

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 2 April 2025

The PRESIDENT (Hon. T.J. Stephens) took the chair at 14:16 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 Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:18): I bring up the 60th report of the committee, 2022-25.

Report received.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I bring up the 61st report of the committee, 2022-25.

Report received and read.

Question Time

DEMOCRATIC INTEGRITY

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing questions to the Attorney-General regarding democratic integrity.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Noting the Attorney-General's comments yesterday that the matter regarding a decision of the District Court in the case against immediate prior Labor Party member Councillor Jing Li is still awaiting a sentencing outcome, my general questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. Is the Attorney-General concerned about electoral integrity more broadly?
2. Has the Attorney-General spoken to the Electoral Commission of South Australia about what measures should be undertaken to ensure electoral integrity?
3. Is the Attorney-General concerned about future elections, given how easily this incident seemed to occur and how long it took to prosecute?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:22): I thank the honourable member for her question. We have traversed this previously but I suspect the honourable member has forgotten that it is not the Attorney-General who is responsible for the conduct of local government elections, but it is in fact the local government minister, but I am happy to continue the education of the Leader of the Opposition for her benefit just in case she ever finds herself in government—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —and can understand—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —ministerial responsibility and who acts are committed to. I am always trying to be helpful to my colleagues on the opposite side.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I think what recent proceedings have shown is that the checks and balances in our democratic system work. The fact that something has been able to be agitated in court and had a process that has come through shows—unlike a lot of other places in the world—we have a robust democratic system in Australia. I think we can be very proud and pleased with how our democratic system works, particularly in South Australia but in Australia generally. I think the fact that people have had concerns, that they have had a place to agitate those concerns and a decision has been made shows exactly how robust our democratic system is. In relation to any reforms or any suggestions that may be made, I am sure the Electoral Commission will take those into account and the minister responsible will consider them.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Wortley, it is not your question.

DROUGHT

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries on the topic of drought. Minister, given the severe drought conditions currently affecting farmers in South Australia, does your government believe that farmers should be expected to solely rely on preparedness plans, considering the lack of emergency assistance provided by your government to date and, if so, how does the Malinauskas government justify this approach in light of the current challenges farmers are facing?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:25): I would certainly like to pay tribute to the farming community and the vast work they have done in terms of preparedness for drought. It's a constant challenge and it's a constant risk. Of course, the provision of the \$18 million drought support package back last November was developed in consultation with industry through the various consultation fora that we had around the state.

We continue as a government to interact and to listen to our farming communities, to peak bodies and individual farmers, as well as those businesses in regional communities who are also, of course, affected by significant economic downturns as a result of the drought. We are continuing to meet with farmers and farming communities. I mentioned yesterday that the Premier and I are hosting a further round table with farmers this afternoon as we continue to work through what is the most appropriate way to assist further.

DROUGHT

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:26): Supplementary: after the round table today, when will further assistance be announced by this government?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:26): We are working through the appropriate assistance that will be rolled out into the future.

DROUGHT

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:26): My questions are to the Minister for Primary Industries on the topic of drought:

1. How many applications did the department receive for the On-farm Drought Infrastructure Rebate Scheme in January?
2. How many of these grant applications received in January have been approved?
3. How many of those grant applications have been declined, and, of those declined, how many have been notified that they were not successful?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:27): I don't have the numbers to hand. I am happy to take that

on notice in terms of the figures that were received in January. We have certainly had a very strong uptake and a number of applications for the on-farm drought infrastructure grants. Clearly, that shows that they are valued, and that's not surprising given they came about as a result of the various engagement and round tables.

In terms of the processing times, because of the high number of applications there has unfortunately been delays in processing those claims, or those applications. On occasion it may be that not full information has been provided and that, of course, will further delay, but PIRSA has doubled the size of the processing team to try to deal with that backlog.

The honourable member, I believe, referred to applications being declined. It is probably worth pointing out that it's not a competitive grant process. If an applicant is eligible, then they will be able to receive the grant. If they are not eligible, then clearly they won't.

DROUGHT

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:28): Supplementary: will applications be declined if the fund has been fully expended?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:28): As I have said a number of times, all of the programs under the drought support package remain open for applications, and that certainly includes this one.

DROUGHT

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:29): Further supplementary question arising from the original answer: have delayed times improved since doubling the team's FTE?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:29): I would certainly expect so.

SOUTH EAST FIELD DAYS

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:29): My question is for the Minister for—

The Hon. H.M. Girolamo: Did you write this question yourself, Russell?

The PRESIDENT: Order! Don't be harassing the Hon. Mr Wortley.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: Thank you, Mr President, for your protection. My question is for the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister inform the chamber about the recent South East Field Days?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:29): I thank the honourable member for his question. I recently had the absolute pleasure of heading to Lucindale for the 45th South East Field Days. Field days are an incredibly important part of regional life and we have a number of highly successful events across the state throughout the year that provide a boost for local businesses and economies and an important opportunity for agricultural businesses to get their products in front of a large number of potential buyers.

Of course, as a South-East local myself, I understand how important the South East Field Days are to our local communities, particularly when times are tough. It's an important opportunity, as I mentioned, for agricultural businesses and other local businesses to show their wares, with field days providing a fantastic opportunity for families and communities to come together to also enjoy food, drink, fun and entertainment.

This year's event featured everyone's favourite gardening guru, Gardening Australia's Sophie Thomson, on the main stage, as well as the SA Police band, and country musician Leah Briggs, who hails from Beachport. I am told that Butcher Girl Alison was a fan favourite as she carved up a storm on the stage with incredible skill. The fun didn't stop at the main stage, with things such as laser tag, Old MacDonald's farm, racing simulators, helicopters, balloons and the SA Yard Dogs Championship all providing fun for kids young and not so young over the two days.

It is good to see the committee continually shaping the event to cater for a wide range of interests. This was just one more reason why this year's version was an incredible success, I am told, with over 500 exhibitors and 22,000 attendees.

I certainly appreciated the opportunity to talk to many farmers and businesses on the day, as well as to speak with organisations such as GPSA and Livestock SA. I visited the PIRSA stall to talk to the team there, as well as having a good opportunity for an outside broadcast with ABC. Drought, of course, was a significant topic and it was a further valuable opportunity to hear from South-East farmers about the impact it's having and to again listen to them about what sort of further assistance might be most beneficial for them as we continue to respond as a government.

Field days are where the very best of regional communities shine through—the hospitality, entrepreneurial spirit, the businesses and the people who have all built up the regions, the younger and older generations working together and actively taking part in rural life together. Congratulations to the South East Field Days chair and his team, as well as all exhibitors and everyone who attended a fantastic two days in our beautiful South-East.

SHARK SIGHTING MANAGEMENT

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:32): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Emergency Services regarding shark sighting management.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: As reported in *The Advertiser* on 26 March, concerns were raised from Anton Covino, founder of Shark Watch South Australia, regarding ineffective and delayed communication of shark sightings provided by the authorities. Shark Watch SA, established in 2014, delivers real-time shark sighting updates to over 150,000 users through social media platforms. Despite Mr Covino's repeated efforts to collaborate with government agencies, particularly the State Emergency Service, to improve the accuracy and timeliness of shark alerts, his offers have reportedly been overlooked.

This situation persists, despite a previous announcement on 25 November 2024 of a \$500,000 government funding package in collaboration with Surf Life Saving SA aimed explicitly at reducing the risk and impact of shark interactions for residents and visitors along South Australia's coastlines. My questions to the minister are:

1. Given these ongoing challenges and the recent funding commitment, what specific outcomes and improvements have resulted from the \$500,000 government investment announced in partnership with Surf Life Saving SA, particularly concerning the timely communication and management of shark sightings?
2. Why have efforts by community initiatives, such as Shark Watch SA, to collaborate with government authorities on shark alerts reportedly been ignored?
3. Will the government actively engage with such community-led groups to enhance public safety?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:34): I thank the member for her question. Obviously, shark attacks are a horrific experience for any community to be going through. It captures the attention of the community for good reason: it is a horrific experience to hear of and to know that families are going through.

I want to congratulate particularly the Hon. Clare Scriven for the work she has done in this space of bringing together a funding package of \$500,000 in partnership with Surf Life Saving. We had a briefing for MPs two weeks ago that was coordinated by the Hon. Clare Scriven's office to provide a bit more knowledge in this space. It is not as simple as saying, 'This is one solution that we can provide,' it is really about working with the community, and that is exactly what has happened here in regard to the Streaky Bay community.

I know PIRSA and Surf Life Saving have been able to work with that community to figure out what needs to happen, and collate a report and a review into that space and really understand at a

local level what is required from things such as trauma kits: being able to find an appropriate trauma kit that works and is available at seaside locations.

As was discussed at the briefing that we had for MPs, it is not as simple as just finding a trauma kit off the shelf; this has really come down to finding the right kit to be able to provide—and one that is weatherproof as well—and to have that on site and available. I know that drones have been looked into to see if they could be made available and provide training in local areas, and that training be potentially made available through Surf Life Saving across our more focused areas.

I know that Shark Watch have been in contact with the SES, and through their social media campaign as well, and I am advised that the conversation is more available and will continue about what we can do post the season.

SHARK SIGHTING MANAGEMENT

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:36): Supplementary: can the minister indicate whether additional resources will be made available to Shark Watch in the future?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:36): As I have said, I have stepped through quite a number of different circumstances that we are doing with the \$500,000. The conversation is absolutely there to be had, but we are also focusing on that review process of what is required at a local level. It isn't just about one answer; there are multiple things that need to be addressed here and the right information that we need to be getting to the community. So, absolutely, that conversation can continue.

WOMEN IN SPORT

The Hon. S.L. GAME (14:37): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing questions to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing regarding women's sport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.L. GAME: World Athletics recently announced it would reintroduce mandatory cheek swabs for all female track and field competitors to detect any athletes with Y chromosomes attempting to compete in women's events. In this chamber on March 20, the minister responded to a question about her government's support of women's sport, saying her government is serious about backing women and girls in sport, and is determined to advance a legacy of equality and inclusion. The minister also said we must champion the positive impact of South Australian women, especially our female athletes. My questions to the Minister for Sport, Recreation and Racing are:

1. Would the minister and her government encourage biological males who identify as female to participate in sport against girls and women and be celebrated for doing so?
2. Does the minister concede that biological boys and men competing against biological girls and women have an unfair and potentially dangerous physical advantage, and that this advantage could also lead to psychological harm to the girls and women they claim to be serious about backing and wanting to provide equality for?
3. How would the minister and the Malinauskas government define a woman?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:38): As I have said before in this chamber, I think we have shown that as a government we want to invest in sport. Whether it is from grassroots right through to SASI, having the most incredible opportunities for people to become elite athletes—and I emphasise 'people' because, at the end of the day, all South Australians should have the opportunity to participate in sport.

It is something, when you step onto a field, a court, into a pool—wherever you are going—that you get to compete not only as an individual but as a team and do the very best for our state and also potentially our country. It is where you get to be a part of something bigger than yourself, no matter what your background is, where you have come from, to be on that journey of being able to participate in sport.

I encourage anyone to participate in sport, because it is a very powerful tool to be a part of a community that will give you the skill set, give you the ability to participate not only in leadership roles on the field but off the field as well. I think that has provided many opportunities for people across a diverse community to be able to shine a light on what the power of sport is. So my message to you is: anyone in South Australia, any South Australian, no matter their background, no matter who they are, as an individual, as a team, should participate in sport and be recognised for doing so.

WOMEN IN SPORT

The Hon. S.L. GAME (14:40): Supplementary: would the minister agree, therefore, that women and girls have a right to be physically safe when undertaking that sport and to have a fair chance in the sport in which they are competing and not be up against, for example, biological males in that sport?

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Game, the minister in her original answer didn't touch on those gender issues. You can answer if you want, minister, but I don't see it as a supplementary question.

TOMATO BROWN RUGOSE FRUIT VIRUS

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:41): My questions are to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development on the topic of tomato brown rugose virus:

1. Has South Australia come to an agreement with all of the other states around protocol for market access and, if not, why not?
2. What has the minister herself done to engage with her interstate agriculture ministers to encourage sensible pathways to trade for many of our tomato growers here in South Australia?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:41): I thank the honourable member for her question. I have mentioned here previously the process that is involved in order to get national agreement for the various protocols required in terms of the eradication of tomato brown rugose virus and also the process going forward.

We are fortunate in that the three businesses that were infected properties last year remain the only businesses in South Australia that have been found to have the tomato brown rugose virus. I think that is a tribute to all the people who have worked so hard, particularly in the industry, to deal with what is a very, very difficult situation. Any time we have an outbreak of an exotic disease it creates and presents significant challenges for all involved.

In terms of market access, that is a matter that each jurisdiction determines. I have had multiple conversations with my interstate counterparts. The department works on an officer level and various other interactions occur. The department constantly is providing updated information in terms of enabling those other jurisdictions to make their decisions. Of course, we would prefer that there was an open and consistent approach to market access, but ultimately that is a decision for those jurisdictions. I continue to advocate for South Australian growers, as does my department.

TOMATO BROWN RUGOSE FRUIT VIRUS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:43): Supplementary: what states currently allow market access to South Australia?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:43): There is market access allowed for all states. They have different requirements, though, depending on those particular jurisdictions.

TOMATO BROWN RUGOSE FRUIT VIRUS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:43): Supplementary: can tomato growers currently, under the market access agreement, send to WA?

The PRESIDENT: We talked about jurisdictions, I guess, minister.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:44): It is important that growers who want to access any other market get in contact with PIRSA, if they are not already—I think most of them are. We have certainly encouraged them to work closely with the department and be able to make available a range of different market access arrangements, because of course it is in everyone's interest if we do have free and open trade between the different jurisdictions.

We would like to see consistency. However, each jurisdiction does have the opportunity to make their own decisions. That is a matter of those jurisdictions making those decisions. Each one is able to determine, for example, the testing regime that they will put in place and, of course, towards the end of last year we saw some of the challenges around that.

We have been very keen to advocate that the national deed, which sets out the eradication processes for this particular disease, which we had not had in Australia previously, be adhered to. It is in everyone's interests, we believe, in terms of South Australia, that we do have that consistency. However, where a jurisdiction decides that they want to protect their own growers, or be perceived to protect their own growers, then we do need to, obviously, respect that.

I have spoken on different occasions with my interstate counterparts, advocating on behalf of South Australian growers, and I think that is a really important process to continue. We do need to be conscious, however, that we have been quite successful in terms of managing this virus. In other countries around the world it has not been able to be eradicated, and they have moved to management processes. Here in South Australia, again, I want to pay credit to the growers as well as the industry organisations and PIRSA staff who have worked so hard in terms of trying to eradicate this disease so that the future for not just South Australian growers but Australian growers more generally can be protected.

TOMATO BROWN RUGOSE FRUIT VIRUS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:46): Supplementary: what else is the minister doing as she calls to advocate for that consistency between jurisdictions?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:46): In addition to speaking to my ministerial counterparts, ensuring that the department is operating on an officer-to-officer level where there has been, our national agricultural ministers' meetings, working with industry bodies; it is very comprehensive, I would suggest.

WORLD AUTISM AWARENESS DAY

The Hon. M. EL DANNAWI (14:47): My question is to the Minister for Autism. Will the minister inform the council about how SA is leading the way this Autism Awareness Day?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:47): I thank the honourable member for this question and interest in the topic, particularly on this day, World Autism Awareness Day, 2 April. This morning, it was wonderful to host members of the autistic and autism communities, members of our advisory committees and advocates to celebrate World Autism Awareness Day. I thank the members who joined us also, particularly from this chamber: the Hon. Ian Hunter, the Hon. Tung Ngo, the Hon. Tammy Franks and the Hon. Connie Bonaros.

This morning, we were also lucky to be joined by a tennis superstar whom I have spoken about before in this chamber, Andriana Petrakis, one of the top players in the world for her disability category and number one in Australia. Andriana gave an inspiring speech this morning, one that closed with one of her classic mottos: 'Be brave and be kind,' very wise words to live by.

We were also lucky to be joined by someone who is no stranger to our parliament, Patrick Saunders. We know it is not easy to share your story, let alone share it on the floor of parliament and with the entire state. That is exactly what Patrick did at this year's Teen Parliament, where he shared a powerful message to all South Australians as an autistic non-speaking advocate.

Earlier this week, I visited Patrick at home for an interview on the couch to learn more about his ideas about how to create a more inclusive autistic community and how to improve the lives

particularly of young autistic people. As a government, we are all about learning from and creating opportunities for autistic people. We have also done this previously with Tim Chan, a non-speaking autistic person, whom we made a keynote speaker at the last conference in 2024 for autism inclusion teachers. We have learned firsthand from his lived experience as a nonspeaking autistic advocate how we can change our educational systems and what we can do differently. I look forward to seeing Patrick and hearing about his story at the next autism inclusion teachers' conference.

As part of a government that has become a world leader in autism inclusion I want to keep on delivering the progress we have made so far in making our state an autism inclusive state. Importantly, though, our government recognises that none of the changes we have made could have been achieved without standing alongside our very proud autistic and autism community. Once again, I thank the many people who came today, and wish everyone a happy World Autism Day.

NUCLEAR WASTE

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (14:50): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question without notice to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development on the topic of nuclear waste.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: The Dutton Liberal opposition has claimed that if they win the next federal election—God forbid—they will introduce nuclear energy to Australia. The details of the plan are unclear and yet to be released. The Coalition's plan includes a small modular reactor in Port Augusta. It is still unclear how much waste would be produced each year, and Australia does not have a national storage facility.

Mr Dutton has been rightly criticised for his claims that only a Coke can's worth of waste would be generated under his plan, given that the waste generated by the untested technology is unclear. According to estimates from Emeritus Professor Ian Lowe of Griffith University's School of Environment and Science, for a small 400-megawatt modular reactor you would expect that to produce about six tonnes of waste a year. It could be more or less depending on the actual technology, but it would certainly be multiple tonnes a year. My questions to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development are:

1. Which regions would be required to store nuclear waste, and what is the potential impact on those regions?
2. Has the Dutton opposition bothered to reach out to the Malinauskas government regarding their plans to store nuclear waste in our state's regions?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:52): I thank the honourable member for his question. It is certainly the case that the amount of detail that has been provided by the federal opposition has been extremely limited. The number of questions that have arisen around their proposal—and I use that term very loosely, very loosely indeed—their thought bubble perhaps, some might suggest, would be a more appropriate term—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I would like to be able to hear the minister.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The detail has been extremely scant. What we do know is that on 19 June last year the Liberal Coalition announced that if elected to government it would establish a nuclear power industry, but it was a policy announcement which, as I have already mentioned, fell extraordinarily short of any detail, including an indication of cost.

However, there are some reputable estimates of what the Coalition's thought bubble might cost in monetary terms. On 9 December last year the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO) published its draft 2023-24 GenCost report for consultation. According to my advice, it again found that integrated renewables provide the lowest cost range of new build electricity technology, and the CSIRO found that a new, large-scale nuclear plant built then—that was, of course, in 2024—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —would require a capital cost of \$8,655 per kilowatt of capacity. In contrast, a large-scale solar farm would cost \$1,463 and onshore wind \$3,223. That is, nuclear—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —would cost many times as much to build as some of the alternatives. The CSIRO report was a general overview of the costs of various technologies. We know the costs would be extremely high. For South Australia, nuclear, I am advised, would increase household bills between \$384 and \$1,160 a year. That is just the increase, according to the IEEFA. We can look at some real-life examples.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Minister, you must be about to conclude your remarks so we can move on.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am happy to leave it there.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Supplementary question arising from the answer.

The PRESIDENT: No. The Hon. Ms Lensink, I couldn't hear most of her answer anyhow, so I can't rule in or out.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: But I haven't asked my supplementary.

The PRESIDENT: I am saying to you that I can't rule on a supplementary when I couldn't hear the answer.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: But I haven't even asked it yet.

The PRESIDENT: Ask your question. I am saying that I can't rule in or out a supplementary question because I couldn't hear the answer. There was too much shouting from both sides.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: That's very disappointing.

The PRESIDENT: Ask your question, please.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: That's very disappointing.

The PRESIDENT: I am disappointed, too.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I was wondering when the minister became an expert on energy policy if she had been provided the question before question time, but I will leave that.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Ms Lensink, please just ask your question.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: You can always throw me out, Mr President. I have been longing for that for 20 years. My question—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Are you going to ask a question or will I move on?

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:56): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Attorney-General regarding Aboriginal affairs and Truth and Treaty.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: According to evidence provided by Mr Colin Marsh, the Director of the First Nations Voice Secretariat, during the Budget and Finance Committee:

The First Nations Voice Act was really intended to be the first step and it's written within the legislation that it would complement any other act designed to implement truth and treaty.

My questions for the Attorney-General and Minister for Aboriginal Affairs therefore are:

1. Can the minister confirm this statement?
2. What further work has begun on legislative reform towards Truth and Treaty?
3. Has the government begun consultation on the Treaty process and will consultation be just with the Voice or will it be broader?
4. What funding has been allocated for progressing Treaty negotiations and how will that be applied?
5. Finally, does the government intend to set a timeline for the full implementation of Treaty and, if so, what is that expected timeline?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:57): I thank the member for the questions. In relation to question 1, yes. In relation to question 2, none as yet. In relation to question 3, initially we will consult with the Voice about how we structure the process and then look at much wider consultation. I can't remember what question 4 was.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Funding will be determined once the structure of further steps are determined. In relation to the timeline and timeframes, absolutely no timeline has been set. We see in many areas where there are Treaty negotiations post colonisation that it takes a varying amount of time and often a long amount of time. In jurisdictions like British Columbia, they are decades into it. This is even in jurisdictions where treaties were initially started during colonisation, like New Zealand where the Waitangi process is still ongoing. So, no, we certainly haven't and will not be setting some sort of artificial timeline and we will look at how this is done historically.

ADELAIDE BIG LUNCH

The Hon. T.T. NGO (14:58): My question goes to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Can the minister tell the council about the GO Foundation's 2025 Adelaide Big Lunch event?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:59): I thank the honourable member for his question and his ongoing interest in Aboriginal affairs. It was a great pleasure to attend the GO Foundation's 2025 Adelaide Big Lunch last week. Held at the Adelaide Oval, the event brought together a diverse range of supporters, alumni of the foundation and community leaders, all united by the common goal of empowering Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students through education.

The GO Foundation is co-founded by AFL legends Adam Goodes and Michael O'Loughlin and is dedicated to supporting Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students by providing scholarships from primary school right through to university. To date the GO Foundation has awarded over 400 scholarships in Adelaide and more than 1,700 scholarships in total for Indigenous primary, secondary and tertiary students in Sydney, Canberra and, of course, Adelaide.

The scholarships offer more than just financial assistance. The foundation's holistic approach ensures that students receive cultural support, mentoring, and leadership opportunities, fostering confidence and resilience. By focusing on education and cultural empowerment, the GO Foundation aims to create brighter futures for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander youth.

The event last week was an inspiring event, featuring entertainment with powerful storytelling. There was a mix of alumni success stories and discussions about the foundation's impact. A key theme was the importance of maintaining a strong alumni network which allows former

scholarship recipients to stay connected, mentor current students and contribute to their communities.

It has been a privilege to attend a number of GO Foundation events over the last few years, including graduations in previous years held here in Adelaide. Hearing the personal story from graduates from the GO Foundation's programs and the role that the foundation has played in shaping their futures highlighted the transformative impact of education and showed how access to resources such as laptops, culture-connect days and leadership programs can make a significant difference. The foundation's commitments to awarding 60 per cent of scholarships to female students and currently ensuring that some 94 per cent go to public school students further underscores its dedication to young people.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the GO Foundation, particularly the founders, Adam Goodes and Michael O'Loughlin, for the work they do in creating opportunities, fostering pride in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students and bringing a strong support network that extends well beyond school years. As I said, it has certainly been a privilege to attend a number of events with the GO Foundation over the last few years, and I am always amazed at the work that Michael and Adam both do. In my view Adam is one of the best humans I have ever met, one of the most complete individuals. The selfless giving he does for his community and culture is remarkable.

DAVENPORT COMMUNITY COUNCIL

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:02): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General and Minister for Aboriginal Affairs a question about the Davenport Community Council of Port Augusta.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: In an embarrassing outcome the state government has failed in its bid to wind up the council over a series of alleged organisational failures. These included alleged breaches of the Associations Incorporation Act, such as a failure to present audited financial statements in 2022 and 2023 and to hold an annual general meeting. If successful, the council would have been forced into administration. But in a judgement handed down last month, Associate Justice Katrina Bochner threw out the government's case, finding the business and consumer affairs commission, which comes under the Attorney's portfolio—

The Hon. K.J. Maher: No.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: No—which comes under the Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs' portfolio, did not follow legally required procedures. Basically it was bungled by the department, with, probably, Crown law advice. This, she ruled, included failing to receive relevant court approvals before issuing the wind-up notice to the council on 14 October last year.

The government launched the legal action last year amid integrity concerns that the council is receiving millions of dollars in ongoing taxpayer funding grants for services that it is not delivering. Its last published report on the Australian Charities and Not-for-profits Commission website, for the 2021-22 financial year, indicated it received \$671,000 in revenue, with \$473,000 of that money used for employee benefit purposes.

Town elders, including the highly respected elder Tiger McKenzie, and the Aboriginal Lands Trust have claimed the council has not delivered on some of its key programs and services, including a youth engagement centre, playgroup and school holiday program, despite receiving \$2 million in ongoing federal funding since 2021. There is a distinct odour of corruption here that is being obfuscated by this government. My questions to the Attorney are:

1. Is the government planning to appeal the judgement?
2. How could the Corporate Affairs Commission make such a rookie blunder?
3. Are you concerned at how the council is servicing the Davenport community, including the amount of money being committed to employee benefit expenses?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:05): I thank the honourable

member for his question and his interest in this area. One thing I wanted to clarify is when the honourable member talks about the government taking action, I want to be clear this is not a minister or a department; this is the independent statutory holder, the commissioner at Consumer and Business Services, making these decisions.

In relation to whether there will be an appeal, that will be up to the commissioner at Consumer and Business Services, not any member of the executive or any department within the government. My understanding is that there was a ruling that was a statutory interpretation of processes to be followed, so it will be up to the commissioner whether there is an appeal to clarify the judgement and the statutory interpretation of the procedures to be followed.

In relation to the community, I know both the state and federal government as well as the Aboriginal Lands Trust are working hard to ensure that services to the community are maintained. For example, the youth programs that the honourable member mentioned that are funded by the commonwealth, I understand, still continue, but the funding is not provided to DCCI; it is provided to another service provider to make sure those youth programs continue.

Regarding the question about an appeal in relation to the statutory interpretation, the process to be followed will be a decision for the commissioner at CBS, but both state and federal governments as well as the trust are keen to ensure that the services that have been provided continue to be provided to the community.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Pangallo has a supplementary question arising from the answer.

DAVENPORT COMMUNITY COUNCIL

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:07): Do you as the Aboriginal affairs minister believe that there should be an appeal?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:07): As I have said, that is not my role. It is no minister who has made the application, and it is not a minister, let alone myself, who is the instructor in relation to these proceedings. However, certainly we are very, very keen to make sure those services continue to be provided to the community and that is what the state department for Aboriginal affairs, the NIAA, the federal department, as well as the Aboriginal Lands Trust are working to do.

FIRST NATIONS VOICE COMMITTEES

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (15:07): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Attorney-General and Minister for Aboriginal Affairs regarding Aboriginal affairs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD: According to evidence given by Mr Colin Marsh, the Director of the First Nations Voice Secretariat, during Budget and Finance Committee on 11 March 2025, not one of the four legislated committees that were supposed to be set up under sections 31 to 34 of the First Nations Voice Act 2023 have been established. This is despite the wording in the act that states that the First Nations State Voice must establish these committees. Mr Marsh responded that the committees are 'in the pipeline' and that 'The rollout plan is yet to be determined.' My questions to the minister are:

1. Has the minister in his meetings with the First Nations Voice discussed these committees being formed?
2. Can he explain why these committees have not been formed despite the clear mandate?
3. Is it in line with the government's expectations?
4. What does the minister believe to be an appropriate time to take to establish these committees?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:08): I thank the honourable member for his question. I think part of the answer would be reflected in the address to a joint sitting of this parliament that was given by the State Voice, I think it was back in October last year. I have had a number of comments from fellow members of parliament both from this chamber and the other chamber and members of the public about how impressed they were with the address that was given to the joint sitting, where it was noted that the South Australian Voice to Parliament is the first of its kind anywhere in Australia. I can't remember the exact words that the co-presiding member Leroy Bilney from Ceduna used, but it was to the effect that they are having to create things for the very first time with nearly everything they do in terms of processes and procedures.

I am pleased that the Voice has made contributions on a number of pieces of legislation. I am pleased that representatives of the Voice have met with a number of ministers on a number of policy areas and, indeed, have met with the whole of cabinet and a whole group of chief executives and will continue to do so, and the Voice will set up committees and processes as they go about creating what is a historic first in this country.

FORESTRYSA

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:10): My question is to the Minister for Forest Industries. Will the minister update the council about ForestrySA's latest community service obligations memorandum of administrative agreement annual report?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:10): I thank the honourable member for his question. ForestrySA has custodianship of approximately 32,300 hectares of land mainly comprising of standing pine plantation and native forest reserve in the Mount Lofty Ranges and the Green Triangle. The South Australian Forestry Corporation, known as ForestrySA, has a charter mandating a range of community service obligations (CSOs) to cover non-commercial activities that would not normally be provided by a commercial entity.

The government of South Australia funds the non-commercial activities through my department, the Department of Primary Industries and Regions, via a memorandum of administrative arrangement to define outcomes and standards of delivery for services in native forest management, community use of forest reserves, forest industry development, and community fire protection. I am pleased to update the council with a summary of ForestrySA's achievements and highlights in these regards over the past 12 months. Some of those highlights include:

- 630,000 visitors to ForestrySA's forests, with the majority, of course, being in the Mount Lofty Ranges;
- over 4,600 students attending 74 school camps;
- over 8,800 permits being issued for camping, horseriding, fossicking and adventure caving;
- an incredible 3,970 volunteer hours conducting trail audits and maintenance, weed control, feral animal control, revegetation, and management of the Kuitpo Forest koala food plantation for provision of koala food for Cleland Wildlife Park;
- 52,548 people visited the TreeClimb at Kuitpo Forest;
- a total of 491 community events were held involving over 10,000 people, including facilitation of the Pines Enduro motorsport event, which involved 2,000 people;
- projects to understand, protect and restore culturally significant Aboriginal sites and heritage were undertaken in partnership with local elders, Aboriginal community and schools, including the new Purrumpa Trail in Mount Gawler Native Forest Reserve, named in consultation with the Kurna as part of National Reconciliation Week 2024;
- ForestrySA campground and accommodation facilities continued to be popular, with the booking system opened 12 months in advance. Upgrades were made to Chookarloo

Campground, Old School House and Thomas Hill House, and new horse yards were erected at Ponderosa, made with timber harvested from the Mount Crawford Forest;

- ForestrySA received a grant from the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing for two new adaptive trails for the Fox Creek Bike Park, which facilitate three and four-wheeled bikes, opening further opportunities for people living with disabilities;
- under funding arrangements with ForestrySA, the Department for Environment and Water responded to three fire incidents in the Green Triangle during the season and ForestrySA responded to 28 fire incidents in the Mount Lofty Ranges; and
- community use of forest reserves has remained high, with continued progression made in community engagements, partnerships and programs such as Aboriginal cultural projects and Friends of the Forests.

It was also pleasing to see that ForestrySA is strongly committed to the economic, environmental and social aspects of sustainable forestry. Our forest management system is certified by Responsible Wood's Australian Standard for Sustainable Forest Management, which requires compliance with internationally accepted criteria. Importantly, this ensures protection of production, Indigenous, heritage, social and environmental values across the ForestrySA plantation estate, values which I would hope we could all commit to.

NEURO-INCLUSIVE WORKPLACES

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:14): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Minister for Autism on the topic of neuro-inclusive workplaces.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: As has been mentioned already by the minister in this question time, today we do celebrate World Autism Awareness Day. It's a day for acceptance and inclusion and celebration, and I thank her for including members of parliament in the wonderful event this morning at the morning tea.

During the event, though, the thing that always happens in Parliament House when the bells start going off and some of the physical impediments in this building become real and the challenges are great, I am reminded that more can probably be done to ensure not just a neuro-inclusive strategy of workplaces across the state, but one for this Parliament House. So my question to the minister is:

1. Is she aware of other parliaments facing the challenges of being more inclusive and neuro-inclusive in their workplaces?
2. What can be done in this state parliament to address that challenge?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:15): I thank the honourable member for her question and ongoing support and interest in this space. We had a great conversation afterwards. It was a very testing environment with the bells going off constantly—finally, they decided to work this morning in the other house—with many divisions in a very short period of time.

Something we have thought about before is how can we make this a more inclusive space. This is a very old parliament and based off of a very old institution, and we have seen over the times different requirements needed to make it more inclusive. It's a long, long way to go though. I have had conversations with the President already in regard to what that could look like, and I guess I would welcome any feedback from members within this parliament about what could make a more inclusive workplace, not only for the members who work here but for guests that are coming in. At the end of the day, this is their house—

The Hon. T.A. Franks: And our staff.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: —and our staff, exactly. I welcome any ideas that can be put forward and that could be considered. It is a very challenging topic because no-one wants to miss a vote, so how can we go about best communicating to people about getting to the chamber if there was an alternative put forward?

FIRST NATIONS VOICE COMMITTEES

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON (15:16): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Attorney-General regarding Aboriginal affairs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON: During Budget and Finance Committee on 11 March 2025, Mr Colin Marsh, the Director of the First Nations Voice Secretariat, was asked a question regarding the remuneration allowances and expenses for the advisory committees, which are yet to be established. Mr Marsh's response focused on the salary rates of the State Voice members but did not provide any details regarding budget allocations. My questions to the minister are:

1. What is the overall budget allocated to the advisory committees?
2. How has this budget been distributed across the four committees, and what are the specific items and associated expenditure?
3. What measures are in place to ensure transparent reporting and independent auditing of the expenditure for these committees?

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 thank the honourable member for her question. As has been traversed a number of times, particularly when the legislation was being proposed some two years ago, the overall budget is about \$1.5 million a year for the administration, reasonably split between the administrative costs of the secretariat as well as the costs for the quite low sums of money that are paid to members—\$3,000 a year—as a recognition of the work that each of the 46 put in from members of their local Voice.

I haven't got the figures in front of me, but it rises to, for the two presiding members of the State Voice, who do a remarkable amount of work, about \$18,000 a year, as recognition of the work that they do, which when you compare to things like government councillors, is I think quite modest in relation to payment. In relation to committees to be set up, as I responded to the Hon. Ben Hood in a question, they are yet to be set up, so any budget impact will be taken into account once that's done.

EMERGENCY SERVICES AFL MATCH

The Hon. M. EL DANNAWI (15:19): My question is to the Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services. Will the minister update the council about the Emergency Services AFL match last Sunday?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:19): I thank the honourable member for her question. We are incredibly proud to honour South Australian emergency services and frontline workers—those who go above and beyond to keep us safe—at the Emergency Services Match that was just held on Sunday, where we not only saw the Crows have another great win but we also were able to have a win for our emergency services.

This special game is about more than footy, it is a platform to express our deepest gratitude to the selfless emergency services agencies across our state, including the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service, the South Australian Country Fire Service, the South Australian State Emergency Service, the South Australia Police, the South Australian Ambulance Service and the Volunteer Marine Rescue organisations. These men and women put their lives on the line every day, facing danger, adverse conditions and immense pressure to protect our communities.

This incredible event was made possible through a partnership between the Malinauskas Labor government and the Adelaide Football Club. Commencing in 2023, this partnership established a dedicated match for emergency services personnel to thank and promote the exceptional work of our emergency services agencies and recognise their positive impact on our community.

This was one of the biggest emergency services rounds that we have held—3,000 tickets were made available, but I think even more ended up being needed on the day. The lucky participants

were picked from a ballot and were able to come along with a guest and enjoy this special game between the Crows and North Melbourne.

The match also presents an opportunity for exclusive access to our emergency services through engaging in interactive off-field activations. There were 38 activation points inside and outside the Adelaide Oval, with activations from all agencies encouraging football fans of all ages to ask questions and sign up as a volunteer or a potential full-time staffer and make this a career.

It has been an extremely busy period for our emergency services personnel and volunteers, supporting communities both locally and abroad. Around the country, South Australian emergency services personnel have been supporting other states. Over 200 personnel have been deployed to varying emergencies, including Western Australia, Queensland, Victoria, Tasmania and, of course, back to Queensland again—twice they have been there, to help with the floods and the ex-Tropical Cyclone.

A massive shout-out to Gary Cabot, who was deployed as an SES volunteer to Queensland on the first task force for ex-Tropical Cyclone Alfred and also to WA to support with the floods. Gary had the opportunity to do the coin toss at the beginning of the game in his orange uniform, showcasing just how proud we should be of our services who are deployed across our country but also when they support us here at home.

Emergency services agencies in South Australia have a strong and enduring legacy of supporting other states in their time of need. The commitment of volunteers and staff of the SES, CFS and MFS who put their lives on hold while they are being deployed—I am sure I share the appreciation of everyone in this chamber.

I want to thank the Adelaide Crows for helping us pull this incredible victory together, but also thank the people behind the scenes who make these events possible, particularly my team and May from my office.

Parliamentary Committees

JOINT PARLIAMENTARY SERVICE COMMITTEE

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:23): By leave, I move:

That pursuant to section 5 of the Parliament (Joint Services) Act 1985 the Hon. D.G.E. Hood be appointed to the committee in place of the Hon. L.A. Henderson (resigned) and the Hon. N.J. Centofanti be appointed as the alternate member to the Hon. D.G.E. Hood, and that a message be sent to the House of Assembly transmitting the foregoing resolution.

Motion carried.

Parliamentary Procedure

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:24): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice concerning the substitution of a member on the Budget and Finance Committee.

Motion carried.

The PRESIDENT: I note the absolute majority.

Parliamentary Committees

BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:24): I move:

That the Hon. B.R. Hood be appointed to the committee in place of the Hon. L.A. Henderson (resigned).

Motion carried.

*Matters of Interest***ARCHITECTURE GRADUATES**

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:24): Recently, I had the honour of attending a celebration for our state's newest architect graduates. These talented individuals have dedicated years to studying the art and science of architecture. As I discovered at their graduation ceremony, their journey has been nothing short of remarkable.

Architects play a crucial role in shaping our world. They are the visionaries who transform abstract ideas into the structures that define our cities. From the homes we live in, to our schools and hospitals, architects design spaces that enhance our quality of life. Their work goes beyond aesthetics—our built environments must be functional, sustainable and innovative. Architects are at the forefront of creating environmentally friendly buildings that reduce our carbon footprint and promote healthier planets. A good architect will blend creativity with technical expertise to solve complex problems and create buildings and spaces that are not only visually appealing but also efficient and resilient.

Moreover, with the growing awareness of climate change, the role of architects in designing sustainable buildings has never been more critical. We now live in a world that values the use of green technologies and sustainable materials so that today's buildings are energy efficient and environmentally friendly. This commitment to sustainability will help reduce our carbon footprint and preserve our planet for future generations.

Problem solving is an important aspect of architecture. The needs of the people the building will serve must be considered. Architecture has and will continue to influence how we feel, how we interact with others and how we experience the world around us. Careful consideration of space, light and choice of materials can create environments that promote wellbeing and productivity.

South Australia in particular is on the brink of a significant transformation, with a vast pipeline of housing and development projects. The government wants these emerging professionals to stay and work in this state, giving them the opportunity to influence the design and functionality of our local communities. We want South Australian communities to meet modern needs, while also reflecting their context and character, including preservation of local heritage.

I extend my congratulations to the 24 architecture graduates at the 2025 graduation ceremony. Reaching this milestone was not just an acknowledgement of academic achievement but also a reflection of the dedication, perseverance and passion they have demonstrated throughout the journey. Special congratulations to Ella Leak from the University of South Australia and Ms Ha Thanh (Chiara) Le from the University of Adelaide, who were awarded the university prize for achieving the highest results in their exams. To become a registered architect in South Australia one must complete a three-year Bachelor of Architectural Studies, followed by a two-year postgraduate Master of Architecture, and then practical experience. That amounts to dedicating several years to study and training.

It is important to also acknowledge the significant role the Architectural Practice Board of South Australia plays in administering South Australia's architectural profession. The board not only approves qualified professionals to legally practise architecture in South Australia, it also enforces professional and ethical guidelines, ensuring architects stay updated on industry advancements by completing continuing professional development sessions throughout their careers. Finally, I thank our university staff and stakeholders working in the industry for their invaluable contributions, for teaching and supporting our emerging architects, not only throughout their courses of study but also into the future.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (The Hon. T.A. Franks): Time probably having expired, I call on the Hon. Robert Simms.

DUTTON, HON. P.C.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:30): Thank you, Acting President. It is difficult to follow that brief contribution from the honourable member. I rise to speak today on a matter that will be of interest to

all South Australians who care about the future of our country, and that is the risk posed by a Dutton prime ministership. It is clear that this man is not fit to be our prime minister.

Let's consider his record. When he was health minister, he was a real dud. A poll conducted by doctors in *Australian Doctor* magazine voted him the worst health minister in Australia in 35 years. Let's not forget that this is the guy who came up with the idea of a Medicare co-payment. What would he do if he got his hands on our Medicare system again?

As Minister for Home Affairs, he was an absolute disaster. Let's not forget the case of a Tamil family, the Murugappans, who were awarded \$200,000 in costs after it was found that they had been denied due process by the government, one of a series of failures in his portfolio.

He also has a terrible track record in terms of fanning the flames of racism and division in our country. This is the bloke who boycotted Kevin Rudd's apology to the stolen generations back in 2008. He recently called for a ban on all Palestinian refugees from Gaza. He says, 'We should stop people coming in from war zones.' Really? This is the way that Australia should treat vulnerable people who are in trouble, who need our help?

He says he will not stand in front of the Aboriginal flag if he is elected. And let's not forget the ugly misinformation campaign he ran against the Voice to Parliament. Shame on those in this place who aided and abetted that dishonest campaign.

What about his policies? I say 'policies', but they are really more thought bubbles, because they are so ill-conceived. His nuclear plan: the Climate Council has done the costings and found that it will cost up to \$490 billion, more than the Liberal Party are claiming. In fact, it could cost up to \$821 billion. As a result of this ill-conceived plan, South Australians could see our electricity prices increasing by \$665 a year on average, a price rise of \$972 a year for a family of four.

What about tax reform? What is his policy? They say there is no such thing as a free lunch—not under the Liberals, if they get back in, because they want to bring back free business lunches. Who is picking up the bill? It is the Australian taxpayer. They would allow businesses to deduct up to \$20,000 for meals and entertainment, and Treasury estimates the average cost will be \$1.6 billion a year, up to \$10 billion a year. What a waste of money in the middle of a cost-of-living crisis.

Let's not forget about their workplace reform agenda. They want to scrap the right to disconnect. They want to force public servants back into the office five days a week—no exceptions, no working from home—and they want to cut 41,000 public servant jobs. How many South Australians will lose their jobs under Dutton? How long will the wait time be for public services under Mr Dutton?

Let's not forget the *pièce de résistance* of the Liberal Party's plan for office: another costly referendum. The last time they pushed for a national vote was on the issue of marriage equality, when they could have done the vote in the parliament. This time, they want to bring Australians to the polls on whether or not we should give the government the power to strip away citizenship rights, so that we can set up a second-class citizen regime in our country where people who have dual citizenship and are born overseas are at the mercy of politicians.

This Temu Trump is not fit to be prime minister of our country. Does anyone seriously think Peter Dutton has the fortitude to stand up to Donald Trump and advocate for our national interest? A Dutton prime ministership means job cuts, longer wait times for public services, higher energy prices, and more racism and division in our country. We cannot afford to risk Mr Dutton.

One of the key safeguards against Dutton getting in is the Greens winning the seat of Sturt, and our candidate Katie McCusker is campaigning hard. No-one knows who the local member is in James Stevens. You have Doctor No with Peter Dutton and Doctor Who in James Stevens, because no-one knows who he is or what he stands for. Let's keep the Liberals out.

REGIONAL SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:35): Why is it that when people talk about resilience, they appear to only speak about the regions? How did we get here? Yes, regional communities are famously resilient; it is a badge of honour for many of us, and rightly so, but why is it that regions are constantly asked to demonstrate this resilience at a level far beyond

what is expected of metropolitan areas? Why is it acceptable for rural towns to endure substandard infrastructure, limited services and economic neglect while Adelaide thrives with the advantages of constant investment and development?

Distance is the reality of regional life, no-one disputes that. Not every town can or should have every service available; however, every region deserves access to a reasonable standard of essential services. For too long this has been treated as an unattainable luxury rather than the basic right of the people who keep this state's agriculture and resource sectors alive.

Take health care, for example. I was shocked to discover that Mount Gambier hospital does not have ICU beds. How is it that the second largest city in our state, which happens to be in regional South Australia, cannot support its own critically ill patients? Furthermore, the absence of general practitioners in rural areas is not just inconvenient, it is a threat to public health. The same can be said for aged care and mental health services, essentials that underpin a community's well being.

What about schools? Time and time again, regional families are expected to settle for underfunded and understaffed schools with fewer resources than their urban counterparts. Then there is the shrinking presence of banks in country towns, leaving residents and businesses struggling to manage their finances, and for those families wanting to access childcare the wait lists are often endless. Supermarkets, when they exist, often carry fewer choices at higher prices, a bitter irony for communities surrounded by farmland that feeds the state. Even something as simple as maintaining quality roads can seem out of reach in regional South Australia, as patchwork fixes and neglect leave residents wondering why taxes do not stretch beyond Adelaide city limits.

What I find especially frustrating is the sense of being overlooked, even as we know that, without a doubt, regional South Australia provides so much for this state. From the paddocks of Eyre Peninsula to the vineyards of the Coonawarra, regional communities drive economic output in ways that Adelaide relies on but rarely acknowledges, yet time and time again they are last in line for investment, development and opportunities to grow.

It is not just about fairness; it is well past time to call for regional equity, because it is about sustaining these communities for future generations. It is about futureproofing our food and fibre security, it is about galvanising over 50 per cent of this state's export product, it is about ensuring the bulk of our economy continues to tick over. If schools, health care and infrastructure continue to fall short, regional areas will not just lose people, they will lose the vibrant social fabric that makes them worth living in. Families will move closer to the city in search of better prospects, draining the countryside of its lifeblood. Without policy intervention to address these inequities, the regions risk being left to wither.

Yes, regional South Australians are tough, but why should we always have to be? Why should resilience be treated as an excuse for neglect and why does regional South Australia always seem to miss out? It does not have to be this way. Regional equality means recognising that these communities deserve investment and opportunity commensurate with their contributions to the state. It means ensuring every region has access to good schools, reliable health care, essential services and the infrastructure to not just survive but to thrive. It is about valuing the regions not just as an afterthought but as an integral part of South Australia's future. Our regional towns deserve more than admiration for their resilience, they deserve the respect of meaningful support and let's make sure they get it.

ADELAIDE FESTIVALS

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:40): With another Mad March completed, it is gratifying to see that South Australia has continued to build on its reputation as the nation's Festival State. The Festival, the Fringe, WOMAD and Writers' Week just keep building on their legacy and make Adelaide the arts and cultural focus of Australia.

When Labor came into office in 2022, one of our many dozens of commitments was to ensure the future and continued growth of our festivals. We are called the Festival State for a reason and much of that has been through the continued work over decades of Labor governments. The month-long Fringe Festival created more than 13,000 direct and indirect jobs in 2024. That is a

250 per cent increase on the number of jobs the Fringe created before the Malinauskas Labor government came into office.

In 2021, the Fringe sold 630,000 tickets, understandably down from 800,000 due to the impact of the pandemic, but in 2023, we broke the million-ticket barrier and it appears that mark has been reached again this year for the third year straight. In 2021, the Fringe attracted more than 26,000 local, interstate and overseas tourists, who provided a \$50 million boost to the state's economy. In 2024, it attracted 58,000 tourists and generated \$149 million in total expenditure. The final numbers are not in for this year, but early projections suggest we are up a further 15 per cent on 2024.

The state Labor government injected an additional \$8 million into promoting this year's Fringe interstate and overseas and to continue attracting international acts. If you have any doubt about the success in attracting business during March, just ask any of the major hotels whether they had spare rooms or ask the cafe and restaurant owners or the taxi and Uber drivers about the spike in their bookings.

There is a reason the Fringe is called the Fringe: it offers an appealing alternative to the main event, started in 1960, the Adelaide Festival of Arts, now known as simply the Adelaide Festival. The showpiece brings world-class theatre, music, dance and visual art to our fine city. The second largest arts festival in the world behind only Edinburgh, it is an event that must be fiercely protected and passionately promoted.

Coinciding with the Festival and the Fringe, we also are the home of Adelaide Writers' Week. This brings world renowned international writers to Adelaide, while allowing local writers to announce themselves. Held in the Pioneer Women's Memorial Garden on King William Road, the week-long celebration of literature attracts huge crowds every year. I know people who plan their annual leave around it.

Labor is also committed to making the Adelaide Film Festival an annual event and delivered on that promise in 2023. It was a natural progression for a South Australian government. Don Dunstan established the South Australian Film Corporation in 1972 and the Rann Labor government launched the Adelaide Film Festival in 2003. Extra funding by the Malinauskas government has allowed event organisers to stage the festival every year. South Australia's film history includes famous classics such as *Picnic at Hanging Rock*, *Breaker Morant*, *Storm Boy* and *Sunday Too Far Away*, as well as the exceptional AFI Award winner, *Look Both Ways*. It is a legacy worth protecting and cultivating.

The Labor-funded redevelopment of the Glenside precinct into a film hub supporting sound and mixing stages brings in international filmmakers. That is \$50 million well spent. It encourages emerging filmmakers to stay here and develop their craft rather than head off to Hollywood or Vancouver or Pinewood Studios in England. The end product of this promotion is usually seen at the Adelaide Film Festival before national and international releases.

In keeping with Labor's ongoing support of festivals, we announced last June that we are funding a \$35 million upgrade of the Festival Centre. While acts are increasingly played out in our streets and parks, the theatre is the main home of the performing arts. It is essential that we maintain the Festival Centre as a showpiece capable of attracting the best acts and performers from around the world. Labor is committed and always has been committed to making sure the Festival State remains just that for many years to come.

HOUSING AFFORDABILITY

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON (15:45): I rise today to speak about the housing affordability crisis in this state. We have had Labor governments in South Australia for all but four years since 2002, watching South Australia's housing unaffordability grow. Throughout this time the evident trend has been the rise of housing costs, placing a heavy burden on the dreams of South Australians. For far too long Labor governments have failed to provide effective solutions to the urgent need for affordable housing solutions. The consequences of this are impacting South Australians, who are those bearing the burden of excessive housing prices.

Without fail, housing affordability is one of the issues that people speak to me about most often when I am out and about in the community. *The Advertiser* reported on 17 March the alarming reality that many key workers can no longer afford to buy an entry level home in Adelaide—with key workers including teachers, electricians, shop assistants, public servants, and ambulance and police officers.

Adelaide has long been considered one of Australia's most affordable housing markets, but today that no longer seems to be the case. The Property Council's March 2025 Beyond Reach report further underscores this issue by ranking Adelaide as the second most unaffordable housing market in the country, trailing only behind Sydney when income to price ratios are considered. This paints a stark picture, with the median household income in Adelaide standing at \$78,000, a figure significantly insufficient to comfortably afford new housing in multiple suburbs where the prices demand well over \$150,000 in annual household earnings.

Too many families are being priced out of the suburbs. The Property Council's report also details that suburbs such as Salisbury, Munno Para, Christies Beach, Tea Tree Gully and Mount Barker remain out of reach for so many. This government has the ability to lower the cost of housing, yet we continue to hear about the housing crisis.

The Liberals believe owning your own home can be key to a better life. That is why we believe abolishing stamp duty for first-home buyers on new builds is simply not enough. This is why the Liberals believe there should be a stamp duty concession of \$10,000 on existing homes too, a step in the right direction towards making home ownership more attainable in South Australia.

The great Australian dream of owning a home is rapidly becoming a distant reality for so many in our state. If home ownership is more attainable, more South Australians are empowered to have a better future. They are the everyday South Australians within our community, those who aspire to move beyond the cycle of renting and who long for a permanent place that they can call their home. It is vital that every South Australian—including young South Australians especially, who are struggling to break into this property market and who simply want to secure their piece of home ownership in this market—is given an opportunity and is given a chance.

AVIAN INFLUENZA

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:48): I rise to speak about the need for a Coorong field research station, particularly with the avian flu and H5N1 and its mutations in particular. Avian flu has now reached Antarctica. We thought distance could save us, but it is now in Antarctica and distance can no longer protect us. Around the world there is evidence of this strain of avian flu jumping from birds to marine mammals, potentially impacting bull seals, sea lions, dolphins and penguins.

We have seen 500,000 wild birds dead in South America, 40 per cent of Peruvian pelicans dead in a matter of months, 30,000 South American sea lions dying, equal to around 10 per cent of that population, and 18,000 southern elephant seals dying as a result of this avian flu. The harsh reality is that, for South Australia, our iconic Coorong, recognised around the world for its exceptional beauty—and rightly so—is the most likely point of entry to Australia for the virus as it is likely to arrive with migratory birds.

The exceptional Ramsar-listed site also faces exceptional challenges. Indeed, the risk to bird populations generally is such that there are serious suggestions that as a nation we should be exploring the vaccination of not only captive at-risk species such as the orange-bellied parrot but also of various species in the wild. The evidence also suggests that this should extend to other at-risk species such as the sea lions of Kangaroo Island. The impact on our wild bird and animal populations has the potential to be disastrous but it does not stop with wild water and bird species, it can impact domestic birds as well. Indeed, most recently in the UK it has been found for the first time in sheep.

The economic impact of avian flu ripping through both our poultry and sheep sectors would be devastating, but hold this picture in your minds and imagine now that, in addition to the impacts on our sheep and poultry sectors, it quickly jumps from waterbirds to seals. We know this is possible but imagine if it were to get into the sea lion population of Kangaroo Island. Imagine Kangaroo Island without seals. I hope it never comes to fruition, and there is much that we can do to prevent that.

Over the last six years, expert volunteers working in the Coorong in partnership with commercial fishers have been able to identify and document multiple pest and disease outbreaks, most critically the presence, distribution and number of animals involved in an avian cholera outbreak. For this avian cholera outbreak they were able to get bacterial samples to PIRSA within the one-hour window that is available and required for accurate testing—that is right, a one-hour window. That is impossible to do if your closest staff are in Adelaide and working to meet other commitments.

If we do not have a presence on the ground in the Coorong, we will not be nimble enough to respond in the kind of timeframe we need, and there is a possibility that the crucial period of identifying the arrival of avian flu may well be missed and we may well be too late. Whilst the Coorong is of critical importance, this issue goes beyond the Coorong. However, it is where this virus is most likely to enter South Australia. It is unrealistic to think that we will, as a nation and a continent, remain free of the H5N1 virus. It is not a question of if it arrives but when it arrives, and when it arrives we need to be ready. But we can only respond with that kind of one-hour timeframe required to secure a quick and accurate identification of the virus if we have a local field research station.

It is not all bad news however. There is actually a suitable property at Woods Well. Indeed, it is ready there and waiting now and it could enable us to set up this much-needed field research station. But we must move quickly. Time is of the essence and much is at stake. Without swift action, it may not be only birds hit by the avian flu that are dead in the water, it may well be our tourism industry, our agriculture industry and parts of our livestock industry too.

NOWRUZ FESTIVAL

The Hon. M. EL DANNAWI (15:53): I rise to speak about Nowruz, a festival that is celebrated by millions of people across the world, especially in countries with deep historical ties to Persian culture. Nowruz marks not only the beginning of spring but also the Persian new year. Nowruz, which means 'new day' in Persian, is a celebration of renewal, hope and unity, and it symbolises a fresh start, rebirth and the triumph of light over darkness. It has been observed for over 3,000 years and is deeply rooted in the traditions of various cultures and civilisations.

Nowruz is based on the solar calendar and occurs around 20 or 21 March, when the day and night become equal, a moment known as the vernal equinox. This alignment with nature reflects the essence of Nowruz, which is about harmony, balance and new beginnings. Although it is a truly ancient celebration, it was only in 2010 that the United Nations recognised Nowruz as an International Day, highlighting its role in promoting peace, cultural diversity and shared heritage.

In South Australia, Nowruz is celebrated by various communities, including those of Persian, Afghan, Kurdish and Central Asian backgrounds. These groups come together to honour the arrival of spring and the renewal it symbolises. Every year, several organisations and educational institutions participate by hosting events to commemorate Nowruz. These celebrations highlight the rich cultural diversity in South Australia and offer opportunities for both community members and the wider public to engage with and appreciate the traditions associated with Nowruz, because no matter where we come from, we can all embrace the spirit of renewal, joy and togetherness.

On Sunday 30 March, I was delighted to attend the Nowruz celebration held by ARTA Cultural Centre, with the support of the Australian Iranian Community Alliance and the Iranian Women Organisation South Australia, at the Burnside Ballroom. I also note the attendance of the Hon. Jing Lee and the Hon. Tung Ngo on the night. We were treated to a fantastic night. From traditional Iranian music to pop music, to dance and theatre performances for the children, it is always a joy to be able to come together and celebrate arts and culture in this way.

I want to take this opportunity to acknowledge the amazing work of the ARTA Cultural Centre. Like so many other multicultural organisations focusing on the arts, ARTA is playing an important role in promoting culture, specifically for Farsi speakers. The offer of support is truly inspiring, providing another valuable service to the community through its ongoing advocacy and assistance to new arrivals. Whether it be emotional support, financial assistance, access to services, counselling or training, ARTA is proving itself to be an indispensable force for good. I want to thank ARTA Cultural Centre President Sahar Khajani and the members and volunteers who worked tirelessly on the night to make sure everyone enjoyed a memorable night.

Tonight, Minister Bettison is hosting a reception at Parliament House for leaders from our local communities celebrating Nowruz, including the Afghan, Iranian, Iraqi, Kurdish, Syrian, Turkish and Uzbek communities. I am very much looking forward to attending and being the emcee of the night. It is events such as these that help to make South Australia such a great multicultural state, a place where people of different cultures and faith have come together, a place where our cultural diversity has become an enduring measure of our democratic values and mutual respect for one another, contributing to our social cohesion and sense of belonging.

I again commend ARTA Cultural Centre for its work in the community and significant contribution to the cultural life of our great state. I want to wish all our South Australian communities a happy Nowruz. May the new year bring you peace, prosperity and happiness.

Motions

DROUGHT ASSISTANCE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:58): I move:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges that the value of South Australia's primary industry and agribusiness is of significant value, an estimated \$18.5 billion in 2022-23;
2. Recognises that the current drought is, for many districts, the worst in living memory and is causing significant financial and mental stress across rural and regional communities in South Australia;
3. Agrees that the Malinauskas Labor government's \$8.1 million 'new' funding in response to this drought is grossly inadequate considering the magnitude of hardship and suffering currently being endured by the sector;
4. Urges the Malinauskas government to explore all possible measures to ensure water and fodder supply to farming communities that desperately need it around the state;
5. Calls on the Malinauskas government to urgently provide meaningful assistance to South Australia's farming sector to underpin its ongoing viability for the benefit of all South Australians; and
6. Recognises that failure to provide meaningful assistance immediately will result in terrible human and animal welfare outcomes.

I rise today to move this motion and to speak on behalf of the many thousands of South Australians who do not have a seat in this chamber but who are living every single day with the brutal reality of the drought currently gripping our state. This is not a political stunt. This is not about headlines. This is about people, real people, farmers, families, workers, regional towns and the very future of an industry that underpins so much of who we are in South Australia.

The facts are clear: South Australia's primary industries and agribusiness sector delivered an estimated \$18.5 billion to our economy in 2022-23. That is nearly one-fifth of the state's entire economic output. It is the engine room of our regional communities. It is what keeps our supply chains humming, our food shelves stocked, and our export industries alive.

But right now, that engine is struggling. It is coughing and it is straining, and in many areas it is grinding to a halt under the weight of one of the worst droughts in living memory. Let me be very clear: this is not just a dry spell. This is not a seasonal inconvenience. This is a sustained, widespread drought event that is having devastating consequences across South Australia.

In the Upper Eyre Peninsula, rainfall totals are at record lows. On Kangaroo Island, in the Adelaide Hills and the Fleurieu, dam levels are critically low. The South-East, parts of the Murraylands and Mallee, the Mid North—all are experiencing the kind of dry that leaves deep scars in both land and people. Pastures have failed across the state. It is a drought that impacts not just what grows above the ground but the spirit and resilience of the people living on it.

I have been speaking with farming families right across the state, people who have worked the land for generations, people who have battled through tough years before but who now find themselves in uncharted territory. One farmer from the West Coast told me he has destocked almost his entire sheep herd. The pasture is gone, the cost of feed is through the roof and the water carting bills are mounting and he said, 'I am not looking for a handout, I am just looking for a lifeline.'

In the Riverland and Mallee, a young couple managing a mixed cropping and grazing property told me they have had two failed seasons in a row. They have maxed out their overdraft just trying to keep their property viable. They said, 'We've got two young kids. We want to stay on the land, but every month that goes by without rain and without support, we are questioning whether it is worth it.'

These are not isolated stories; this is the reality for many. What has been the response from the Malinauskas Labor government? Only \$8 million in actual new drought support. Let's be honest, that is a drop in the ocean. When you spread that across the entirety of drought-affected South Australia, it barely scratches the surface. It is the equivalent of saying to our farmers, 'We see your pain, but we are not going to do much about it.' It is grossly inadequate, it fails to meet the moment, and it falls desperately short of the kind of leadership this crisis demands.

Let's compare it to what is actually needed. Farmers need further assistance with freight subsidies for charity hay runs so that donated fodder can get to where it is desperately needed. They need support for water cartage because when dams run dry, trucking water in needs to be done daily and it is an unaffordable burden. They need low and no-interest concession loans, not to take on more risk but to maintain cashflow so that they can buy essential stockfeed, plan next year's crop and keep their workers employed. These are commonsense practical measures but, instead of delivering, the government is dithering.

What is even worse is that we have seen a complete lack of interest from those in charge on other critical primary production issues facing our state. The recent Senate inquiry into the mandatory code of conduct for wine grape producers was a key opportunity for South Australia to speak up, to advocate for our growers, to push for fairness, but what did the Malinauskas government do? Absolutely nothing—not one submission, not a word from the Minister for Primary Industries, Clare Scriven, not a single contribution to a national discussion that directly affects one of our state's most iconic industries.

That silence speaks volumes. It shows just how disengaged this government is from the needs of rural and regional South Australians. Yet we continue to see the Premier and his ministers rolling out the red carpet in the city, posing for glossy media opportunities while the bush burns in silence. They seem to think the next election is already won, that the regions do not matter, that the votes are locked in and that no real effort is needed. That arrogance is dangerous, and it is South Australians, particularly those in regional South Australia, who are paying the price.

The state opposition has not only been listening, we have been advocating consistently since September last year. We have been calling on the government to act, offering practical, evidence-based solutions to relieve some of the pressures this drought is causing. We have met with farmers, we have stood in dusty paddocks, we have listened to communities who feel utterly forgotten, and we have used our voice in this place to push for change because we know what is at stake.

This motion also highlights something often left unsaid: the human toll. Drought does not just kill crops and stock; it erodes hope, it leads to social isolation, it fuels anxiety and depression, and it pushes families to breaking point. Without urgent intervention, we will see terrible human and animal welfare outcomes.

I want to tell you about a grazier in the Mid North who called our office recently. He told us he was selling off breeding stock he had spent decades breeding—not because he wanted to but because he had no choice. Then he said something I will never forget: 'It's like watching your legacy slip through your fingers and knowing there's nothing that you can do.' That is the kind of quiet suffering happening right now in the regions. That is what this government is failing to see.

So today I urge this government, and indeed this parliament, to support the motion before us that makes six clear and powerful statements:

1. That we value our primary industries and agribusinesses and recognise their \$18.5 billion contribution to this state.
2. That the current drought is, for many, the worst in living memory and is having devastating financial and emotional impacts.

3. That the government's current funding response is simply not good enough.
4. That all possible measures must be explored to ensure water and fodder reach those who need it.
5. That meaningful, immediate assistance must be provided to underpin the ongoing viability of the sector.
6. That failing to act will have dire human and animal welfare consequences.

So let us not waste this opportunity to do what is right. Let us not look back months from now and say we could have done more. Let us act now with the urgency, empathy and leadership that this moment demands. The drought will not wait and neither can we.

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

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (DECRIMINALISATION OF SEX WORK) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:07): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Civil Liability Act 1936, the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935, the Equal Opportunity Act 1984, the Local Government Act 1999, the Return to Work Act 2014, the Spent Convictions Act 2009 and the Summary Offences Act 1953. Read a first time.

Motions

INTERNATIONAL DAY TO COMBAT ISLAMOPHOBIA

The Hon. M. EL DANNAWI (16:08): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises 15 March as International Day to Combat Islamophobia.
2. Notes that 15 March was adopted as International Day to Combat Islamophobia by the UN General Assembly, in order to commemorate the Christchurch Mosque attacks.
3. Acknowledges the concerning rise in Islamophobic rhetoric, actions and sentiment in Australia.
4. Acknowledges that Islamophobia:
 - (a) isolates, endangers and dehumanises Muslim people;
 - (b) creates barriers to full and equal participation; and
 - (c) undermines social cohesion.
5. Affirms that Islamophobia, racism and discrimination have no place in Australian society.

I rise today to speak about a pressing issue that impacts hundreds of thousands of Muslim Australians, and that is Islamophobia. March 15 is the International Day to Combat Islamophobia, a day dedicated to raising awareness about the discrimination, prejudice and violence that many Muslims face worldwide. This day is not just about acknowledging the problem; it is about standing together in solidarity to create a world where every individual, regardless of faith, is treated with dignity and respect.

The United Nations General Assembly adopted this day on 15 March 2022 in response to the alarming rise in hate crimes, discrimination and violence targeting Muslims globally. The date was chosen in remembrance of the Christchurch mosque attacks in New Zealand on 15 March 2019, where 51 innocent worshippers lost their lives. This tragedy was a stark reminder of the deadly consequences of hatred and the urgent need to combat Islamophobia at all levels.

Islamophobia is not an abstract concept: it is a major societal issue that has real consequences on the physical, mental and psychological wellbeing of the individuals subjected to it. It fuels hate crimes, discrimination in workplaces and schools, and policies that marginalise entire communities. It creates fear and division, preventing us from seeing the shared humanity that unites

us all. No-one should have to live in fear because of their religion, the way they dress or the language they speak.

Unfortunately, there has been a concerning rise in Islamophobic rhetoric, actions and sentiment in Australia in the past few years. On 13 March, the Islamophobia Register released its fifth Islamophobia in Australia report, detailing an increase in the number of reports it received between January 2023 and November 2024. I encourage anyone listening to read through the entire report, because the stories that they have collected are both upsetting and eye-opening. The Islamophobia Register Australia is a non-profit organisation and provides a unique platform for incidents of Islamophobia to be reported, recorded and analysed. It has now operated for over nine years collecting hate incident data by working in partnership with universities.

They recorded a 250 per cent increase in reported online incidents and a 150 per cent increase in reported in-person incidents. Women and girls are the target of these incidents by an overwhelming 75 per cent. Muslim women and girls were 79 per cent of the reported victims of verbal abuse, 60 per cent of the victims of physical abuse, 95 per cent of the victims of reported incidents on public transport and 100 per cent of victims of reported incidents where a Muslim was spat at. The lead researcher, Dr Susan Carland from Monash University commented:

This is the tenth consecutive year of reporting on Islamophobia in Australia that has demonstrated that Muslim women and girls are specifically, overwhelmingly the victims of these incidents, and the perpetrators are generally men.

Professor Mehmet Ozalp said in his foreword to the report:

These numbers are not just statistics; they represent real lives impacted by fear, violence and systemic discrimination.

The impact of these incidents cannot be underestimated. They prevent many Muslim Australians from feeling safe and from fully taking part in the economic and social life of our country.

For the first time, the report also included a dedicated chapter on the issue of anti-Palestinian racism and how it drives an increase in Islamophobia. Reports to the register spiked after 7 October 2023, and I would like to read directly from the report:

The intersectional relationship between Islamophobia and anti-Palestinian hate is complex and contested. There is a documented overlap and relationship between anti-Palestinian hate and Islamophobia, their roots, and their manifestations. Palestinian Muslims constitute approximately 98% of the population of Gaza and West Bank, with Christians making up about 2%, and some political rhetoric used in Gaza employs religious symbolism...

The media often demonises or reduces the Palestinian activism against the Israeli occupation, framing the Palestinian nationalism and global support only as an Islamic struggle. This framing has contributed to the Islamisation of the Palestinian cause...It is worth noting that conflating Islamophobia and anti-Palestinian hate ignores the distinct experiences of Christian and Druze Palestinians, risks confusing political and racial bigotry with religious hate, and ignores the distinct aspects of anti-Palestinian hate that are not present in Islamophobia.

What is clear from the huge increase in reports to the register is that when anti-Palestinian racism is not condemned or addressed by the media and the community it emboldens those who hold Islamophobic beliefs to act.

Since 7 October, the government has created roles for a special envoy to combat antisemitism and a special envoy to combat Islamophobia, noting that there has been an increase in both. It is concerning when we see the two roles being given different treatment by some politicians. On Monday, federal opposition leader Peter Dutton stated to journalists that the role of the Islamophobia envoy would be up for review and he would not commit to retaining the position if elected. A spokesperson for the opposition later confirmed to SBS News that the antisemitism envoy role would not be reviewed.

It is this sort of rhetoric that leads Australian Muslims to think that their safety is not as important, that they are not as valued by our society, despite a genuine increase in Islamophobic threats and attacks. The reality is that Islamophobia has complex and deep-seated origins stemming from political narratives, media portrayals and psychological biases.

While Islamophobia is a deeply rooted issue, it is not unchangeable. There are concrete steps we can take as individuals, communities and institutions to combat it, starting with education

and awareness. One of the most effective ways to dismantle prejudice is through education. Schools and universities must play a role in raising awareness amongst our young people cohort about recognising and rejecting stereotypes and challenging misconceptions among students and their peers as well as the teaching and staff teams.

Secondly, we must challenge the media narrative. The media plays a crucial role in shaping public opinion and often perpetuates negative stereotypes about Islam. This contributes to an unconscious bias against Muslim Australians that unfairly associates them with violence, terrorism, oppression or backwardness. It is vital that we hold media outlets accountable for biased reporting and demand fair representation. This means amplifying Muslim voices, sharing positive stories about Muslim contributions to society and calling out Islamophobic rhetoric when we see it. It does not just end with the media, though. As public leaders, we need to avoid using divisive language that scapegoats Muslims.

Finally, on a societal level we need to be speaking up against discrimination. We must call out Islamophobic remarks in conversations, support Muslim colleagues and friends when they face discrimination and use our platform to advocate for inclusivity. The Islamophobia Register's recent report found that only 9 per cent of Australians believe that there has been an increase in Islamophobia. Despite the prevalence of incidents occurring in public places, people witnessing incidents are often not intervening to support victims. Bystander inaction was a common behaviour cited in the report, and witness reporting for the period dropped by about half.

If anyone listening today ever finds themselves in a place where someone is being Islamophobic or, indeed, discriminatory in any way, I encourage them to remember the four Rs: recognise, respond, record and report. Combating Islamophobia effectively is a challenge that requires collective effort, honesty and the courage to stand up. By educating ourselves, challenging biased narratives, advocating for stronger protections and building meaningful relationships across communities, we can create a society where everyone, regardless of faith or background, is treated with dignity and respect.

The fight against Islamophobia is not just about protecting Muslims, it is about upholding the fundamental values of justice and equality that define a healthy society. This is what makes Australia a model for multiculturalism worldwide, ensuring that diversity is not just tolerated but celebrated. I commend the motion to the chamber.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:19): I rise to speak in support of this motion and associate myself with the comments of the Hon. Mira El Dannawi, and thank her for bringing this motion before this council. It is very important—and we have seen a terrifying rise in Islamophobia in recent years, both in Australia and across the globe. We have seen stories of people being harassed, being spat at, being grabbed, being hit, and just recently there was an attempt to set a woman on fire in Canada.

I acknowledge the Christchurch mosque attack, which led to the International Day to Combat Islamophobia being set and established for 15 March, and I note that date has recently passed. The horrific attack there shows just what can happen when these prejudices are left unchecked. They can manifest in violent and catastrophic ways, taking the lives of people who should still be with us today. It shows that we must do better to protect Muslims in our community and Muslim communities from Islamophobia.

Despite this, a recent report on Islamophobia in Australia that is based on reports to the Islamophobia Register between January 2023 and November 2024 has found a steep increase in assaults, abuse and threats. More than 600 in-person and online incidents were analysed, and it was found that Muslim women are overwhelmingly victims of these attacks. People have been jumped in the street, attacked, yelled at in shopping centres. They have been exposed to violent threats online and, after a Muslim man's truck was set on fire in Victoria, he expressed frustration at the police, stating that he 'felt like they don't care', and that, 'They wouldn't even say it's a hate crime.'

That report found that a spike in incidents occurred after 7 October, including the targeting of Palestinian rallies and, of course, university encampments right across the country and here in Adelaide. I must say that there were several firework attacks on the encampment at Adelaide University, where people in tents were sleeping peacefully in the night time when fireworks were thrown into their presence, creating fear and, of course, potential harm.

Some people have been targeted for displaying Palestinian symbols such as the keffiyeh, a traditional Palestinian scarf, which started out as a garment worn by farmers for protection during harsh desert conditions and which has become a powerful symbol of Palestinian identity and resistance.

Shamefully, despite this rise we often see incidents of Islamophobia go unreported or not given the same level of reporting as other kinds of discrimination. There is no hierarchy in which one type of discrimination is worse than others: they are all abhorrent, and should be treated with the same level of action to call out that behaviour. One example of this asymmetric treatment was the horrific attack on an Islamic school bus in Reynella in December just last year here in Adelaide. That bus was parked outside the driver's home overnight when it was targeted and lit on fire. It received scant coverage in our local media and barely got a mention in the national media.

I note that the UN Secretary-General has repeatedly condemned the continuing acts of anti-Muslim hatred and bigotry around the world, saying the impacts and trends of this rise have impacts beyond Muslim communities. While this might be true, we should not care about Islamophobia just because of the impacts it might have on other communities and non-Muslim groups: the simple fact that such discrimination and harassment exists at all, and impacts those that are the target of it, is enough.

Everyone has the right to peace and freedom of religion, values that the Greens are proud to uphold and stand behind. No-one should be fearful of simply existing while wearing religious clothing, such as a hijab.

As this motion sets out, Islamophobia isolates, endangers and dehumanises Muslim people. It is unacceptable in all its forms. But on the campaign trail, as the Hon. Mira El Dannawi noted, just in this last week in the federal election, the federal Opposition Leader, Peter Dutton, said he would review the role of the recently appointed Islamophobia envoy, questioning its role in helping; however, he would not apply that same level of scrutiny to the antisemitism envoy's role. This is an unacceptable double standard from the man who wants to be our Prime Minister. I will repeat that—he wants to be our Prime Minister, which means governing for us all.

So in this chamber today, I am glad that we do acknowledge that 15 March was the International Day to Combat Islamophobia. I am saddened and outraged that we have to have such a day, but we acknowledge here today the tragedy that this day evolved from and I cannot do this without acknowledging and calling out that Muslim people are still targeted at utterly alarming rates and that it is getting worse. There is so much more work to be done to ensure that Muslim people feel safe to practise their religion and simply just exist.

It is heavy lifting that this parliament should be doing in this debate, and I look forward to all parliamentarians joining and supporting this motion, not just here today with our words but with our ongoing actions.

The Hon. S.L. GAME (16:27): I rise briefly to put on the record my support for the honourable member's motion. There is no place in a civilised society for Islamophobia or targeting of a particular group based on their religion or their heritage, so I strongly support this motion.

I also want to echo the sentiments of the Hon. Tammy Franks. I absolutely believe we need to do everything we can in this parliament to foster peace and freedom of religion in our community. Certainly, global events have inflamed tensions between certain groups where we, unfortunately, unfairly hold one another accountable for events that are beyond our control happening overseas. So I absolutely want to put on the record that we all have a right to exist peacefully and cohesively regardless of religion or background and I absolutely extend that to the Muslim community.

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

Parliamentary Committees

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SUPPORT AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES FOR POLICE

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON (16:28): I move:

That the report of the select committee be noted.

It is my great privilege to today move that the report of the Select Committee on Support and Mental Health Services for Police be noted. The committee was established on 30 August 2023 to inquire into and report on support and mental health services for police, a number of other emergency services responders and other occupations that may be exposed to emergency situations in the course of undertaking their duties.

The committee received written submissions from 55 stakeholders. The vast range of stakeholders gave the committee the opportunity to gain insight from a different cross-section of perspectives and experiences. The committee was pleased by the number of submissions received from serving and former police officers as well as those who appeared to give their evidence in person. Oral evidence was received from 24 witnesses at SAPOL, and PASA witnesses appeared on two occasions.

At their request a significant number of submissions received from serving police officers were not published. One submission from a former officer was not published. It was accepted in respect of serving officers that publication of such submissions may result in difficulties in their ongoing employment relationship with SAPOL.

On behalf of the committee I would like to acknowledge the outstanding contribution of SAPOL's members to the South Australian community. They are assigned often difficult, stressful and potentially dangerous tasks. It can be thankless work. The committee was of the view that exposure to such work, particularly where it involves traumatic circumstances, will inevitably impact mental health. The committee wished to express its gratitude to SAPOL members for their service.

In establishing the committee I wanted to give those who selflessly make sacrifices and put themselves in harm's way to protect our community the opportunity to have their voices heard and to have and give honest feedback on whether the mental health and support services offered to SAPOL members and their families are sufficient. The evidence has shown that they are not.

The committee has made 30 recommendations, with these recommendations including multiple findings. It is my hope that the committee's work can result in meaningful change, particularly in encouraging police members to seek any support they may need. In saying this, I acknowledge that this is only the beginning, with a long list of suggestions by both the committee and in the feedback given in the submissions and the evidence.

It is my sincere hope that the government will take the report's recommendations and implement them swiftly in consultation with SAPOL in order to improve the conditions faced by our police force. It should be highlighted that the recommendations set out in this report are not intended to contribute to the already stretched workload of SAPOL officers but instead to provide some additional avenues where officers may feel comfortable in approaching for support.

I take this opportunity to acknowledge all stakeholders who have provided written submissions or oral evidence to the inquiry. I acknowledge the bravery of witnesses with lived experience in sharing their feedback on support and mental health services for police. The committee is grateful for the insight of all those who have made a contribution.

I would also like to thank committee members the Hon. Dennis Hood, the Hon. Sarah Game, the Hon. Tung Ngo and, up until her recent appointment as a minister, the Hon. Emily Bourke, for their bipartisan approach to this incredibly important issue and the effort they have put into the committee's work. I also acknowledge the invaluable and hard work of Shannon Riggs and Ben Cranwell for their contributions and their assistance with this important inquiry.

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

Motions

NORTH ADELAIDE GOLF COURSE

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:33): I move:

That there be laid upon the table of this council, within two sitting weeks of the passing of this resolution, by the Leader of the Government, the business case and any related documents regarding the proposed redevelopment of the North Adelaide Golf Course.

On Sunday 16 February 2025, the Malinauskas government announced, standing alongside One Nation and the Hon. Connie Bonaros, that the state had secured the rights to continue hosting the LIV Golf tournament until 2031. The Premier also announced that the North Adelaide Golf Course would be redesigned by former professional golfer and LIV Golf founding commissioner Greg Norman and that the tournament would be relocated there in 2028.

I understand from media reports that the Hon. Connie Bonaros and the Hon. Sarah Game have pledged to support any backup legislation that might be required to enable the redevelopment of the site. I have asked questions in this place about what the backup legislation might look like or, indeed, what legislative changes might be required to achieve this redevelopment. I still do not know what legislative change the government has in its contemplation and, indeed, I reiterate my calls for them to release any draft legislation that they are considering so that members of the community can form a view.

During the announcement, the Premier stated that the government had not reached a final figure on the cost of the North Adelaide upgrade and said the configuration of the new course was still being decided. It was reported in *The Advertiser* on 1 March that a redevelopment proposal for the North Adelaide Golf Course developed back in 2018 by the council had been put online, and the plan costed a potential redevelopment at tens of millions of dollars. The planned development proposed the removal of trees to redesign holes.

South Australia's first Christian mission for Aboriginal people and a school to teach Kurna language was established in the late 1830s, and is located at the current par 3 course. I understand from media reports that the initial plans placed a minigolf course, which was made public, over the two sacred sites. Kurna elder Aunty Lynette Crocker has labelled the redevelopment proposal as 'outlandish' and said that there should have been consultation with the Kurna community prior to the public announcement.

The Adelaide City Council, which both owns and manages the North Adelaide Golf Course, has been calling on the state government to sign a long-term lease for the course and pay for all of the costs associated with redevelopment whilst continuing to have oversight. Indeed, Adelaide Lord Mayor, Dr Jane Lomax-Smith, has stated:

Importantly, we want income streams and we're mindful very often when the government takes activities we lose an income stream... We don't get any benefit from car racing, any benefit from Adelaide Oval or the aquatic centre.

Many in the community are concerned about the secrecy around this proposal and have a number of questions around what the development might look like. Indeed, I attended a public meeting hosted by the Adelaide Park Lands Association on the weekend where serious questions were asked about this redevelopment. How many trees will be lost? Will there be guaranteed public access as part of this new development?

The Greens' position on LIV Golf is well known. Indeed, my colleague the Hon. Tammy Franks has spoken at length in this place about LIV Golf and the odious human rights record of the Saudi government. That was a view also shared by the previous opposition leader as well, who was also a vocal critic of LIV Golf plans. But this motion speaks to another issue, and that is the business case. What is the business case for this proposal? How much government money will potentially be sought for this proposal? Are there any documents associated with that? This motion calls on the Malinauskas government to make that public.

We know that the Malinauskas government has form when it comes to secret business cases. Indeed, this is a government that promised \$500 million for a university merger on the basis of a confidential business case. The government offered up the money and, according to the Premier's own admission, he had not even seen the business case, so they have form when it comes to signing on sight unseen, but we in this place need to do our due diligence.

This motion is calling for any business case in relation to the redevelopment to be made public, and any of the associated documents to be made public, so that the people of South Australia have an opportunity to form a view on this proposal, so that we can have an informed debate. I know the government might have their backup plan in some members of the crossbench, but it is really important that we as a parliament do our due diligence.

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

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (RATES—ELECTRICITY GENERATION) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 March 2025.)

The Hon. S.L. GAME (16:39): I rise today to briefly speak in support of the Hon. Frank Pangallo's private member's Statutes Amendment (Rates—Electricity Generation) Bill 2025. The bill effectively aims to erase a 25-year rates anomaly for electricity generation companies based in South Australia. It will allow South Australian councils to apply the same rating principles to energy providers as those currently applied to other businesses and residents, resulting in these companies providing a fairer contribution to the communities in which they operate.

The honourable member says South Australian councils are collectively losing around \$6 million a year as a result of this historic ECRD Act, and he also points out that a predicted increase in land use for electricity generation in South Australia in the coming years could see that \$6 million figure eventually jump up to an annual figure of \$20 million.

In speaking to this amendment, and keeping it particularly relevant amid the current political zeitgeist, the honourable member has painted this proposed change as a cost-of-living issue, rightly pointing out that regional South Australians could benefit most from this change. We also note that, unsurprisingly, this measure has won the support of the Local Government Association of SA, which our office has spoken to, and its member councils.

Underwriting this overwhelming support from the local government sector has been suggestions of rates discounts should this bill become law. Indeed, the Wattle Range Council has already raised the prospect of a 5 per cent cut to ratepayers' annual rates bills, as reported on recently in local media, including *The SE Voice*.

Should the honourable member's bill become law, I will be keeping a very close eye on the impacted councils to see if they indeed follow through with these mooted cost-of-living cuts, or whether the additional funds reaped merely disappear into council coffers, because local government certainly has a role to play in easing cost-of-living pressures, chiefly through its own spending decisions and subsequent rates charges, many of which have escalated way above CPI.

One of our concerns with this amendment was whether it would potentially serve as a disincentive for South Australian energy investment, which is the last thing we need, given the rush to unproven costly renewables embraced by this nation and our own state. However, we have been reassured that energy companies do not make location decisions based on council rates, which pale in comparison to operating costs. The LGA tells us this observation is backed up by data.

Our other concern is whether any increased costs incurred by energy companies would be passed on to consumers. Again, the LGA has reassured us that these costs cannot be passed on due to the structure of the national market, including spot pricing. Armed with those two assurances from the LGA, and with a pledge on behalf of ratepayers to continue monitoring rates notices distributed by the impacted councils, we thank the honourable member for this commonsense amendment and look forward to supporting it.

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

Motions

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. R.A. Simms:

That this council—

1. Notes the Queensland government's announcement that it will make 50¢ fares permanent on all public transport networks in Queensland following a successful six-month trial;

2. Acknowledges that the implementation of 50¢ public transport fares in Queensland has resulted in a significant increase in public transport patronage and positive outcomes for cost of living, traffic congestion, business, and the environment;
3. Notes that Adelaide City Council resolved at its meeting on 11 March 2025 to approach the state government to explore the possibility of implementation of a similar scheme in Adelaide; and
4. Calls on the Malinauskas government to undertake a six-month trial of 50¢ public transport fares as part of its upcoming budget.

(Continued from 19 March 2025.)

The Hon. J.S. LEE (16:43): I rise today to support the motion introduced by the Hon. Robert Simms advocating for a 50¢ fare trial for public transport in South Australia. This motion notes the remarkable success of Queensland's recent 50¢ public transport trial, which clearly demonstrates significant and tangible benefits that could similarly be realised in our state.

Data from Queensland's Department of Transport and Main Roads reveals the 50¢ fare initiative generated an 18.3 per cent rise in overall public transport usage. Bus patronage grew by 15.8 per cent, train usage by 18.6 per cent, and ferry patronage surged dramatically by 42.8 per cent. Equally important, this trial significantly reduced fare evasion, with a 27 per cent decrease in fare evasion fines recorded during the trial period, highlighting that affordable fares directly encourage compliance and increase system integrity.

This substantial increase in public transport patronage can produce positive impacts for South Australia in terms of a reduced reliance on personal vehicles and also mitigate traffic congestion and support sustainable urban growth. Increasing the number of people using public transport directly translates to fewer cars on our roads, leading to reduced emissions, improved air quality and better overall urban liveability.

South Australian families currently face substantial economic pressures, with rising living costs stretching household budgets to their limits. A shift towards affordable public transport fares will substantially ease financial burdens. Consider, for instance, a daily commuter travelling from Elizabeth to the Adelaide CBD via public transport, currently paying around \$7 per day, totalling approximately \$140 a month and \$1,680 per year. Under a 50¢ fare trial, the same commuter will pay only \$10 monthly, equating to just \$120 for the whole year. This represents an annual saving of around \$1,560 in funds that can benefit families and could be redirected towards essential costs such as groceries, utilities and housing.

This affordability becomes even more impactful for lower income households and families reliant on multiple public transport journeys daily. An average family of four, for example, consisting of two adults and two school students commuting regularly, could see savings exceeding \$3,464 in one year. These savings represent meaningful financial relief that can substantially improve quality of life and ease daily economic stresses. Beyond the financial benefits, affordable public transport significantly enhances social connectivity. Anglicare's recent survey highlighted how cheaper transport options allow individuals to more frequently visit family and friends, participate in community activities and reduce social isolation.

In addition to addressing cost-of-living pressures, the social impact measure should not be underestimated. Affordable transport has shown to actively foster stronger, healthier community bonds and improve the overall wellbeing of residents by reducing loneliness and enhancing community participation. I can speak very highly about this involvement in community activities from a multicultural community perspective because I see that many of them do not have a driver's licence and they need to get to many community events. They can certainly utilise public transport a lot more frequently if such a measure is introduced.

Furthermore, improved affordability and accessibility of public transport are pivotal solutions to Adelaide's escalating road congestion issues. Recent reports indicate that Adelaide's population has significantly grown since the COVID-19 pandemic, placing additional strain on road infrastructure as private vehicle use has increased. By implementing a 50¢ fare, more people would be encouraged to opt for public transport over private cars, alleviating congestion, particularly on major routes approaching Adelaide's CBD. This transition can substantially improve commute times, decrease pollution levels and enhance the overall sustainability of our urban environment.

In closing, I firmly support the immediate implementation of a six-month 50¢ fare trial in South Australia. This trial will provide crucial data and insight, demonstrating the tangible benefits of affordable public transport economically, socially and environmentally. It represents a genuine investment in the wellbeing of our communities and families and environment. I strongly urge the Malinauskas government to prioritise this initiative, demonstrating a clear commitment to affordable, accessible and sustainable public transport solutions for all South Australians. Once again, I thank the honourable member for introducing this motion. I commend the motion.

The Hon. T.T. NGO (16:48): I thank the Hon. Robert Simms for bringing this issue to the chamber. The government recognises the importance of public transport and of course the current issue around cost of living. While the government opposes this motion, we do support parts of the honourable member's motion. We share an interest in improving public transport. Unlike the Liberal opposition, we recognise public transport as the essential service it is.

The Malinauskas Labor government is committed to delivering an accessible, efficient, sustainable and frequent public transport system, one that provides the greatest benefits to as many areas and people as possible. The government is currently focusing on ensuring a smooth transition of the trains and trams coming back into public hands.

When the Queensland government conducted its six-month trial of 50¢ fares and subsequently made this change permanently, we paid attention. The Department for Infrastructure and Transport looked at this closely and reported that, while the reduction to 50¢ fares in Queensland led to a temporary rise in patronage, since then numbers have stabilised to the current trend. Additionally, there were observations that many of the people who tried public transport for the first time experienced reduced amenity. This was due to the frequency and security on services not keeping up with the sudden spike in demand. This report shows us that the cost of public transport is just one factor people consider when making the decision to use it.

The Malinauskas Labor government takes a holistic approach to public transport and is committed to addressing the increased cost of living, including the affordability and accessibility of public transport for people in the community experiencing financial pressures. In South Australia, public transport is already heavily subsidised by 80 per cent of its cost to run—80 per cent subsidised.

Some positive initiatives the Malinauskas Labor government has implemented include free all day, every day public transport for Seniors Card holders. This is along with an extensive concession system for a range of passengers, including Companion Card holders, veterans and students. Additionally, from 1 January 2025 a further cost-of-living relief for Health Care Card holders was implemented. This provides 50 per cent concession fares on Adelaide metro and regional bus services.

These subsidies cover off-peak times and weekends when fewer people use public transport, so the total value of fares collected is lower. The current level of fare revenue is essential to ensure that the government can maintain and improve our public transport services. If we prioritise lowering fares even further, we put at risk our holistic approach. While already providing these comprehensive concession systems, I assure Mr Simms and the chamber that the state government will continue to investigate initiatives to enhance the accessibility of public transport.

Again, I want to thank the honourable member for his advocacy for public transport improvements. I hope he appreciates the government's position on this motion and recognises that the Malinauskas Labor government considers public transport an essential service for South Australians, as our actions have demonstrated.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (16:53): I rise and thank the honourable member for bringing this motion, and state that the Liberal opposition does not oppose the motion. We on this side think public transport is a cost-of-living measure. I do wonder how often the Minister for Transport catches public transport, because as the shadow minister for infrastructure and transport I catch public transport quite often. It was only a week or so ago that I was on the O-Bahn heading north, and quite often I am on the Seaford line, heading south. I love jumping on the tram and tearing around, and I do that mainly because, when I am home in Mount Gambier, I really do not have an option to use public transport much because it has been hollowed out or was not really there to begin with. We do need

to see much better public transport options in the regions, which is something I will continue to advocate for.

In his motion, the honourable member referenced the Queensland trial, which did see an 18 per cent increase in patronage, including significant rises amongst students and regional commuters. He framed that initiative as a model for what we might be able to do in South Australia. I would note that South Australia's network differs markedly from Queensland's. Queensland's infrastructure is broader, they have more frequent services and better regional integration. Regional areas, such as Gympie and the Sunshine Coast, saw up to 49 per cent and 37 per cent increases in ridership respectfully.

I make that point again, because our public transport in South Australia does not quite stack up; it really is not fit for purpose. We do not have a northern line that links into our southern line. When cities around the world in the seventies were linking their north and south and east and west rail lines, we are yet to even have that conversation, although I do note that the 20-year infrastructure plan released only a week ago did acknowledge that our Adelaide Railway Station is at capacity, and we seriously need to consider an underground metro here in Adelaide. I have certainly been on the record stating that we may have a workforce after Torrens to Darlington is finished who know how to dig tunnels and we will have some tunnelling machines to do it, so maybe we need to consider that.

The opposition supports efforts to increase patronage, to ease congestion and to address the cost-of-living pressures that so many in South Australia are facing. We do need to also consider important parts of our public transport system when we do look to consider increasing patronage. We need to consider that, when we look at pre-COVID levels of use in public transport to now, we have seen a 13 per cent drop in public transport usage. If we overlaid the Queensland model and we saw an increase of 18 per cent across the board—18 per cent on trains and a 15 per cent increase in buses (we saw a 27.5 per cent increase in light rail in the Queensland example)—what would that look like from a capacity perspective with what we currently have in South Australia, again acknowledging the fact that our network is not up to scratch?

In discussions with public transport advocacy groups, I do acknowledge that there are some differing options. The Hon. Tung Ngo noted that at the end of the day there needs to be in some respects a value added to public transport, if not only just to be able to pay for some of the things that we need to do within our network. We do subsidise some 80 per cent of our public transport in this state already, and we are still not quite getting the service that we probably do require.

It will be important for us to explore a range of policy avenues within public transport to improve the network, to expand the network, and that will include considering fair reform. We also must consider the efficiency, the effectiveness, of our public transport system, and with any broader public transport policy framework investment in infrastructure, reliability and service coverage must be at the top of the list.

I do thank the Hon. Robert Simms for bringing this motion. I thank him for his continued advocacy in this space, not just in the metro context but in the regional context as well, and I look forward to many more debates in this place as we head towards 2026 and the election and what the parties will be offering the people of South Australia with regard to public transport.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:59): I want to thank all honourable members for their contributions: the Hon. Jing Lee, the Hon. Tung Ngo and the Hon. Ben Hood. I thank members for their generous comments as well. I do always feel a sense of dread when I see the Hon. Tung Ngo rise to his feet on one of my motions because I know that he is being deployed to try to defeat it. You know when you see the Hon. Mr Tung Ngo on his feet that the Labor Party have sent him out to deliver—

The PRESIDENT: Order! Do not attack the Hon. Mr Ngo. Come on, the Hon. Mr Simms.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I am defending the Hon. Tung Ngo, Mr President, because he is always being deployed to deliver the bad news, so I feel sorry for him in that regard. But today it does appear that there is broad support in this chamber for the proposal. I recognise the fact that the opposition are not opposing this motion. If this motion passes today, as it appears that it will, I think

that sends a clear message to the Malinauskas government as they craft their next budget that this chamber wants action on public transport fares,

We are seeing momentum building now for 50¢ fares. We saw a resolution pass the Adelaide City Council last month calling on the government to take this seriously. We are now going to see a resolution pass this chamber today also calling on the government to take this seriously. It should be noted that in their last budget the Malinauskas government actually increased Metrocard single fares by 15¢ to \$4.40, which means that South Australian commuters pay some of the highest public transport fares in the country. That is in the middle of a cost-of-living crisis and the middle of a climate crisis. Reducing fares to 50¢ would provide real relief to South Australian families. Indeed, the Greens have calculated that 50¢ fares would save the average SA family of four that uses public transport five days a week up to \$290 a month and \$1,740 over a six-month period.

It is my view that public transport should be free, but at least a six-month 50¢ trial would provide families with some relief. I am calling on the Malinauskas government to follow the lead of Queensland and to roll that out here. In summing up, I recognise the point that the Hon. Ben Hood has made—and it is a fair point—about the need also to increase accessibility of our public transport network. Absolutely, that includes underground rail, that absolutely includes rail to Mount Barker and the Adelaide Hills, and it absolutely includes expanding public transport in the regions as well.

Motion carried.

CROWLEY, HON. DR R.A.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (17:03): I move:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges the recent passing of former Senator for South Australia, the Hon Dr Rosemary Crowley AO;
2. Pays tribute to Dr Crowley's remarkable legacy, particularly in the areas of social justice, women's rights and progressive reform; and
3. Extends its deepest sympathies to her family, friends and loved ones.

I rise today with great sadness to speak on behalf of the government, and the Labor Party more generally, of the passing of former South Australian Senator the Hon. Dr Rosemary Crowley AO. First and foremost, I convey the government's condolences formally to Dr Crowley's family and friends, particularly to Rosemary's sons and her beloved grandchildren. I also pay condolences and welcome here today Kaye Johnston and her husband, Wayne, representing the Crowley family in parliament. Kaye worked on Rosemary's staff when Rosemary was a backbencher and again from 1993 when she became a minister.

Born in Melbourne in 1938 as Rosemary Anne Willis, she was the second of six children. Her upbringing in a Roman Catholic household and her education at Kilmaire Brigidine Convent in Hawthorn instilled in her a strong sense of social responsibility and a passion for community service. Rosemary pursued a medical degree at the University of Melbourne before moving to California with her husband, James Crowley, and was completing her qualifications at Berkeley during the social movements of the sixties, which significantly deepened her political interest and engagement.

After settling back in Adelaide in 1969, Rosemary followed her calling in community health care and also joined the ALP, with her advocacy being centred around welfare reforms, health care and women's rights. Rosemary saw a clear connection between her work as a doctor and her role as a member of parliament and, as a result, she vigorously fought for reforms close to her heart. She was exceptionally passionate about restoring Medicare and was not afraid to voice it, saying, 'I will take the fight about Medicare anywhere, anytime to the people of this country and beat the opposition on Fightback dead.' Pretty apt for today's scenario.

Rosemary made history as the first South Australian woman to be elected to the federal parliament and the first woman from South Australia to be a federal minister. She was appointed as Minister for Family Services and Minister Assisting the Prime Minister for the Status of Women. She delivered major reforms and expanded financial support for families and disability services.

Some of the key milestones Rosemary was intimately involved with were the passage of the Sex Discrimination Act in 1984 and the establishment of a government working group on attitudes to and support for women's sport, which in 1985 produced a report titled 'Women, Sport and the Media'. As Minister for Family Services, Rosemary enhanced the Hawke government's program of financial assistance for families with increased family payments, additional payments for low income families, maternity allowances, disability support programs, carers' pensions, students' assistance and youth training allowances.

Rosemary will be remembered for her intellect, integrity and dedication to public service. She inspired generations of women to step into leadership. Again, I express our condolences to her family, friends and colleagues. She will be dearly missed, but the impact of what she did in her life lives on.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (17:07): I rise as the lead speaker for the opposition on this motion, and I appreciate the opportunity to celebrate the late Hon. Rosemary Anne Crowley AO.

Rosemary was born in Victoria, and her Catholic education instilled in her a strong sense of community and social justice. She was able to complete her matriculation and then her medical degree through winning scholarships and, after a move to California and marriage in the late 1960s, was surrounded by a hotbed of political activism and social change, with the Vietnam War protests, the civil rights movement, and women's rights issues shaping her future life.

After returning to Australia, Rosemary joined the Australian Labor Party. The mother of three sons, she was one of three Unley High School mothers contesting politics at the time, the other two being Anne Levy and Joan Harcourt. A teenage student at Unley High School at this time may have been inspired by these women and, as we now know, Julia Gillard went on to become the nation's first female prime minister. Following attempts to win the South Australian lower house seat of Mitcham and then preselected for the seat of Unley, she was successfully elected to the Senate in the 1983 federal election.

Rosemary was a strong advocate for social causes, including child care, community health, income support for the aged and accessible health care. Following the election of the Keating government in 1993, she became Minister for Family Services and the Minister Assisting the Prime Minister on the Status of Women.

Upon her departure from politics, Ms Crowley was acknowledged in valedictory speeches delivered on 27 June 2002 by senators from all sides of politics for her commitment to societal equality, her work ethic and her great sense of humour. Friends and acquaintances have noted that, while her sense of humour was wideranging, Rosemary had the misfortune to have some jokes misquoted. In his book, Mark Latham attributed some particularly colourful quotes to Rosemary that were in fact made by the former Mayor of Port Augusta, Joy Baluch; however, this is unlikely to have bothered Rosemary a great deal for she is remembered for her willingness to deliver unexpected punchlines.

After her retirement from politics, she continued to serve on consultative bodies, public committees and to work for causes she saw as admirable. She was appointed an Officer of the Order of Australia in the 2015 Australia Day Honours for distinguished service to parliament and for promoting the status of women.

Rosemary will be fondly remembered as a hardworking and dedicated South Australian who worked to build a better world. She will also be celebrated as a trailblazer who helped to encourage women on all sides of politics to be ambitious and fearless in pursuit of their goals. Vale Hon. Rosemary Anne Crowley AO.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:10): I rise to acknowledge the passing of Dr Rosemary Crowley, the former South Australian Labor senator, and I thank the mover for putting this motion on the *Notice Paper* so that we had this opportunity to mark Rosemary Crowley's passing.

Rosemary was born in Melbourne in 1938 and she won several scholarships throughout her schooling and university life, allowing her to work as a doctor in the early 1960s. She then moved to Berkeley, California, with her husband, where they lived for a couple of years. During this time,

Rosemary trained as a children and family counsellor and lived within the civil rights, anti-Vietnam War and women's rights movements era. Being surrounded by this political climate, you could see the impacts on Rosemary's work throughout her career.

Upon her return to Australia, she moved to Adelaide and joined the Labor Party around the time of the election of the Whitlam government in 1972 and became 'capital P' political. Rosemary was elected in 1983 to the Senate under the Hawke government. It took a month to finalise the counting, as she was the final senator, elected at number 5 on the ticket. Yes, that is not a typo, that is how many senators they used to elect back then. By 1996, she was number 1 on the ticket.

Rosemary has said that there was a clear connection between her work in the medical field and her work in the parliament. She said:

My medical work was very much highlighting ill-health no individual doctor could solve...there was a lot of ill-health, unemployment, a lack of transport...Politics seemed the arena where decisions could be made to try to solve these problems.

During her time in the Senate, she was instrumental in the passing of the Sex Discrimination Act. I remember those debates, those outrageous debates, where spurious claims were made about not necessarily the sky falling in but the end of the world as we knew it under the passage of the Sex Discrimination Act and guess what happened? We stopped having discrimination so much on the basis of sex—a good outcome, one would think.

She also supported the women's camp at Pine Gap—again, good on her—advocated for several health and social welfare reforms such as Medicare and childcare, and she publicly spoke out against the Hawke government's move to introduce a Medicare co-payment back in 1991. That co-payment was introduced but quickly abolished by the Keating government the following year—on the right side of history.

She was a minister in the Keating government. She served as Minister for Family Services and Minister Assisting the Prime Minister for the Status of Women. As minister, childcare was a priority, and Rosemary Crowley introduced legislation for cash rebates for childcare and a home childcare allowance—groundbreaking stuff at the time.

She retired from 'capital P' politics in 2002. Rosemary was the fourth woman to be elected to the federal parliament for South Australia and the only woman Labor senator from South Australia during her nearly 20 years in the Senate. She was the first woman minister from South Australia and she was rightfully recognised as a pioneer amongst her colleagues and frequently argued for initiatives that would lead to more women being elected, knowing that 'it is a matter of justice, it is a matter of equity and it is also a matter of best practice', to choose her well-worn words.

In 2015, Rosemary Crowley was appointed an Officer of the Order of Australia for distinguished service to the federal parliament and for promoting the status of women. Women in this country are better off due to the amazing work of Rosemary Crowley. My thoughts are with her family, her friends and loved ones. She was and is a true icon. I was honoured to have met her. I am honoured to have lived in a time when she made such great leaps forward and long may they continue.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (17:14): I thank all those who have contributed to this debate. As the words that have been spoken in this chamber show, the Hon. Rosemary Crowley had a very significant impact right across the political spectrum and was respected on all sides of politics for her work and her advocacy. Once again, we thank all those who have contributed and paid tribute to the life and the work of Dr Rosemary Crowley.

Motion carried.

HYDROGEN POWER PLANT

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

1. That a select committee be established to inquire into the government's election promise to deliver a hydrogen power plant, with particular reference to:

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

(Continued from 19 February 2025.)

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (17:15): Another opportunity to talk about hydrogen. On this occasion though, we are going to be opposing it. It is not going to shock anyone; we are going to be opposing this.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: 'Shame', they say. 'Shame' are the calls from the other side. Well, we will get back to that, won't we? Given the recent developments in Whyalla, I think it really goes without saying that the timing of this call for a select committee is pretty poor and lacks a bit of vision. The South Australian government has deferred the Hydrogen Jobs Plan to prioritise stabilising the Whyalla Steelworks and transitioning towards a sustainable long-term future. That has been deferred.

We know that actual spending for the Hydrogen Jobs Plan is disclosed in the Office of Hydrogen Power's annual report, which is around about \$63 million. Of this, a significant portion was a direct payment for turbines, which will—will—be recouped. The total GE turbine value is about \$249 million. It is, of course, a first-of-its-kind gas turbine capable of running on hydrogen fuel. These turbines will be onsold for the original purchase price or higher, with the guarantee that they will be installed in South Australia to provide additional generation capacity.

That amount also includes capitalised salaries which will work on other projects in the Office of Hydrogen Power, such as hydrogen industry development at the Port Bonython Hydrogen Hub, which is a project that was championed by, oh, that is right, the former Liberal government, and which continues to be praised by the current opposition.

Just to remind my colleagues on the other side who had some interesting comments to make earlier on, I will just quote some of those. The member for Morphett, Mr Stephen Patterson said on 5 May 2022:

I would like to take this opportunity to speak in parliament today about the fantastic federal government announcement last Friday of the Marshall Liberal government's successful \$146.5 million Port Bonython hydrogen hub bid. This is a huge win for South Australia that will create thousands of jobs and establish South Australia as a globally significant supplier of clean hydrogen. It really is a great initiative of the former Marshall government.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: This was the Liberals?

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: This was the Liberals. But Stephen Patterson actually even before that said on 5 December in 2019:

...hydrogen really has a fantastic ability. It is going to provide clean energy going forward, and it will support the transition to low-emissions energy across not only electricity but also potentially going forward heating transport and industry as well.

That is high praise from the member for Morphett, who I understand is a shadow minister at this point. Further than that, of course, we have got the member for Hartley back on 23 June 2021 saying that hydrogen has emerged as an area of future growth.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: Who's the member for Hartley?

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: Vincent Tarzia is the member for Hartley, the Hon. Mr Hunter.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Vincent Tarzia.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: Yes, the Hon. Vincent Tarzia, Mr President. You correct me correctly. The Hon. Vincent Tarzia seems also to be quite the fan of hydrogen as well, so it just seems a little bit odd now that I am getting some of these interesting comments from my colleagues across the chamber here in regard to hydrogen and their concerns about it, which do not seem to be shared by their lower house colleagues. Maybe they should pick up the phone. The domestic production—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: They are trying to talk their way out of it now, Mr President, but that is okay, it is on *Hansard*. The domestic production of structural steel is critical—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Ms Girolamo, if you want to speak on this, list yourself.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: I appreciate your protection, Mr President. The South Australian government, as I said, has deferred the Hydrogen Jobs Plan to prioritise stabilising the Whyalla Steelworks, something I know that will be very close to your heart, Mr President. The domestic production of structural steel, as I have made comment on here before, is critical to our national interest and, indeed, our national security.

Sovereign steel is how Australia can build its infrastructure, be that railways, defence assets, hospitals, housing, transmission bridges, things like that. Without it, we would rely on steel and capability from overseas amid what I think is a pretty increasingly uncertain international climate and, indeed, a national housing crisis.

The Whyalla Steelworks is one of only two Australian steelworks. It produces 75 per cent of Australian structural steel and 100 per cent of the nation's domestic long steel products, for instance, rail, which is pretty critical also for defence and transport sectors. That capability quite simply, and to put it very simply, is just too important to lose. The Malinauskas Labor government and, indeed, the Albanese Labor government have partnered together to invest \$2.4 billion to secure the Whyalla Steelworks, and this will include a \$1.9 billion investment for upgrades and new infrastructure, which is pretty vital to ensuring the steelworks has a sustainable and long-term future.

The state government remains committed to the establishment of a hydrogen industry in Australia. The world wants green iron and steel, and hydrogen will play an important part in that transition. But South Australia can only manufacture green steel with a strong, sustainable Whyalla Steelworks, and that simply must be our priority.

I once again echo what I said back at the start, which is that the timing of this call for a select committee, given recent developments in Whyalla, is very poor. We will be opposing it and, as I said, maybe the members opposite here might want to give their lower house colleagues a call about the level of interest in hydrogen in their party.

The Hon. J.S. LEE (17:22): I rise today to support the motion introduced by the Hon. Nicola Centofanti calling for the establishment of a select committee to investigate the Labor government's hydrogen power plant commitment. The parliamentary inquiry is essential to ensure accountability, transparency and responsible management of taxpayer funds. The Malinauskas Labor government promised South Australians a significant reduction in power prices, sustainable economic growth and leadership in renewable energy through their Hydrogen Jobs Plan.

Unfortunately, what we are witnessing instead is a troubling pattern of unmet promises, excessive expenditure and minimal tangible outcomes. As highlighted by a recent article published

in *The Advertiser* on 26 March 2025, global commodities giant Trafigura recently abandoned a proposed \$750 million green hydrogen project plan for the Nyrstar Port Pirie smelting facility. This substantial cancellation, attributed to prohibitive construction costs and insufficient market demand, underscores a concerning trend.

Similar significant hydrogen projects, including the AGL Torrens Island Green Hydrogen Hub and Neoen Australia's Hydrogen Superhub at Crystal Brook, have either stalled or been indefinitely deferred. The state government's flagship \$600 million Whyalla hydrogen plant has been shelved, with most of the funds being redirected to its Whyalla Steelworks support package. However, the government has confirmed that the Office of Hydrogen Power SA will continue to operate, focusing on exploring and facilitating new investment opportunities in the hydrogen sector.

Despite the evidence, setbacks and lack of practical progress, more than \$130 million in taxpayer money has already been expended by the Office of Hydrogen Power SA. These funds have primarily covered substantial executive salaries, consultant fees and extensive engineering and feasibility studies without delivering any meaningful outcomes.

South Australians were assured that this investment would bring actual benefits, yet today we see little to no evidence of substantial progress, raising significant questions about financial stewardship and strategic management. The impacts of these unmet commitments are felt profoundly by communities and industries, particularly in regional areas like Whyalla, where economic stability and future prospects have been tied directly to these ambitious but elusive hydrogen projects.

Families and businesses of South Australia now face uncertainty, compounded by the persistent reality of high energy costs despite promises of affordability. Indeed, the scale of public spending and the government's lack of clear outcomes of measurable achievements highlights the critical need of a rigorous oversight. South Australians deserve clarity on precisely what outcomes, if any, have been achieved by the Office of Hydrogen Power SA, and whether continued public investment is justified. Therefore, I fully support this motion.

A select committee would ensure thorough scrutiny of this project's commitments, cost, viability and actual achievements. Transparency is paramount if we are to maintain public trust and ensure responsible use of taxpayer funds. We owe it to every South Australian to hold the government accountable for their spending decisions and ensure genuine progress towards a sustainable energy future. With those remarks, I commend the motion.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (17:26): I rise to indicate that the Greens will not be supporting the select committee. I understand the concerns that the opposition has in relation to this proposal and, indeed, I did call for there to be a committee established back when the hydrogen bill was originally put forward. However, since that time, the government has announced a major shift in terms of the policy approach that they are taking, with a reorientation towards Whyalla, and so the plan has been significantly scaled down.

The Liberal Party have also, since that time, made it clear that they want to just abolish the Office of Hydrogen in its entirety. The question I have then is: what is the purpose of an inquiry? If you already have an end goal in mind, what is the purpose of an inquiry? It seems to me that this is going to be used as yet another opportunity for them to undermine renewables, and another opportunity for the climate deniers in the Liberal Party to get a platform.

On that basis, the Greens will not be supporting the committee but, of course, we will continue to urge for transparency in terms of how this matter is dealt with. I recognise the Budget and Finance Committee has the capacity to look into this, and I hope that there will continue to be some level of transparency around this, but a forum to attack and undermine renewables is really not the best way forward.

The Hon. S.L. GAME (17:28): I rise to support the motion of the Hon. Nicola Centofanti in accordance with my previous comments in this chamber regarding the government's Climate Change and Greenhouse Emissions Reduction Bill, when I highlighted the global and national market movement away from investing in green hydrogen, and the implications for the government's election promise to deliver a hydrogen power plant.

It is also worthwhile repeating my previous reference to Zoe Hilton, the senior energy policy analyst at the Centre for Independent Studies, who stated:

Green hydrogen was always a pipe dream—the economics simply don't stack up and it's unlikely they ever will.

Such comments highlight the need to maintain the scrutiny on the government's plans and expenditure post Whyalla given the ongoing cost to taxpayers of the 55 staff in the government's hydrogen office, and the chief executive's annual salary of \$600,000, as well as the recent announcements that the \$750 million green hydrogen project in Port Pirie has been axed.

The fact that most of these multimillion-dollar green hydrogen projects rely on government funding, and that so many projects continue to be abandoned across the country and globally, raises serious questions about the waste of taxpayer dollars on these pipedreams. With that, I confirm my support for the honourable member's motion.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (17:30): I would like to, first and foremost, thank all the honourable members who have contributed to the debate—the Hon. Justin Hanson, the Hon. Jing Lee, the Hon. Rob Simms and the Hon. Sarah Game. In summing up, it is disappointing that the Greens have ultimately chosen to side with the government to block this important motion. This was a genuine opportunity, I think, for transparency and accountability on a major public investment, an investment that, whilst it has been delayed, according to the Premier, has not been scrapped and therefore taxpayers continue to fork out for bureaucrats sitting in the office of hydrogen doing I am not sure what, to be honest.

We all know that the hydrogen power plant is certainly a vanity project for the Premier, rather than a sound energy strategy. Around the country and across the globe, both private businesses and governments are walking away from hydrogen power plants because they simply do not stack up financially, technically or environmentally. As the Hon. Jing Lee pointed out, even last week we saw Trafigura cancel its \$471 million green hydrogen plant at Port Pirie, citing economic challenges and limited market demand, yet here in South Australia the Malinauskas government seems intent on continuing to push ahead with little scrutiny, no clear business case and mounting concerns about viability.

South Australians deserve to know how their money is being spent, what the actual costs are, whether the promised outcomes are achievable, and if this technology is truly the best use of our resources at this stage. Instead of welcoming the proper oversight, the government has effectively shut it down, unfortunately, with the Greens' help. I do think it is a missed opportunity to ensure that public policy is transparent, evidence based and genuinely in the best interests of the people of South Australia.

The council divided on the motion:

Ayes7
 Noes.....9
 Majority2

AYES

Centofanti, N.J. (teller)
 Henderson, L.A.
 Pangallo, F.

Game, S.L.
 Hood, B.R.

Girolamo, H.M.
 Lee, J.S.

NOES

Bourke, E.S.
 Hanson, J.E.
 Ngo, T.T.

El Dannawi, M.
 Hunter, I.K.
 Simms, R.A.

Franks, T.A.
 Maher, K.J. (teller)
 Wortley, R.P.

PAIRS

Hood, D.G.E.
Scriven, C.M.

Martin, R.B.

Lensink, J.M.A.

Motion thus negated.

CHILD PROTECTION

The Hon. S.L. GAME (17:36): I move:

That this council—

1. Censures the Minister for Child Protection, the Honourable Katrine Hildyard MP; and
2. Calls on her to resign for her failures in managing her portfolio, in particular, her failure to deliver the government's commitments for timely legislative reform of the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017 to address identified systemic deficiencies.

Given the complex, sensitive and significant history of child protection in this state, you would expect the current minister to endeavour to administer this portfolio with care, caution and respect for the many stakeholders who continue to collectively call for immediate reformation of a broken, self-serving bureaucracy that is no longer fit for purpose. Instead, this minister has responded by engaging the media to accuse stakeholder advocates of playing political games and then commenced to forge ahead with her agenda through unilateral executive orders rather than adhere to the democratic process of debate, scrutiny, compromise and negotiation.

The Advertiser has characterised the minister's actions as channelling US President Donald Trump, but we need to remind the minister that this place is a long way from the corridors of the White House. We exist within a parliamentary democracy, the Westminster system of responsible government, where ministers are accountable to the parliament and executive orders are contingent upon legislative delegation. Unfortunately for the minister, such declarations to the media only further confirm the need for someone else to take charge of this incredibly important portfolio that has continued to decline under what can only be described as inept leadership.

This was most evident during the recent Budget and Finance Committee session where the Chief Executive of the Department for Child Protection, Jackie Bray, failed to provide answers to multiple basic, clear, fundamental questions about understaffing, under-resourcing and deficiencies in the complaint-handling process across the department. Quite frankly, the committee session turned into an embarrassing game of cat and mouse where the obviously underprepared chief executive could only provide scripted responses, took most questions on notice and failed to identify any clear or quantifiable achievement in a department with a budget reaching close to a billion taxpayer dollars.

While the minister might like to replicate Trump's executive orders, it is clear that what is really needed is not more executive power but an Elon Musk-style Department of Government Efficiency to uncover exactly where the millions of taxpayer dollars are going, and in true Trump style those responsible for any exorbitant waste of resources should be let go.

What is most concerning, however, is the impact of this mismanagement and waste on South Australia's most vulnerable children and young people. The history of avoidable death, harm and injury is nothing sort of horrific, and it should cause all South Australians to pause and reflect on what type of community we are and what type of community we want to become. It was back in 2022 when the separate deaths of six-year-old Charlie Nowland and seven-year-old Makai Wanganeen prompted the minister to declare that the government would be relentless in efforts to improve the system.

The Premier also launched an independent review into how government intersected with these families. Initial findings of the review found that 500 children were at high risk, based on data related to the number, type and frequency of notifications made to the child protection system. The full findings of the review are still yet to be released, pending the outcome of criminal neglect charges.

However, in February 2024 the DCP released figures to the Adelaide *Advertiser* under an FOI request, which showed that 17 young people living in state care or known to the system had

died in 2023. Disturbingly, nine of these deaths were children under the age of 10. Despite the DCP pledging to be more transparent about child deaths, the death of a three-year-old child in Whyalla in May 2024 was only revealed after a tip-off to the ABC in July. The ABC requested further details under an FOI request but only received heavily redacted documents, and the department refused to provide any public comment on the case. However, according to an *Advertiser* report in August of 2024, alarms were raised with authorities before the little girl's death, and since her death her younger sister has been taken into state care.

In addition, there was the case of the young Whyalla mother who was convicted for the criminal neglect of her 1½ year old daughter in 2023. In sentencing, the judge noted that a person caring for the child notified the Department for Child Protection that the girl and her sibling were both wearing dirty nappies. Five months later, a social worker attended the house and observed the children in urine-soaked pyjamas, but no action was taken to remove the child. The familiar response of the department was, 'The safety of children is the department's highest priority, and we are continually working to drive positive change and improvements.'

What this reveals is the ongoing and urgent need for immediate action to reform this dysfunctional system before any more children are put at risk. The government, the minister and her department have continuously committed to doing this in press releases and media statements. However, these statements and commitments are consistently belied by their constant stonewalling and disregard for stakeholder concerns.

When asked specific questions about staffing and resourcing at the Whyalla DCP office by the Budget and Finance Committee on Monday 24 March, chief executive Jackie Bray avoided the question and then requested to take it on notice, then finally conceded, 'I do not have the necessary information about the resource questions with me today.' Given the significant incidents at Whyalla, Ms Bray should have expected the committee to question the department about the resources and operations of the Whyalla office. Such an unprepared response shows a deliberate disregard for the committee and its functions and further highlights the immediate need for greater scrutiny of this department.

Even the minister's Trump-style executive orders acknowledge the immediate need for accountability, with the minister demanding monthly reports on the progress of reforms. But, unfortunately for the minister, it is all a bit late. This should have happened at least 12 months ago, and to act now can only be seen as a last desperate attempt to avoid responsibility by frankly throwing the chief executive, Jackie Bray, under the bus, when it is the minister who has been driving this bus, the minister who is the captain of the sinking ship and the minister who has been asleep at the wheel.

It is also the minister who has consistently delayed these reforms, and the minister who has failed to consult properly with stakeholders and tried to ram this half-baked, piecemeal legislation through this place under the fog of the last sitting day of Christmas 2024, and it is now the minister who refuses to negotiate appropriately with the crossbench and would rather abandon the urgent need for reform if it is not on her terms.

We can do better. However, unlike the minister, the crossbench and opposition have listened to stakeholders, and I am certain we have all heard multiple disturbing accounts from individuals and organisations about the continued failures of this department. I have been particularly moved by the plight of carers, and the lack of recognition and reward for the valuable work they do.

A recent poll conducted by The Carer Project identified that 72 carers had paid out-of-pocket expenses for medical treatments, therapies and assessments. The poll also identified that 21 carers were currently waiting for medical or disability equipment for the children in their care, and that 19 had been denied the necessary equipment. This is unacceptable, and it is just another example of the deep-seated failure of this faceless bureaucracy, which is no longer fit for purpose. We are contacted at our office frequently by carers, who report to me that the minister will not engage appropriately with them and they are simply at wit's end and have given up on the minister.

It is increasingly clear that no meaningful reform will be achieved while the current minister remains in the driving seat. However, a new minister can be appointed who is prepared to address the problems with DCP, someone prepared to sit down and work with stakeholders to achieve meaningful reform to improve the lives of our most vulnerable children and young people, someone

who genuinely supports the brave carers and workers who just want to operate in a framework that assists them, rather than prohibits them from doing their job. With that, I conclude and put this motion before the chamber.

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON (17:44): I rise today to speak in support of the honourable member's motion. In doing so, I indicate that I am the lead speaker for the opposition. A censure motion is not something that should be treated lightly, so it is quite significant that we see this censure motion being moved today. It is even more significant that this is not the first censure motion that has been moved against this minister. I think it clearly displays a significant level of concern by members of this chamber towards the minister and her performance that we are debating this motion before us today.

Last year, we saw the Hon. Nicola Centofanti move a censure motion. During that censure motion, I clearly put on the record the many concerns of the opposition around the minister's failed budget targets, concerns from carers and the calls of thousands for a standalone child protection minister. I do not propose to relitigate those issues here today. They are on the record for all to see.

As an opposition, we have been calling for a standalone child protection minister for quite some time. It was the opposition's view that the portfolios of sport, recreation and racing and child protection went together like oil and water, that it was not sustainable for the minister to be juggling her time between the in-crisis child protection system and the bread and circuses sports agenda of this government.

We saw the Premier remove the portfolio of sport, recreation and racing from this minister's responsibilities only earlier this year. This was indeed a concession from this government that the child protection system is in crisis. Despite this clear concession, we continue to see unsatisfactory outcomes in the child protection portfolio.

It was hoped that with the removal of her sports portfolio the Minister for Child Protection could use this newly found time to listen to the child protection sector and experts, to be able to act attentively to their calls. Alas, newly found time has not amounted to a newly found attitude of listening. This government and this minister continue to bury their heads in the sand and adopt a 'We know best' approach rather than listen to the advice that is being given by the sector and by the experts.

It was only in June of last year that the Liberal opposition and members of the crossbench called for the resignation of the Minister for Child Protection for her failures in managing her portfolio, in particular her failure to deliver the government's commitments for timely legislative reform of the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017 to address identified systemic deficiencies. At this rate, I will have grown a baby in the time that it has taken for this minister to deliver on this legislative reform.

It seems as if we are going around and around in circles but getting nowhere with this minister and with this government. We continue to see the sector ask for one thing and then the minister and this government double-down on another. It has been clear that the sector would like 'best interests' to be adopted as the paramount principle in this government's legislative reform. Yet the government has not heeded their calls and instead said that should 'best interests' be made the paramount principle they would shelve this legislative reform and retain the 2017 legislation, an outcome that I do not think anyone would like to see.

To be clear, it would not be in the best interests of a child for a decision to be made that is unsafe, so any commentary that the options are either 'best interests' or 'safety', that best interests comes at the expense of a child's safety, quite frankly is disingenuous. I find it hard to believe that you would see the vast support in the sector and calls from the experts, including the Commissioner for Children and Young People, the Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People and the Guardian for Children and Young People, if best interests came at the expense of child safety.

Any claims by the government for the opposition to, 'stop playing political games, back children's safety, and back these important reforms,' is, quite frankly, the government playing political games, considering that they should know that 'best interests' includes safety, considering that they

should know that the experts are calling for 'best interests', and that we are not standing alone in our calls. That is political spin, if you want to talk about political spin, Mr President.

The government's approach is frankly perplexing to see, to have the minister so out of step with the expectations of her own sector. Despite knowing that the child protection system is in crisis, the government has advised this place that should 'best interests' be made the paramount principle, they would retain the existing 2017 legislation—and I do query whether this decision is being made on advice from the chief executive or whether this is a decision of the minister herself. This is legislation that has seen this child protection system reach breaking point, an outcome I do not think anyone would like to see, but this government and this minister's pride is getting in the way of compromise and getting in the way of achieving better outcomes for vulnerable South Australian children.

The parliament has the opportunity to address key issues that are vital to ensuring the safety of vulnerable children, including ensuring consistency in the application of the harm thresholds, expansion of active efforts, early intervention and prevention, and the prioritisation of reunifying families where it is safe to do so—just to name a few. Without these key legislative changes, children remain at risk of being lost in the widening cracks of this broken child protection system.

Katrine Hildyard has shown that she is not listening to the experts. It is time that she resign and that a new minister be appointed. The Premier can no longer sit on his hands as we watch the system fall into further disrepair. He must take action and replace Minister Hildyard with a competent minister who is willing to listen to the experts and get the job done. We need a show of leadership from this Premier, and the ball is squarely in his court.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (17:52): I rise to speak on this, and note that they are pulling the vote on this tonight in the knowledge that it was destined to fail with my vote and that of the Hon. Mr Simms. However, I will speak to it now.

I have never supported a censure motion or a move for one in my time in this place, and it is not going to change now. The reason for that is that I firmly believe this extreme step should only be reserved for the most egregious conduct by a minister of the Crown, like misleading parliament or gross misconduct. I am a backbencher, and I never supported calls for the resignation of the minister last year.

This motion does not meet any threshold to justify the removal of the minister, except that the mover and those who support the motion are clearly trying to character assassinate Minister Hildyard for political gain—nothing new, because it has happened with previous ministers. This agenda has been evident long before the child protection bill was tabled in this place.

There have been constant attacks in this place, and in the media, on Minister Hildyard's competence in the portfolio, and they will not stop until they get their scalp. I am not going to participate in this shameful, petty show of petulant politics when there is more significant work to be done in this area of child protection in the parliament.

I sit and watch in dismay the glacial progress this bill is making in the Legislative Council, and note that there are nearly 100 more amendments that have been put up today. I dare say, at the pace it is going, the Hon. Laura Henderson will be a mother of three before it goes through. This is a deliberate stalling tactic again to derail the bill and reflect poorly on the minister.

I fully support the minister and her commitment to make child protection and child safety a priority and make it in the best interests of children and their families. We have been bamboozled by all these amendments by movers who have not even had the courtesy to give me or my office any respectable notice about what they are up to and what they are about. This is having the effect of holding up the many good measures in the bill while denying children the additional care and consideration they deserve.

For the record, my dealings with Minister Hildyard have always been informative and productive. She impresses me as a hardworking minister committed to her portfolios. As we all know in this place, child protection has long been perceived as a poisoned chalice for any politician who has the misfortune of inheriting it, such is the nature of the topic of that portfolio. They are under greater scrutiny and attract criticism from all sides of the political spectrum.

This happened under the Rann, Weatherill and Marshall governments and now the Malinauskas government. I imagine it will happen under future governments as well, such a problematic area is this. It is difficult to find effective solutions in such a challenging area. There have been royal commissions, inquiries and reviews and, as I have said, it still remains a complex and challenging area by its very nature. You can talk about the way that this department is being managed or mismanaged, but we know that almost every government department has issues of management in itself, and this is no different.

In closing, I would like to ask the mover why she is yet to bring to a vote one of her priority bills to repeal one of this government's cornerstone pieces of legislation: the Voice? I ask if there has been any pressure applied to her by the government to keep it on the backburner a year or less from a state election? With that, I give my indication that there is no way I am going to support this censure motion, unless there is evidence presented to the chamber of egregious misconduct by the minister.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:58): Can I start at the outset by placing on the record and reminding the government and anybody who is listening to this debate that the Hon. Sarah Game is not alone in moving this motion. It is identical to the motion that was moved by the Hon. Ms Centofanti, it is identical to the motion moved by the Hon. Tammy Franks and it is identical to the motion moved by me, and that should be indicative of why we are standing here today.

I do not take censure motions lightly. In fact, I have not supported any censure motions previously. That in and of itself should speak to the seriousness of the topic that we are debating today. We may not have all agreed on all of the detail when we moved those motions, but there are two things that we were fundamentally in absolute universal agreement on, and they go to the heart of the sentiments that have been expressed by the mover of this motion today, and I share the sentiments that have been expressed by the mover of this motion today. As I said, we do not make these decisions lightly. They go beyond that to the heart of everything that those who have been involved in these negotiations have been frustrated by since last year. To suggest that this is personal, to suggest that we are after somebody's scalp is objectionable, because nothing could be further from the truth.

This has nothing to do with making it personal or politicking, which is what we know has been happening every time the minister has commented publicly, but everything to do with the frustration of the MPs who have tried in genuine good faith to negotiate with the government and the minister on this issue and of the stakeholders and experts who have bent over backwards and pleaded and begged to be heard.

It goes to the heart of everything that was at the centre of the inquiry that took place over Christmas, the submissions that were made, the open letter to every member of this place by the three commissioners who are responsible for vulnerable kids in our state. All three of them penned an open letter saying, 'Please do not proceed with this bill.' The Youth Court said, 'Please do not proceed with this bill in its current state.' Over 50 submissions to the inquiry said, 'Please do not proceed with this bill in this state.' It has taken this censure motion today for the government to finally extend an olive branch and say, 'Let's sit down and talk about this bill.' That is indicative of the attitude that we have had from the minister in response to this debate.

I do not have to repeat everything I have said publicly, because it is all on the record. I have not been harsh without good reason, because it has been like pulling teeth to get some common sense to prevail. So if there is any question, any doubt, as to whether I am behind the Hon. Ms Game in terms of moving this motion, then that should be removed from people's minds now, because unless and until—and the government has been on notice—the government and the minister show a genuine effort and intent to get this bill right then the only thing left to us is this censure motion. That is a sad state of affairs not for us as politicians and not for us as a parliament but for every vulnerable kid who we are letting down in the system and who we have consistently let down in the system and for every expert who has provided evidence who has said we have consistently let down or we will let down those kids further if we do not get this right.

We know that this legislation has been an opportunity for generational reform, and what we have heard is a minister who has said over and over again that the rest of us are politicking and that she will not resile from her position. I have responded to that by saying, 'Well, I will dig my heels in

just as deep as you.' But it is not because I am taking this personally. Everything we have tried to date has failed, so it is little wonder then that we find ourselves in a position where we are considering and where we are voting on a censure motion. I remind members again, regardless of the outcome, it is a pretty good indication of where members sit on this issue, and it is a pretty good indication of where stakeholders sit on this issue. I remind honourable members again that it is not the only one: there are two more censure motions sitting on the table.

They are there for a reason. We should never have got to this point. We should never have got to the point where we actually say, 'Minister, resign, because you have failed to negotiate.' We should not have got to a point where we say, 'Minister, you have failed in your duties and obligations to every vulnerable kid in the state, who is looking to us to provide them with the level of protection that they deserve.'

It is a generational reform. We are not going to get the opportunity to think about whether we can change this again in a year. We have spent so many years reviewing this legislation and if anyone suggests that between last year and now the aim of those MPs who have supported this legislation is to politic, to play personal politics, or to hold up a bill, then they are very sorely mistaken. The reason we are here now in April is because up until now, up until the last 24 hours, there has been no opportunity to negotiate on those key fundamental reforms that everybody who has had input into this process has said are absolutely critical to this piece of legislation if it is to go forward.

The Hon. Laura Henderson, in the last sitting week, talked about whether or not this bill would be dumped if we did not move from our positions—yes, it would, setting kids back even further from that generational reform that we need in order to finally get a handle on child protection. Child protection is not an easy portfolio; we all know that. You do not take it on lightly; we all know that. Just like health, it is vexed and it is difficult, but what you do not do if you are the minister is dig your heels in and say, 'It's my way or the highway.' That is what you do not do, and that is why we are here today.

It is my genuine hope that the discussions that are now underway will address those issues and will see some genuine attempt at addressing the fundamental flaws—as the Hon. Tammy Franks has said, you could drive a truck through the holes in this legislation. If we do not address those, it is kids who pay the price, nobody else. We do not pay the price, kids do. Vulnerable kids, the most vulnerable kids in our society, pay the price.

So of course I am going to stand here and speak on this motion today. Of course I am going to join my colleagues and put up an identical motion to the one that is being discussed today, because that is the only tool we have left available to us to get the attention of government and the minister. That is a sad state of affairs in and of itself, and I find it objectionable that anybody would suggest that we are playing politics with something as important as the future of our vulnerable kids. On that note, I seek leave to conclude my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Bills

STATE DEVELOPMENT COORDINATION AND FACILITATION BILL

Introduction and First Reading

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

At 18:09 the council adjourned until Thursday 3 April 2025 at 14:15.