and put back what we have lost.

We know we are facing two clear threats to the planet and consequently, our way of life; climate change and biodiversity decline.

While both are independent challenges to our collective future, they each exacerbate the effect of the other.

The Bill includes actions to guide conservation and restoration of nature and to build the resilience of our remaining biodiversity, including to climate change.

Recognising Aboriginal People

This Bill also seeks to enshrine, respect and acknowledge Aboriginal South Australians and the role that they have played in caring for and living sustainably on Country.

Native plant and animal species hold considerable meaning to Aboriginal South Australians. The wisdom they hold provides important understanding of our ecosystems, providing unique and valuable insights into biodiversity and how we can live with nature.

The Bill ensures that Aboriginal knowledge is considered alongside science and local expertise in shaping conservation policy and restoration projects.

An Aboriginal Biodiversity Committee will be established to provide environmental and cultural perspectives to the operation of the Act.

Recognition of culturally significant biodiversity entities will be established and determined voluntarily by Aboriginal groups to help guide policy and conservation efforts at a landscape level.

This recognition will not inhibit individual land use decisions such as development approvals, instead it will help shape long term environmental policy and restoration efforts.

General Duty

Biodiversity is not just the government's responsibility—it belongs to all of us. That is why this Bill introduces a General Duty to not cause harm to biodiversity, ensuring that individuals, businesses, and governments take proactive steps to prevent harm.

This is intended to encourage individuals, businesses and governments to take all reasonable prevention or minimisation measures before engaging in activities that could harm biodiversity.

The Biodiversity Bill contains a range of offences that regulate harm to biodiversity. The General Duty acts as an extra layer of protection—a fail safe for unanticipated harms.

If someone breaches this duty it is not a criminal offence, but it does trigger corrective action. Compliance orders, reparation orders or civil court proceedings can be issued to ensure that any harm is swiftly rectified or prevented.

The introduction of the General Duty for biodiversity presents a unique opportunity to acknowledge and encourage best practice across a range of industries and the community generally. The Bill allows for Biodiversity Policies to outline what constitutes 'reasonable measures', providing clear guidelines for compliance.

By accrediting industry practises as compliant with the General Duty, the Bill gives land managers and others certainty that their actions align with government expectations.

Accreditation of industry practices will also enable businesses to maintain access in export markets as global trade increasingly values nature positive practises.

Strong Governance and Oversight

As I have previously stated, the Bill will be supported by four committees:

- The Biodiversity Council will set the policy direction for biodiversity protection and restoration in the State and provide the Government with advice. The Bill requires that in appointing members to the Biodiversity Council, peak bodies are able to nominate qualified people to ensure a strong mix of skills and relevant experience are brought together to provide balanced advice to government.
- A Clearance Assessment Committee will review and assess land clearance proposals
- The Aboriginal Biodiversity Committee, which will ensure that Aboriginal knowledge informs biodiversity management and
- A Scientific Committee to provide technical ecological expertise.

- While the Biodiversity Council's composition is detailed in the Bill, the other committees will be defined through regulations to ensure that expertise aligns with their roles.

Transparent and Accountable Funding

The Bill is also supported by three Funds.

The Biodiversity Restoration Fund and Biodiversity Conservation Fund are largely rolled over from the Native Vegetation Act and National Parks and Wildlife Act, respectively.

The Bill establishes a new Biodiversity Administration Fund, to provide better transparency and accountability in the expenditure of funds.

Modernising South Australia's approach to Native Vegetation and Biodiversity

For more than 30 years the *Native Vegetation Act 1991* has played a key role in preventing the broadscale clearing of South Australia's landscapes. At the time it was progressive and effective in halting widespread destruction, however over time amendments have made it complex to navigate and administer and some of its protections have become outdated.

The National Parks and Wildlife Act also contains plant protection provisions—mostly for public land. The Biodiversity Bill combines these with those of the Native Vegetation Act, simplifying and strengthening biodiversity protections across all lands.

Under the new Act, clearance consent will be required for all plants indigenous to South Australia, regardless of species or size.

Indigenous plants from the rest of Australia will also be protected if they:

- Meet the regulated tree size under planning laws
- Are a prescribed species
- Are part of a Biodiversity Agreement

Recognising the Value of Planted Vegetation

Currently, most planted native vegetation is not protected under the Native Vegetation Act. The Biodiversity Act changes this—native plants that were planted at least 20 years ago will now have the same protections as naturally occurring native vegetation.

This reform acknowledges and safeguards decades of restoration efforts, ensuring that habitat restoration projects continue to contribute meaningfully to biodiversity conservation.

Clearer rules for regulated and excluded activities

The Bill defines activities that require consent as regulated acts. It also lists some activities that do not require approval, which are mostly carried over from existing Native Vegetation Regulations to ensure continuity. However, all activities—whether regulated or not—must still take steps to minimise harm to biodiversity.

The Bill also adds new exclusions to support the 20-year planted vegetation rule, ensuring that home gardens can be maintained, commercial forestry and farm forestry operations (including windbreaks) can continue and that commercial floriculture is not disrupted. These are in addition to existing exclusions that exist under the Native Vegetation Act for a range of other activities.

Stronger protections and responsible offsetting

The Bill will require stricter application of the mitigation hierarchy. The hierarchy requires applicants seeking to clear native plants to demonstrate that they have, as far as is practicable, avoided, minimised and restored any harm to biodiversity and where there are remaining adverse impacts, that these will be offset.

The Bill also requires prioritisation of on-ground offset projects before allowing payments into a biodiversity fund.

The existing Native Vegetation Act includes a requirement for people clearing native plants to achieve a significant environmental benefit as a means of offsetting their impacts. This is a well-established process but needs revision in line with emerging science and best practice.

The Bill requires a new Significant Environmental Benefit (SEB) policy to be developed with extensive consultation. This process will begin following the Bill's passage.

Importantly, the SEB policy will ensure that offsets genuinely compensate for the impacts and loss and leave biodiversity in a better place. At the same time, development of the policy will have regard for the practical implications for businesses and industry.

Feedback received through public consultation advocated for revising the principles of preservation, which are carried over from the Native Vegetation Act and are used to guide decision making. Feedback suggested these need to be updated to reflect current ecological science and be framed to have an outcomes-focus.

In order to properly consult on these principles and ensure that we receive the correct expert input, revision of the principles will be undertaken as a future project and any proposed changes will need to be brought back to Parliament for consideration.

New appeals process for Native Plant Clearance

The Bill introduces an appeals process for native plant clearance. If a clearance request is denied, the applicant can request a review by the Biodiversity Council. If they are not satisfied, they will also then have the option to appeal to the Environment, Resources and Development Court.

Continuing Protections for Public Land & Special Species

Existing protections for the taking of native species—such as seed collection and flower picking on public land or for prescribed species—will continue to apply.

Protecting Native Animals

The Biodiversity Bill carries forward key protections for native animals from the National Parks and Wildlife Act, while modernising and improving how we manage species at risk.

Certain activities—such as taking from the wild, killing, or keeping native animals—will continue to require ministerial approval. These provisions will ensure that interactions with wildlife are properly managed and do not threaten biodiversity.

Currently, the National Parks and Wildlife Act contains an outdated list of unprotected animals that can be controlled or dealt with freely, without oversight. The Biodiversity Bill removes this list, replacing it with a more balanced approach to managing species that may cause environmental or economic harm. Provisions within the Bill will allow for the continued keeping or managing of those previously unprotected species without additional regulatory burden.

Instead of a blanket approach, the Bill introduces mechanisms like Ministerial declarations, which allow for the targeted management of specific species. This will ensure that species which can be problematic—such as little corellas—can be efficiently controlled without requiring individual permits for land managers.

The Bill recognises that serious and organised wildlife crime is an increasing threat. It introduces the concept of 'trafficable quantities', allowing for stronger penalties for activities related to illegal poaching.

While existing permit systems for protected animals remain largely unchanged, they have been streamlined and updated to improve clarity and ease of compliance.

Preventing extinctions and strengthening threatened species protections

At the heart of the Biodiversity Bill is a fundamental goal to prevent extinctions and stop biodiversity loss before it is too late.

Species are declining globally, nationally and in South Australia at an alarming rate. What is even more concerning is that we don't fully understand the extent of the loss. Every extinction has unpredictable ripple effects that could impact our food production, health and industries.

The Bill adopts a nationally consistent approach to identifying and listing species at risk of extinction, ensuring that South Australia's approach aligns with best practice.

The Bill goes beyond listing—it provides new tools to actively protect and restore threatened species and ecosystems, including action plans and threat abatement plans.

Recognising and declaring critical habitat

Importantly, the Bill includes new provisions to recognise and protect 'critical habitat'— which is habitat that is essential for the survival or recovery of a threatened species or ecological community.

Without habitat, species cannot survive. Protecting the right places is essential to arresting biodiversity decline and giving species a chance to recover.

The Bill describes that the responsible Minister must, within six months of listing a species or ecological community, decide whether or not to make or amend a critical habitat declaration. This decision trigger will ensure that we understand and respond to the conservation needs of our most vulnerable biodiversity.

In making a critical habitat declaration, the Minister would be required to consider the relevant Biodiversity Policy, which would step out the criteria for what constitutes critical habitat, and undertake consultation.

A critical habitat declaration will be spatially explicit, so that you can look at a map and understand whether you are within a critical habitat declaration or not. A critical habitat declaration will also be required to describe the features that make it critical.

Destroying, damaging or disturbing a critical habitat feature is an offence if it is undertaken without authorisation and authorisation may only be given where the clearance assessment committee is confident that the impacts to the threatened species or threatened ecological community are addressed and offset with on-ground action. Paying money into a Fund to offset harm is not an option when it comes to these important features.

By defining these features, the Bill seeks to encourage compatible land uses that maintain biodiversity in the landscape. For example, paddock trees with tree hollows may be the critical habitat feature for a threatened woodland bird species in a spatially explicit area in our agricultural landscape. By being explicit that tree hollows are the feature that needs to be maintained, the Bill allows for surrounding appropriate grazing regimes to continue.

Recognising and supporting conservation on private land

The Bill acknowledges that private landowners play a crucial role in protecting and restoring biodiversity. The Bill formally recognises and supports these efforts with new tools and agreements.

Existing sanctuary provisions from the National Parks and Wildlife Act are carried over, ensuring that these areas remain protected.

The Bill establishes Biodiversity Agreements, which replace Heritage Agreements from the Native Vegetation Act. These agreements offer greater flexibility, allowing conservation to be integrated into working landscapes. They recognise that biodiversity can thrive in diverse landscapes, including farms, woodlands and urban green spaces.

The Bill introduces a framework for creating new types of conservation agreements. This ensures that the law can adapt to emerging conservation finance models, such as nature markets and new scientific understandings of biodiversity conservation.

Enforcement

To ensure compliance with biodiversity protections, the Bill introduces modern enforcement tools that allow efficient and responsive action.

Authorised officers will have contemporary enforcement powers, including the ability to investigate breaches and issue compliance orders.

The Bill enables faster enforcement actions, to ensure that biodiversity damage is stopped and addressed quickly.

For the first time, the Bill introduces third-party enforcement provisions, allowing people who are impacted by a breach to take legal action in cases of biodiversity harm. Concerned citizens who are not directly impacted but have a legitimate interest may also take action, with the Court's permission.

Safeguards are included against vexatious litigation, but this provision is an important way of empowering the public to help uphold environmental protections.

The Bill also includes stronger sentencing considerations and Courts will be required to consider the sensitivity of the biodiversity affected, such as harm to a threatened species or critical habitat and the scale of the impact, as well as impacts on Aboriginal peoples' cultural connections.

Building a Stronger Biodiversity Data System

Good decisions start with good data.

The Bill establishes a State Biodiversity Data System to improve how South Australia collects, manages and shares biodiversity information.

The Minister responsible for the Biodiversity Act will oversee data collection, management and accessibility.

The Bill will require government agencies to share biodiversity data, ensuring better coordination.

The availability of accurate data will support land use planning, allowing for quicker approvals and stronger conservation planning.

Long-Term Vision: The State Biodiversity Plan

To ensure South Australia's biodiversity is protected for future generations, the Bill introduces the requirement to develop a State Biodiversity Plan, which will be a strategic roadmap to protect and restore biodiversity.

It will set the long-term vision for biodiversity protection and define state-wide biodiversity indicators to track progress.

The Plan will also guide conservation investments, ensuring that funding goes where it's needed most. It will use more advanced planning tools, including spatial mapping, to guide regional conservation efforts.

It will align South Australia's biodiversity goals with national and global conservation standards.

It will also give greater certainty for developers and landowners by clarifying biodiversity priorities to guide development and restoration planning.

Biodiversity Policies—clear and practical guidance

The Bill introduces Biodiversity Policies to provide guidance on practical implementation of biodiversity conservation measures

These policies will guide the community on issues such as how to comply with the General Duty to protect biodiversity and how culturally significant biodiversity entities will be recognised.

A formal procedure for creating policies is included in the Bill and community consultation will be required before policies are finalised.

Guidelines

Guidelines that currently exist under the Native Vegetation Act will be revised to align with the Biodiversity Act. This process, conducted through consultation, will ensure that they remain effective and inclusive.

Biodiversity Register

Transparency and accountability are key to protecting biodiversity.

The proposed biodiversity register will ensure that key decisions and their rationale are documented to enable appropriate scrutiny.

This register will highlight our State's green credentials, responsible decision-making and high-value biodiversity areas, including restoration projects.

It will assist in supporting nature markets and philanthropic investment in key projects.

Related Amendments

The Bill makes several related amendments to other pieces of legislation that have the potential to impact on biodiversity.

The intent is to mainstream consideration of biodiversity, and the objects of the Biodiversity Act, across sectors and portfolios, in recognition that we all share this responsibility.

In particular, some amendments are made to the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act to establish the Biodiversity Act as a special legislative scheme and to enable better and timely interactions with the new critical habitat provisions such that they appear in our planning system and can inform decision making at the outset.

A new provision will require the Minister responsible for administering the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act to seek the concurrence of the Minister responsible for the Biodiversity Act when approving a Code Amendment to a zone or overlay that is prescribed in regulation to be of importance to biodiversity. Such zones or overlays could include those which offer protection to biodiversity, or those that are likely to contain areas of high biodiversity value.

A Call to Action

Through this legislation, we commit to three simple but profound objectives:

- Protect what's irreplaceable.
- Repair what's damaged.
- Share the responsibility.

We cannot afford to let biodiversity decline any further on our watch. Our children and grandchildren deserve a future where South Australia's natural landscapes are thriving, where our industries are resilient and productive and where our unique plants and wildlife are adequately protected.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

3—Interpretation

This clause defines certain terms used in the measure.

4—Interaction with other Acts

The measure is in addition to and does not limit or derogate from the provisions of any other Act. A requirement to obtain authorisation under the measure to carry out or undertake an act or activity applies despite the fact that the act or activity may be authorised under another Act or law.

The *Fire and Emergency Services Act 2005* will prevail to the extent of an inconsistency with the measure.

5—Act to bind Crown

The measure binds the Crown but does not impose criminal liability on the Crown.

6—Operation of Act

This clause sets out the territorial operation of the measure. It also provides that nothing in the measure prevents a native title holder from carrying out or undertaking an act or activity in the exercise of their native title rights and interests.

Part 2—Objects, principles and general duty etc

7—Objects

This clause sets out the objects of the measure.

8—Principles

This clause sets out principles that a person or body engaged in the administration of the measure must seek to give effect to.

9—Acting consistently with State Biodiversity Plan

A person or body engaged in the administration of the measure must act consistently with, and where appropriate give effect to, the State Biodiversity Plan.

10—Aboriginal knowledges

A person or body engaged in the administration of the measure must, as far as is practicable, seek Aboriginal knowledges and, where available and endorsed by the holders of the knowledges, consider and apply the knowledges in certain specified matters.

11—General duty

A person must not carry out or undertake an act or activity that harms or has the potential to harm biodiversity unless the person takes all reasonable and practicable measures to prevent or minimise any resulting harm. The clause also contains provisions to assist in determining what reasonable and practicable measures are required to be taken in accordance with the clause.

Part 3—Administration

Division 1—General

12—Delegation by Minister

This is a delegation power.

13—Ministers not to administer Act

The measure must not be committed to certain Ministers (responsible for mining and planning).

Division 2—Statutory bodies

Subdivision 1—Biodiversity Council

14—Establishment of Biodiversity Council

15—Composition of Council

16—Functions of Council

These clauses establish the Biodiversity Council and set out its membership and functions.

Subdivision 2—Clearance Assessment Committee

17—Establishment of Clearance Assessment Committee

18—Composition of CAC etc

19—Functions of CAC

These clauses establish the Clearance Assessment Committee and set out its membership and functions.

Subdivision 3—Aboriginal Biodiversity Committee

20—Establishment of Aboriginal Biodiversity Committee

21—Composition of ABC etc

22—Functions of ABC

These clauses establish the Aboriginal Biodiversity Committee and set out its membership and functions.

Subdivision 4—Scientific Committee

23—Establishment of Scientific Committee

24—Composition of Scientific Committee etc

25—Functions of Scientific Committee

These clauses establish the Scientific Committee and set out its membership and functions.

Subdivision 5—Other committees, advisory bodies and trusts

26—Other committees and advisory bodies

The Council may, with the approval of the Minister, establish committees to advise or assist the Council and the Minister may also establish any committees and advisory bodies for the purposes of the measure.

27—Ability to establish trusts

The regulations may establish a trust for the purposes of the measure.

Subdivision 6—Conditions of membership, remuneration, procedures and other matters

28—Conditions of membership

29—Remuneration

30—Procedures

31—Application of Public Sector (Honesty and Accountability) Act

32—Staff

33—Annual reports

34—Delegation

35—Validity of acts of Council, committees, advisory bodies and trusts

These clauses establish general procedural and other matters applying to the Council and any committee or advisory body established by or under the measure.

Division 3—Funds

Subdivision 1—Biodiversity Restoration Fund

36—Biodiversity Restoration Fund

37—Accounts and audit

Subdivision 2—Biodiversity Conservation Fund

38—Biodiversity Conservation Fund

Subdivision 3—Biodiversity Administration Fund

39—Biodiversity Administration Fund

Subdivisions 1, 2 and 3 set up various funds and outline the sources of money that are to be paid into each fund and what each fund is to be applied towards. The Biodiversity Restoration Fund (which is subject to the management and control of the Council rather than the Minister) also has provisions about accounts and audit.

Subdivision 4—General

40—Ability to establish other funds

The regulations may establish a fund for the purposes of the measure.

41—Investment

Money in a fund under the Division may be invested in a manner determined by the Minister.

Part 4—Native plants

Division 1—Preliminary

42—Regulated acts or activities

This clause defines the acts and activities that will be *regulated acts or activities* for the purposes of the Part.

43—Clearing and taking of plants by Aboriginal persons

Except as may be prescribed under subclause (1), nothing in the Part prevents an Aboriginal person from clearing or taking a native plant for the purposes of using the plant for a non-commercial cultural or spiritual practice (which may include using the plant as food in the course of that practice).

44—Declaration to clear and take certain native plants

The Minister may, by notice in the Gazette in accordance with the clause, declare that native plants of a specified species that are not indigenous to the State may be cleared or taken, or both cleared and taken.

Division 2—Offences

45—Offence to carry out or undertake regulated act or activity without authorisation

Subject to the measure, a person must not carry out or undertake a regulated act or activity unless the person is taken to hold an authorisation under clause 48 authorising the person to carry out or undertake the regulated act or activity.

46—Contravention of condition of consent

A person must not contravene a condition attached to a consent given under Division 3.

47—Illegal possession of native plants

A person must not have in their possession or control a native plant that has been illegally taken or acquired.

Division 3—Authorisation

48—Authorisation to carry out or undertake regulated act or activity

This clause sets out when a person is taken to hold an authorisation to carry out or undertake a regulated act or activity.

49—Application for consent

This clause sets out requirements relating to an application for consent to clear native plants.

50—Matters CAC must have regard to when determining application

This clause sets out the matters that the CAC must have regard to in determining an application for consent.

51—Circumstances in which consent may be given etc

This clause sets out circumstances in which consent to the clearance of native plants may, or may not, be given by the CAC under the Division.

52—Consultation and representations

The CAC must, before giving its consent under the Division undertake consultation in accordance with this clause and allow people to make representations.

53—Conditions of consent

This clause details the sorts of conditions that can be imposed on a consent. Conditions imposed on consent to clear native plants are binding on, and enforceable against—

- the holder of the consent; and
- the owner, and any subsequent owner, of the land to be cleared and any other land to which a condition relates; and
- an occupier of the land to be cleared and any other person who acquires the benefit of the consent.

54—Assignment of consent

The CAC may, on application, assign a consent to undertake clearance to another person.

55—Other matters relating to consents

Consent under the Division must be given in writing and remains in force for 2 years or for such longer period (which must not be more than 5 years after the consent is given) as the CAC may fix. The CAC must—

- observe the rules of natural justice;
- provide the applicant with a written statement of the reasons for its decision;
- publish its decision and statement of reasons on the Biodiversity Register.

56—Consent of Minister required if biodiversity agreement applies

Native plants that are growing or situated on land that is subject to a biodiversity agreement that does not allow the clearance to be undertaken cannot be cleared unless the Minister has also given consent to the clearance.

57—Application of Division if referral under Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act

This clause applies certain clauses to circumstances where the CAC is considering a development application referred to it under the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016*.

58—Avoidance of duplication of procedures etc

This clause makes various modifications to procedures and compliance requirements in order to avoid unnecessary duplication with requirements under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* of the Commonwealth where the clearance of native plants requires consent under both this measure and approval under the Commonwealth Act.

Division 4—Environmental benefit credits

59—Environmental benefit credits

This clause allows a person to apply to the CAC to be credited with achieving an environmental benefit. The CAC must not grant an environmental benefit credit unless satisfied that the land that is the subject of the credit is, or will be, subject to a biodiversity agreement and biodiversity management plan.

60—Use of environmental benefit credit

This clause allows for assignment of the whole or part of an environmental benefit credit and for application of the whole or part of a credit against a requirement under the measure to achieve a significant environmental benefit.

61—Other matters relating to environmental benefit credits

This clause sets out requirements in relation to applications under the Division, provides for establishment of a trust for the purposes of receiving money required by clause 60(6)(b) and its disbursement in the prescribed manner and provides for other matters to be prescribed by the regulations.

Division 5—Review etc of clearance refusal or revocation

62—Review by Council of clearance refusal or revocation

This clause:

- allows an applicant for consent to clear native plants to apply to the Council for review of a decision of the CAC to refuse to give consent to the clearance; and
- a person whose consent to clear native plants has been revoked to apply to the Council for review of the decision of the CAC to revoke the consent.

63—Appeal to ERD Court against review by Council of clearance refusal or revocation

This clause allows for appeals to the ERD Court against a decision of the Council to confirm a decision that was the subject of a review under clause 62.

Part 5—Protected animals

64—Regulated acts or activities

This clause defines the acts and activities that will be *regulated acts or activities* for the purposes of the Part.

65—Offence to carry out or undertake regulated act or activity without permit

Subject to the measure, a person must not carry out or undertake a regulated act or activity unless the person holds a permit.

66—Taking of animals and eggs by Aboriginal persons

Except as may be prescribed under subclause (1), nothing in the Part prevents an Aboriginal person from taking a protected animal or protected egg for the purposes of using the animal or egg for a non-commercial cultural or spiritual practice (which may include using the animal or egg as food in the course of that practice).

67—Illegal possession of protected animals etc

A person must not have in their possession or control a protected animal, protected animal product or egg of a protected animal that has been illegally taken or acquired.

68—Management plan in relation to harvesting relevant protected animals

The Minister must prepare a management plan, in accordance with this clause, in relation to the harvesting of each relevant protected animal.

69—Declaration to take certain protected animals

The Minister may, by notice in the Gazette in accordance with the clause, declare that protected animals of a specified species, or protected eggs of a specified species of protected animal, may be taken.

Part 6—Threatened species, threatened ecological communities and listed ecological entities

Division 1—Designated lists

70—Threatened species list

The Minister must establish and maintain a threatened species list in accordance with this clause.

71—Threatened ecological communities list

The Minister must establish and maintain a threatened ecological communities list in accordance with this clause.

72—Ecological entities list

The Minister may establish and maintain a list in respect of any ecological entity (other than a native species, ecological community or critical habitat).

Division 2—Eligibility

73—Eligibility criteria

The regulations may prescribe the criteria to be applied to determine the eligibility of a native species, ecological community or ecological entity to be included in a designated list and in a particular category of a designated list.

Division 3—Processes

74—Establishing or revoking designated lists

This clause provides for establishing a designated list and for revoking an ecological entities list.

75—Listing decision

This clause specifies what a *listing decision* is.

76—Listing process

A listing decision may only be made in accordance with the process set out in this clause unless clause 77 applies.

77—Expedited listing process

This clause sets out circumstances in which the Minister need not follow the process set out in clause 76.

78—Provisional listing

This clause sets out circumstances in which the Minister may make a provisional listing.

Division 4—Protection of threatened species, threatened ecological communities and listed ecological entities etc

79—Action plans

This clause sets out provisions relating to action plans which may be prepared and published by the Minister in respect of threatened species, threatened ecological communities, listed ecological entities or critical habitats.

80—Declaration of key threatening process

The Minister may declare a threatening process to be a key threatening process in accordance with this clause.

81—Threat abatement plans

The Minister may prepare and publish *threat abatement plans* in respect of key threatening processes in accordance with this clause. The Minister must take reasonable steps to implement a threat abatement plan and must report on the implementation and effectiveness of the plan.

82—Extinction inquiry

Under this clause the Scientific Committee is required to undertake an inquiry into the potential extinction of a native species or the potential collapse of an ecological community in certain circumstances.

83—Protection of threatened species of fish

This clause requires the Minister to consult with the Minister responsible for the administration of the *Fisheries Management Act 2007* when a species of fish is added to the threatened species list.

Division 5—Protection of critical habitat

84—Declaration of critical habitat

The Minister may declare habitat of a threatened species, threatened ecological community or listed ecological entity to be critical habitat in accordance with this clause.

85—Minister may enter into agreement or arrange for action plan

The Minister may engage with the owner of land on which critical habitat is located to protect the habitat by entering into a biodiversity agreement or arranging for the preparation of an action plan.

86—Offence to destroy, damage or disturb critical habitat without authorisation

Subject to the measure, a person must not destroy, damage or disturb critical habitat features of critical habitat unless the person is taken to hold an authorisation under clause 88 authorising the person to carry out or undertake the destruction, damage or disturbance.

87—Destroying, damaging or disturbing critical habitat by Aboriginal persons

Subject to regulations under subclause (1), the Division does not prevent an Aboriginal person from destroying, damaging or disturbing critical habitat features of critical habitat for the purposes of using the critical habitat features for a non-commercial cultural or spiritual practice (which may include using the features as food in the course of that practice).

88—Authorisation to destroy, damage or disturb critical habitat features

This clause sets out when a person is taken to hold an authorisation to destroy, damage or disturb critical habitat features of critical habitat.

89—Application for consent

This clause sets out requirements relating to an application for consent under the Division.

90—Circumstances in which consent may be given etc

This clause sets out circumstances in which CAC can give consent to an application to which clause 89 applies where the proposed destruction, damage or disturbance of critical habitat features of critical habitat is, in the opinion of the CAC, likely to negatively impact on, or hinder the recovery of, the threatened species, threatened ecological community or listed ecological entity that was the basis for the habitat's eligibility to be declared as critical habitat.

91—Consultation and representations

The regulations may set out consultation requirements relating to applications for consent and the clause provides an entitlement for a person to make representations in writing to the CAC in relation to the giving or refusal of consent to an application to destroy, damage or disturb critical habitat features of critical habitat.

92—Conditions of consent

CAC may impose conditions on a consent in accordance with this clause and the conditions are binding on, and enforceable against—

- the holder of the consent; and
- the owner, and subsequent owner, of the land on which the critical habitat is situated and any other land to which a condition relates; and
- an occupier of the land on which the critical habitat is situated and any other person who acquires the benefit of the consent.

93—Contravention of condition of consent

A person must not contravene a condition of a consent given under the Division.

94—Assignment of consent

The CAC may, on application, assign a consent under the Division to another person.

95—Other matters relating to consents

Consent under the Division must be given in writing and remains in force for 2 years or for such longer period (which must not be more than 5 years after the consent is given) as the CAC may fix. The CAC must—

- observe the rules of natural justice;

- provide the applicant with a written statement of the reasons for its decision;
- publish its decision and statement of reasons on the Biodiversity Register.

Part 7—Conserved areas

Division 1—Sanctuaries and other conservation areas

96—Establishment of sanctuaries

A sanctuary may be established by the Minister in accordance with this clause.

97—Other conservation areas

The regulations may establish, or set out processes for establishing, conservation areas on private land, with the consent of the owner of the land.

Division 2—Biodiversity agreements

98—Biodiversity agreements

The Minister may enter into a biodiversity agreement with the owner of land in accordance with this clause.

Division 3—Financial and other assistance

99—Financial and other assistance

An application may be made to the Council for financial or other assistance in accordance with this clause for the purposes specified in the clause.

Part 8—Enforcement

Division 1—Authorised officers

100—Appointment of authorised officers

Authorised officers under the measure are—

- persons appointed by the Minister;
- police officers;
- wardens appointed under the *National Parks Act 1972*, other than wardens whose appointments are limited to a particular provision or provisions of the *National Parks Act 1972* or to a particular reserve or reserves.

101—Identification of authorised officers

This clause provides for the issuing, and production, of identity cards.

102—Powers of authorised officers

This clause sets out the powers of an authorised officer under the measure.

103—Issue of warrants

This clause provides for the issue of warrants by the Magistrates Court or a justice.

104—Provisions relating to seizure

This clause sets out how things seized under the measure must be dealt with.

105—Offence to hinder etc authorised officers

It is an offence to hinder, obstruct , abuse etc an authorised officer or to refuse or fail to comply with a requirement or answer a question or to make a false representation. It is also an offence to assault an authorised officer.

106—Self-incrimination

It is not a reasonable excuse for a person to fail to answer a question or to produce, or provide a copy of, a document or information as required under the measure on the ground that to do so might tend to incriminate the person or make the person liable to a penalty.

Division 2—Power to require or obtain information

107—Information discovery orders

An authorised officer may, for the purpose of obtaining information reasonably required for the administration, operation or enforcement of the measure, issue an information discovery order to a person who is reasonably suspected of having knowledge of, or documents dealing with, a matter. Failure to comply with the order is an offence.

108—Obtaining of information on non-compliance with order

If a person fails to furnish information as required by an information discovery order or furnishes information that is inaccurate or incomplete, the authorised officer who issued the order may take such action as is reasonably required to obtain the information and may recover reasonable costs and expenses incurred.

109—Appeal to ERD Court

A person to whom an information discovery order has been issued may appeal to the ERD Court against the order or any variation of the order.

Division 3—Administrative remedies

110—Interpretation

This clause defines *designated authority* for the purposes of the Division.

111—Compliance orders

A designated authority may issue a compliance order, or an emergency compliance order, in accordance with this clause for the purposes of securing compliance with a requirement imposed, or duty created, by or under the measure. Failure to comply with the order is an offence.

112—Reparation orders

If a designated authority is satisfied that a person has caused harm to biodiversity by breach of any requirement imposed, or duty created, by or under the measure, the designated authority may issue a reparation order in accordance with this clause requiring the person to take certain action. Failure to comply with the order is an offence.

113—Action on non-compliance with compliance order or reparation order

If the requirements of a compliance order or reparation order are not complied with, the Minister may take any action required to give effect to the order in accordance with this clause and may recover reasonable costs and expenses incurred.

114—Registration of orders by Registrar-General

The Minister may apply to the Registrar-General for the registration of a compliance order or reparation order issued in relation to an activity carried out on land, or that requires a person to take action on or in relation to land.

115—Enforceable voluntary undertakings

The Minister may accept a written undertaking given by a person in connection with a matter relating to a breach or alleged breach of the measure. Failure to comply with the undertaking is an offence.

Division 4—Enforcement proceedings

Subdivision 1—Civil enforcement

116—Application to ERD Court for enforcement

Various specified persons may apply to the ERD Court in accordance with this clause for an order to remedy or restrain a breach of the measure.

117—Order where native plants have been cleared

Subject to the clause, if the ERD Court is satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the respondent has cleared native plants in breach of the measure Act or has not complied with certain kinds of condition attached to the consent, the Court must make an order against the respondent requiring the respondent to make good the breach.

118—No development orders

If the owner of land is convicted of an offence against clause 45 or clause 46 in relation to clearance of native plants, the ERD Court may, in addition to imposing a penalty for the offence, order that no development of the land in relation to which the offence was committed may be undertaken during a period (not exceeding 10 years) fixed by the Court except for the purpose of re-establishing or restoring native plants cleared in, or otherwise making good any damage to native plants caused through, the commission of the offence. A person who undertakes development contrary to such an order is, in addition to liability for contempt of the order, guilty of an offence.

119—Interim order

The ERD Court may make an interim order if it is satisfied that is desirable in order to protect biodiversity or to preserve the rights or interests of parties to the proceedings, or for any other reason.

120—Enforcement of ERD Court orders

A person who contravenes an order of the ERD Court under the Division is, in addition to liability for contempt of the order, guilty of an offence. If the ERD Court makes an order requiring a respondent to make good the breach and the respondent fails to comply with the order, the Minister may cause any work contemplated by the order to be carried out, and may recover the reasonable costs and expenses of that work.

121—Miscellaneous provisions

This clause makes various provisions in relation to orders of the ERD Court under the Division.

122—Commencement of proceedings

Proceedings under the Subdivision must be commenced within 1 year after the date on which the respondent expiated, or was convicted or found guilty of, an offence to which the proceedings relate or, in any other case, within 5 years after the date on which the breach is alleged to have occurred or, with the authorisation of the Attorney-General, within 10 years after the date on which the breach is alleged to have occurred.

123—Initiating civil proceedings to require offender to make good clearance of plants

If a court finds a person guilty of an offence against clause 45 or clause 46 in relation to clearance of native plants, the CAC must, within the prescribed period, initiate civil proceedings under the Subdivision in order to require the offender to make good the breach of the measure unless such proceedings have already been commenced in, or an order has already been made by, the ERD Court under the Subdivision in relation to the matter, or the finding of guilt is overturned on appeal.

124—Recovery of civil penalty in respect of breach

The relevant authority (being either the Minister or CAC) may, as an alternative to criminal proceedings, recover, by negotiation or by application to the ERD Court, an amount as a civil penalty in respect of a breach of the Act in accordance with this clause.

Subdivision 2—Criminal enforcement

125—Jurisdiction of ERD Court

Offences constituted by the measure lie within the criminal jurisdiction of the ERD Court.

126—Applications during or after criminal proceedings

This clause allows a court that is or has dealt with criminal proceedings under the measure to also deal with an application for an order under the measure.

127—Commencement of proceedings for offence

Proceedings for an offence against the measure may be commenced at any time within 5 years after the date on which the offence is alleged to have been committed or, with the authorisation of the Attorney-General, at any later time within 10 years after the date on which the offence is alleged to have been committed.

128—Offences by bodies corporate

Where a body corporate is guilty of an offence against the measure, each member of the governing body, and the manager, of the body corporate are guilty of an offence and liable to the same penalty as is prescribed for the principal offence.

129—Sentencing considerations

This clause sets out matters that a court is to have regard to in imposing a penalty for an offence under the measure.

Subdivision 3—Defences

130—Application of defences

A person charged with an offence against the measure bears the legal onus of proving, on the balance of probabilities, any defence under the measure. Any challenged statement of fact or opinion in support of a defence must be substantiated on oath.

131—Notice of defences

A person who intends to rely on a defence may only do so if the person gives notice in writing of that intention to the Minister.

132—General defence

It is a defence to a charge of an offence against the measure if the defendant proves that the alleged offence was not committed intentionally and did not result from any failure on the part of the defendant to take reasonable care to avoid the commission of the offence.

133—Acts authorised under legislation

It is a defence to a charge of an offence against the measure to prove that the defendant acted in compliance with a requirement of, or in accordance with a power under, this measure or another Act or in prescribed circumstances.

134—Defences in relation to Part 5

This clause sets out various defences that are specific to the protected animal offences.

135—Defence in relation to hunting

This clause sets out various defences that are specific to the hunting offence.

Subdivision 4—Evidentiary provisions

136—Interpretation

This clause defines terms used in the Subdivision.

137—General evidentiary matters

138—Documents and data

These clauses specify various ways in which matters can be proved in proceedings under the measure (by allegation in the application or information or evidentiary certificate etc).

139—Possession

This clause defines the concept of *possession* for the purposes of the measure.

Subdivision 5—General provisions

140—Classification of offences

This clause specifies when offences are classified as summary or as minor indictable for the purposes of the measure.

141—Aggregation of offences

Certain protected animal offences may be aggregated (so that the quantity of the protected animals, protected animal products or eggs concerned for the purposes of the offence is the total quantity of the protected animals, protected animal products or eggs in respect of the different separate offences).

142—Culturally sensitive information

A court may dispense with any formalities it considers appropriate in order to facilitate the hearing of culturally sensitive information.

143—Interest

This clause specifies how interest accrues on certain unpaid amounts.

144—Sale of land for non-payment

An amount payable under the measure, or interest in relation to such an amount, is a first charge on land and if it has been unpaid for 1 year or more, the Minister may sell the land in accordance with this clause.

145—Constitution of ERD Court

This clause makes provision in relation to the constitution of the ERD Court when exercising jurisdiction under the measure.

146—Assessment of costs and expenses

The reasonable costs and expenses that have been or would be incurred by the Minister in taking any action under the measure are to be assessed by reference to the reasonable costs and expenses that would have been or would be incurred in having the action taken by independent contractors engaged for that purpose.

147—Vicarious liability

For the purposes of the measure, an act or omission of an employee or agent will be taken to be the act or omission of the employer or principal unless it is proved that the act or omission did not occur in the course of the employment or agency.

148—Statement of officer evidence against body corporate

A statement made by an officer of a body corporate is admissible as evidence against the body corporate in proceedings for an offence under the measure.

149—Recovery from related bodies corporate

Related bodies corporate are jointly and severally liable for amounts payable under the measure.

Subdivision 6—Appeals

150—Appeal to ERD Court against prescribed order

A person to whom a compliance order, reparation order or order to comply with an enforceable voluntary undertaking is issued may appeal to the ERD Court against the order or any variation of the order in accordance with this clause.

151—Appeals to Supreme Court

An appeal lies to the Supreme Court against an order made, or a decision not to make an order, under the 'Civil enforcement' Subdivision.

Part 9—Permits

152—Prescribed matters

This is a regulation making power relating to permits.

153—Permits—general matters

This clause sets out the general matters relating to permits such as applying for a permit, grounds for refusing a permit, variation of a permit, suspension or revocation of a permit and the term of a permit.

154—Permits—conditions

This clause sets out some of the matters that may be dealt with in permit conditions.

155—Permits—fees

This clause makes provision in relation to permit fees, which will be prescribed and may exceed the Minister's costs in granting the permits and administering the measure in relation to the permits.

156—Permits—provision of information

The holder of a permit must provide the Minister with information in accordance with this clause.

157—Permits—certain areas

This clause creates special provisions for permits relating to an act or activity that is to be, or may be, undertaken within a River Murray Protection Area or an act or activity that is to be, or may be, undertaken within the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary.

158—Permits for commercial purposes relating to native plants

This clause provides a process for the declaration of a species of plant that may be the subject of a permit authorising the taking and sale of such plants for commercial purposes.

159—Permits to take native plant that is critical habitat feature

This clause imposes a restriction on the grant of a permit that relates to the taking of a plant that is a critical habitat feature of critical habitat and is, in the opinion of the Minister, likely to negatively impact on, or hinder the recovery of, the threatened species, threatened ecological community or listed ecological entity that was the basis for the habitat's eligibility to be declared as critical habitat.

160—Permits to carry out or undertake regulated acts or activities under Part 5

The Minister may only grant a permit to take a protected animal or a protected egg in accordance with this clause.

161—Permits to hunt

A permit cannot authorise hunting within the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary.

162—Review by SACAT of certain permits

A person who has applied for a permit in respect of taking a protected animal or a protected egg may apply to SACAT for review of certain decisions of the Minister.

163—Contravention of condition etc of permit

A person must not contravene a condition of, or requirement, restriction or limitation applying in respect of, a permit granted to the person.

164—Royalty

A permit granted under the measure may require the permit holder to pay a royalty.

165—False representation

It is an offence for a person to falsely represent that they are the holder of a permit granted by the Minister under the measure.

Part 10—Miscellaneous

166—Offence to hunt without permit

Subject to the measure, it is an offence for a person to hunt unless the person holds a permit.

167—Hunting by Aboriginal persons

Nothing in the previous clause prevents an Aboriginal person from hunting for the purposes of using the hunted animal for a non-commercial cultural or spiritual practice (which may include using the animal as food in the course of that practice).

168—Unlawful entry on land

This clause creates various offences in relation to being on land for a specified purpose.

169—Restriction on use of certain devices

The Governor may, by proclamation, restrict or prohibit the use of firearms, ammunition or taking devices of a specified class for the taking of specified species of animals or for the taking of animals generally and it is an offence to contravene such a restriction or prohibition.

170—Noting of conditions or agreements against title to land

This clause provides for the Registrar-General noting conditions imposed under the measure, or noting an agreement, a variation or termination of an agreement or the expiration of a term of an agreement under the measure, against the relevant instrument of title for the land or, in the case of land not under the *Real Property Act 1886*, against the land.

171—Minister may sell or dispose of surrendered animal, animal product or egg

The Minister may sell, or dispose of as the Minister thinks fit, any protected animal, protected animal product or egg of a protected animal surrendered under the measure.

172—State biodiversity data

The Minister is responsible for compiling, maintaining and updating State biodiversity data and for providing access to such data in accordance with this clause.

173—State Biodiversity Plan

The Minister must prepare, publish and maintain a State Biodiversity Plan in accordance with this clause.

174—Council guidelines

The Council may prepare and adopt guidelines in relation to—

- the clearance or taking of native plants;
- damaging, destroying or disturbing critical habitat features of critical habitat;
- any other matter required by or under the measure.

175—Biodiversity policies

The Minister may make biodiversity policies for the purposes of the measure in accordance with this clause.

176—Biodiversity management plans

A biodiversity management plan required for the purposes of the measure must be prepared in accordance with this clause.

177—Biodiversity Register

The Minister must establish and maintain a website for the purposes of the measure which contains the following:

- the information in respect of applications received by the CAC for consent to clear native plants and for consent to destroy, damage or disturb critical habitat features of critical habitat;
- prescribed information in relation to clearances in respect of which the CAC must be notified;
- certain matters relating to environmental benefit credits;
- biodiversity agreements;

- each prescribed area of land;
- each Culturally Significant Biodiversity Entity;
- any management plans adopted under clause 68;
- the threatened species list;
- the threatened ecological communities list;
- an ecological entities list established and maintained under clause 72;
- an action plan made under clause 79;
- a threat abatement plan made under clause 81;
- habitat declared to be critical habitat;
- records of compliance orders and reparation orders;
- records of proceedings in respect of enforcement and any decision, order or determination of a court in such proceedings;
- enforceable voluntary undertakings accepted by the Minister;
- any management plans adopted under clause 158;
- a record of any notice in the Gazette required by or under the measure;
- Council guidelines;
- biodiversity policies;
- any other document or matter required by the measure to be published on the register or prescribed by the regulations.

178—False and misleading information

This clause creates an offence of providing false or misleading information under the measure.

179—Service of notices etc

This clause specifies that manner of giving notices and other documents as required under the measure.

180—Concurrence under Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act

If a request is made for the Minister's concurrence under section 73 of the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016*, the Minister must, in determining whether to grant concurrence have regard to, and seek to further, the objects and principles of the measure and act consistently with the State Biodiversity Plan.

181—Reports of public sector agencies

An annual report that is required to be prepared by a public sector agency must, to the extent that it is relevant to the operations or activities of the agency, include a report on the manner in which the agency is addressing matters relating to biodiversity conservation, restoration and enhancement.

182—Waiver etc of fees

The Minister may waive, reduce or remit a fee imposed under the measure if the Minister considers it appropriate to do so.

183—Regulations and fee notices

This is a regulation making power and power to make fee notices.

184—Review of Act

The Minister must cause independent reviews of the measure to be undertaken after 5 years and at further intervals not exceeding 10 years.

Schedule 1—Regulated clearance area

This Schedule provides for the definition of the regulated clearance area by a plan or plans deposited in the GRO and identified by the Minister by notice in the Gazette.

Schedule 2—Native plants—regulated acts or activities exclusions

This Schedule specifies acts or activities that are not regulated acts or activities for the purposes of clause 42(2).

Schedule 3—Principles of preservation of native plants

This Schedule sets out the principles of preservation of native plants in accordance with the definition of that term in clause 3.

Schedule 4—Protected animals—regulated acts or activities exclusions

This Schedule specifies acts or activities that are not regulated acts or activities for the purposes of clause 64(2).

Schedule 5—Related amendments and repeals

This Schedule updates references and makes other necessary related amendments to the following Acts:

- *Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary Act 2005*
- *Arkaroola Protection Act 2012*
- *Biosecurity Act 2025*
- *Coast Protection Act 1972*
- *Community Titles Act 1996*
- *Criminal Assets Confiscation Act 2005*
- *Criminal Investigation (Covert Operations) Act 2009*
- *Crown Land Management Act 2009*
- *Dog and Cat Management Act 1995*
- *Energy Resources Act 2000*
- *Environment Protection Act 1993*
- *Fire and Emergency Services Act 2005*
- *Firearms Act 2015*
- *Fisheries Management Act 2007*
- *Harbors and Navigation Act 1993*
- *Hydrogen and Renewable Energy Act 2023*
- *Landscape South Australia Act 2019*
- *Land Tax Act 1936*
- *Livestock Act 1997*
- *Maralinga Tjarutja Land Rights Act 1984*
- *Marine Parks Act 2007*
- *Mining Act 1971*
- *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972*
- *Parliamentary Committees Act 1991*
- *Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act 1989*
- *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016*
- *Real Property Act 1886*
- *Recreational Greenways Act 2000*
- *River Murray Act 2003*
- *Strata Titles Act 1988*
- *Unexplained Wealth (Commonwealth Powers) Act 2021*
- *Wilderness Protection Act 1992.*

The Schedule also repeals the *Native Vegetation Act 1991* and the regulations under that Act.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. D.G.E. Hood.

SOCIAL WORKERS REGISTRATION (COMMENCEMENT OF ACT) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

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

Second Reading

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:21): 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.

Mr President, today I introduce the Social Workers Registration (Commencement of Act) Amendment Bill 2025.

As I do so I again place on record the many exception people undertaking work in this field.

Social workers and people providing social work services are highly skilled, dedicated, wise and compassionate. They walk alongside people when they face really difficult times, empowering them to traverse new paths.

Social workers in the Department for Child Protection, for example, encounter some of the most challenging and heartbreaking circumstances that children, young people and their families are experiencing.

They are there for children, young people and their families at their hardest moments.

These workers are resilient and compassionate, offering empathy and support and also setting about empowering people to have agency. They go about their work, often at the coalface of need, dutifully and not always with the praise or acknowledgement they deserve.

The Bill seeks to amend the *Social Workers Registration Act 2021* so that the scheme can commence on a day fixed by proclamation.

We take this step following months and months of consultation with Unions representing social workers and those providing social work services, the AASW, government agencies and community sector organisations. Consultation which has highlighted the complexity of the work and workforce issues, the need for multiple registration pathways to recognise qualifications and experience and associated fees and timeframes.

Paramount in the Government's thinking around this bill is our desire not to impose a new fee on South Australians at this time.

Our work on this groundbreaking Scheme will continue.

I acknowledge the intensive and remarkable work already undertaken.

Professor Sarah Wendt and the team of the Office of the Social Work Registration Board have worked really hard, diligently and with such wisdom on this very unique and highly complicated piece of work.

It is the Government's intention for Professor Sarah Wendt to continue to lead this work. She will rightly remain as Director and will continue to refine the specifics of the scheme until its implementation, particularly around the need for diverse pathways for registration, how best to recognise experience and how best to ensure the work of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people who provide social work services is recognised.

The Office of the Social Work Registration Board is in the process of forming an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Committee to provide advice on this important area.

Mr President, again, the Office of the Social Work Registration Board has consulted with the sector at length about the scheme.

I'm advised, that around 1,845 people from the sector (Government, Non-Government, Unions) were engaged.

What we have learnt during this very comprehensive consultation period is that this extra time will allow the Office of the Social Work Registration Board to refine some of the concerns that have been raised with a scheme this complex.

The Government will continue to advance this scheme in a thoughtful way that takes account of the complexity of the work and also takes account of the fees that will be required to be paid for registration in due course.

Thank you again to all the of the contributors who have taken the time to be part of the process so far including, but not limited to, Women's Safety Services SA, Anglicare, Life Without Barriers, Connecting Foster and Kinship Care SA, Child and Family Focus SA, Embolden, Wakwakurna Kanyini, the PSA, the ASU, Flinders University and University of South Australia.

I extend, again, my sincere gratitude to Professor Sarah Wendt whose leadership in this space has been exemplary.

Also, the efforts of her team and all those who have worked on this over time need to be acknowledged, with special mention to the Australian Association of Social Workers who are fierce advocates for social workers and their members.

Mr President, I commend the Bill to the Council.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Social Workers Registration Act 2021*

3—Amendment of section 2—Commencement

This clause amends the commencement provision of the measure so as to provide for commencement of the Act on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

4—Amendment of section 68—Regulations and fee notices

This amendment is consequential.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. D.G.E. Hood.

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE (SAFETY AND SUPPORT) BILL

Final Stages

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

At 15:22 the council adjourned until Tuesday 17 June 2025 at 11:00.