

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 30 April 2025

The PRESIDENT (Hon. T.J. Stephens) took the chair at 14:17 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.

Question Time

SARDI FISH DEATHS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:21): My questions are to the Minister for Primary Industries on the investigative report on mortalities of finfish and shellfish hatcheries at the South Australian Aquatic Sciences Centre:

1. Why were no water samples collected at the time mortalities were first observed, despite reports from Robarra and SARDI staff indicating abnormal fish behaviour and suspected toxicity as early as 14 October?
2. Given the report acknowledges that acute toxicity often leaves no histological trace, why was there no protocol in place to immediately test for dissolved contaminants like sulphides or copper at the time of the event?
3. Does the minister accept that the absence of real-time water quality sampling during the mortality events has rendered the investigation fundamentally, and some may say conveniently, inconclusive?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:22): I thank the honourable member for her question. Our very well qualified and world-renowned SARDI staff at the institute of course were most concerned when there appeared behaviour and impacts on fish that were not consistent with their usual operations. Based on previous experience, SARDI staff focused on potential biosecurity issues and fish health in the first instance. Once it was clear that it was not a potential biosecurity issue causing the mortalities focus turned to water quality testing.

In its past decades of operation the West Beach site has not had a water quality issue, which is why it was not the immediate focus of SARDI staff as they responded to these events. Obviously, through these unfortunate events as well as the subsequent investigations that have been undertaken, it became clear that this was indeed a gap, and it was a gap that has been addressed.

Implementing the learnings from the investigations that SARDI undertook, SARDI now has a focus on water quality at the site, has changed its procedures and has installed sensors that detect changes in water chemistry. That is obviously an appropriate way to go and means that if there should be any similar events in the future there will be a broader range of evidence available to be able to make an assessment.

However, it is worth noting that there were a wide range of different pieces of evidence that were available that they were able to look at. Obviously that meant that there were a number of things that were able to be ruled out. As always, when something like fish deaths occur those involved with research continue to learn and apply those learnings.

SARDI FISH DEATHS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): Supplementary: does the minister believe it was a failure of her government that no protocols were in place to test water quality issues with any mass fish mortality event?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:24): The scientists involved in the research that occurs at

SARDI are well-qualified, they are world-renowned. They approached this in a way that was consistent with their experience in these matters.

SARDI FISH DEATHS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): A further supplementary: did SARDI consult, at the time of the significant fish mortalities, with any veterinarians either on staff or external?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:25): In terms of the specific personnel who were involved, I can take that on notice and bring back a response.

SARDI FISH DEATHS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking questions of the Minister for Primary Industries on the investigatory report on mortalities at finfish and shellfish hatcheries at the South Australian Aquatic Sciences Centre.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: The minister, in late afternoon on Friday of the Gather Round, released her department's investigative report on mortalities at finfish and shellfish hatcheries at the South Australian Aquatic Sciences Centre, which openly admitted that no water samples were collected at the time of the mortality event. That is somewhat baffling, considering that sand placement activities and dredging, both known to disturb potentially toxic sediments, were happening within 150 metres of the SARDI intake pipes.

Within the report, the recommendations page somewhat strangely starts with recommendation 4 rather than recommendation 1. This has raised significant questions with regard to the report. My questions to the minister are:

1. What were the initial recommendations listed 1 to 3 inclusive?
2. Why were these recommendations removed from the report that was made public?
3. Has there been any other information altered by either the minister, her staff or anyone else in the government department from the original version of the report?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:27): I thank the honourable member for her questions. I am also pleased that she is referring to the transparency that has been part of this investigation when she says that the report 'openly admitted' that water samples were not taken. That does speak to the fact that all those involved are very keen to be able to, first, acknowledge where there were gaps in what was available and, secondly, as I have already outlined, then go forward in terms of addressing those gaps.

I am not quite sure what the honourable member is referring to in terms of the numbering. I can certainly find out whether there has been some kind of typo or something like that. I am not aware that it apparently starts at recommendation 4, and therefore I think we should certainly note that her assumption that it means recommendations were removed is not necessarily the case at all.

SARDI FISH DEATHS

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:28): Supplementary: when did the minister or her office first receive the report, and why was it released late on a Friday?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:28): I don't have the date in front of me, but what I will say is that one of the parts of the investigation included having the SARDI report independently peer-reviewed by Professor Michael Goodsite. That peer review supported the findings that were in the report. Obviously, having that kind of additional input takes additional time.

SARDI FISH DEATHS

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:28): Further supplementary: when did the minister or her office receive the report, and how many days was it before the report was then released?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:28): I just answered that.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: You did not answer that.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Franks, the minister—

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: On what date did the minister or her office receive the report?

The PRESIDENT: The minister has chosen to answer in the way the minister sees fit.

SARDI FISH DEATHS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:29): Supplementary: is the minister aware whether the independent reviewer, Vice-Chancellor Professor Michael Goodsite, signed a full report with all recommendations or the report with the recommendations beginning at No. 4?

Members interjecting:

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

SARDI FISH DEATHS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:29): My questions are to the Minister for Primary Industries on the investigative report on mortalities of finfish and shellfish hatcheries at the South Australian Aquatic Sciences Centre:

1. Given the investigative report raises more questions than answers, with key data not being collected, will the minister commit to commissioning an independent and external review separate from SARDI into the government's handling of this incident, including the failure to collect contemporaneous water samples and the overall lack of coordination between government agencies?

2. Does the minister accept that the failure to collect water samples during the mortality event has fundamentally compromised the investigation's ability to determine the cause, and that this represents a serious procedural shortfall?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:30): I thank the honourable member for her question. She seems to have failed to appreciate that there has been an independent peer review by Professor Michael Goodsite. That is the first and foremost point to make. In terms of whether water quality samples would have shown the reason, that is a matter for speculation. It is well accepted and acknowledged that had there been water samples, that would have been preferable. I have already outlined the reasons why in the past.

There have been many years of operations at West Beach. Water quality hasn't previously been an issue, and therefore it was not part of the protocols to collect those samples until it became clear that it wasn't one of the more expected reasons—namely, biosecurity issues or fish health.

The excellent staff at SARDI followed their usual protocols. It is well acknowledged, and acknowledged within the report and by the department, that having additional data such as water samples would of course have been helpful. That has now been addressed so that in the future if there are issues around mortalities of snapper larvae or oyster spat or barramundi broodstock or fingerlings—or, indeed, any other aspects at SARDI—that will be part of it. I think that learning from where there has been a gap and implementing changes is the appropriate outcome.

SARDI FISH DEATHS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): Supplementary: can the minister rule out that dredging did not cause the issues with water quality?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! That's enough. Minister, answer please.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:33): I will refer members to the report, which said that there was no evidence directly linking the hatchery mortalities with dredging.

DROUGHT ASSISTANCE

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:33): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister speak to the chamber about the bulk water being made available at Bundaleer Reservoir to help drought-affected farmers?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:33): I thank the honourable member for his question.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am very pleased to announce that, through the state government's extensive \$73 million drought support package, an emergency water supply for livestock and primary production has been made from today at the Bundaleer Reservoir in the Mid North. This was made possible through a \$500,000 allocation of funds. This bulk water collection point will be open on Wednesdays and Thursdays from 2pm to 4pm initially for primary producers needing emergency water for livestock or other primary production purposes. Producers can access the reservoir via Wheat Sarah Road, off Goyder Highway, and there is currently no limit to the amount of water that can be taken from the collection point.

The emergency water collection point will assist farmers in retaining their core breeding livestock. SA Water will of course be carefully monitoring uptake of water from the Bundaleer Reservoir with regard to supply and demand. The opening hours will be able to be amended if necessary to enable producers in need of emergency water to be able to access it. Of course, the water levels of the reservoir will also be carefully monitored to ensure the populations of native fish, including Murray cod and golden perch, are not adversely affected.

This initiative is another example of how the government's extensive drought package has been thoughtfully designed to address various areas of need. We have acted on direct feedback received from extensive engagement with industry, primary producers and our communities affected by drought. The \$73 million package addresses a wide range of needs, including extensions to measures from our initial package, more funding for mental health support, pest management measures, immediate financial relief for those who need it and programs to help regional communities affected by the flow-on effects of drought. Our engagement will continue as the drought package continues to roll out, and I look forward to continuing to work with those affected.

DROUGHT ASSISTANCE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:35): Supplementary: how did the minister and her department or SA Water arrive at the decision to open the water allocation points only two hours a day and only on Wednesday and Thursday, and what will be SA Water's assessment criteria for extension of operating hours, mentioned in the minister's answer?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:36): The operating hours, as I mentioned, can be changed if there is clearly a demand. Obviously, the uptake will be monitored. If there are many, many people arriving, then clearly it might be appropriate to extend the hours. If there are very few, it may not be so appropriate to extend the hours. Indeed, if there is feedback to the department or indeed to government from many people saying that there is not an appropriate timeframe, then it will be changed.

ABORIGINAL CORPORATIONS

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:37): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs a question about Aboriginal corporations.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Whadjuk Aboriginal Corporation, the Aboriginal corporation representing traditional owners in Perth, has been cut off from money that flows from Australia's biggest native title settlement after months of internal turmoil. Industry, government departments and councils that relied on the corporation for heritage work are now paralysed. Whadjuk has been given a default notice which requires it to appoint a special administrator to oversee operations. The crisis is now raising very serious issues of governance in Aboriginal corporations not just in Western Australia but around the country and here, where they seem to be endemic yet nobody, from governments down, seems to care one iota despite hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars either being squandered or misappropriated.

Why is that, minister, because if it was a white corporation, police and ICAC would be all over it? Since your decision to scrap without reason the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee, elders across the state have contacted me, angry and frustrated that you have cut off an avenue to speak directly with their elected representatives to air legitimate grievances of corruption in governance. My questions to the minister are:

1. What, if any, investigations have you launched into similar allegations of poor governance, lack of capacity and corruption in Aboriginal corporations in South Australia?
2. Can you confirm your government paid more than \$50 million to the Narungga Nation Aboriginal Corporation on Yorke Peninsula despite allegations of unauthorised loans and consultancies which have generated a large petition signed by many concerned common law holders of that corporation?
3. Can you provide to the Legislative Council evidence of how these funds were managed or mismanaged?
4. Can you explain how and where First Nations people can raise concerns under the protection of parliamentary privilege afforded them under the standing committee inquiry into Aboriginal governance that you disbanded?
5. Will you support an independent judicial review or royal commission into the governance of Aboriginal corporations in South Australia?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:39): I thank the honourable member for his question. I might dispel some misapprehensions that I think the honourable member is labouring under in some of the ways that the questions were phrased.

The honourable member talked about a situation in Western Australia where implicit in the honourable member's question was the claim that heritage applications or issues had come to a standstill because of an issue with native title. I want to be very clear: they are completely separate things—I suspect—in WA, but they certainly are in South Australia where the native title regime, as I have said in this chamber before, is entirely a creature of commonwealth statute and commonwealth jurisdiction, as opposed to the Aboriginal heritage regime which, under our 1988 legislation in South Australia, is completely separate from native title.

Indeed, the South Australian Aboriginal Heritage Act 1988 went through parliament and came into force before 1992 when *Mabo & Ors v The State of Queensland* (the Mabo decision) was decided in the High Court, so our heritage regime predates native title. Certainly, the requirement under the Aboriginal Heritage Act is consultation with traditional owners, so anything to do with a native title corporation wouldn't necessarily have any effect on the operation of the Heritage Act or heritage applications in South Australia.

As I said, in relation to native title bodies, they are wholly a construct of federal legislation and the federal native title jurisdiction in the Federal Court. The regulation of prescribed bodies

corporate that are established under the Native Title Act falls under the auspices of the Office of the Registrar of Indigenous Corporations (ORIC) under the CATSI Act that many Indigenous corporations are registered under.

Certainly, in South Australia from time to time there have been native title bodies that have been investigated, and there have been some during the history of native title in South Australia that have been placed in administration by ORIC. I think the suggestion that Aboriginal corporations or Aboriginal bodies aren't scrutinised is one that many Aboriginal corporations and bodies, particularly those that have interactions with ORIC, would fundamentally disagree with.

I think many Aboriginal corporations are very well scrutinised and have ORIC conduct audits and also provide guidance on governance, so I just don't accept some sort of view that Aboriginal and particularly native title corporations are less scrutinised than others. In fact, they have an extra layer of scrutiny through the operation of the Office of the Registrar of Indigenous Corporations that they are required, as prescribed bodies corporate under the Native Title Act, to be registered under.

ABORIGINAL CORPORATIONS

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:42): Supplementary: basically, I would like the minister to answer the question. Can you confirm your government paid more than \$50 million to the Narungga Nation Aboriginal Corporation on Yorke Peninsula, despite allegations of unauthorised loans and consultancies which have generated a large petition signed by many concerned common law holders of that corporation, and can you provide the Legislative Council evidence of how these funds were managed or mismanaged?

The PRESIDENT: Do you want to answer that? It's not really a supplementary.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:43): Yes, I am happy to answer it, sir. I will check. I don't think that there was a settlement that was over \$50 million, but I am happy to go and check.

KANGAROO DEATHS, TUNKALILLA

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:43): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development on the topic of animal deaths in Tunkalilla.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Almost six weeks ago, almost 100 kangaroos that were showing severe neurological symptoms and were in distress were euthanised by the PIRSA animal biosecurity team and the National Parks and Wildlife Service at Tunkalilla. Following that, investigations have been undertaken, carcasses were collected and samples were taken. My questions therefore to the government minister are:

1. Were the animals observed as having the staggers, typically associated with grass toxicity poisoning of phalaris or canary grass, prior to their euthanasia?
2. Was the offer of Associate Professor Wayne Boardman to perform necropsies taken up?
3. Will the government release the entire veterinary report?
4. Have any other animal deaths been related to this incident?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:45): Before I begin the answer to that question, I would like to make a clarification to a question I answered earlier today in regard to the SARDI report into fish deaths. The opposition is mistaken in saying that the recommendations begin at No. 4; recommendations Nos 1 to 3 are in the executive summary, according to my advice, so the numbering is consistent and the opposition is wrong yet again.

In terms of the Hon. Ms Franks' question, for which I thank her, I am advised that on Monday 24 and Wednesday 26 March this year the PIRSA animal biosecurity team did attend

Tunkalilla Beach to investigate reports of kangaroo deaths. A mob of approximately 200 kangaroos had been impacted, with approximately half the mob showing mild to severe neurological signs. The animal biosecurity team euthanised approximately 50 animals, and a further 30 were impacted but were not euthanised.

Earlier reports of small numbers of kangaroo deaths on 20 March at this location were thought to be linked to phalaris grass toxicity. Disease investigation by PIRSA concluded that the neurological symptoms experienced by the kangaroos were likely caused by phalaris grass toxicity. The dry conditions, lack of palatable food and high densities of kangaroos may have contributed to the poor condition of the animals. National Parks and Wildlife Service rangers visited the site in the week of 14 April and advised that the situation had improved and the kangaroos remaining at the site looked healthy.

KANGAROO DEATHS, TUNKALILLA

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:47): Supplementary: were the animals observed to have had the staggers prior to their euthanasia?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:47): I am happy to take that on notice and provide a response.

KANGAROO DEATHS, TUNKALILLA

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:47): Supplementary: was the offer of Associate Professor Wayne Boardman to perform necropsies taken up?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:47): I am happy to take that on notice and bring back a response.

KANGAROO DEATHS, TUNKALILLA

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:47): Supplementary: will the government ensure the veterinary report is released in full?

The Hon. C.M. Scriven: Is it from the original answer?

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Are you saying there was no veterinary report? What were you referring to if not the veterinary report? Will you release it in full?

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Ms Franks has asked a supplementary question: minister, you can answer it in whatever way you see fit.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:48): I am happy to take that on notice and bring back a response.

KANGAROO DEATHS, TUNKALILLA

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:48): Final supplementary: have any other animal deaths been related to this incident? All the supplementaries were my four questions that were not answered by your answer. Have any other animal deaths been identified as related to this incident?

The PRESIDENT: Minister, it does not arise from the original answer because you did not make reference to it.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Mr President, that is completely related to the answer given by the minister. Have any other animal deaths been identified as related to this incident? Which water samples, carcasses, were taken? A statement has been made by the minister as to what the government has purported to have identified. Have any other animal deaths been related to this incident?

The PRESIDENT: Minister, you can answer it how you choose to, or not.

ADELAIDE LIGHTNING

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:49): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Sport questions on Adelaide Lightning.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: The Adelaide Lightning, South Australia's most successful sporting team and five-time national champion, is at risk of folding and being removed from the WNBL. Even though the club wants to stay in the league, owner Steve Wren from the Pelligra Group says that they have been rejected for the upcoming season.

New WNBL CEO Jennie Sager has said in recent media that the league still wants a team in Adelaide and is looking at new ways to make this happen. Despite this, the current owners, who hold the rights of the Adelaide Lightning, have indicated that they have not been recently contacted by the WNBL with regard to next steps. My questions to the minister are:

1. What discussions has the minister had with the WNBL?
2. Does the minister know what new ways the WNBL is looking into?
3. Will the Adelaide Lightning remain in the WNBL?
4. What is the government doing to help secure the future of this important club?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:50): I thank the honourable member for her question. This was brought to our attention formally yesterday. We met with the WNBL yesterday, working through those options and what they look like. There are new owners of the WNBL at a national level. We need to be working with not only that league but also Basketball SA, finding out the situation. There are a lot of moving parts at this very point in time with a very short timeframe that has now been made available. So we have definitely entered into the conversations. We would like a quick response to this as well and we will be continuing those conversations.

ADELAIDE LIGHTNING

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:51): Supplementary: thank you, minister, for the update. When did the WNBL first reach out to meet with you?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:51): It was very, very recently, and that's why we met with them as quickly as we could, and that was yesterday. We met with them very, very quickly and had those conversations and asked how can this be progressed as quickly as possible, and where are they going into providing the support for a very successful team in South Australia?

As a government, we have made it very clear that we are very much invested in women's sport. We have invested \$18 million through the Power of Her and through grassroots sport, including basketball, which also supports our elite teams. But we need to know that these conversations can continue. As I said, they started yesterday, and we look forward to seeing where they go.

COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE

The Hon. T.T. NGO (14:52): My question is to the Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services. Can the minister update the council about the recent quick response vehicle additions to the SA Country Fire Service fleet?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:52): I thank the honourable member for his question. Thirty-five quick response vehicles are soon to be commissioned and will be making their way into local Country Fire Service brigades across the state. This rollout of 35 vehicles represents one of the largest rollouts of this type of vehicle in CFS history. The 35 vehicles will be heading to strategic locations across the state to enhance existing capabilities in some areas and replacing existing vehicles that have reached the end of life in other areas.

These purpose-built, high-quality vehicles can support a wide range of firefighting duties, including allowing access to the harshest environments where traditional trucks are unable to get to. These are complex vehicles which are stripped down Toyota Landcruisers, rebuilt to make them fireproof and carry extra weight.

The commissioning of these vehicles includes radio installations, signage, stowage, registration and inspections from the Department for Infrastructure and Transport. It is my understanding that the CFS firmly believes that this type of quick response vehicle is the best example of its kind anywhere in the country.

It was my pleasure to join the federal member for Boothby, Louise Miller-Frost, to see fresh from production the new quick response vehicles, one of which will be going to the Sturt group. The commonwealth funding fought for and won by the local federal member allowed the two first prototypes, which were warmly received at Lobethal and Montacute last year.

These state-of-the-art vehicles will become additions to the South Australian Country Fire Service fleet and we look forward to the delivery of the rest of these vehicles from the interstate factory to assist the hardworking CFS volunteers across our state.

TARRKARRI CENTRE FOR FIRST NATIONS CULTURES

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:54): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Leader of the Government about Tarrkarri.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: The state government launched its long-awaited cultural policy titled 'A Place to Create' on Monday 31 March 2025; however, this 10-year plan does not contain one single reference to the Tarrkarri Centre for First Nations Cultures. On 31 March, InDaily quoted the Hon. Peter Malinauskas as saying that 'the Tarrkarri dream for us is still alive' and that the Premier noted that additional funding partners were needed before progress could be made. The government still has not released the findings of the review undertaken into the Tarrkarri project and the Premier has alluded to 'not insignificant' agreements with private funders, but has not released any details.

According to the opinion piece in InDaily on 6 February 2025, the site of the planned Tarrkarri project has been described as a 'dust bowl' and a 'political stain' for the Premier, with significant delays and cost blowouts causing frustration among stakeholders. My questions to the Leader of the Government are:

1. Given that the work on Tarrkarri has been on hold since October 2022 and the high-level review was handed to the state cabinet two years ago in April 2023, why was Tarrkarri completely omitted from the 'A Place to Create' 10-year cultural policy released last month?
2. When will the government release the findings of the review to make a commitment to the South Australian public about its plans to either progress or shelve the Tarrkarri project?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:56): I thank the honourable member for her question and her interest in this area. I think much of the answer to the question the honourable member helpfully gave as part of her very extensive and well thought out question.

The honourable member outlined some of the comments the Premier has made in relation to the fact that this project is still alive but is needing more support. I have said in this chamber before that, upon coming to government, the advice the government received was that what was planned would be a project that would be of some state interest and perhaps national interest but certainly not on the scale that would attract international interest, and that is something the government is keen on investigating. As the honourable member said, the project is still alive but work continues on looking for further funding, whether that be federal government funding or philanthropic or private sector funding.

PUBLIC HOUSING, ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOUR

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:57): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Attorney-General regarding antisocial behaviour in public housing and SACAT.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Mr Dennis Brown, who is a resident in public housing at Mile End, has reportedly endured serious and repeated incidents involving a neighbouring public housing tenant. This includes faeces being left in his letterbox, an assault requiring 17 stitches and the property being set on fire. Understandably, members of the community are concerned that, even in extreme cases like this, serious antisocial behaviour is not being acted upon swiftly or decisively. My question for the minister is: under this government, what type of antisocial behaviour meets the threshold for immediate eviction through SACAT?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:58): I thank the honourable member for her question. As the honourable member would know, having had portfolio responsibility in some of these sorts of areas previously, there is, and quite rightly, a process before someone is evicted and vacant possession is given.

I understand there are many applications, which might even be into the thousands each year, from the South Australian Housing Trust in relation to antisocial behaviour and I think—but I am happy to check to make sure—some hundreds of orders are made in SACAT for vacant possession after applications from the South Australian Housing Trust. I will have to go away and get some information. I think there was further policy information released earlier this year in relation to Housing Trust tenants.

In relation to my area, which is the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal (SACAT), they do make substantial orders in a whole range of areas, including the housing area, including evictions, and particularly evictions that are applied for by the public housing authorities. I think, in answer to a question in recent weeks, the figure that I remember was SACAT make an order something like every 3.9 minutes. It is a jurisdiction that is exceptionally efficient. It is a high volume jurisdiction making many orders.

PUBLIC HOUSING, ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOUR

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:59): Supplementary: can the minister, and he might need to take this on notice, provide some statistical data in relation to whether the number of orders has increased in recent years or not? I think he quoted an order every 3.9 minutes. Is that more or less than in the past?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:00): I am happy to take that on notice. Over the years that SACAT has been running—I think it's 10 years now that SACAT in South Australia has been running—I know from time to time decisions that this parliament makes adds areas to their jurisdiction. It's probably not an easy comparison to make from year to year, given that SACAT, with each new jurisdiction it takes on, may have areas that are more or less complicated and take more time. So with that caveat I will see if any statistics are available over time, but with the caveats about the different jurisdictions that SACAT inherits as time travels.

FEDERAL LABOR CABINET

The Hon. M. EL DANNAWI (15:01): My question is to the Attorney-General. How has South Australia benefited from having South Australians in senior positions in the Albanese Labor government, and how has this benefited legal services in South Australia?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:01): I thank the member for her excellent question that specifically relates to how South Australia has benefited from having so many senior members of the federal Labor government from South Australia. I will give just a couple of examples.

The honourable member particularly talked about access to justice. Last year—and I think I have outlined some of this in previous answers to the chamber—South Australia signed up to the National Access to Justice Partnership. This agreement provided more than \$300 million for South Australian legal services, including things like community legal centres, women's legal services, family violence prevention legal services, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander legal services and the Legal Services Commission. It was a significant increase on what had been provided under the previous NLAP agreement.

If you think about some of the other areas where South Australia has benefited from having the input of many senior cabinet ministers from South Australia, you need to think no further than something that the Hon. Robert Simms mentioned in a question yesterday, and that is the Whyalla Steelworks. It is an exceptionally significant partnership between the South Australian government and the federal government that no doubt has benefited from having so many senior people from South Australia in the federal Labor cabinet.

You need to think no further than Senator Penny Wong, the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Leader of the Government in the Senate, and Senator Don Farrell, Minister for Trade and Tourism and Deputy Leader in the Senate. It is quite remarkable that we have both the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Senate hailing from South Australia as exceptionally senior ministers in the government. You also have people like Mark Butler, the member for Hindmarsh, as the Minister for Health and Aged Care, or Amanda Rishworth, the member for Kingston, who is the Minister for the NDIS and Minister for Social Services.

We have extraordinarily senior people in the federal government, and I think it stands in stark, stark comparison to what would be offered and what benefits South Australia would have from having a Liberal government. They have a single member in the shadow cabinet, Senator Anne Ruston—a single member in the shadow cabinet, not in the outer ministry. One single member from South Australia is in the shadow cabinet, and we well remember how that senator was treated in the latest round of preselections. The Hon. Michelle Lensink would well remember how Senator Anne Ruston was treated in the last round of preselections.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Point of order.

The PRESIDENT: I will listen to your point of order. What is your point of order?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: My point of order is: how is the opposition relevant when it wasn't part of the question?

The PRESIDENT: Minister, I know that you are going to wind this diatribe up shortly.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am going to wrap up shortly, sir, but I appreciate the honourable member asking me about the benefits of South Australia having so many senior members of a federal cabinet, and I will briefly—and I will take your advice—compare and contrast to what would be on offer if there was a change of government. As I said, before I was interrupted—and I can understand why the Hon. Michelle Lensink would want to interrupt me: the embarrassment of having Senator Anne Ruston, the sole member of the federal shadow cabinet being demoted to number two. Having the hardcore right—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: We had the Hon. Ben Hood try to interrupt, and he knows this too: having the extreme right-wing forces within the Liberal Party demoting the one member of federal cabinet. We are seeing it time and time again. I will conclude by talking about how clever members opposite have thought it is to replicate Trump-style politics in Australia and South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: And South Australia. We saw how that has played out. Let's look at the latest foray into Trump-style politics last year: the Hon. Ben Hood's late-term abortion bill and the way that was campaigned for. We saw how that worked out, didn't we? We saw how that worked out, that extraordinary right-wing extremism.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Attorney, that was sort of on the edge of the time limit you are allowed to have for a Dorothy Dixier, alright?

REGIONAL HOUSING

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:06): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question without notice to the Minister for Regional Development on the topic of regional housing.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: This morning, Anglicare released its annual housing affordability snapshot. The report shows that for a single person on JobSeeker or Youth Allowance there are no affordable homes in regional South Australia, not even in share house accommodation—not even one affordable home. For a single person on the minimum wage only 5 per cent of properties were affordable in north and west country SA, the Limestone Coast, the Riverland and the Murraylands. The report by Anglicare recommends more social and affordable homes and states:

With the private rental market failing so many people, we must invest in homes for people [that] need them most. Ending our affordable housing shortfall would be the most powerful way to tackle the rental crisis—and boost our regional economy. The Federal and State governments must work together [to] end this shortfall.

My question to the Minister for Regional Development is:

1. How many public houses and affordable homes have been built by the Malinauskas government in the regions so far?
2. When will people in the regions expect to see more housing delivered?
3. Is the minister concerned that affordable housing is out of reach for her constituents in regional South Australia?
4. Will she advocate for a rent freeze to finally provide renters in the regions with some relief?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:07): I thank the honourable member for his question. I will refer the question to the Minister for Housing and bring back a response.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Can you stop wasting your question time? The Hon. Ben Hood.

SARDI FISH DEATHS

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (15:08): Thank you, Mr President. What a rabble.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ben Hood, just get on with your question.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD: I seek leave to ask a question of the Minister for Primary Industries about fish deaths at the SARDI aquatic research facility at West Beach.

The PRESIDENT: Are you seeking leave or just asking the question?

The Hon. B.R. HOOD: I am seeking leave, thank you, to make a brief explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD: When asked previously by the Leader of the Opposition earlier as to why recommendations in the report started at No. 4, the minister said the recommendations numbered 1 to 3 were in the executive summary and the opposition was wrong. The points or recommendations 1 to 3 in the executive summary are exactly the same, word for word, as the recommendations listed at 4 to 6 in the recommendation sections. They are not additional recommendations but the same points. My question to the minister is:

1. Why is she wrong about this?
2. What happened to the recommendations 1 to 3?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:09): I thank the honourable member for his question, which entirely supports what I said: recommendations 1 to 3 are in the executive summary. If the opposition was closely reading the recommendations, both those in the executive summary and in the body of the report, they would have seen that they were the same and, therefore, it was clearly a formatting error to have 4 to 6 in the second lot. It was exactly what I said, that the numbers, the recommendations, were in the executive summary.

Obviously, those opposite like to fill up question time with discussions around typos in reports. If that is what their priorities are it doesn't surprise me because, as we know, they are not really concerned about the issues facing South Australians, they are not really concerned about coming up with constructive ideas to address the issues that are being faced by South Australians. What they are interested in, as evidenced by spending question time talking about typos in a report, is trying to score petty little political points.

If the suggestion, if the interpretation, by those opposite is that somehow some recommendations have been removed, I can reiterate again that no, they have not. There is a typo. The first three recommendations in the executive summary are exactly the same as the three recommendations in the body of the report. If they bothered to read the report, they would have seen that.

CHINESE TRADE RELATIONSHIPS

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:11): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister inform the chamber about the positive impacts for South Australian farmers, for South Australian growers and fishers, following the state and federal government's re-establishing trade relationships with China?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:11): I thank the honourable member for his question. In May 2022 the federal Coalition lost government, but by then our state's key export industries had been harshly exposed by the damaged relationship of the Coalition government with our largest trading partner, China. The Morrison government and its then South Australian MPs Nicole Flint, James Stevens, Rowan Ramsey and Tony Pasin had left that mess behind.

The damaged relationship led to severe tariffs and trade restrictions placed by China, which had an enormous impact on our state's wine and seafood sectors, and timber, barley and beef as well, causing years of pain for South Australian growers, producers, winemakers and rock lobster fishers who were previously exporting product to China—in some cases, most of their product to China.

Of course, as we know, the former state Liberal government stood on the sidelines while this happened, in much the same way as the members I mentioned a moment ago—including the member for Barker, Tony Pasin, despite his party's actions resulting in such devastating consequences for so many businesses in the Barker electorate and across the state. The Leader of the Opposition in this chamber talks a lot about advocacy, but we did not hear very much from her at the time as a member of the state government that was standing idly by.

Fast-forward to 2025 and, fortunately, we are in a very different space. Both the Malinauskas and Albanese governments have worked extremely hard to rebuild the relationship with such an important trade partner, because we know how incredibly important it is to our state's agricultural and fishing industries, the communities they support and the state's economy more broadly.

I was fortunate to visit China in the early part of last year as part of progressing our state's wine and seafood industry re-entry into the Chinese market, and I was heartened by the knowledge and appreciation of our state's premium wine and seafood—the best, I would say, in the world. Over the past few years a number of state and federal colleagues have also visited China including, of course, the Prime Minister, the Premier, and federal trade minister Don Farrell, with a firm mission to see South Australian product back on Chinese menus. In recent weeks my colleagues the Deputy Premier, Susan Close, and Joe Szakacs, Minister for Trade and Investment, have also been in China.

Following the calm, determined and diligent work of both state and federal Labor governments, and those in the wine and seafood industries, as well as others, our premium produce is back on Chinese menus and tables—and it is back with a bang, having exported more than \$850 million worth of products in the year to February 2025. That is \$850 million worth of products, and the flow-on effects in a positive way to our economy and our producers are indeed intense.

We have seen seafood exports to China grow by almost 500 per cent in the year to February, rising to \$63.3 million. After just two months of trade restrictions and barriers being removed, we have seen \$47.1 million in southern rock lobster exports alone. It was great to hear on radio during this morning's *FIVEaa Breaking at 8* from Mitchell Taylor, chief winemaker and managing director of Clare Valley's famous Taylors Wines, talking about wine exports to China returning to pre-COVID levels and his appreciation for the 'great work' done by federal trade minister Don Farrell in opening up our relationships with China.

Of course, this stands in direct contrast with the devastation brought by the former Morrison government of which, of course, Peter Dutton was a key part—devastation to South Australian exporters. What do we see from the opposition here? Derision; they don't care. They don't care that this is what producers had to endure because of their federal colleagues when they were in government, and they don't care again that, if there was a change of government, their mates in Canberra would not be giving a toss about South Australia and our industries.

It is all money that flows back to our businesses, communities and economy. The fact that the former state and federal governments either caused or sat idly by as it happened flies in the face of our hardworking growers and producers, who just want to be able to grow or catch their product and not be victims of those opposite and their mates.

The relentlessly negative member for Barker seemingly spends a lot of time doing two things: trying to take control of the Liberal Party and criticising the Labor government. I will tell you what he didn't do: he didn't use his position in the former government to have any influence on his superiors, and he didn't do anything to address the pain of the huge number of wine and seafood businesses in his electorate as well as others.

It has taken a Labor government at both state and federal level to get back to where we are today. I am very pleased for our state's wine and seafood exporters that our products are once again in such high demand in China—supporting jobs, businesses and, importantly, regional communities.

FORENSIC PSYCHIATRY

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:17): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services a question regarding the state's shortage of forensic psychiatrists.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: An article appearing in *The Advertiser* yesterday details a severe shortage of expertise in the field of forensic psychiatry in South Australia, an underappreciated but essential role when it comes to ensuring prisoners are treated with dignity. Forensic psychiatry as a subspecialty intersects criminal law and psychiatry. Practitioners treat people with serious mental illness who come into contact with the justice system and assess their mental competence to stand trial and ability to grasp criminal responsibility with the assistance of the courts. They also determine the likelihood of recidivism in an offender, and this is particularly important given the high rate of mental health issues amongst offenders in both the adult and minor jurisdictions.

The article cites Parole Board chairwoman Frances Nelson KC's assessment of the results of the shortage, in which she says, and I quote:

It can be up to three months that we are waiting for a report to be prepared on one individual...And obviously if we're waiting for a psychiatric report, the prisoner is going to wait in custody until such time we get it and assess it.

The Psychiatry Workforce Plan commissioned and released late last year by the state government recognised the critical workforce shortage in private and public psychiatric expertise, including the forensic specialty. Therefore, my questions to the minister are:

1. Can the minister provide an update on the state government's recruitment campaign undertaken as a result of that workforce plan recommendation?
2. Can the minister inform the chamber as to whether there are any plans to change South Australia's rate of beds for forensic patients, which currently ranks the lowest in any Australian jurisdiction?
3. Does the minister accept that time spent in custody as a result of workforce shortages presents a much likelier outcome for recidivism?

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. As I have highlighted in this chamber before, South Australia does have the lowest rate of reoffending in the country. But in regard to this particular matter, I appreciate her raising concerns. I am advised that, upon entering the prison system, all prisoners are assessed by DCS in conjunction with the South Australia Prison Health Service, which is part of the South Australian health network, so coordinated by SA Health.

As this is more of a SA Health matter in regard to what we are doing in this space, I am advised that the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare website shows that SA has the equal highest number of forensic public mental health beds per capita in the country. The state government appreciates the important role forensic psychiatrists and psychologists play in court proceedings. The health and justice systems work closely together to monitor demand and timeframes associated with the provision of forensic reports to the court to ensure that processes are as effective as they can possibly be.

I am also advised that the state government commissioned and has recently released the Psychiatry Workforce Plan for South Australia, recognising critical workforce shortages in psychiatry across both the public and private sector, including forensic specialists. This long-term workforce plan has been developed in partnership with psychiatrists.

I am advised that the recruitment campaign is now underway and was one of the key recommendations from this plan. In addition, I am advised the plan's key findings, including recruitment shortages in the shorter term, increase in training and specific strategies for specialists in these areas, are something that they are focusing on.

FORENSIC PSYCHIATRY

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:21): Supplementary: despite the low recidivism rates that the minister refers to, does the minister accept that it is unacceptable to wait up to three months to have such a report prepared for somebody who is waiting in custody?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:21): As I said earlier, this does fall under SA Health. I am happy to look into further information that can be found in this space. It is my understanding that they do work as quickly as they possibly can in providing those reports.

Matters of Interest

PUBLIC HOUSING

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:22): I would like to speak about Labor's shameful record in public housing. During Labor's 16 years in office prior to 2018, they sold off seven and a half thousand public houses to the tune of \$1.5 billion, including estates established by Sir Thomas Playford. Their view internally was that there were no votes in public housing. It was Labor's intention to reduce the public housing stock to 30,000 properties.

Labor Treasurer Jack Snelling was outed on these plans in a talkback radio interview with Mr Leon Byner, a veteran of radio station FIVEaa, and I quote:

The problem that we've got is we have a very high public housing stock compared to interstate and that's just an historical thing.

Mr Byner says:

Isn't that a good thing?

Mr Snelling replies:

No, it isn't.

He then goes on to talk about CRA. Mr Byner says:

We've got about 45,000 in round terms, what would you have that down to?

Mr Snelling replied:

I think if we were to be at the national average and I'm not saying that's where we'd go...it would bring us down to probably around 30,000.

Some six months later, Mr Snelling was back on radio reiterating Labor's plans. Mr Byner says in the interview:

Hang on, you told me you were going to reduce the amount of public housing from 45,000 to 30,000. You're still sticking to that?

Mr Snelling said:

Yeah, indeed.

Labor had baked in forward sales of public homes to prop up their budget, which sat at about 400 per annum when the Liberal Party came to office in 2018. We managed to reduce that to 150 per annum, and by 2022 that was zero. Labor needs to make amends for their past sins through a commitment to build an additional 400 houses during this term to make up for their crimes of the past.

Now that they are back in office, however, destruction of public housing continues on other fronts. Antisocial behaviour, which dropped under the Marshall government, has now increased so dramatically that security staff are needed to provide a safer environment for Housing SA staff.

When we were in government, we changed the policy. We reduced Labor's seven warnings to three, which saw Trust tenants who engaged in illegal activity taken to the tribunal for immediate eviction. We kept strikes active for 12 months instead of Labor's six months. This led to 146 evictions in the first 12 months of its operation and led to a reduction in antisocial behaviour because tenants understood the rules. We know that antisocial behaviour has increased by 25 per cent under the current government and it is a major contributor to housing damage.

In terms of maintenance and vacant houses, Labor has signed up to a maintenance contract which has left critical repairs undone for months on end. FOI data obtained by the Liberal Party has shown that the percentage of priority 1 repairs—that is, those that are immediately dangerous, such as an exposed live electrical wire—not being commenced within the required four hours has doubled. Similarly, the priority 2 repairs, which cause serious inconvenience—such as a blocked toilet—and should be started within 24 hours, blew out by 50 per cent.

Overdue vacancy maintenance works peaked in September 2023, but the number of vacant properties continued to rise and peaked in June 2024. We continue to receive complaints from Housing Trust tenants about long delays in maintenance work. The number of vacant properties has increased by 20 per cent since the commencement of Labor's contracts, and the most recent number that is publicly available for empty public housing property data sits at 1,927 under Minister Champion. As the state's largest landlord, with public funding of close to \$1 billion, the maintenance contract needs to be independently examined by the Auditor-General.

The impact of this is harsh on tenants and it is harsh on tenants' neighbours. Public housing tenants should not have to wait for months and months to have critical repairs done. The impact is also felt by people who are experiencing homelessness. We released a 10-point plan in July 2022 to assist people in the rental market and those who are at risk of homelessness, and while it was a slow start for the new government we are pleased that they have adopted approximately two-thirds of our suggestions.

I am also pleased that the Labor Party finally accepted calls not just from the Liberal Party but from those who have experienced homelessness firsthand that public housing maintenance can

be done after someone has moved into a home. If the house is safe to live in, jobs such as painting and landscaping can wait, rather than keeping people living in their cars or sleeping on their friends' couches. Labor's commitments to public housing pale into insignificance in comparison to the Liberal Party's record spend of \$168 million in one year alone in our final year in office.

Time expired.

FALL OF SAIGON ANNIVERSARY

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:27): Fifty years ago today, on 30 April 1975, the North Vietnamese communists invaded South Vietnam and took over the city of Saigon. For Vietnamese refugees around the world, this day is remembered as Black April. The international Vietnamese community commemorates Black April and honours the fallen soldiers and compatriots who sacrificed their lives. We grieve for what has happened to Vietnam over the last 50 years. The Vietnamese communist government's abuse of power is a source of great pain for many Vietnamese, both in Vietnam and abroad. Our questions to the Vietnamese communist government are:

- Why, after 50 years of ruling Vietnam with hundreds of billions of dollars in foreign investment and foreign aid, does Vietnam still remain one of the poorest countries?
- Why, after 50 years, do Vietnamese people still lack basic health care and millions go hungry every day?
- Why does Vietnam remain one of the most corrupt countries in the world?
- Why, for 50 years, have the Vietnamese people been denied freedom of political association, freedom of the press and freedom of religion?
- Why does the government continue to crack down on human rights activists and those with differing views?
- Why, after 50 years, are so many people still trying to leave Vietnam by any means possible?

As we commemorate this dark day, the Vietnamese Australian community also remembers how fortunate we are to call Australia home. In this country, our rights and freedoms are protected. Those who have fled war and oppression—myself and many others—have been granted the chance to live safe, peaceful and free lives. We were welcomed with open arms and given the opportunity to rebuild our lives.

We thank Australia and its people for warmly welcoming and accepting the hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese refugees and migrants. We owe a debt of gratitude to the many Australians who gave their lives and their future in the Vietnam War, and also to the many Australian families who lost their loved ones. To repay this debt, Vietnamese Australians past, present and future live our lives in a way that betters this country, so we can honour those men and women who made the ultimate sacrifice to protect our freedom and our way of life. Thank you, Australia. Lest we forget.

DEFIBRILLATORS

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:30): Tomorrow morning I will be attending the launch of a new life-saving program at the Grange Golf Club born out of the nation-leading legislation in South Australia making defibrillators (AEDs) mandatory in the community. The rollout of AEDs started in January this year in public buildings and next year extends into the private sector.

I am pleased to say that the business, sporting and general communities and groups have enthusiastically embraced this groundbreaking move, and South Australia is now well on the way to becoming the largest heart-safe community on the planet. I am seeing a lot more AEDs installed everywhere I go. I was on Kangaroo Island recently, where there are now more than 50 AED locations around the island, including at tourist hotspots like Seal Bay, Admirals Arch and Remarkable Rocks. I have people and organisations asking me about it and saying how thankful they are that these devices are now so widely accessible. Let's hope other states soon follow our lead.

The statistics around cardiac arrest are still disturbing. It is one of the biggest causes of death and disability in Australia, with nearly 30,000 dying each year. We all know someone who has experienced cardiac arrest or died from it. In the past few weeks alone two of my friends have passed away, while I see reports in the media where people have died because of sudden cardiac arrest or where they have been revived because an AED was nearby and there were persons in the vicinity who could use one in association with administering CPR. Cardiac arrest does not discriminate and can occur at any time and at any age. The survival rate is less than 10 per cent, unless there is early intervention, and we are talking about minutes here.

A quick response results in survival rates as high as 89 per cent. Eighty per cent of SCAs happen outside hospital—at home, the workplace or at sporting events. That brings me to the HeartSmart model being adopted by golf clubs around the country, where a large sprinkling of seniors play the game, which also makes them a common place for health incidents. HeartSmart has been developed with input from Ambulance Victoria, NSW Ambulance, Monash, La Trobe and Victoria universities, the South Australian government and industry leaders.

Our health minister, Chris Picton, is very supportive, and I understand HeartSmart will have a more visible presence at coming LIV Golf tournaments. Here is how it works: being a HeartSmart Club provides staff members and guests with the knowledge, confidence and tools to be well prepared in the event of a cardiac arrest occurring. It demonstrates and encourages a genuine culture of caring through awareness and instilling confidence in how to handle these situations, particularly when it comes to administering CPR.

Importantly, this awareness and creating pathways to act in these emergencies also assist in filling the gap before state emergency services, like paramedics, arrive on the scene. Every minute is critical, so having individuals on hand who know what to do is so important. It is all well and good to have these AEDs blinking away in a box in the clubhouse or dotted around the course, but this is about knowing what to do and how to handle the situation when needed.

HeartSmart, through its ongoing training and information program, put into practice by a team with expertise in paramedicine, health, psychology, workplace health and safety, helped State Emergency Services strengthen the four steps of the chain of survival. They are: recognising symptoms, calling for help, CPR and defibrillation. It also assists clubs with their legal requirements under legislation, like we have, and ensuring the equipment is maintained and ready to use.

Grange Golf Club is looking to invest in a CPR helper to be on every golf cart to close the gap in any response to a sudden cardiac arrest and accessing an AED. Programs like BeHeart Smart will definitely help improve survival rates while increasing the number of Australians trained in CPR and defibrillation. They can make a vital difference between life and death. I urge more sporting clubs to follow the lead of the Grange Golf Club.

HeartSmart has also enlisted the help of highly respected medical practitioner Dr Peter Larkins, renowned for his work in Australian rules football. He is an ambassador for HeartSmart. I am also pleased and honoured to be an ambassador. All I need to do now is work on my swing and handicap.

DECRIMINALISATION OF HOMOSEXUALITY

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (15:35): This year, 2025, marks 50 years since the decriminalisation of homosexuality in South Australia. Decriminalisation came from the work of many activists who championed equality and inclusion against systemic injustice. Today, I rise to retell a similar story of change labelled the 'greatest gay victory of the time'.

The first Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM), published in 1952, classified homosexuality as 'sexual deviation' within a larger category of 'sociopathic personality disturbance disorders', including transvestism, paedophilia, fetishism and sexual sadism. The American Psychiatric Association (APA) codified homosexuality as unnatural compared to heterosexuality.

In the wake of the 1969 Stonewall riots in New York City, gay rights activists began protesting about the classification. At the 1970 APA convention, activists targeted psychiatrists who argued homosexuality could be cured, and during the presentation of a paper discussing the use of aversion

practices to treat sexual deviation, gay rights activists interrupted and were heard to shout 'Vicious!', 'Torture!' and, 'Where did you take your residency?'

Protesters were met with retaliation, being called 'maniacs', 'paranoid fools', 'bitches', and one psychiatrist called the police to come and shoot the protesters. Kent Robinson, a psychiatrist sympathetic to the gay community's concerns, met with Larry Littlejohn, a protester. The two agreed they needed to have gay community involvement at the 1971 APA convention and a panel discussion, entitled *Gay is Good*, was held platforming activists to speak on stigma and discrimination.

The following year, a psychiatrist, Dr H. Anonymous, led the panel dressed in an oversized suit and mask because he feared his career would be jeopardised as a psychiatrist and he would not get to work in his field if it was known that he was supporting gay activists in addressing their concerns. A booth at the convention encouraged psychiatrist support, declassifying homosexuality with the phrase 'gay, proud and healthy'. They published a flyer emphasising that:

Psychiatry...has been the major single obstacle in our society to the advancement of homosexuals and to the achievement of our full rights, our full happiness and our basic human dignity. Psychiatry can become our major ally.

Support from within the psychiatric profession to declassify homosexuality was growing. APA vice-president Judd Marmor expressed these concerns well. He said:

The cruelty, the thoughtlessness, the lack of common humanity, in the attitudes reflected by many conservative psychiatrists is I think a disgrace to our profession.

Pressure from within the APA and gay rights activists saw progress in the sixth printing of the DSM-II in 1973. There was a change in language from 'homosexuality' to 'sexual orientation disturbance'. This shifted focus towards distress caused by same-sex attraction or the desire to change it—not entirely a satisfactory change to modern thinking, but for its time, revolutionary.

The APA held a referendum amongst members in 1974 that supported this change with a 58 per cent majority. With that, gay rights activists had won what was labelled back in the early seventies a 'decade long battle'. Subsequent editions of the DSM continued to focus on distress about sexual orientation until 2013 when any diagnostic category relating to sexual orientation was removed completely with the release of DSM-5, in 2013! It was 43-year battle for a change that required a bit of copying, pasting and editing in the psychiatric handbook.

In 2024, the Malinauskas Labor government and this chamber banned conversion practices. This recognises the ongoing need to protect the rights of LGBTI people from harm and interference by conversion practice proponents, which we know on the evidence of people who have been through this is still happening now, operating on psychiatric beliefs that are now out of date and have subsequently been discredited by any worthwhile psychiatric practitioner for more than half a century.

The 1970s were a key turning point in the fight for gay liberation. In the space of 10 years we went from being deviants and criminals to disturbed and criminals to, at least in my case, being very cranky and determined to change all of these things.

GENERATIONS IN JAZZ

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (15:40): Today, I rise to speak on a really big tent in a paddock in the Limestone Coast, a really big tent that this weekend is going to be full of jazz, all that jazz, at the Generations in Jazz festival, something that has been going on since 1987 right in Mount Gambier. It is going to be amazing, as it always is amazing.

I have been involved with Generations in Jazz since 2010, when I used to help out with live event filming and with a website and with the amazing volunteers who put this show on where you see over 4,000 kids from around Australia, indeed around the world. People actually fly to Australia to take part in this festival.

These kids get the experience of a lifetime. Not only are they performing amazing jazz set pieces put together by some of the best jazz musicians in the world but they are learning to be better jazz musicians from people like James Morrison; Ross Irwin; James Muller; Wycliffe Gordon; Graeme Lyall; Gordon Goodwin; Jeff Clayton, who is an amazing saxophonist; Jimmy Cobb, a legendary

drummer from Miles Davis' *Kind of Blue* album; and Liam Burrows—it just does not stop. It is amazing jazz that we see coming out of Mount Gambier and, as I said, it is on this weekend and I cannot wait for it.

What Generations in Jazz does is unlike any other festival for kids around the world. It gives a platform for secondary school big bands and vocal ensembles; encourages participation from public and private catholic independent schools; offers an opportunity for students to perform, learn and be adjudicated by the very best; fosters a growth in jazz music; and inspires young people to achieve.

I have spoken with parents across South Australia when they learn I am from Mount Gambier and they say, 'Oh, my kid is heading to Generations in Jazz.' If it is their first time I say to them, 'Your kid is not going to come back the same kid. They are going to be just so filled with opportunity and with ambition to be a better musician.' As a musician myself, I sit there watching these kids and I am humbled at how good they are. You are talking about 12, 13 and 14-year-old kids who can just wail on drums, sax, xylophones, whatever you want. These kids do such an amazing job and it just warms my heart to know it is happening in the Limestone Coast, that it is happening in regional South Australia.

As I said, it started in 1987 and it has just grown. I remember that when I was first involved we were in a little tent. You might have got 2,000 people there. Now you crest over the hill heading towards The Barn Palais and there is literally a circus tent, the largest modular tent in the world, sitting there in a paddock in Mount Gambier. As I said, we fit over 4,000 kids. They come to Mount Gambier in buses. There are buses lined up for days.

The people of Mount Gambier get together and rent out their homes. The accommodation offering in Mount Gambier is completely booked out and it is not only Mount Gambier but Penola, Millicent, Naracoorte and everywhere through the South-East that people are staying. It is an absolute amazing thing to behold, and I encourage anyone if you have never seen Generations in Jazz to make sure you make the trip to Mount Gambier. Make sure you book early because you are not going to be able to get any accommodation.

It has been going for years. There was a slight hiccup with COVID, but the Generations in Jazz team still got together and put together a virtual Generations in Jazz, one that was online. We are now back in the tent, we are ready to go and put on an amazing show for the people of Mount Gambier, and the people of Australia as well.

There will be people competing. Kids will be competing for the James Morrison Jazz Scholarship: \$10,000 awarded to a solo instrumentalist. There will be a Generations in Jazz vocal scholarship. Again, as someone who likes to sing—not particularly great—watching these people sing is absolutely mind-blowing for the talent that we have right here in South Australia.

Congratulations to every single volunteer who helps put on Generations in Jazz. Thank you to everyone who has been involved previously putting on this event. Long may it continue in Mount Gambier. Long may it continue in the Limestone Coast. It is bringing all that jazz to the regions and I cannot wait to be there on Friday, on Saturday and on Sunday for Generations in Jazz.

PREFERENCE DEALS

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:45): I regret that my speech is not going to be music to the ears of the honourable member because I am about to speak about the dirty deal between the Liberals and One Nation, a matter that I know will be of concern to many people in our state. It is an issue that has not had appropriate focus during this election campaign, but just a week or so ago the Liberal Party quietly announced that in 139 of the 147 seats where One Nation is running a candidate the Coalition will recommend that its voters put One Nation above the Labor Party.

In 55 of these seats, the Coalition has placed One Nation candidates in second place. In the rest of the seats, candidates from minor conservative groupings like Family First and the Libertarian Party are being preferenced before One Nation, but One Nation is still ranked before Labor and, of course, before the Greens. The Coalition has also given One Nation top ranking on its Senate preference sheets after its own candidates in Queensland, WA, SA and Tasmania.

What does this mean in practical terms? In South Australia, according to the polls, we have a very tight race for the Senate and, according to the latest opinion polls, the Liberal Party are polling at around 30 per cent. As a result of this preference deal, they all but guarantee the election of a One Nation Senator should their preferences flow the way they are recommending.

What does this say about the modern Liberal Party? John Howard was very clear that the Liberal Party would never preference One Nation. Indeed, back in 1998, he said:

We will not be entering into any coalition or preference deals with One Nation. Their policies are divisive and not in line with the values of the Liberal Party.

Tony Abbott in 2011:

We will not be entering into any coalition or preference deals with One Nation. Their policies are divisive.

Tony Abbott in 2013:

The Liberal Party will preference One Nation below the Labor Party at the federal election.

Malcolm Turnbull in 2017:

We will not be doing any preference deals with One Nation. We are a mainstream party, and we will not be trading preferences with extremists.

Peter Dutton in 2017:

The Liberal Party will preference One Nation below the Labor Party.

In 2019, Peter Dutton said:

We will not be doing any preference deals with One Nation. We are a mainstream party...

What does it say about the modern Liberal Party that they would get into bed with extremists like One Nation? *The Saturday Paper* wrote an interesting exposé on this, and I quote from Mike Secombe where he interviews key people within the Liberal Party in his article 'Devastating: Inside the Liberals' One Nation deal'. He speaks to long-term Liberal, Jim Barron, who notes that:

All these years later, the Liberal Party has embraced the person who it once excommunicated.

This is Pauline Hanson. He says:

It's devastating. And I think that says more about the Liberal Party than it does about One Nation. Its radical, hardline racist policies used to be at the fringes of politics. Now they no longer live on the fringe. The Liberal Party has pretty much normalised a lot of what Hanson was going on about.

What a disgrace. And what exactly are One Nation's policies? Here is a little snapshot for you. They want to ban Muslim immigration. They want to ban burkas. Pauline Hanson wants to ban halal certification, she says it funds terrorism. They want to conduct surveillance in mosques. They want to abolish native title claims. They want to cut Indigenous programs. They want to withdraw Australia from global bodies—from the United Nations, the World Health Organization. They do not support climate change, of course. They oppose same-sex marriage. They oppose foreign aid. They oppose gun control, one of John Howard's great achievements when he was in office.

I do not have enough time to talk about the myriad toxic policies of One Nation's political handmaiden Family First, the homophobic, transphobic, sexist and misogynistic political party at a national level that offers a very dangerous vision for our society. But might I say I am deeply concerned about what the Liberal Party are doing here. They run the risk of giving Pauline Hanson and One Nation a serious leg-up and Lyle Shelton, the former ACL advocate, a leg-up in the federal parliament. It is a disgrace, and they should be held to account by the South Australian people on Saturday.

FALL OF SAIGON ANNIVERSARY

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:51): Fifty years ago today tanks rolled into Saigon, and that marked the moment that the Republic of Vietnam's capital fell to the communists and really, I think, was a moment that shook the world. That moment marked the end of two decades of pretty brutal conflict. It also reflected the conclusion of any democratic rule within the sovereign nation of South Vietnam.

Back home, the Vietnam War, it is fair to say, was a nation-defining conflict. It was a nation-defining conflict because it was fought in the years after the war that was termed the war to end all wars. It was fought just years after the conflict in Korea, and it again demonstrated a commitment and a willingness of our nation, Australia, to fight for what is just, to stand shoulder to shoulder with those in Vietnam who fought for democracy and stood for freedom and for many of the things that we take for granted today and we are going to do this weekend.

More than 50,000 serving Australians never returned from the battlefield, including many South Australians whose loss I know is still felt by so many here today. We also, I think, as a nation, have much to learn from the way that we welcomed home those who did serve. We should reflect on that shameful part of our history, but we should also probably recognise and build on the lessons that we can learn from that.

The cost of this conflict to the Vietnamese people is beyond comprehension. More than four million people were killed or wounded in the course of the war. But the fall of Saigon did not just end the brutality for so many people in South Vietnam. We know that the introduction of the communist oppression in South Vietnam brought a new regime of cruelty and oppression for so many innocent people and indeed families, which is why, of course, over two million people from South Vietnam sought refuge in places that were to become their homelands.

That brings us back to Australia. I believe that we as a nation, and indeed South Australia as a state, define ourselves by the safety, the refuge and the hope that we can and that we did provide to the tens of thousands who fled South Vietnam and found our shores, the safety and the refuge we provided to those who now call South Australia home, those refugees who sought nothing more than freedom of speech, freedom of association and that fundamental freedom of safety.

So today is about more than just commemorating. Today is a day when we must commit ourselves to action. Whilst I think it is proper and important to recognise the service, to recognise the loss, to recognise the trauma and to recognise the fall of Saigon, we must also commit ourselves to continuing to pursue unequivocally the same ideals that took us to Vietnam in the first place, the same ideals that took Vietnam itself to conflict; that is, the pursuit of democratic ideals and democratic freedoms.

Today, I shared the great honour of attending the commemoration services marking the 50th anniversary of the fall of Saigon, and it was so good to see so many, and a broad spectrum, of my parliamentary colleagues, including the Premier and the opposition leader and, indeed, the Hon. Tung Ngo, attend the service with me today. I want to thank Mr Nguyen, the President of the Republic of Vietnam Veterans Association of South Australia, and Ms Quin Tran, President of the Vietnamese Community in South Australia, for extending the invitation to today's service.

Today is the day that we reflect on the profound loss, the profound sorrow and remembrance, but it is also a day that I believe reminds us of the strength of the human spirit, of courage in the face of severe adversity, of resilience in the face of loss, of hope amidst the greatest of tragedies, which is the loss of what you call home. But the finding of a new home perhaps brings us to say, 'Lest We Forget'.

Members

MEMBER'S LEAVE

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:56): I move:

That further leave of absence be granted to the Hon. R.B. Martin until 19 August 2025 on account of medical treatment.

Motion carried.

Motions

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN CRICKET TEAM

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:56): I move:

That this council—

1. Congratulates the South Australian Cricket Team on winning the 2024-25 Sheffield Shield;
2. Notes the win is South Australia's first in almost 30 years;
3. Acknowledges the historic nature of South Australia's double trophy after also winning the state's first One-Day Cup in 13 years;
4. Recognises the exceptional effort and performance of the entire squad; and
5. Acknowledges the efforts of the state government, Adelaide City Council and the South Australian Cricket Association in transforming Karen Rolton Oval, doubling its capacity for the event.

I offer my congratulations to the South Australian men's cricket team on an incredible season, one that will be etched into the sporting history of our state. After nearly three decades, South Australians have brought the Sheffield Shield home once again. That is no small feat; our last win was back in the 1995-96 season, and for many South Australians this is the first time in their life they have seen our state lift the shield.

However, it was not just a win: it was a statement, a demonstration of resilience, teamwork, and the determination to bring glory back to South Australian cricket. To top it off, the squad also clinched the One-Day Cup in the lead-up, securing a rare and historic double.

Behind the success is a team effort. In his first season as coach, Ryan Harris has led with strength and vision, and captain Nathan McSweeney has been nothing short of inspiring, lifting the performance of everyone around him. Together they guided this group with belief.

The transformation of Karen Rolton Oval into a true experience gave fans a front row seat to history. Thanks to the support of the South Australian Cricket Association, the City of Adelaide and the Malinauskas Labor government the venue was enhanced to accommodate 10,000 people, from a 300-seat grandstand to multi-tiered viewing decks, big screens and a festival-like atmosphere. It was more than a match, it was a celebration of community and cricket.

Importantly, the event was free and accessible. Families, schools, kids and local cricket clubs came together to witness something truly special, adding to the occasion. That spirit carried over to Rundle Mall, where thousands turned up for the Heroes Reception on 31 March. Co-hosted by Premier Peter Malinauskas and Lord Mayor Jane Lomax-Smith, it was a fitting tribute to a squad that had reignited passion for the game across the state. We must also acknowledge everybody behind the scenes: support staff, volunteers and the families of players who give so much. They, too, are part of this victory.

What South Australia's cricket team has achieved this year is more than silverware; they have reminded us what is possible when hard work, belief and unity come together. They have created memories for a generation. To the team, the coaches, the administrators and everyone involved: congratulations, you have done South Australia proud.

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

Parliamentary Committees

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: INQUIRY INTO THE POTENTIAL FOR A HUMAN RIGHTS ACT FOR SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (16:00): I move:

That the final report of the committee for the inquiry into the potential for a human rights act for South Australia be noted.

The terms of reference for this important inquiry were referred to the Social Development Committee by its own motion on 30 October 2023. The committee thanks all those who submitted evidence to the inquiry. A full list of submitters and witnesses is contained in the report. That said, the committee particularly wishes to thank the following individuals and organisations for their significant contributions to the area of human rights and for the time that they have given in preparing very high-quality submissions to the committee.

We are grateful to Associate Professor Sarah Moulds and the Rights Resource Network; Professor Matthew Stubbs; the Guardian for Children and Young People; the Commissioner for Children and Young People; the Justice and Society Unit, University of South Australia; the Castan

Centre for Human Rights Law and Dr Julie Debeljak; the Human Rights Law Centre; Ms Natalie Wade and Australian Lawyers for Human Rights; the Human Rights and Coercion Reduction Committee, Office of the Chief Psychiatrist; and the Public Law and Policy Unit, University of Adelaide. The committee also thanks its secretariat staff, Ms Robyn Schutte and Ms Mary-Ann Bloomfield, for their work on the inquiry.

The committee advertised for submissions to the inquiry through metropolitan and regional print media, and it was promoted through the South Australian parliament website and the SA parliament Facebook page. A media release was distributed on 8 December 2023 in time for International Human Rights Day on 10 December 2023. In addition, the committee directly invited submissions from a wide range of government and non-government organisations and special interest organisations and individuals.

The committee received 325 written submissions. Of these, 58 were from individuals; five were jointly authored submissions from individuals; 72 were received from non-government organisations, associations, legal and advocacy groups; seven were received from university departments; and nine were received from government, local government and statutory office holders. The remaining 174 submissions were received through an online proforma.

The committee held 12 hearings of oral evidence at Parliament House. Oral evidence was given by representatives of 19 organisations and by five individuals. The majority of written submissions received, numbering 131, were in favour of a human rights act for South Australia. Only four submissions were against a human rights act for South Australia. One hundred and eighty-eight submissions were noncommittal, as they were neither specifically opposed nor supportive of a human rights act for South Australia.

Members may be aware—I hope they are—that we in South Australia have a very proud history of progressive social reform. Not everyone has agreed with the advances but, in terms of parliament at least, majorities in both chambers have agreed to put forward this social reform. Over the years it has been applauded as such, not only here but around the country and internationally. We have often led the charge for changes, since at least the 1960s.

Indeed, there have been many attempts in the past to establish a human rights framework by former members in this place. However, these past attempts have not been realised and the committee received evidence that over the past few decades South Australia's rights-based agenda has not benefited from being updated significantly for at least four or five decades. We are now considered, in Australia at least, as being at the back of the pack.

Some of the submissions received by the committee show that human rights in South Australia are only partially protected through various laws and these have numerous gaps making them limited in scope and enforceability. The Equal Opportunity Act 1984 requires updating. Though it was remarkable for its time, it was over 40 years ago. The committee received evidence that, with few or no legislated protections to remedy human rights breaches, there will continue to be inadequate justice for some complainants.

The committee was informed that South Australia has not kept up, as I said earlier, with several of the other states and territories, namely, Victoria, the Australian Capital Territory and Queensland, nor have we kept pace with many OECD countries and advanced democracies that we like to compare ourselves to in the progression of human rights and the modernisation of our discrimination law.

Many submissions received by the committee wanted to see implementation of an accessible, affordable, timely and effective complaints process provided through a dedicated human rights commissioner with a complaints, conciliation and advisory and education mandate.

The inquiry looked at various types of models for a human rights act from both Australia's jurisdictions and also internationally. It would be probably advisable to consider a model based on the 'dialogue model', a phrase used to describe a model of human rights legislation which preserves parliamentary sovereignty but also requires that parliament, along with public authorities and the judiciary, give consideration to how legislation or policy impacts the human rights of its citizens. By applying a human rights lens at the early stages of policy development and the legislation

development, before the implementation and during administering of subsequent law, breaches of rights can be avoided.

It has been commented on by many witnesses that, whilst we have a number of pieces of legislation to protect human rights and individual rights in a number of disparate circumstances, they are spread across numerous pieces of legislation. It is very hard to keep track of them and how they interact with each other. Indeed, some of them cross over and contradict each other in a couple of specific cases.

The committee considered the expert advice received and decided to report to the parliament with a unanimous recommendation that the South Australian parliament and government consider adopting a human rights act for South Australia, albeit one that would only happen subsequent to the government of the day launching a public inquiry to bring the public along with the parliament in terms of discussing a human rights act, how it would be composed, how it would work and what rights should be incorporated into such an act.

We could draw upon the experience of Queensland, the ACT and Victoria, which have had such legislation in place in some instances for over a decade. The evidence received from those jurisdictions was that it has indeed helped the Public Service, at least, in being able to deliver services to the community in a way which at least looks at the impact of human rights and how the legislation might override or compromise human rights in some instances but for the greater good of society—for instance, in terms of the COVID pandemic or any subsequent pandemic, how the greater good had to be overridden in some specific cases. The legislation was crafted in such a way that would allow that and makes that an obvious example of where the common good should take predominance.

A human rights act for South Australia has the ability to provide many of these benefits to our society and our communities. The committee notes that the commonwealth has recently inquired into the potential for a human rights act, with the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Human Rights reporting in May 2024 with a recommendation that the commonwealth government establish an Australian human rights act as well.

I hope the report is read by members of this chamber. I hope it is read by the government and senior members of the Public Service, because I think sooner or later we will need to revisit some of the very important pieces of legislation that this state embarked on in the seventies and eighties and decide that it is a time when we should update those very important pieces of legislation and protect our citizens' human rights in South Australia.

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

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (DECRIMINALISATION OF SEX WORK) BILL

Second Reading

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:09): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I rise to speak on this particular bill on the day before May Day, in fact, noting that sex work is work and workers' rights should be respected and supported no matter what their work. In the case of sex workers, we still have a situation in South Australia where sex work and sex workers are stigmatised, discriminated against and criminalised.

This bill is not a bill that I would have put forward before this place any time before now in my parliamentary career. This is what I call the compromise bill. This is a bill that holds some of the things that I have fought for for many years in this place around decriminalisation of sex work—to recognise workers' rights, to give and afford them freedom from discrimination, freedom to unionise, to organise, to have safe workplaces, to have work health and safety policies that support them—but it is also a compromise bill put before this place for future debates that has been negotiated with other members of this place in regard to decriminalisation.

Of course, decriminalisation is not deregulation, and indeed this bill has regulation in it. It has the governance, description and definition of 'brothels' and 'prescribed brothels' properly defined. It has a 'fit and proper person' test. It has protections against brothels being run by bikies, which do not currently exist. It provides for regulation not through SAPOL, not through the police force, but rightfully through the office of Consumer and Business Services. This is a bill that also provides that sex work activities are conducted in some ways in a restricted manner around certain premises, such as churches, childcare centres and schools, and at certain times and on particular days.

This is a compromise bill that takes on board the good work right around the country—that South Australia has so far been unable to do—since we last properly debated decriminalisation of sex work in this Legislative Council; indeed, two-thirds of this council supported the decriminalisation of sex work in a previous bill. It takes on board the good work in Victoria, where they now have decriminalisation of sex work, having moved from a legalisation and regulated model of laws there that had a licensing approach. That was a failed approach and they have now moved to decriminalisation.

It takes on board the good work in the Northern Territory which, literally weeks after our bill for decriminalisation of sex work in South Australia failed in the other place, saw the Northern Territory decriminalise sex work in that territory. It takes on board the very good work in Queensland, where their version of the Law Reform Institute did a thorough investigation into sex work and their licensed model that they had had in operation for some time, and recommended a transformation to decriminalisation, something that now exists in the state of Queensland—and my goodness, if Queensland can do it, I do not understand why South Australia cannot, but I am hopeful that one day we will.

I admit that that day will not be when I am in this parliament, so I have brought this bill before this place to ensure that it remains beyond my time here as a suggestion towards a compromise. It is a compromise that has been negotiated with those in the Labor Party and in the labour movement that affords workers rights and sees us take these steps forward for workers, with a review process and a gradual, incremental change rather than full decriminalisation in one swoop, as I would have preferred.

With that, however, I will move that the bill be withdrawn. I simply wanted to leave it here. I do not want it in my name for the future, but I do want the good work of the compromise and negotiations that have gone on now for years to develop this bill to be available for future members of this parliament. Therefore, I move:

That the bill be withdrawn.

Motion carried; bill withdrawn.

Parliamentary Committees

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SUPPORT AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES FOR POLICE

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. L.A. Henderson:

That the report of the select committee be noted.

(Continued from 2 April 2025.)

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (16:15): I rise somewhat briefly to speak in support of the Hon. Laura Henderson's motion to note the report of the Select Committee on Support and Mental Health Services for Police in South Australia. It was a real privilege to be part of this committee, which endeavoured to inquire into and report on the support and mental health services currently provided to, primarily, serving and also former police officers in some cases but also to a number of other emergency services respondents where appropriate and occupations that may be exposed to emergency situations in the normal course of their duties. It is quite far reaching.

It will be no surprise to members of this place that police officers and emergency services workers are frequently exposed to traumatic incidents—maybe not on a daily basis, but very frequently—because it is an inherent part of their frontline work and places them at greater risk of adverse mental health outcomes. Our parliament, in my view, has a very strong and serious responsibility to ensure that these men and women are adequately provided with the support,

services and resources they require for their wellbeing. I would go so far as to say that it is of the utmost importance. I commend the Hon. Ms Henderson on her initiative in moving to establish this committee to this end in this place approximately a year ago now.

The committee was of the view that issues leading to reduced retention must be addressed as a matter of urgency in the police force, and I imagine that issue would have bipartisan, even multipartisan support. Given that a convincing link was found between fatigue and low morale, due to the increased demand placed on the remaining officers with the high number of officers departing SAPOL in recent times—that is, when people leave there is more work for others to do; it is not rocket science—the committee heard that the reasons for the higher turnover can be diverse, including the impact of shift work on social and family life, just being on call on occasions, the rising number of assaults on police officers and a perception of the lack of support and protection and, in some cases it was suggested, even lack of sympathy from leadership. I do not know if that is true or not, but that was put to the committee.

Accordingly, the committee's recommendations were developed largely within the context of endeavouring to improve the mental health of current and former police officers to increase morale and ultimately improve long-term retention, which of course would be such a fillip for our police officers. Some of these key recommendations include providing an option for officers to seek support from a registered health professional of their choice, which is not currently the case as I understand it, or from a panel of mental health professionals and for which SAPOL would bear the cost. That consideration is the first one.

Further, the committee recommended that consideration be given to the establishment of a dedicated specialist post-traumatic stress disorder research and treatment centre, with a specific focus on service-related trauma, and further that the provision of ongoing medical support to former police officers be considered. My understanding is that is not currently the case.

Further, it was recommended that a review of SAPOL's corporate structure be undertaken to identify roles that should be available as a priority to officers diagnosed with mental health problems. How can these officers who have suffered trauma and been through very difficult situations that have impacted them be used in other roles whilst they are undergoing treatment or, potentially for some of them, on a longer term basis?

In total the committee made 30 recommendations, and I express appreciation to all who appeared before the committee, but perhaps especially to the police commissioner, Grant Stevens. He was particularly receptive and open to the findings of the committee. He was very cooperative throughout its dealings. Some might have entered this with a level of scepticism, but I saw no evidence of that from him whatsoever; in fact, I saw evidence that he was seeking to find ways to improve what he even agreed at times were not optimal outcomes.

I would also like to take the opportunity to thank the Chair of the committee, as I just did, the Hon. Mrs Henderson, its secretary, Shannon Riggs, and Ben Cranwell, the research officer. Both Shannon and Ben were exemplary in my view and really almost set the standard in their work through that inquiry. We have had many good staff assistants on committees over the years, but they were among the best.

I lastly thank the many stakeholders who made submissions or appeared as witnesses before the committee to give evidence, as their efforts will undoubtedly have a considerable impact on the future welfare of our police officers serving in very difficult circumstances. It is absolutely my sincere hope that the recommendations made by this committee are implemented as soon as practicable in the best interests of South Australia's invaluable police force. I wholeheartedly commend the motion to the council.

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

Motions

NORTH ADELAIDE GOLF COURSE

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

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.

(Continued from 2 April 2025.)

The Hon. J.S. LEE (16:20): I rise today to support the motion put forward by the Hon. Robert Simms. As we know, on 16 February 2025, the state Labor government announced plans to redevelop the North Adelaide Golf Course in order to host the LIV Golf tournament there from as early as 2027.

In my former role as the shadow minister for tourism and hospitality, I heard from many stakeholders from the Tourism Industry Council of South Australia and the Australian Hotels Association of South Australia that the LIV Golf tournament has brought significant economic benefits to South Australia, boosted tourism and showcased our beautiful city on an international stage.

While I support the continued hosting of the LIV Golf tournament, I am concerned about the apparent lack of transparency surrounding this redevelopment. There has been no business case shared, no costings provided, and even the Adelaide City Council, as the owners and operators of the course, are calling for more information.

I remember the days when we were discussing the university mergers and there was a joint committee, and similar practices by the Labor government in terms of lack of transparency and accountability certainly raised lots of questions. This lack of transparency raises important questions about whether this redevelopment aligns with the best interests of the community and the state of South Australia.

The impact on the Adelaide City Council and its residents is significant and cannot be overlooked. This motion calls on the government to make public the business case and related documents, which we believe the public needs to know. I believe in a transparent, accountable government, a government that shares why decisions make sense for the state. I urge the government to demonstrate this transparency by releasing the necessary information.

The Adelaide City Council has emphasised the importance of maintaining public ownership and operation of the golf course, ensuring no permanent fencing and minimising the loss of significant trees. These are valid concerns that deserve to be addressed openly and transparently, particularly independently as well, and such a select committee would certainly hope to do that. We must ensure that any redevelopment respects the heritage and environmental significance of the site, including the sacred Kurna sites. The committee deserves to be informed and consulted on such important matters.

Furthermore, the honourable member has raised important questions about the legislative changes that might be required to achieve this redevelopment. Despite asking for clarity, there has been no information provided on what these legislative changes might entail. It is crucial for the government to release any draft legislation they are considering so that members of the community and members of parliament can form views on behalf of the community.

Transparency in this process is essential to ensure that all stakeholders are aware of the potential impacts and can participate in the discussion. While I wholeheartedly support the continued hosting of the LIV Golf tournament and acknowledge the benefits that it brings to our state, I urge the government to uphold the principles of accountability and transparency and such a select committee will hopefully be able to get the business case published or given to members of parliament for consideration, along with any related documents for the North Adelaide Golf Course redevelopment. With those remarks, I support the motion.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:24): I rise to support the motion put before this place by my colleague the Hon. Robert Simms and commend him for pursuing this with what is known in the trade as an order for production of documents. An order for production of documents is something that has not often been debated in this particular council for the last few decades and was recently finally successfully passed in this council after many decades of such a parliamentary tool not having been implemented in South Australia.

It is something that actually is used quite often, particularly in parliaments such as in New South Wales, where South Australia has actually benefited from an order for production of documents revealing information in South Australia they had the right to know in terms of public interest. It is quite an extraordinary situation when other parliaments are doing our work for us, and I hope that today we will see another order for production of documents motion passed.

This one, of course, calls for the business case and other documents with regard to the North Adelaide Golf Course proposed redevelopment. Why is this of great interest to me? I have certainly been very critical of LIV Golf and, indeed, while LIV Golf has been dubbed as 'golf as you have never seen it', certainly critics of that particular issue, and I am one of them, say that it is because it sportswashes the human rights abuses of the Saudi regime and indeed the Public Investment Fund is bankrolling most of this.

It is quite an extraordinary situation where we are pumping public moneys at a great rate, a rate that we do not know the exact quantum of, into one of the wealthiest entities in the entire world. They do not need our money. They do need our reputation and, if we are to protect our reputation, the good people of South Australia and this parliament should ensure we have access to full documentation. That is why this is a simple transparency measure that should be supported regardless of your views on LIV Golf or indeed any of the events that may be of interest to this council or any of the issues that may be of interest to this council, whether it is the particular results that in question time today were not forthcoming with inquiries into fish deaths and kangaroo deaths or previously lead levels in bats in Port Pirie.

These pieces of information are the reason we have parliament and parliamentary tools such as an order for production of documents because currently we have a bit of a secret state going on. We do not get to know what information the government has. It is not forthcoming and transparent. Far too often, there are more questions than answers not just in question time in this place but ongoing and the secret state times have to end and this order for production of documents can be the next step in that journey.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (16:27): I rise as the lead speaker for the opposition to briefly speak in support of this motion brought forward by the Hon. Robert Simms MLC. Let's be clear: this is not a motion about whether LIV Golf should come to North Adelaide; it is simply about transparency. It is about making sure South Australians see the business case behind the potential multimillion dollar redevelopment of the Parklands and to address those valid concerns raised by the Hon. Rob Simms and the other honourable members who have spoken previously today.

We know LIV Golf generates a significant economic return—some \$70 million last year alone. That is certainly not nothing. Now we have the government looking to the North Adelaide Golf Course for a potential expansion and possibly extending the event past 2031. Again, some would argue that is good for the state; however, what we have not seen is any detail on what this redevelopment will cost taxpayers—no documents, no business case, no public explanation, no addressing the valid concerns that have been raised.

At a time when we have families that are doing it tough, the very least this government could do is produce these documents as the Hon. Rob Simms' motion requests. We do owe it to the public to scrutinise this proposal properly and that starts with full disclosure. I commend the motion to the chamber.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (16:29): I rise to say that I am supporting the motion of the Hon. Robert Simms. Let me say at the beginning that I support the LIV Golf tournament. I think it has been great for South Australia, because of the benefits that it has brought our state, not to mention the branding of South Australia on a global scale. To see that tournament and the excitement and crowds that it generated, and the entertainment that was provided, I think is a good thing for the state, albeit I know members of the Grange Golf Club have been very unhappy with the tournament because they claim that they have not seen many benefits as a result of it being staged there.

But then lo and behold, the Premier makes an astounding announcement on the final day of the tournament that they intend to redevelop the North Adelaide Golf Course, and standing alongside him were two members in this place who clearly indicated their support for legislation that we have

not even seen yet. We do not even know the details of what is going to be proposed at North Adelaide and how it is going to impact the residents in North Adelaide.

We do not know how it is going to impact on taxpayers or the Adelaide City Council, which, of course, are the ones that look over the golf course and have to maintain it. We got no detail from the Premier except it is going to happen. 'The legislation is going to go through because I have two crossbenchers in the Legislative Council who are going to support it.' We have not seen any evidence of any legislation to know what is going on. This is why it is important that the honourable member, Robert Simms, wants to see a full disclosure of documents, so that we know what is being proposed here, and how it is going to impact all the affected stakeholders.

I am just going to go back to some of the comments the Premier was making at the time about what was going to happen at the North Adelaide Golf Course. I play golf. I am not a good golfer, but I certainly play at North Adelaide, both the North Course and South Course, and I know that many people enjoy that facility, not just for the sake of playing golf in the centre of the city but also the affordability of playing golf in the centre of Adelaide. Few golf courses in the world have that location, so it is no wonder it has been targeted for a major tournament.

The cost of playing 18 holes of golf on the South Course I think on a weekend is about \$65, which is quite reasonable. On the North Course, which is not in as good a shape as the South Course, it costs you about \$40. There are a lot of people who enjoy that golf course, and you often see it packed with players on weekends. That is all going to change. That will change with this proposal, but we do not know much detail, except the fact that I understand the government managed to get its hands on a master plan that had been put forward to the Adelaide City Council some years ago.

I must point out that, while I was watching the Premier make that announcement, I saw that the Lord Mayor of Adelaide seemed to be somewhat confused or perplexed at what was going on, even though she has lent her support to it, and I can understand that. But I am sure that the Adelaide City Council and the Mayor would have had questions about what was going on, what their role was going to be in the development of this golf course, and also how it was going to be maintained and who was going to pay for it. There are a lot of questions about this golf course.

Just going back to affordability, the Premier was making comments like, 'What a great place this will be for young golfers who will be able to walk the same fairways and play on the same greens as the stars that play in LIV Golf.' Well, will they? If they will, if they can, at what cost? For what is going to be proposed here, you have to spend a lot of money. You have to develop a PGA golf course, a world-standard golf course similar to those that we see in big events that are played around the world.

You are going to have to fence that off. You are not going to have a golf course of that calibre and allow people to freely walk across it. We know that there is a lot of antagonism towards the Saudis in the community, and others have expressed their concerns about Saudi Arabia and its petrodollars and also the fact that it has made its fortunes from fossil fuels, and you have people in the community who may well target that golf course and cause damage to the fairways or the greens.

So it is quite disingenuous of the Premier to say, 'Everyone is going to be able to go on this golf course. Have a look. It's going to be fantastic. Young kids can play on there. They are going to enjoy this.' Well, it is not going to be that easy. There will be restrictions, and it will come at a cost. I want to know how much it will cost for the general public to be able to play on that golf course, because it would not be anything under \$150, maybe even \$200, for a round of 18. If you go to many of the other golf courses around Adelaide that the public have access to, some of those that I play at, it is \$120, \$130, \$150, maybe a bit more.

So we need some transparency here. We need to know just what this is all about. I will be interested to know what kind of a deal the Premier cut to ensure that he was going to fulfil this field of dreams in having his golf course established by 2027. He has obviously done a lot of fast talking to ensure that all this was going to happen.

I will just go back to this: how can members in this place agree to pass legislation without even seeing a word, without even seeing a draft, before doing so? I do not know. I think a lot of people would be perplexed that that deal has gone through already without even seeing legislation.

As I said, I have no objections to LIV Golf, no objections to the move from Grange to North Adelaide, but we need to know what this deal is all about. We need to know what is at stake here and how it is going to be developed.

I want to point out: I do not know how much money taxpayers are going to be putting into this project, but members who follow golf and the financial dealings in sport of the Saudis may well be aware that they are spending hundreds of millions of dollars in developing a golf resort near Riyadh, which will be run I believe by The Trump Organization. They are putting in a lot of money there, and I just want to know: are they are putting any money into this project?

In closing, I am fully supporting this motion. I am all about disclosure, full disclosure. We did not see that with the university merger. We have not seen that there and in other things. The Premier seems to think that if he gets a couple of crossbenchers onside, he can bulldoze his agenda through the place. I think the taxpayers of South Australia have a right, and he has an obligation, as does his government, to make full disclosures. We need to see what is being proposed here. You cannot hide behind cabinet confidentiality, or in confidence contracts that have been done, at all. We are talking about significant taxpayer investment here.

If the Premier wants to beat his breast about how good this tournament is, along with the Gather Round—and congratulations on the Gather Round as well, where they spent \$50 million on the Lyndoch Oval—as I pointed out during Gather Round, only a few months ago I was in the Davenport community that did not have the same privilege of their kids being able to play on a football ground, which has been abandoned for something like 20 years.

I paid a visit to Davenport with elder Tiger McKenzie, and I was appalled at the lack of facilities there for the youth of the Davenport community—which is only a couple of kilometres from Port Augusta. The oval has not been used for 20 years, and Tiger McKenzie told me the reason for that was because the government, both federal and state governments, had turned off funding for the water supply. Up until then, 20 years ago, it was a magnet for Aboriginal communities around the state. They would often go there for tournaments and play fixtures against each other in both football and cricket.

However, you should see this place for the last 20 years: it is totally desolate. I could not find one blade of green grass there; there was nothing but rocks, scrub, prickles. The dressing rooms were totally trashed. It was just an absolute embarrassment. I was also saddened to learn that the swimming pool in Davenport is empty and has not been filled for some time. So the youth in Davenport have nowhere to kick a footy around, and we know that Aboriginal kids love their sport and particularly enjoy kicking a footy around; they have no recreational activity in that place. It is no wonder that they migrate into Port Augusta itself—and we have seen the wave of crime there—because there is nothing to engage those kids in the Davenport community.

There you see the total contrast in this government's priorities: \$50 million at Lyndoch having this fantastic oval—yes, fantastic; tick the boxes—but there at Davenport Community there is no football ground whatsoever. It is an embarrassment. As Tiger McKenzie said to me—and you can view what he said to me on social media—I invite the Premier and the Aboriginal Affairs Minister, Kyam Maher, to come up here and have a look, see what we have got here.'

Anyway, going back to the North Adelaide Golf Course and the proposal, it is important that the people of South Australia are informed; they certainly have a right to know just how their money is being spent, rather than it being hidden behind cabinet confidentiality and other clauses that the Premier may come up with. I wholeheartedly support the honourable member's motion.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:43): I rise very briefly to speak to this motion. I will digress from commenting on matters just expressed that are factually inaccurate, other than to say that everyone has expressed—and I know the Lord Mayor remains very committed to this—that legislation simply will not be required, and that if and when that legislation is required, we will deal with it. That has been stated time and time again.

The Lord Mayor herself, publicly and in conversations I have had with her personally—and I have taken it upon myself to have those conversations—is steadfast in her commitment not only to

disclose documents, including plans when decisions have been reached, but to get this through the first and preferred option, which is the council option.

Reference has obviously been made to legislation, which none of us have seen, and to apparent deals that have been done, which I certainly have not been a party to. I will say that the member may not give me any credit, but I know that the Premier certainly knows me well enough to know that I do not sign blank checks: not for him, not for anyone else, not on this and not on anything else.

The commitment that I will give to the mover in a moment will follow the comments that I make. In relation to this motion, again, I have looked very carefully at the wording. I have said that I will not support it at this stage, but not for the reasons that the member may assume. I have of course sought advice from the government, and indeed from those who I have been having discussions with, and I think it is fair to say that things are still in the very early stages of planning.

Based on the conversations I have had, I do not think the government itself could possibly know what is going to be included and what is not going to be included in those final plans, what is in and what is out in terms of the proposals, what may be happening and what may be the subject of discussions and what may not eventuate. The tabling would in effect require tabling before the government, or indeed the council, have landed on something that is ready for consultation or scrutiny. My understanding is that those discussions are still in the infancy stage. It is certainly my expectation that when that stage is reached—and indeed the government has made those commitments and the council has indicated the same—they will release those plans and documents relating to work that is occurring.

The motion itself calls for tabling within two weeks. As I said, I have taken it upon myself to follow this up and say, 'Are you likely to be ready in two weeks to have anything to release publicly?' The answer at this stage to me has been no. I would have thought it appropriate for anybody who is looking at this motion to go and ask those questions and say, 'What is an appropriate timeframe? Is two weeks appropriate?' It is not my job to go and do the job of the mover or anyone else in this place, but it certainly is my job to go and inform myself. I have done that. Given that it is calling for the production of those documents within two weeks, the view seems to be that that is premature—that, simply, the government and council are not at that stage.

However, I have made it crystal clear that when the government and indeed the council are in a position to have documents ready for release that are not premature and have already taken into account what might happen, what might not happen, what may be in and what may be out, that it is my firm expectation—and, indeed, I believe the government and council's intent—to disclose those documents. That is the advice I have clarified and that is the advice I intend to go with today.

For the sake of the mover, if it gives him any sense of hope in terms of where this goes in the future, I have also made it very clear that if the Premier or indeed the council were to fail to reach those commitments in terms of disclosing those documents within the appropriate timeframes that they have deemed when they are ready to do so, then I will support a subsequent motion calling for the release. But I do not think that we are at that stage yet, and the advice that I have had is that we are not at that stage yet.

We are at a very early stage, and when I say 'we' I mean all of us. They are not discussions that are taking place with me. The council is in an early stage of its work. The government is in an early stage of its work. To release documents—I do not know what they would release, for one. I think that, in short, sums up the discussions that I have had to date. I simply do not know at this stage that they have anything of value to release publicly, but certainly, when they do, I have made it crystal clear that it is my intention that they would do just that. The response to me from all involved has been that it is their intention to do precisely that.

Again, the member may come back here after a period of time and say, 'I have now had conversations with the government and the council, and they say that in one month or two months or three months those documents will be complete.' If they are not disclosed publicly, then bring another motion before this place, but a two-week timeframe from the time of the passage of this is premature, based on the advice I have had. It is on that basis and that basis alone that I will not be supporting this motion.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (16:50): I will briefly tee off on behalf of the government. The government—it is not going to shock anyone, obviously—opposes the motion.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: I know, I know, but we are only on the front nine, the Hon. Mr Simms. Work has only just begun, and design and planning for the North Adelaide Golf Course is still in its early stages. As with all public works where there is an amount applied to construction of work totalling more than or \$15 million, a report will be prepared for the parliament's Public Works Committee. That report, I am reliably informed, will provide specific information on the government's planned construction, including its purpose, its design, its appearance, how it will be built, its estimated costs, the trees, if there is a train involved. As such, the establishment of this committee, we say, is unnecessary and diverts resources that could be better used for other priorities of this parliament.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:51): It is worth clarifying that I am not proposing there be any committee on top of what has already been undertaken. I am suggesting that there be a production of documents and that the government reveal any business case and related documents regarding the proposed redevelopment of the North Adelaide Golf Course.

I must say the comments of the Hon. Connie Bonaros have heightened my concerns somewhat, because it appears to me from what the honourable member has said that there is not actually a business case that the government has considered. If that is the case, then I am very concerned that the government is pledging potentially millions and millions of dollars of taxpayer money for a significant redevelopment project when no business case has been seen. Does a business case even exist?

I should not be that surprised, because the Malinauskas government has form in that regard. I remember us having a discussion about this very issue in the context of \$500 million—half a billion dollars—being put on the table for a university merger when the government had not even seen the business case at that time. In this instance, it seems we have secret backup legislation that no-one here is privy to, and we have a secret business case, or a non-existent business case, that is being used to underpin potentially an investment of millions and millions of dollars of taxpayer money.

This is not about whether or not we support LIV Golf. I am not supportive of LIV Golf, the Hon. Tammy Franks is not supportive of LIV Golf, but I recognise that other members have different views. This is a simple transparency measure. It is about saying, 'If you are putting a huge amount of taxpayer money on the table, then surely the taxpayer has a right to know what is the business case. Does it stack up?' I am not asking the government to do any work that has not already been done, but I am getting the significant impression from the comments that have already been made that there is not actually a business case that underpins this investment, and that is very concerning.

I respect the Hon. Connie Bonaros and the work she does in this place, but I am disappointed that she and the Hon. Sarah Game are acting as a Praetorian Guard for the government when it comes to this proposal. It is not the role of crossbenchers to cloak this sort of information from public view. The public has a right to access this information and all members of parliament have a right to see any potential legislation that may be required. Despite my requests of the government, I am yet to find out whether or not there is any backup legislation in the works, what that looks like and what precisely is in scope.

I think all of us in this place have a right to access that information and, more importantly, our constituents—the people we represent—have a right to access that information. After all, with respect to a business case, it is their money that is going to be invested in this project. I remind members that I will be calling a division on this matter so that their views can be clearly documented and made available to the public.

The council divided on the motion:

Ayes7
Noes.....8
Majority1

AYES

Centofanti, N.J.
Lee, J.S.
Simms, R.A. (teller)

Franks, T.A.
Lensink, J.M.A.

Hood, D.G.E.
Pangallo, F.

NOES

Bonaros, C.
Hanson, J.E. (teller)
Scriven, C.M.

Bourke, E.S.
Hunter, I.K.
Wortley, R.P.

El Dannawi, M.
Maher, K.J.

PAIRS

Henderson, L.A.
Ngo, T.T.

Martin, R.B.
Girolamo, H.M.

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

Motion thus negatived.

ICE FACTOR PROGRAM

The Hon. J.S. LEE (16:59): I move:

That this council—

1. Congratulates the Ice Factor Foundation on reaching the significant milestone of its 20th anniversary in 2025;
2. Recognises that the Ice Factor program was established in 2005 to assist schools in their efforts to keep at-risk students at school by providing students with a focus through which they can develop vocational and life skills in a team environment;
3. Notes that the Ice Factor program is the only high school ice hockey program in Australia, and trains students to skate and play ice hockey in a special program which includes life skills, team building and leadership training;
4. Acknowledges the Ice Factor Foundation Co-Founder and Director, Marie Shaw KC, its patron Her Excellency the Governor of South Australia, Frances Adamson AC, board members, participating schools, coaches and volunteers for their hard work and commitment to supporting at-risk students and disadvantaged young people and for helping them to avoid homelessness, drug addiction and crime; and
5. Commends the Ice Factor Foundation for its contributions to making life-changing differences in supporting young people in South Australia to develop personal leadership, resilience and responsibility in all aspects of their lives.

It is a great pleasure to move this motion and acknowledge the remarkable milestone of Ice Factor celebrating its 20th anniversary in 2025. This is a significant achievement and it speaks volumes about the dedication and impact of this life-changing program. Young people from various backgrounds face enormous challenges to cope with the demand of schools, family and peer pressures and other challenges that our complex society gives them.

The Ice Factor program was established in 2005 to assist schools in their efforts to keep at-risk students at school as most show a high probability of leaving prematurely. Ice Factor provides these students with focus through which they can develop vocational and life skills in a team. These life skills are developed around the formation of the ice hockey team and are discussed in a university tutorial style fashion at the beginning of each training session.

Ice Factor is the only high school ice hockey program in Australia; it is really unique. The pilot program ran for only eight weeks and had 15 students. Now, 20 years later, there are 20 public high schools across South Australia participating in a weekly term-time program and two more will be seeking to join this year. This equals over 350 students a season going through the Ice Factor program.

Over the last 20 years, Ice Factor has helped thousands of students at risk—those who are disadvantaged or disengaged students, with the support of IceArenA professional coaches and staff. The Ice Factor program is centred on the development of an ice hockey team, beginning at learning to skate all the way to competing as a team against other schools, with an end-of-term tournament held at the IceArenA.

I acknowledge the contributions of the Ice Factor Foundation Co-Founder and Director, Marie Shaw KC, who, through her outstanding services, has committed the last 20 years to ensuring the ongoing success of the program along with partner schools, sponsors and board members. Through her diligent work—and many honourable members in this place would be familiar with Marie's long list of accomplishments in the legal system—Marie Shaw KC has seen countless children in court following a trial of neglect and dysfunction. She realised that there was an opportunity to help these disadvantaged children after seeing the positive impact the sport has had on her own adolescent daughter. I have met her family over the years and I really commend Marie Shaw for her own compassion towards bringing out the best potential in every young person; I think that is to be highly commended.

I also recognise the patron of the Ice Factor Foundation, Her Excellency Frances Adamson AC, Governor of South Australia. The Governor holds a celebration of the Ice Factor program at Government House each year. This function recognises the students and celebrates those participants in the program, with numerous awards handed out to students.

Every second year the Ice Factor Spectacular is held at the Hilton Hotel to raise money for the program. Over 500 guests usually attend such an evening where a fashion parade is put on, with the Ice Factor students modelling clothes from a range of clothing stores across Adelaide. The sponsorships they attract for this gala dinner from the business sector are enormous. I have attended many of those gala fundraising dinners in the past and also donated Parliament House vouchers, for example, as a prize towards the fundraising efforts.

I wish to thank the current and previous board members and volunteers for their hard work and commitment to supporting at-risk and disadvantaged young people. I think what they are doing is important. When participants actually take part in Ice Factor, it becomes a turning point for many of the students. It takes them off the pathway of homelessness, drug addiction and crime and helps these young people to build self-esteem and confidence and allows them to press a reset button to change their directions and goals for the future. This ought to be acknowledged.

It is also a great pleasure for me to acknowledge the other contributors. Particularly, I want to commend Sami Mantere, the Director of Ice Factor programs, for his outstanding efforts. Originally from Finland, Sami has been instrumental in the development and success of Ice Factor programs over many years. He has been a familiar face that welcomed me every time I attended an opening or closing ceremony of Ice Factor competitions. I have seen his commitment and dedication to motivating young players and teams.

Another special mention goes to Bob Battersby, my good friend. He does not hold any official positions as such. He is a very humble man, but I know that he is one of those unsung heroes working behind the scenes to support Ice Factor. He informed me that the Ice Factor program was an initiative of the SA Ice Sports Federation at the time when Marie was a board member. Bob became an adviser to the SA Ice Sports Federation for many years, primarily on business modelling and providing assistance in dealing with government.

However, something I did not know about Bob was that his skating background was in figure skating, not ice hockey. He was a judge in later years. He told me that his own personal background and passion had influenced his ongoing commitment to Ice Factor. He is involved in so many different capacities when his assistance is called on. This included working as a volunteer with the council for the welfare of overseas students and early exposure in Australia and overseas in assisting those in need.

I want to take this opportunity to thank Bob Battersby, along with all the other volunteers for their ongoing support and contributions to Ice Factor. The success of the program is clear in the achievement of participants. Twenty-two students have represented South Australia in the national ice hockey championships. Seven students have played in the top Australian ice hockey leagues,

both men and women, six have represented Australia in the Ice Hockey World Championships, one has represented Australia in the Youth Olympics, and three have gone on to play in the AFL.

So many of these Ice Factor students have overcome their own barriers and challenges in life and they are able to use these particular youth programs to channel their energy for education and volunteering within the program as mentors or coaches.

In addition to all of this, born out of Ice Factor Foundation was the first ever Australian Indigenous ice hockey team, the Kaurua Boomerangs, and the only Indigenous ice hockey program in the Southern Hemisphere—that is to be congratulated. The Boomerangs are recognised by the leading ice hockey body, the International Ice Hockey Federation. They have competed in an Indigenous exchange event in both Canada and Australia.

The Ice Hockey Foundation welcomes all students from participating schools, embracing diversity and ensuring that everyone has the opportunity to succeed. Whether they are Indigenous, refugees or students with disabilities, such as autism or spinal injuries, every student is given the chance to become a leader within their team and achieve success both on and off the ice.

Success can look different for each participant. All aspire to graduate from high school. Some wish to find a trade or others seek to go to university or perhaps find a career in sports. Some even start their own business. Success can be found in a student who was unable to read or write then being able to write and create their own story, or perhaps students who lack motor skills due to disability being able to excel on the ice hockey rink.

Breaking down barriers and providing strategies and skills to combat anxiety, the Ice Factor program truly helps kids learn how to live with purpose and dignity. One of the participating schools reports that the Ice Factor program has been integrated into the school curriculum, allowing students to earn SACE credits. In 2019, participating students at the school earned SACE credits with a 100 per cent pass rate and 75 per cent of the students achieved a B grade or higher.

The curriculum focuses on skill development, game play, tactics, teamwork, relationships, leadership and communication skills. It also emphasises positive education and the PERMA model (Positive emotions, Engagement, Relationships, Meaning and Achievement model) to improve the wellbeing of all participants.

One of the key reasons why ice hockey is good for all these young people, as opposed to other sports programs offered in high school, is that when they all start they are really bad at sport. They do not have to be good at sports at all. Some may already have experience of football, cricket or basketball in their background, but with Ice Factor they all start at the bottom and they all learn to skate and they are all at the same level. This evens the playing field and allows the focus to be on building both life and ice hockey skills concurrently as a team.

The Ice Factor program not only teaches students how to play ice hockey but also instils in them the values of perseverance, teamwork and resilience. These are essential life skills that can help them navigate challenges both on and off the ice, ultimately preparing them for a brighter future.

Once again, it is a great opportunity to be able to move this motion to congratulate the Ice Factor Foundation for reaching its significant milestone of its 20th anniversary. Congratulations to Marie Shaw, the board members and the team for 20 years of fostering an inclusive and productive space for students to become successful and engaged members of society. I wish the Ice Factor Foundation continuous success and growth in the future. With those remarks, I commend the motion.

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

MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS

The Hon. J.S. LEE (17:12): I move:

That this council—

1. Congratulates the MS Society SA & NT for hosting the MS Mighty Swim, which is one of the largest fundraising events in South Australia to support those affected by multiple sclerosis (MS), since 2005 and celebrating the 20th anniversary of the event this year;

2. Notes that MS is a chronic, neurodegenerative condition that impacts the body's central nervous system and currently affects over 33,000 people across Australia and over 2,900 people across South Australia;
3. Recognises that MS Society SA & NT is a leading organisation in providing information, education, connection, care and support to people living with MS across South Australia and the Northern Territory;
4. Acknowledges the MS Society SA & NT President, Ms Kerry Sanders; CEO, Mr Shaun Kennedy; board members, executive and staff for their dedication and contributions to serving and supporting those afflicted with MS and their families; and
5. Commends MS Society SA & NT for its significant contributions towards providing every person living with MS access to the highest standard of services and support they need to live well.

It is a great honour to congratulate the MS Society SA & NT for their many years of important work, including 20 years of successfully holding the MS Mighty Swim. Multiple sclerosis is a chronic, neurodegenerative disease that attacks the central nervous system, brain, spinal cord and optic nerves. It currently affects more than 30,000 people across Australia and over 2,900 people in South Australia.

It is an unfortunate disease that causes fatigue, pain, mood changes, altered sensations and changes in memory, concentration and reasoning, among other symptoms. On average, the quality of life for people with MS in Australia is 31 per cent less than for those of the overall Australian population. MS is estimated to have cost the Australian community close to \$2.5 billion as of 2021. At an average cost of about \$73,000 per person, this is quadruple the cost of a long-term cancer survivor.

It is not yet known what causes multiple sclerosis or why it affects one person and not another. As a result, people living with MS are often faced with uncertainty about the future. There is no one test that will say a person has MS. Unfortunately, receiving a diagnosis can be a difficult and time-consuming process as each person's case of MS is different and can present with different and often vague symptoms which make this very mysterious disease require a lot more assistance. This is a harsh and unfortunate reality that those living with MS have to face each day. It is why I am so deeply grateful for the work of the MS Society SA & NT to help improve the lives of those with MS and in funding research to find solutions to diagnosing and treating MS.

The MS Society is a leading organisation providing information, education, connection, care and support to people living with MS across South Australia and the Northern Territory. Their services include providing MS nurses who can give expert information and advice; physiotherapy and occupational therapy; organising social and peer support groups; specialist employment services; and NDIS planning and support. The MS Society also plays a key role in contributing significant funds to Multiple Sclerosis Research Australia to support ongoing national MS research efforts. They primarily accomplish this through their various fundraising programs, which in 2023-24 managed to raise over \$900,000.

One of the largest of these fundraisers is the MS Mighty Swim. The MS Mighty Swim has been held since 2005, with the 20th edition being held earlier this year in February. For 24 continuous hours, the Unley Swimming Centre was transformed into a vibrant celebration of community spirit and determination, with 13 dedicated teams taking to the water in a powerful demonstration of solidarity with South Australians living with MS.

The MS Mighty Swim is a 24-hour swimming relay-style event that brings together people of all ages and backgrounds to raise vital funds to support people living with MS. The event was also filled with entertainment, including live music and family activities, and created a festival atmosphere that celebrated both the competitive spirit and deeper mission of supporting those affected by MS. This milestone event reached record heights this year with 253 participants who swam an incredible 8,283 laps and raised over \$160,000.

It was my honour to attend the closing ceremony, alongside Mr Rod Bunten, to speak with the swimmers and volunteers and bring the festivities to a meaningful conclusion in a touching display of cross-community support. The Governor, Her Excellency the Hon. Frances Adamson AC, and Mr Rod Bunten are joint patrons of the MS Society SA & NT. I would like to thank them both for their

strong support and advocacy for the society, and I would like to also commend the Mayor of Unley, Michael Hewitson AM, for his tremendous support as well.

The ever so energetic Shanelle Franklin did a fantastic job as the master of ceremonies. I was also amazed to learn about the many inspirational stories, including Rita Smith, who at 90 years young completed her 20th consecutive MS Mighty Swim. Rita's unwavering commitment over the two decades honours her daughter, Helen, who lives with MS, exemplifying the profound personal connections that drive this community. With wonderful stories like Rita's and many others, the MS Mighty Swim stands as a testament to what is possible when a community unites around a shared purpose, creating hope, fostering inclusion and, ultimately, changing lives.

I would like to take this moment to highlight the leadership team at the MS Society SA & NT. The board of directors comprises eight positions elected by members. It is chaired by Kerry Sanders, alongside Dr David Wilkinson OAM, Adrian Hinton, Maureen Lawlor, Geoff Bowels, Rachel Allen, Professor Jenny Fereday and Will Gray. The combined knowledge and experience of the board helps to guide the organisation's strategic direction.

There are also six executive staff who work with the board to drive impactful changes. They are CEO Shaun Kennedy, Jason Morrison, Sarah Fitzharris, Karin Ridgeway, Helen Whitworth and Ileana Nadu. I would like to add a special shout-out to my friend Steven Rypp, the executive assistant, for his wonderful support in sharing all the information and making sure that my office was supplied with all the knowledge and information for this particular contribution today.

My heartfelt thank you to the board members and executive staff for their passion, dedication and leadership, which guides a wonderful group of staff and volunteers towards accomplishing their vision of eliminating MS and ensuring that every person living with MS is accessing the highest standard of services and support they need to live well.

The MS Society faces unprecedented challenges in providing essential care. Currently in South Australia there is a patient to nurse ratio of 995:1—I will just repeat that: 995:1. This is triple the recommended best practice ratio of 315:1. With MS prevalence increasing in South Australia, which has the fourth highest number of people living with MS nationally, the MS Society's resources are severely stretched.

I would also like to highlight other key challenges. These include limited access to disease modifying therapies, with only 62 per cent of MS patients currently receiving these vital treatments; complex NDIS navigation barriers, preventing 50 to 70 per cent of eligible individuals from accessing support; restricted Medicare billing capability for specialist nursing services; rising service delivery costs for complex neurological care; and declining fundraising income due to economic pressures. These are all resulting in over 20 per cent of MS patients having unmet healthcare needs.

So today I am joining with the MS Society to call on the government to fund additional dedicated specialist MS nurses. I understand there has already been proposed a strategic partnership plan which builds on the \$2 million that has already been invested by the MS Society into their new Wellness Centre. The proposal calls for a three-year funding commitment of \$1.2 million to support specialist MS nurse positions, noting that every dollar invested in MS nurses equals a saving of \$11 in healthcare costs.

This partnership will leverage existing infrastructure and expertise to deliver maximum impact for the community. With the increasing needs for improved healthcare services and decreasing dependability of fundraising and revenue raising due to cost-of-living pressures, it is a sensible proposal which will help some of the most vulnerable members of our community.

Together we can build a more sustainable, accessible healthcare future for people living with MS and other neurological conditions across South Australia. Once again, I express my heartfelt thanks to the MS Society SA & NT for their outstanding hard work and compassion, and I also congratulate them on achieving and hosting 20 years of the MS Mighty Swim. I would like to wholeheartedly commend this motion to the chamber.

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

AUSTRALIA MALAYSIA BUSINESS COUNCIL SA

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. J.S. Lee:

That this council—

1. Congratulates the Australia Malaysia Business Council SA (AMBCSA) for reaching the special milestone of its 30th anniversary in 2024;
2. Recognises that the AMBCSA is a pioneering business chamber that was established by the Malaysian Australian community with the objectives of fostering, supporting and promoting business, investment and cultural opportunities between Australia and Malaysia;
3. Acknowledges the important work of founding members, current and past presidents, committee members and volunteers of AMBCSA for their hard work, dedication and contributions in fostering bilateral relationships between the Malaysian and South Australian business communities;
4. Commends AMBCSA for working collaboratively with businesses and educational institutions to deliver its flagship annual event 'Merdeka Gala Dinner and Awards Presentation', which serves two main purposes: to celebrate Merdeka—Independence Day of Malaysia and to present Outstanding Students Awards to recognise educational achievements and community contributions by Malaysian students who are studying at South Australian universities and TAFE;
5. Recognises two former governors of South Australia—former AMBCSA patron, Sir Eric James Neal AC, and its current patron, Hon. Hieu Van Le AC—for their important contribution and support to AMBCSA; and
6. Reflects on the many achievements of AMBCSA over the three decades and recognises the impact of AMBCSA in the advancement of trade, business and cultural connections between South Australia and Malaysia.

(Continued from 5 March.)

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (17:22): I rise briefly as the lead speaker on behalf of the opposition in support of the Hon. Jing Lee's motion to congratulate the Australia Malaysia Business Council of South Australia (AMBCSA) for reaching a special milestone of 30 years in 2024.

The Australia Malaysia Business Council of South Australia is a business chamber founded by the Malaysian Australian community with the aim of nurturing, backing and advancing business ventures and cultural exchanges. I recognise the endeavours of the founding members as well as the unwavering commitment of the former and current presidents, committee members and volunteers. Their efforts and contributions have been instrumental in fostering mutually beneficial ties between the Malaysian and South Australian business sectors.

It is truly commendable how the Australia Malaysia Business Council of South Australia has collaborated with various businesses and educational institutions in orchestrating its annual event, the Merdeka Gala Dinner and awards presentation. This occasion not only serves as a celebration of Malaysia's independence day but also provides a pivotal role in honouring Malaysian students in South Australian universities and TAFE.

Furthermore, it is deserved to mention and express gratitude to the distinguished patrons who have played pivotal roles in supporting the Australia Malaysia Business Council of South Australia, namely, the former patron, Sir Eric James Neal AC, and the current patron, the Hon. Hieu Van Le AC, both former governors of South Australia.

Over the span of three decades, by fostering trade networks, driving business initiatives and nurturing cultural connections between South Australia and Malaysia, the Australia Malaysia Business Council of South Australia has forged an impressive legacy on the two countries it serves. Congratulations again to the Australia Malaysia Business Council of South Australia in celebrating 30 years.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (17:25): The South Australian government congratulates the Australia Malaysia Business Council of South Australia on its 30th anniversary. We take great pride in South Australia's relationship with Malaysia.

Just over a year ago we celebrated 50 years of our sister city relationship with Georgetown, Penang, Malaysia and the City of Adelaide, and I would like to acknowledge the former Premier Don

Dunstan, who is a leading voice for this relationship. Throughout the last 50 years there have been significant steps in cultivating this relationship with Malaysia. At the head of this has been the establishment of the Australia Malaysia Business Council, ensuring that the connections between both South Australia and Malaysia is a bridge between not just business to business relations but, more importantly, people to people.

The Australia Malaysia Business Council Incorporated has been an important part and an influential player in forging those links and expanding those networks over many years, and it has done so with an incredible leadership team that continues to deliver for members year in and year out. It is no accident that South Australian exports to Malaysia are worth over \$1 billion, highlighted by metals, food, wine and education.

What the Australia Malaysia Business Council does is ensure that those connections are maintained economically and culturally. Many of us here in the chamber are well aware of the networking events conducted by the business council. I believe the last one they held was at Zagame, attended by the Hon. Catherine Hutchesson MP. These are fantastic in building the important connections between South Australia and Malaysia and the opportunities that come from trade and relationships.

Our cultural relationship with Malaysia is one that we take great pride in. Over the past 60 years we have also seen the Malaysian community flourish in our state. According to the 2021 census, there were 9,099 Malaysian-born people in South Australia. Our Malaysian community is a vibrant mix of ethnicities, languages and faiths that enhances the rich cultural and religious diversity of our state.

Every year the Australia Malaysia Business Council SA hosts the Merdeka gala dinner. The gala celebrates the national day, and is an opportunity to raise money for charities. One of the highlights of this annual dinner is the presentation of awards to international students from Malaysia to recognise their academic achievements while studying at universities in South Australia. International students are such important ambassadors for their country while they are here in South Australia, and I am so pleased to see that Malaysian students bring their energy, ambition and fresh perspectives to the excellent universities and TAFE campuses in our state. It is important that young people who are on their learning journey in a different country are recognised for their academic achievements.

I am also very pleased that the business council is a key member of the Multicultural Chamber of Commerce, which was brought back by the Malinauskas Labor government, but our thanks and congratulations go to the past and current executive team who have fostered this group to be such an influential and successful community organisation. Your time and effort have been immense. I particularly want to congratulate the current president, Evelyn Yap OAM. She is an incredible person in her own right, but her leadership of the business council is one that we all celebrate.

As this motion indicates, the organisation has been supported by very passionate patrons the Hon. Sir Eric Neal AC and the Hon. Hieu Van Le AC, both former governors. Their contributions to not just the objectives of the Australia Malaysia Business Council but the people-to-people links between South Australia and Malaysia has been widely felt in our state. Congratulations again on their 30th anniversary.

The Hon. J.S. LEE (17:29): I would like to thank the Hon. Nicola Centofanti and the Hon. Justin Hanson for their contributions to support the congratulations motion for the 30th anniversary of the Australia Malaysia Business Council, and also to highlight the significant bilateral relationships between Malaysia and Australia, and particularly South Australia. With those remarks, I commend the motion.

Motion carried.

*Bills***RESIDENTIAL TENANCIES (MINIMUM STANDARDS) AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 28 August 2024.)

The Hon. M. EL DANNAWI (17:30): I rise on behalf of the government to indicate that we will not be supporting the honourable member's motion. However, we understand that the honourable member likely has the support to refer this bill to a select committee and will take part in that process.

The Malinauskas government has made the most significant reforms to South Australia's rental laws in a generation, through changes detailed in the Residential Tenancies (Miscellaneous) Amendment Act 2023. We thank the Hon. Robert Simms for his contributions and support to help deliver these measures. As part of these laws, it is a requirement for rental properties to meet minimum housing standards under the Housing Improvement Act 2016, known as the HIA minimum standards. These are the same standards that must be met for any residential premises to be considered safe and suitable for human habitation in SA.

The standards include being reasonably draft-proof and weatherproof; being reasonably free from the adverse effects of moisture or dampness; having adequate kitchen, bathroom and laundry facilities; and having secure external doors with locks. Our reforms also included a requirement that all new appliances and fixtures installed in rental properties meet minimum efficiency standards. The government believes we have struck the right balance by setting the minimum standards at the same level as those that are required in every other home in SA.

The measures proposed by the honourable member would impose a significant financial cost on landlords. The last thing we want to do is put additional cost obligations on landlords that might cause them to exit the market and risk reducing supply, thus driving up the price of rent. In order to meet the obligations imposed by the bill, landlords would be required to perform detailed assessments of their rental properties to determine whether they meet the specific standards prescribed.

It would be a further and potentially substantial cost to bring rental properties up to the prescribed standards, in which case landlords may find it more economically viable to sell their rental properties or to lease them as short-term rentals through platforms including Airbnb. This has the potential to further reduce the supply of rental homes and put upwards pressure on the price of rent.

The Hon. J.S. LEE (17:32): I rise briefly to speak about the Residential Tenancies (Minimum Standards) Amendment Bill proposed by the Hon. Robert Simms. I understand that in January 120 organisations called on the federal government to support renters and landlords with energy upgrades, including providing funding and support to states and territories to implement bills like this one. The South Australian signatories which supported that proposal included SA Power Networks, Anti-Poverty Network SA, Shelter SA and Uniting Country SA.

I understand that the honourable member has good intentions with this bill, but I also believe that he is now moving this to a select committee. It is my understanding that the South Australian Council of Social Service, Better Renting and Uniting Communities support the bill going to committee, saying that it is a crucial opportunity for sector stakeholders to discuss improving rental homes' energy performance. With that support from the community, I indicate that I will support the bill going to a select committee.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (17:34): The Liberal Party had determined that, if this was going to go to a vote as a bill, we would not be able to support it, although it is no doubt well intentioned. The honourable member might say in his summing-up whether he thinks I am verballing him or not, but my understanding is that he has never met a new statute he did not like, and he also does love a stick to beat about anybody who might have made a bit of a nest egg for themselves by being a landlord.

If I speak first to the merits of the bill, my concern is that it crosses a couple of acts. The Residential Tenancies Act, which this bill is addressed to, but also the Housing Improvement Act, already enable the government to set housing standards by regulation and to take enforcement action where properties are deemed unfit for human habitation. I have certainly attended briefings with the groups that have been referred to—Better Renting, Uniting Communities and SACOSS—who have highlighted some of the situations that private renters find themselves in. Some of their tales are really quite horrific. The question mark that has been left in my mind is that surely these standards would fail the test of the Housing Improvement Act on the face of it.

The proposition was put forward that this would instead be referred to a committee, which I think enables the parliament to explore some of those opportunities to determine whether these egregious examples that have been brought to our attention are actually breaches of existing laws and, if there were to be laws that were to be introduced to address minimum standards, where they might best fit. So I think we certainly will need to hear from a range of stakeholders who represent a range of interests, including landlords as well as tenants, and also to hear from organisations such as RentRight, which is a service operated by Uniting Communities and SYC.

One of the difficulties, too, when you introduce statutes without taking consideration of whether that is the best place for them to exist, and if indeed they duplicate existing statutes, is that the only people who benefit from it are the people who can interpret the law, so in my view that is not the best approach to take.

Given that it is a referral to a committee, the party will support that. The honourable member has reassured me that the committee will report quickly, so we think that that is a useful exercise to hear from all the different stakeholders. We may hear about a few carrots rather than sticks as an approach to this, so that might be for the benefit of all renters in South Australia across the board, as well as landlords.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (17:38): I thank all honourable members for their contribution: the Hon. Ms El Dannawi, the Hon. Jing Lee and the Hon. Michelle Lensink. I should say I am a bit perplexed by the position of the South Australian Labor Party, who in the middle of a cost-of-living federal election indicate that they do not support a bill that would deliver tangible changes to South Australian renters and assist them in reducing their power bills at a time of economic crisis. I think that is disappointing.

I have made it clear that the second reading stage is, in effect, the device that is required to enable this bill to be referred to a select committee that will examine the bill. I have given notice that I will move a contingent motion, so should this bill pass its second reading stage I will then move subsequently that it be referred to a select committee. I appreciate the support of the opposition in that regard.

As the Hon. Michelle Lensink indicated, I have given her and other members who have expressed an interest in this committee an assurance that should a committee be established we will move quickly to get it finalised. It is important, I think, that the committee wrap up by the middle of the year and certainly, should the committee be established, I will be talking to members about that. In terms of the comments made again by the Labor government, it is also important to note that this bill applies to new tenancies. Of course, these are the sorts of issues that we can tease through in any committee process, should it get off the ground.

I should also say that I am proud of the work that the Greens did with the Labor government back in 2023 to negotiate important reforms to the Residential Tenancies Act. Some of those reforms are really good, tangible changes for renters, but there is still work left to be done. In particular, the energy standards space is an area that I think has been neglected by the parliament for far too long and I am hopeful that if this committee gets support there is an opportunity for us to work together and really address that. It is an area that would deliver some real, tangible change for South Australians who are struggling at the moment and who are in the rental market but, because of the record low vacancy rate, are not in a position to be able to really assert their rights and have been given a dud deal.

Bill read a second time.

Referred to Select Committee

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (17:41): I move:

1. That the bill be referred to a select committee of the Legislative Council for inquiry and report.
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.

Motion carried.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I move:

That the select committee consist of the Hon. N.J. Centofanti, the Hon. J.M.A. Lensink, the Hon. T.T. Ngo, the Hon. F. Pangallo and the mover.

Motion carried.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I move:

That the select committee have the power to send for persons, papers and records; to adjourn from place to place; and to report on 4 June 2025.

Motion carried.

SUMMARY OFFENCES (INVASIVE IMAGES AND DEPICTIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 June 2024.)

The Hon. J.S. LEE (17:42): I rise today to speak in support of the Summary Offences (Invasive Images and Depictions) Amendment Bill 2024. I wish to thank the Hon. Connie Bonaros for bringing this bill to the chamber and for her diligent work negotiating with the government on subsequent amendments that greatly strengthen the efficacy of the proposed legislation.

The bill will create new offences related to the creation, distribution and threat to distribute artificially generated invasive images and depictions. Commonly known as deepfakes, AI-generated depictions may draw on real photos, video or audio of a real person to create a realistic-looking but false image or video of that person—how disgusting. Most often, such deepfakes are invasive and sexually explicit depictions that seem to portray a real person doing or saying something that they did not actually do, which is pretty scary.

Rapid advances in AI capability have seen an explosion of explicit deepfakes on the internet, with authorities estimating that there has been growth of 550 per cent year on year since 2019. According to Australia's eSafety Commissioner, pornography videos make up 98 per cent of deepfake material currently online, and 99 per cent of that imagery is of women and girls. Deepfakes can be almost impossible to detect, with detectors specifically designed to analyse whether images, video and other media have been artificially manipulated or fabricated entirely, struggling to tell the difference between what is real and what is fake.

With AI programs becoming a common practice in our daily lives, creating deepfakes has become easier than ever before, and our laws must keep pace. We have seen deepfakes used to create child exploitation material, create pornography material without a person's consent, create revenge porn, bully, blackmail, spread misinformation, and destroy reputations. While there are a number of laws that may apply to deepfakes in some circumstances, depending on how they are created or used, this bill will ensure there is no doubt that creating, distributing and threatening to distribute artificially generated invasive images and depictions without consent is unlawful.

The bill seeks to double the existing penalties for indecent filming or sexting offences to match the new deepfake offences. Like the existing penalties, the new offences would have a higher penalty if the person depicted is under the age of 17 years. I note that the honourable member has also filed a series of amendments to include offences for creating a humiliating or degrading depiction of a person, such as content depicting an assault or other act of violence done by or against a person, or an act that would be considered humiliating or degrading to the real person.

There is a test against generally accepted community standards, so something that would only be considered to cause minor or moderate embarrassment would not be captured by this legislation—it is pretty commonsense stuff. It is important that amended offences are included. Humiliating and degrading deepfake content can be just as damaging to a victim's reputation and personal and professional relationships as can sexually explicit content.

The idea of someone maliciously spreading an awful image or video that looks like you or someone you love is terrible and nauseating. It can have long-term psychological impacts, causing shame, anxiety and depression. We have all seen too many cases of the tragic impact it can have, particularly on vulnerable young people. I also mention that, for multicultural communities, if any shame or lies are told about them, it creates lots of taboos and damage, not just for the person but for the families and the communities.

We must ensure that our laws prevent the proliferation of harmful deepfake content and protect vulnerable community members from being threatened and exploited in such a way. I commend the Hon. Connie Bonaros for her interest, passion and diligent and thoughtful work on this bill. With those remarks, I commend the bill to the chamber.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (17:48): I rise to speak in favour of this bill on behalf of the Greens, and in so doing I acknowledge the leadership of the Hon. Connie Bonaros. She is very passionate about this area and has been pushing the parliament to deal with this. We are in a situation where technology has developed at a pace that has been out of step with legislation, and legislators like the Hon. Connie Bonaros have played a very important role in making sure that we pause and take note of those advances in technology and ensure that vulnerable people, in particular children, are not falling prey to this technology. I thank her for her leadership in this space.

Artificial intelligence has enormous potential benefits, but it also has the potential to harm society, the economy and our personal lives. Artificial intelligence technology has crossed a threshold with the capability to make people look and sound like other people. A deepfake is fabricated, hyper-realistic digital media, including video, image and audio content. Not only has this technology created confusion, scepticism and the spread of misinformation—and we have certainly seen this particularly in other jurisdictions in the context of election campaigns—but deepfakes also pose a threat to privacy, security and psychological wellbeing.

Manipulation of images is not new, but over recent decades, digital recording and editing techniques have made it far easier to produce fake visual and audio content not just of humans but of animals, machines and even inanimate objects. Advances in artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning have taken the technology even further, allowing it to rapidly generate content that is extremely realistic, almost impossible to detect with the naked eye and very difficult to debunk. This is why the resulting photos, videos and sound files are called deepfakes.

To generate convincing content, deepfake technology often requires only a small amount of genuine data, images, footage or sound recordings. Indeed, the field is evolving so rapidly that deepfake content can be generated without the need for any human supervision at all. The possibilities for misuse of this technology are growing exponentially as digital distribution platforms become more publicly accessible and the tools to create deepfakes become relatively cheap, user friendly and mainstream.

Deepfakes have the potential to cause significant damage. They have been used to create fake news, false pornographic videos and malicious hoaxes usually targeting well-known people such as politicians and celebrities. Potentially, deepfakes can be used as a tool for identity theft, extortion, sexual exploitation, reputational damage, ridicule, intimidation and harassment. Any person who is targeted by such efforts may experience financial loss, damage to their professional or social standing, fear, humiliation, shame, a loss of self esteem or reduced confidence.

Reports of misrepresentation and deception could undermine trust in digital platforms and services and increase general levels of fear and suspicion within our society. As advances in deepfake technology gather pace and apps and tools are emerging that allow the general public to produce credible deepfakes, concerns are growing about the potential for harm to both individuals and society.

As noted in eSafety Commissioner Julie Inman Grant's opening statement to a Senate standing committee inquiring into the Criminal Code Amendment (Deepfake Sexual Material) Bill of last year:

Deepfake detection tools are lagging behind the technology itself. Open-source AI apps have proliferated online and are often free and easy to use to create damaging digital content including deepfake image-based abuse material and hyper-realistic synthetic child sexual abuse material. Companies [should] be doing more to reduce the risks that their platforms can be used to generate damaging content.

However, using deepfakes to target and abuse others is not simply a technology problem. It is a result of social, cultural and behavioural issues that are being played out in the online space. As noted by the Australian Strategic Policy Institute's report, 'Weaponized deep fakes', there are challenges to security and democracy represented by deepfakes. These include heightened potential for fraud, propaganda and disinformation, military deception and even the erosion of trust in our institutions and fair election processes.

The risks of deploying a technology without first assessing and addressing the potential for individual and societal impacts are very high. Deepfakes provide yet another example of the importance of safety by design to assist in anticipating and engineering out misuse at the get-go. It is very clear that AI technology has rapidly outpaced government regulation. Digital rights are essential for a fair and just society. People deserve control over their data, transparency and automated decision-making and robust protections against misuse, including from the harmful practice of creating, distributing and threatening to distribute artificially generated images.

As I said from the outset, the Greens appreciate the work of the Hon. Connie Bonaros in this space. This is an important reform, I think, in terms of moving us more towards a society that strikes a better balance between technology and the rights of all members of our society to live free from harm. The Greens support the bill.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (17:54): I rise to speak briefly on this private member's bill and at the outset indicate the government will be supporting the bill. I would like to acknowledge the significant work and advocacy of the Hon. Ms Bonaros, who has undertaken a significant amount of work leading up to this point regarding invasive deepfakes.

The use of artificial intelligence is now a part of our world, whether we like it or not, and we will need to make sure that we are doing all we can to harness the positive potentials of AI while ensuring our laws are fit for purpose to dissuade and punish its misuse. One of the more harmful ways that artificial intelligence can be misappropriated—and more often than not it is targeted on women and girls—is via artificially generated deepfakes that are often sexual in nature. Authorities have reported that deepfake technology is being widely used in the creation of non-consensual pornography, and concerns have also been raised about the potential to use deepfakes to harass, intimidate, threaten, blackmail or extort victims, including victim survivors of domestic and family violence.

Earlier this week, we heard distressing reports of sexualised deepfakes targeting at least 15 female public servants in Canberra, with the Australian Capital Territory's current laws unable to hold the young male creator to account. That loophole is exactly what this bill seeks to close. As the Hon. Jing Lee pointed out, it is estimated that as many as 90 to 95 per cent of all deepfakes created are non-consensual pornography and 99 per cent of the victims depicted are women and girls.

The eSafety Commissioner, Julie Inman Grant, has further stated that explicit deepfakes have increased on the internet as much as 550 per cent year on year since 2019. Those alarming statistics highlight the need for more to be done to protect members of our community from these malicious attacks. That is why we have seen not just one but two pieces of legislation introduced, seeking to protect from these harmful deepfakes.

I am pleased at the work the government has been able to do alongside the Hon. Connie Bonaros with Michael Brown MP, the member for Florey, who chaired a committee looking at the use of AI in South Australia. This takes the best elements of both the bill that the government has put forward and the one that the Hon. Connie Bonaros has introduced, to ensure we have the best legislation we can to protect people from these harmful deepfakes. As I said at the outset, the

government will be supporting this bill, but we do reserve the right to ask some very pointed, difficult and challenging questions during the committee stage.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (17:56): I rise today to offer the opposition's support for the Summary Offences (Invasive Images and Depictions) Amendment Bill 2024 introduced by the Hon. Connie Bonaros. This bill is timely, it is necessary and it is incredibly important, and I want to commend the member for her commitment to this process. I am glad the government has recognised that the honourable member started this process and has allowed her the opportunity to see it through by removing their own catch-up version of the bill.

This bill recognises the rapid escalation of new technology, particularly artificial intelligence, in enabling the creation and spread of invasive, degrading and, critically, non-consensual depictions of individuals. It is a technology that, while powerful in legitimate hands, has also been weaponised to humiliate, to harass and to exploit. This parliament has a duty to ensure that our laws keep pace with the modern methods of abuse. Without legislative action, victims—often young people and often women—are left exposed to an insidious form of violence, one that strikes at dignity, at autonomy and at personal safety.

The bill does three key things. Firstly, it increases penalties for existing offences. These include for the distribution of an invasive image without consent under section 26C, for engaging in indecent filming under section 26D, for the distribution of images obtained by indecent filming under section 26D(3), and for threatening to distribute invasive images or indecent filming material under sections 26DA(1) and 26DA(2).

Secondly, it creates new offences to address the menace of artificially generated contents in sections 26G(1) and (2) and 26H. This is by specifically noting the creation, distribution and the threat of distribution of an invasive depiction. Thirdly, it introduces balanced protections. A defence is available under section 26G(3), where a depiction is created with the written consent of each real person depicted, and at section 26GA(4)(b) there is also a defence for distribution, where the depiction forms part of a work of artistic merit.

Further, section 26I makes clear that consent given by someone under 17, by someone with cognitive impairment, or obtained through duress or deception, is not valid consent for the purposes of the new offences in this bill. Importantly, the Summary Offences (Invasive Images and Depictions) Amendment Bill 2024 provides for the forfeiture of devices or objects used in the commission of these offences under sections 26I(2) and 26I(3).

This issue must have swift and decisive action. Every day without action risks further harm to innocent people that may truly have a lifelong traumatic impact. The digital footprint of humiliation can be impossible to erase. The opposition stands ready to work constructively to ensure these new protections are passed into law today without delay. We owe it to the victims, we owe it to the future, and I commend the bill to the chamber.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (18:00): It heartens me that there is always room for middle ground and meaningful reform and collaboration in this place. At the outset, can I thank Ms Emilia Freitas Lay, South Australian parliamentary intern student through the Uni of South Australia—and this is important—because she did a substantial body of work for my office that dealt with deepfakes and the impact on women and girls, much of which has been referred to today. Can I also make special thanks to the Assistant Minister for AI, Mr Brown, the member for Florey, not just for his collaboration on this bill but his dedication more broadly to ensuring AI plays its role in emerging technologies in safe and appropriate ways.

It is a critically important body of work and I know the assistant minister, who is also a computer programmer by background, I understand, has been keen to promote AI opportunities, but not at the expense of these sorts of laws. In so doing, he has in fact prioritised the safety of victims of deepfakes, the majority of whom—in fact almost 100 per cent of whom, as we have just heard—are women and girls. I do note again, and I think it is worth pointing out for the record, the assistant minister led an inquiry that backed calls to develop this sort of technology capability. That was very welcome and had bipartisan support from this parliament but, again, has prioritised these areas.

There is, of course, a very sinister side to AI, and it comes at great personal costs to its victims, so I am equally pleased that the minister has used his position to promote and advocate for these laws. Of course, I thank the Attorney-General for his commitment to strengthening our laws when it comes to issues of sexual offending, sexual harassment, child exploitation; and this body of work is really a continuation for me of something that I think we have all been committed to, and he has shown a genuine desire to get it right in this place when it comes to stamping out abuse and empowering victims. I am grateful to both the Attorney and the assistant minister for their willingness to work so collaboratively and constructively on this bill.

I would also, of course, like to thank today's speakers, the Hon. Ms Lee, the Hon. Mr Simms, the Attorney-General, and the Leader of the Opposition, for what I think is a good outcome in politics when we all come together in this multipartisan way and support something that is so critically important in our community. As we have heard overwhelmingly, it is women and girls who are the victims of deepfake abuse. As the assistant minister said earlier today, you do not have to be Taylor Swift to be the subject of inappropriate deepfakes, and today we are collectively drawing a line in the sand and introducing what will be the toughest laws in the country. Together with Victoria, we are leading the nation through these reforms.

You have heard that current estimates suggest that up to 95 to 98 per cent of all deepfakes are nonconsensual pornography, and 99 per cent of victims are women and girls. The eSafety Commissioner, as the Hon. Jing Lee has pointed out, has reported that explicit deepfake content online has exploded by a whopping 550 per cent year on year since 2019. It is becoming one of the most serious threats facing women and young girls online and, even more frightening, it is happening in our schoolyards. That is because what two or three years ago was very much in the realm of hackers and the underworld of the internet is now mainstream.

It is being used to harass, to shame, to intimidate, to extort and to violate young women and girls with devastating psychological impacts and, worse still, suicides. Sadly, it is perpetrated in the main by men and reflects broader cultural attitudes around power, control and entitlements over women's and girls' bodies. These laws make it clear that we will not stand by while technology is weaponised to humiliate and harm anyone.

There is no excuse for this and if you feel entitled enough to exploit, to humiliate, to denigrate and to degrade a person by using their image without their consent, then you should feel the full consequences of the law. There is simply no excuse for this sort of behaviour and it will not be tolerated. That is what the work of this place today reflects, and I am very grateful for that.

In closing I will leave you with this: it should horrify all of us—it horrifies me and I am sure it does horrify us all equally, especially when it comes to our kids—that victims of child pornography and child exploitation material could be none the wiser that their images have been used to create hideous, horrendous and sickening content and their families and parents may be none the wiser that their kids' images are being used for such sickening and depraved purposes. That does not make them victimless crimes though, and we have to do all we can, as the Hon. Rob Simms, said to keep up with technologies that enable perpetrators who use these tools for such sinister and depraved purposes.

In terms of the amendments, I might take this opportunity to speak to them because it is probably the easiest way to deal with this bill going forward. As the Attorney said, we have taken the best elements of both bills and put them together. I pause there and remind honourable members firstly of the importance of education and deterrence. We have seen how important these sorts of laws are when it comes to sexting offences, to the stealthing laws that we passed through this place and to consent laws, especially amongst younger people, and it is absolutely critical that it should form part of the education curriculum going forward.

There are a number of amendments to the bill, and the easiest way to explain that is that rather than tinkering with the existing provisions and incorporating them as I had initially proposed into clause 5B, I have effectively introduced amendments in set 3 which seek to do all of the things that we have agreed to do in one consistent set. I have done that first because it is much cleaner, it is much more streamlined and it deals explicitly with deepfakes. This is important because, as I have said, it is cleaner for one but, more importantly, it fits in with the intent of this bill to remove any doubt

and close any potential loophole when it comes to deciphering between a real image, an image that is wholly generated by AI or an image that is partly generated by AI.

In short, the laws as amended will apply to all images, regardless of whether they are real or generated in part or in whole by AI. It is the depiction of a simulated person itself and the creation of that depiction that will form the basis of these laws and, together with existing laws, the creation and/or dissemination or even threat to disseminate will be the subject of hefty criminal penalties. The bill, as amended, will remove any doubt as to its applicability for perpetrators of deepfake abuse and it will also ensure consistency with penalties under the existing penalty regime.

With those words, I thank everybody once again—all honourable members across the political divide—for their support on this. I thank the Attorney for working diligently with me to get to this point and look forward to the swift passage of this bill through this place.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Bonaros–3]—

Page 2, line 4—Delete 'Invasive Images and' and substitute 'Humiliating, Degrading or Invasive'

This amendment seeks to delete the current 'Invasive Images and' words and replace them with 'Humiliating, Degrading or Invasive', which is more consistent with the language we use in other parts of this legislation.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

New clause 1A.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I move:

Amendment No 2 [Bonaros–3]—

Page 2, after line 5—Insert:

1A—Commencement

This Act comes into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

This amendment simply deals with the commencement date of the legislation.

New clause inserted.

Clause 2.

The CHAIR: The Hon. Ms Bonaros has indicated that she will be opposing this clause.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I move:

Amendment No 3 [Bonaros–3]—

Page 2, lines 7 to 11—This clause will be opposed

I move this amendment for the reasons already outlined.

Clause negatived.

Clauses 3 and 4 negatived.

Clause 5.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I move:

Amendment No 6 [Bonaros–3]—

Page 3, line 17 [clause 5, inserted section 26F(1), definition of *artificially generated content*]—Delete 'an audiovisual or visual' and substitute 'audiovisual, visual, or audio'

Amendment No 7 [Bonaros–3]—

Page 3, lines 24 to 29 [clause 5, inserted section 26F(1), definition of *depicted person*]—Delete the definition

Amendment No 8 [Bonaros–3]—

Page 3, line 30 [clause 5, inserted section 26F(1), definition of *depiction*]—After 'audiovisual' insert ', audio'

Amendment No 9 [Bonaros–3]—

Page 3, after line 31 [clause 5, inserted section 26F(1)]—After the definition of *distribute* insert:

humiliating or degrading depiction, in relation to a simulated person, means artificially generated content depicting—

- (a) an assault or other act of violence done by or against the simulated person; or
- (b) an act done by or against the simulated person that reasonable adult members of the community would, were the act to be done by or against a real person, consider to be humiliating or degrading to the real person (but does not include an act that reasonable adult members of the community would consider to cause only minor or moderate embarrassment);

Amendment No 10 [Bonaros–3]—

Page 3, line 32 [clause 5, inserted section 26F(1), definition of *invasive depiction*]—Delete 'depicted person' and substitute 'simulated person'

Amendment No 11 [Bonaros–3]—

Page 3, line 34 [clause 5, inserted section 26F(1), definition of *invasive depiction*, (a)]—Delete 'depicted person' and substitute 'simulated person'

Amendment No 12 [Bonaros–3]—

Page 3, line 35 [clause 5, inserted section 26F(1), definition of *invasive depiction*, (a)(i)]—Delete 'depicted' and substitute 'simulated'

Amendment No 13 [Bonaros–3]—

Page 4, line 3 [clause 5, inserted section 26F(1), definition of *invasive depiction*, (b)]—Delete 'depicted person' and substitute 'simulated person'

Amendment No 14 [Bonaros–3]—

Page 4, line 4 [clause 5, inserted section 26F(1), definition of *invasive depiction*]—Delete 'depicted person' and substitute 'simulated person'

Amendment No 15 [Bonaros–3]—

Page 4, after line 11 [clause 5, inserted section 26F(1)]—Insert:

simulated person means a person depicted in artificially generated content that—

- (a) purports to be a depiction of a particular real person; or
- (b) so closely resembles a depiction of a particular real person that a reasonable person who knew the real person would consider it likely to be a depiction of the real person.

Amendment No 16 [Bonaros–3]—

Page 4, lines 16 to 37 (inclusive) [clause 5, inserted section 26G]—Delete the section and substitute:

26G—Creation of humiliating, degrading or invasive depiction

- (1) A person who creates a humiliating or degrading depiction of a simulated person is guilty of an offence.
Maximum penalty: \$10,000 or imprisonment for 2 years.
- (2) A person who creates an invasive depiction of a simulated person is guilty of an offence.
Maximum penalty:
 - (a) if the simulated person purports to be a real person who is under the age of 17 years—\$20,000 or imprisonment for 4 years;
 - (b) in any other case—\$10,000 or imprisonment for 2 years.

- (3) It is a defence to a charge of an offence against this section to prove that the creation of the humiliating or degrading depiction or invasive depiction (as the case may be) occurred with the written consent of each real person depicted in the depiction.

26GA—Distribution of humiliating, degrading or invasive depiction

- (1) A person who distributes a humiliating or degrading depiction of a simulated person is guilty of an offence.

Maximum penalty: Imprisonment for 1 year.

- (2) A person who distributes an invasive depiction of a simulated person is guilty of an offence.

Maximum penalty:

- (a) if the simulated person purports to be a real person who is under the age of 17 years—\$20,000 or imprisonment for 4 years;

- (b) in any other case—\$10,000 or imprisonment for 2 years.

- (3) It is a defence to a charge of an offence against this section to prove that the distribution of the humiliating or degrading depiction or invasive depiction (as the case may be) occurred with the written consent of each real person depicted in the depiction.

- (4) No offence is committed against this section—

- (a) by law enforcement personnel and legal practitioners, or their agents, acting in the course of law enforcement or legal proceedings; or

- (b) by reason of the distribution of artificially generated content that constitutes, or forms part of, a work of artistic merit if, having regard to the artistic nature and purposes of the work as a whole, there is no undue emphasis on aspects of the work that might otherwise be considered to be a humiliating or degrading depiction or an invasive depiction (as the case may be) of a simulated person.

Amendment No 17 [Bonaros–3]—

Page 4, line 38 [clause 5, inserted section 26H, heading]—After 'distribute' insert 'humiliating, degrading or'

Amendment No 18 [Bonaros–3]—

Page 4, after line 38 [clause 5, inserted section 26H]—Before subsection (1) insert:

- (a1) A person who—

- (a) threatens to distribute a humiliating or degrading depiction of a simulated person; and

- (b) intends to arouse a fear that the threat will be, or is likely to be, carried out, or is recklessly indifferent as to whether such a fear is aroused,

is guilty of an offence.

Maximum penalty: \$5,000 or imprisonment for 1 year.

Amendment No 19 [Bonaros–3]—

Page 4, lines 40 to 41 [clause 5, inserted section 26H(1)(a)]—Delete 'depicted person' and substitute 'simulated person'

Amendment No 20 [Bonaros–3]—

Page 5, lines 5 to 10 [clause 5, inserted section 26H(1), penalty provision]—

Delete the penalty provision and substitute:

Maximum penalty:

- (a) if the simulated person purports to be a real person who is under the age of 17 years, or the threat is made to a person who is under the age of 17 years—\$10,000 or imprisonment for 2 years;

- (b) in any other case—\$5,000 or imprisonment for 1 year.

Amendment No 21 [Bonaros–3]—

Page 5, line 13 [clause 5, inserted section 26H(2)]—Delete 'consented to the distribution of the invasive depiction' and substitute:

gave written consent to the distribution of the humiliating or degrading depiction or invasive depiction (as the case may be)

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. C. BONAROS (18:13): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Motions

GREEN SPACE, KENT TOWN

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. T.A. Franks:

That this council—

1. Notes that Kent Town is the only suburb in the Norwood Payneham St Peters council with no green space available to the public;
2. Recognises that Kent Town residents' access to the adjacent Adelaide Parklands is obstructed at various periods throughout the year due to fenced-off special events; and
3. Calls on the Malinauskas government to acquire the vacant Lot 26 on College Road, Kent Town, from the federal government for the purposes of turning it into a publicly accessible park for the local community.

(Continued from 6 March 2024.)

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (18:14): I rise to speak on the motion of the Hon. Tammy Franks. You should all have received an amendment, which I would like to read out now. I move to amend the motion as follows:

Leave out paragraph 1.

Leave out paragraph 3 and insert new paragraph as follows:

3. Recommends that Norwood Payneham and St Peters council consider the spatial distribution, accessibility and quality of open space required to support additional housing opportunities in Kent Town through the development of their Open Space, Playgrounds and Recreation Strategy and then engage with the federal government regarding the purchase of the property, should it align with their strategic intent for open space in the area.

The vacant allotment at Lot 26 College Road, Kent Town, currently owned by the commonwealth and previously used by the Bureau of Meteorology, has been on the commonwealth's land disposal list since 2022. The council supports the transfer of the land from the commonwealth to the council if it incurs no cost, including all associated transfer fees and any remediation expenses. If this were to occur, the council undertakes to assume ownership and care of the land as a community park.

The site is zoned urban corridor (main street) under the Planning and Design Code and is adjacent to the established neighbourhood zone to the east of College Road. This zoning encourages a mix of medium and high-density urban development, with a focus on main street characteristics, such as activated frontages and frequent pedestrian access points.

Approximately six months ago, council provided preliminary feedback in relation to the feasibility of developing Lot 26 College Road for affordable housing. The proposal was deemed too large in scale for the site and unlikely to gain approval. Notably, the neighbouring site at 25 College Road has a valid planning consent for a three-level car park and a retail shop development.

In the suburb of Kent Town there is one green space available to the public at Hardman Gardens, which is located at the intersection of The Parade and Fullarton Road. The Greater Adelaide Regional Plan was released on 17 March 2025, which includes a new Greater Adelaide

open space strategy. The GARP highlights the importance of identifying priority areas for new public open space to support equitable distribution and space for increased tree canopy and other urban green cover.

It also describes how local planning for additional housing should consider the spatial distribution, accessibility and quality of open space and identify opportunities to partner with the state to invest in open space and public realm linked to housing growth to support these growing communities. Similarly, council is working on a new Open Space, Playgrounds and Recreation Strategy to help guide their management and investment in these areas.

Council's current open space strategy focuses on exploring opportunities for smaller pocket reserves throughout the south-west precinct of the council area, including Kent Town. Additionally, the Planning and Development Fund enables the South Australian government to adopt a statewide approach to strategically implement good planning outcomes, which can include supporting open space and public realm projects, including grants to councils.

Over the past two decades, council has received \$5.6 million in grant funding for open space projects, including \$45,000 specifically for the Kent Town Urban Design Framework in 2015-16 and \$450,000 towards the Dunstan Adventure Playground redevelopment project in 2020-21. The council also received \$47,600 in 2024 to support the finalisation of their heritage code amendment and to complete additional heritage-related works.

The GARP considers contributions to the fund should be redistributed to areas proportionate to the amount of development occurring, strengthening the connection of open space investment between the developments that result in payments into the fund and the communities experiencing the growth. Given these factors, it is recommended that the council engage with the federal government regarding the purchase of the property, should it align with their strategic intent for open space in the local area as well as the principles and strategies in GARP regarding open space provisions across all of Greater Adelaide.

The City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters has over 180 hectares of open space, with 72 parks and reserves and 29 playgrounds offering diverse recreational opportunities for residents. While Kent Town faces limitations in direct open space availability, the broader council area upholds high standards for public open space, catering to a wide array of community needs, from informal recreation to structural sports and biodiversity conservation.

Over the past two decades, council has received \$5.6 million in grant funding for open space projects from the Planning and Development Fund. The Dunstan Adventure Playground is a recent example of successful collaboration between the council and the state government, with the Planning and Development Fund providing \$450,000 of support. This playground demonstrates the importance of connection to open space along the banks of the River Torrens, creating a strong link to the Linear Park trail and supporting positive health and wellbeing outcomes and improved safety and accessibility.

The state government's continued commitment to improving our open spaces and public realm is vital to ensuring South Australia remains a great place to live, where people feel connected to their communities. The Greater Adelaide Regional Plan was released by the government on 17 March 2025 and sets out our long-term vision for how we can sustainably prepare for future growth. The GARP has a focus on increasing tree canopy cover, connecting people with nature, creating open spaces and creating climate resilience. It also considers that funds for new open space areas should be prioritised in areas proportionate to the amount of development occurring, strengthening the connection of open space investment between the developments and the communities experiencing the growth.

Open space investigations were undertaken to inform the GARP, and subsequently a new Greater Adelaide Open Space Strategy was developed to form part of the GARP, providing high-level guidance for local open space strategies. The GARP also requires councils to undertake local housing strategies to identify additional housing opportunities.

Council is developing a new Open Space, Playgrounds and Recreation Strategy to help guide how it manages and invests in its open space, playground and recreational facilities, further

developing short-term and long-term plans for the community. This underscores the importance of sustainable development and outcomes, requiring a cross-sectoral approach and integrated planning at both local and state levels to ensure equitable distribution of open spaces across South Australia.

It would be prudent to await the finalisation of council's local housing strategy and Open Space, Playgrounds and Recreation Strategy to inform future investments in open space amenities. Given these factors, it is recommended that council engage with the federal government regarding the purchase of the property, should it align with their local housing strategy and strategic intent for open space in the area, as well as the principles and strategies in GARP regarding open space provisions across Greater Adelaide.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (18:24): That was quite an interesting contribution and I am not quite sure who wrote it. I will not put the blame at the feet of the Hon. Mr Wortley. I rise to speak in support of the unamended motion of the Hon. Tammy Franks. The residents of Kent Town, and in particular the Kent Town Residents Association, have been advocating for this small piece of land previously used by the Bureau of Meteorology (BoM) to be made available as green space for the local community.

During the Dunstan by-election last year, the Liberal opposition and our candidate for Dunstan, Dr Anna Finizio, committed to supporting the transfer of the land to the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters for use as a community park. I know this is something that Anna has advocated for on behalf of the Kent Town Residents Association and her community.

But the people of Dunstan have once again been let down by Labor's broken promises. Not even a Labor member for Dunstan, a state Labor government and a federal Labor government could manage to transfer this small parcel of land for the benefit of Kent Town residents. How disappointing it is for the community who continue to lose access to green space under this Labor government.

We have seen Labor continually encroach on the Adelaide Parklands, including the relocation of the Thebarton Barracks, which the SA Liberal Party stood side-by-side with the Adelaide Parklands Association to oppose. We have also supported legislation through the parliament to add the Parklands to the state heritage list, which was not supported by the Labor member for Dunstan or this Labor government.

Since coming into government, Labor has shut off the Parklands to the public for months at a time due to the Adelaide 500. The prescribed works period last year alone was 161 days. That means thousands of residents in Dunstan cannot enjoy the Parklands, including its cycling and walking tracks. We know how important green space is to the community, particularly to the community of Dunstan.

The Kent Town Residents Association have collected around 500 signatures in support of the former BoM site being made available for a community park space. Kent Town is a community where we have families living across the suburb in apartments and it is home to an Elder Care Independent Living Village in close proximity to the site, who would, no doubt, utilise the space if it were available to them.

Kent Town is also home to social housing like Dr Kent's Paddock, where I have had the opportunity to meet with residents who I know very much value green space and want to see more of it in Kent Town. Currently, Kent Town does not have safe, accessible, public green space. The benefits green space can bring to mental and physical health is immense. We know there is support across the community for this land to be turned into a community park and that it would be enjoyed by many residents.

I certainly hope that if the Greens, who have brought this motion to the Legislative Council, are truly supportive of this community park and of protecting green spaces like our Parklands, they will look to support candidates like Anna Finizio in the next election. Anna is a progressive and accomplished female candidate who I know would have been prepared to fight tooth and nail for her community. She is someone who would have brought accountability to the parliament on these issues and on the issues that her community care about, from the environment to women's health.

It is disappointing that the Greens used their preference votes to support the Labor Party in the 2024 Dunstan by-election, which as we can see has failed to deliver for the people of Dunstan

on a very simple issue. I also express my disappointment that Labor has gained an even greater majority in the parliament through Greens' support for the Labor candidate for Dunstan, who is a conservative, right wing Labor candidate as compared to a progressive moderate Liberal candidate. It highlights a serious hypocrisy that voters in Dunstan need to be aware of.

I am pleased to see that Anna Finizio continues to advocate for the residents of Kent Town on issues like this. I take this opportunity to reiterate that, despite Labor's broken promises to make this space available to residents in Kent Town at last year's by-election, over a year later they have failed to do so. As I have already foreshadowed, we will not be supporting the Labor Party's amendments to this motion.

Sitting extended beyond 18:30 on motion of Hon. I.K. Hunter.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (18:29): I move to amend paragraph 3 as follows:

Leave out 'vacant Lot 26' and insert 'decommissioned Bureau of Meteorology (BoM) site'

The reason for the amendment is to make it expressly clear which parcel of land the motion is referring to. It is no surprise, of course, that I am supportive of the motion that my colleague is putting forward. It is disappointing that there has not been a solution found to this parcel of land. I hope that, should this motion pass the upper house, it will put a bit of a rocket under the Labor government and encourage them to take action.

In terms of the points made by the Hon. Michelle Lensink, I do know Dr Anna Finizio. I have had the opportunity to meet her on many occasions. She is indeed a very impressive and accomplished person. Of course, preference decisions are made by party organisations, and they are made not necessarily with regard just to individual candidates who are standing, although I do know Cressida O'Hanlon and know her to be a formidable and impressive person also.

Preference decisions are also made with regard to the policy platforms of the respective political parties. If one looks at the policy platform that the Liberals have advanced here in our state and at the national level, there are significant points of difference with the Greens, so it would hardly be surprising that preference decisions have lined up in the way that they have. Certainly, I support the motion that the Hon. Tammy Franks is putting forward and urge the government to finally do something with respect to this green space.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (18:31): I thank those members who have made a contribution, including the Hon. Robert Simms, the Hon. Russell Wortley and the Hon. Michelle Lensink in this chamber tonight. There has been a lot of interest in this issue for quite an extended period of time over many elections—state elections, by-elections and now federal elections.

Before I turn to that, I would just like to respond to the proposed amendments. I support the amendment put by the Hon. Robert Simms. We have done that to clarify the piece of land that we mean. I will refer members back to my original speech to this motion, where I noted that there were actually two parcels of land in this spot and that one had already been purchased to erect a car park. My understanding is—and out of the abundance of caution—there are actually two different lots there. It is to ensure we are sticking to the issue of the land left at the decommissioned BoM site as the land we are talking about in this particular motion, as opposed to historically the larger parcel of land.

I note also the Labor amendment in the name of the Hon. Russell Wortley proposes to leave out paragraph 1. That paragraph reads currently:

1. Notes that Kent Town is the only suburb in the Norwood Payneham St Peters council with no green space available to the public;

That is certainly the contention of the Kent Town residents—some 475 people who know their suburb, who signed a petition calling for this community park to be created. If the Labor Party have another particular parcel of land that they would like to identify, I think that would have been a more useful amendment. At this point, I am not sure why they seek to strike out that particular paragraph and, consequently, we will be opposing that.

Further, the Hon. Russell Wortley's amendment proposes to leave out paragraph 3 and instead insert a new paragraph. Currently, paragraph 3 reads:

3. Calls on the Malinauskas government to acquire the vacant lot 26 on College Road, Kent Town, from the federal government for the purposes of turning it into a publicly accessible park for the local community.

That is quite simple. The government's proposed amendment reads:

3. Recommends that Norwood Payneham St Peters council consider the spatial distribution, accessibility and quality of open space required to support additional housing opportunities in Kent Town through the development of their Open Space, Playgrounds and Recreation Strategy and then engage with the federal government regarding the purchase of the property, should it align with their strategic intent for open space in the area.

I note that I am not sure if that means the federal government's strategic intent or the council's. I suspect the state government means the council's strategic intent. But should the state government and the Malinauskas government in this place have any doubt of what the current Norwood Payneham & St Peters council's position is on this, I refer them to the correspondence of both their member for Dunstan, as well as their current candidate for Sturt, Claire Clutterham, who has written to the Senator, the Hon. Katy Gallagher, who is the Minister for Finance and has responsibility for deciding what happens with this particular parcel of land.

In that correspondence from the Labor candidate for Sturt, she outlines and notes the council's support that was confirmed in a meeting in October 2024 when a particular motion was passed. That motion reads that the council:

1. Fully supports the request by the Kent Town Residents Association to the Senator, the Hon. Katy Gallagher, Minister for Finance, to transfer Lot 14 College Road, Kent Town, to the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters;

2. That this transfer, if agreed to, incurs no cost to the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters, including remediation costs;

3. In the event that the request is agreed, the council undertakes to assume ownership and take care of the land as a community park; and

4. That the Kent Town Residents Association understand that any development of this land is not contained in the recently adopted 2023-24 to 2033-34 long-term financial plan of the council.

I think the council has already considered this matter, and while I am sure that they might find the suggestion being made in the form of this amendment from the state Malinauskas government interesting, I do not think that they will find it useful, so on those grounds I will certainly be opposing it, and I encourage Labor members to stand by their candidate for Sturt in this particular matter—stand by her. What is it? Three sleeps until the election and some of us are actually awake, and paying attention to what is going on in the seat of Sturt. Certainly, the Kent Town residents are watching this debate closely. We have seen before that elections have a particular effect when it comes to pocket parks.

I draw members' attention to the fact that Labor delivered for Lucy Hood, the now member for Adelaide, on a pocket park in Prospect, and that was done under the state government's auspices and is not dissimilar to this particular issue. It has an annual program where not just tens of thousands, not just hundreds of thousands but year after year, millions of dollars are given out to very similar projects. I point to \$2.1 million for a park in Fremont, a pocket park in Carol Avenue in the Port Adelaide Enfield council, that is \$1.29 million, or Paxtons Walk in the city, over \$2.2 million.

That is one of a raft of state government-led moves to create better green space and better community in those particular electorates. I guess time will tell whether or not the Sturt electorate counts to the Malinauskas Labor government. In the federal government—that has now been considering this matter for some time—in response back to the Labor candidates and members, Minister Gallagher in December 2024 noted the interest in the future of the Kent Town property, and noted that she was actively considering the matter, that it was under active consideration by the federal Albanese government, and she would write to those particular people once a decision was made.

Well, December, January, February, March, April, May—and here we are still waiting. As I say, three sleeps to go. Let's see what happens in that decommissioned Bureau of Meteorology

(BoM) site in Kent Town. It could just be the explosion that the Sturt people need to know which way they choose to cast their ballot on Saturday.

The PRESIDENT: As we work our way through this, the first question I am going to put is that paragraph 1, as proposed to be struck out by the Hon. R.P. Wortley, stand as part of the motion. So if you are supporting the Hon. Mr Wortley you are going to vote no.

Question resolved in the negative.

The PRESIDENT: The next question is that all words in paragraph 3, down to but excluding 'vacant Lot 26', stand as part of the motion. So if you are with the Hon. Ms Franks you will vote yes, and if you are with the Hon. Mr Wortley you will vote no.

The council divided on the question:

Ayes8
Noes6
Majority2

AYES

Bonaros, C.
Girolamo, H.M.
Lensink, J.M.A.

Centofanti, N.J.
Hood, D.G.E.
Simms, R.A.

Franks, T.A. (teller)
Lee, J.S.

NOES

Bourke, E.S.
Hunter, I.K.

El Dannawi, M.
Maher, K.J.

Hanson, J.E.
Wortley, R.P. (teller)

PAIRS

Game, S.L.
Martin, R.B.

Ngo, T.T.
Hood, B.R.

Henderson, L.A.
Scriven, C.M.

Question thus agreed to.

The Hon. R.A. Simms' amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

At 18:46 the council adjourned until Thursday 1 May 2025 at 14:15.