

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 3 September 2025

The PRESIDENT (Hon. T.J. Stephens) took the chair at 14:18 and read prayers.

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

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (14:19): I bring up the 68th report of the committee, 2022-25.

Report received.

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN: I bring up the 69th report of the committee, 2022-25.

Report received and read.

Ministerial Statement

PORT OF WHYALLA LITIGATION

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:21): I table a copy of a ministerial statement made by the Premier in another place on the Port of Whyalla litigation.

VARROA MITE FOUND IN MANAGED BEEHIVE

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:22): I make a ministerial statement on varroa mite found in managed beehive. On Tuesday 2 September 2025, PIRSA's Apiary Unit surveillance teams identified a suspected detection of varroa, commonly known as varroa mite, in a managed beehive located in Pootung in the Riverland region of South Australia. This detection was made during routine surveillance activities which have been in place since its first detection in New South Wales in 2022.

Varroa mite has since been detected in New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland and ACT. Samples were promptly submitted to the South Australian Research and Development Institute (SARDI) which has since confirmed the presence of varroa mite. The infested hive is part of a consignment of hives originating from Queensland. PIRSA is currently undertaking further sampling across the consignment. To support this, sticky mats and acaricides are being deployed across all hives within the orchard. Acaricides is a highly effective treatment in the destruction of varroa mite. Bees, hives and associated equipment from the site cannot be moved and PIRSA continues to undertake tracing activities.

A biosecurity notice to beekeepers is being issued today, and a meeting of the South Australian Varroa Industry Advisory Committee (SAVIAC) will be held. South Australian industries are heavily reliant on interstate pollination services. The almond industry has advised that, without access to interstate pollination this season, up to \$100 million in almond production would have been at risk. Since the national decision of transition to management in 2023, PIRSA has been supporting South Australian beekeepers and pollinators by implementing strict biosecurity conditions for hives entering South Australia from varroa-positive states.

All beekeepers, whether commercial or recreational, are urged to inspect their hives regularly using recommended techniques such as sugar shake, soapy water or alcohol wash. Information on hive care and varroa mite detection is available at www.pir.sa.gov.au/varroa. Beekeepers must also ensure their hives are registered and their details updated annually. Registration ensures they receive timely biosecurity updates and can take swift action to protect their bees. For more

information on registration, hive identification and branding requirements visit www.pir.sa.gov.au/bees.

If any beekeeper suspects varroa mite in their hives, they should immediately contact the Exotic Plant Pest Hotline on 1800 084 881. PIRSA remains committed to working closely with industry and the community to manage this detection and protect South Australia's vital pollination and honey production sectors.

Question Time

SARDI FISH DEATHS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:28): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development about fish deaths at the South Australian Aquatic Sciences Centre.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: It was moved in this place on 19 February this year that there should be an independent investigation into the deaths of fish and shellfish at the South Australian Aquatic Sciences Centre. On 4 February, I asked the minister why departments should be free to investigate themselves and why the government was against an independent investigation. The minister replied, and I quote:

It's very disappointing to see the Leader of the Opposition again undermining the world-renowned staff and researchers at places such as SARDI. They are keen to understand, if indeed it can be found, the reason for the fish deaths. They are world-renowned researchers. They are keen to find the answers, and this constant undermining of the SARDI staff I think is extremely disappointing.

As we know, the government ignored the will of this place. While the opposition was not in any way undermining the SARDI researchers, we were seeking independence and transparency on behalf of the South Australian public. The report was then released, titled 'An investigative report on mortalities in finfish and shellfish hatcheries at the South Australian Aquatic Sciences Centre'.

With that in mind, my question to the minister is: can she guarantee to this chamber that that report, 'An investigative report on mortalities in finfish and shellfish hatcheries at the South Australian Aquatic Sciences Centre', was entirely the work of SARDI's world-renowned scientists and that it was not altered, amended or influenced at any stage by staff from the Department for Environment and Water or the EPA?

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. I am happy to go back and check any of the individual details, but I do recall that the report was independently reviewed by scientists from a university. I am very confident that there was robust investigation. Again, we see those opposite and the Leader of the Opposition in this place constantly trying to undermine scientists and science. We have seen the newest star recruit to those opposite constantly undermining science in other aspects that are of interest to the general community. We see those opposite peddling conspiracy theories. Why is it that those opposite don't accept science?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Why is it that those opposite don't trust science?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Minister, sit down.

The Hon. N.J. Centofanti interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: I beg your pardon? You have asked a question. The minister is answering the question in a way that she sees fit. You will listen to the answer; otherwise, we will move on to the next question.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Thank you. Again, we have those opposite who, if they don't like the answer, like to attack the scientists who have provided it. I don't think that's helpful in this circumstance or any others.

SARDI FISH DEATHS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:31): Supplementary.

The PRESIDENT: Supplementary arising from the answer. I hope that I could hear what the minister actually said at the time.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Is the minister suggesting that she cannot rule out that government departments other than SARDI did not influence or change the outcome of the investigative report to suit the government's agenda?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:32): There were a lot of double negatives in there, but what I can state clearly is that there has been no inappropriate influence from any department. This is about finding, to the extent possible, the reasons for the deaths of the fingerlings and the spat. It is in everyone's interest to find as much information as possible. It needs to be credible information, something that those opposite clearly don't care about a great deal. It needs to be credible information, and I am very confident that all of the credible information that could be provided has been provided.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN SHELLFISH QUALITY ASSURANCE PROGRAM

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries on the updated version of the South Australian Shellfish Quality Assurance Program that was tabled in this place yesterday.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: The original version of the South Australian Shellfish Quality Assurance Program, which was tabled in this place by the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs on 19 August, detailed that on 24 March there were *Karenia mikimotoi* cell counts of 140,000 cells per litre at Boatswain Point in the South-East. Yesterday, the updated document tabled stated that it was, and I quote, 'correcting an administrative error relating to the recording of *Karenia mikimotoi* counts'. This error, according to the tabled document, was due to human error in the collation and recording of the testing data. My questions to the minister are:

1. Who within PIRSA or SASQAP was responsible for collating and verifying the original results and what accountability measures will be taken for this error?
2. Given the seriousness of *Karenia mikimotoi* blooms, what risk assessments were undertaken to ensure that this administrative error did not impact shellfish safety, aquaculture viability or consumer confidence?
3. How can South Australians have confidence in the accuracy of the South Australian Shellfish Quality Assurance Program testing results when such a significant error, recording 140,000 cells per litre instead of zero, was only corrected months later, after it was brought to the attention of the minister?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:34): I thank the honourable member for her question. I think pretty much all the information was in the document that was tabled yesterday. There was an error in terms of the location of one of the samples and the counts, and that was corrected as soon as it was brought to the department's attention. All of the other entries were then double-checked and were found to be accurate.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN SHELLFISH QUALITY ASSURANCE PROGRAM

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:34): Supplementary: how was the error brought to the department's attention?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:34): I am happy to take that on notice and bring back a response.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN SHELLFISH QUALITY ASSURANCE PROGRAM

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:35): Supplementary: did the ABC bring the error to the department's attention?

The PRESIDENT: We are still talking about the error, so I guess I will allow the supplementary question.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:35): I am happy to take that on notice. I think that certainly a media outlet did raise a query. I don't know if that was the only or the first time that it was brought to the department's attention. What I do know is as soon as it was brought to the attention of the department, it was double-checked and, as soon as we were able—as in our first sitting day—it was corrected.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN SHELLFISH QUALITY ASSURANCE PROGRAM

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:35): Supplementary: why did the corrected entry not record the presence of dead fish as had been identified in Botswain Point at that particular time, unlike other entries in the data?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:35): I have to check the accuracy of that. I am happy to take it on notice and bring back a response.

ABALONE VIRAL GANGLIONEURITIS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:36): My questions are to the Minister for Primary Industries regarding aquatic disease management:

1. Can the minister advise the chamber of the current frontline of the abalone viral ganglioneuritis, or AVG as it's commonly acronymed, and identify the location and timing of the most northern positive detection?

2. What management plans are currently in place to ensure effective monitoring of the virus over the next six to 12 months?

3. What new measures are being implemented to reduce the risk of cross-contamination between the western boundary of the southern zone and the eastern boundary of the northern zone rock lobster fisheries?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:36): I thank the honourable member for her question. To remind members, on 23 February 2024, abalone viral ganglioneuritis (AVG) was confirmed in wild abalone in waters south of Port MacDonnell in the South-East of our state. AVG is known to occur elsewhere in Australia, including Victoria and Tasmania, but that was the first detection in South Australia. Since the initial detection, abalone collected from areas between Port MacDonnell and Nora Creina have been confirmed positive for AVG, and observations of AVG-infected abalone are now evident as far west as Cape Jaffa. AVG is now considered widespread across the whole southern abalone fishing zone (SAFZ).

With assistance from the commercial abalone industry, a Department of Primary Industries and Regions incident management team was put in place at that time in response to the initial detection. The IMT facilitated surveillance activities and confirmed virus presence at several points west of the initial infection point at Breaksea Reef near Port MacDonnell, included Nene Valley and Nora Creina. While this surveillance and testing was undertaken, a legislated control area and buffer zone was put in place between the Victorian border and the mouth of the Murray River, with associated restrictions and decontamination requirements for fishing equipment prescribed for each area.

On 27 March 2024, following expiry of the temporary notices, a notice under the Livestock Act 1997 was issued providing longer term arrangements for movement of fishing equipment outside of the southern zone, and storage of live abalone by fish processors sourced from the southern zone. In addition, a closure under the Fisheries Management Act was implemented at Port MacDonnell to support local abalone stock recovery.

In May 2024, this closure was extended westward to Nene Valley, following observations of dead and dying abalone in Douglas Bay, which is approximately 10 kilometres north-west of the initial detection site, made by SARDI divers. Samples from this area were confirmed as AVG-positive, with observations of mortality rates of up to 95 per cent in some affected areas.

These observations were corroborated by an industry diver in the area. Consultation was undertaken with industry, and an outcome of that was a biosecurity code of practice for South Australia being developed. The code provides industry standards for dive operations, decontamination, regional movement of fishing equipment, as well as protocols for observing and reporting suspect abalone.

Fishing in the southern zone continued in 2024 until February 2025 under the procedures described in the code. In December 2024, abalone from a new area of the fishery between Carpenter Rocks and Beachport, north-west of the previous active areas, tested positive for AVG. Since December 2024 or January 2025, from industry diver observations of AVG-infected abalone provided to PIRSA, it became evident that AVG has now spread throughout the southern zone.

SARDI commenced baseline surveys in the main fishing areas of the southern zone in February 2025 to estimate the current level of depletion of stock in the area. Unfortunately, results from five sites indicated the impact of AVG in the southern zone had been substantial. PIRSA met with the southern zone abalone industry on 25 February 2025 to consider the measures required to appropriately support recovery of the local abalone stocks.

At that meeting, based on industry feedback, diver reports and the SARDI surveys, industry and PIRSA discussed a total closure of the harvest of abalone throughout the whole zone to support rebuilding the abalone stocks in this zone as quickly as possible. The depletion had been estimated at between 79 per cent and 88 per cent.

PIRSA has now implemented a closure prohibiting the take of all abalone by any person—that includes both recreational and commercial—in all marine waters of the southern zone abalone fishery, that being the area from the Murray River mouth to the Victorian border. All relevant stakeholders have been informed of the closure. Given the biology of abalone, it is considered likely, unfortunately, that recovery of depleted stocks will require significant time of five years plus, and possibly even more, maybe up to a decade, to achieve.

The closure will have a significant impact on what was a highly sustainable and successful commercial fishing industry, and the proactive and collaborative approach this commercial industry has taken throughout the response is testament, I think, to their great professionalism. I congratulate them for that. It is also acknowledged that abalone fishing is an important recreational activity for divers. The closure has been implemented under section 79 of the Fisheries Management Act in the first instance.

As AVG is now endemic throughout the southern zone, it is considered that restrictions on the other fishing activities in the area are no longer required and so the closure notice that was in place at Breaksea Reef at Nene Valley has been revoked as it has been replaced by the new closure notice. The new arrangements in this area allow fishers to fish for other bottom-dwelling animals, such as rock lobster, an activity that was previously prohibited for that period of time.

It is noted that management controls, under the Livestock Act, restricting the movement of fishing gear outside of the southern zone without decontamination are appropriate mitigation measures to limit the risk of spread of AVG to fishing areas outside the southern zone. These are essential management arrangements to protect the state's other abalone fisheries and have been maintained.

A communications plan to advise the community of the closure and the reasons why it was necessary was implemented. That included signage, media, social media and notices to

stakeholders to ensure stakeholders are adequately aware of the closure. PIRSA continues to liaise with the Victorian Fisheries Authority and other jurisdictions to support market access opportunities for licence holders in the remaining fishing areas.

PIRSA, in collaboration with representatives of the central zone and western zone abalone fisheries, have been developing a risk assessment and that is in regard to the risk from the southern zone to the other two zones. To raise awareness among fishers and the broader community about AVG, electronic variable message signs have been installed at key locations. These include Robe, Mount Gambier, Tailm Bend, Port Wakefield, Port Augusta, Cape Jervis and Wallaroo. Those signs serve as critical reminders about the importance of boat hygiene and biosecurity compliance in safeguarding the central and western abalone zones from the spread of AVG.

ABALONE VIRAL GANGLIONEURITIS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:43): Supplementary: does the minister believe a code of practice is sufficient for biosecurity direction given the seriousness of the disease and is the minister considering directions via regulation or as a condition of licence moving forward?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:44): Directions for what?

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Biosecurity directions. You talked about a code of practice and best practice.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I have just outlined the multiple steps that are in place. If the honourable member is proposing something specific rather than simply 'a direction', we need to know what direction she is referring to and then I might be able to provide an update.

ABALONE VIRAL GANGLIONEURITIS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:44): Supplementary, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: I will listen to it.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: It will be tough, though.

The PRESIDENT: No, I will listen to it. I don't need your help.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: From the original answer—unfortunately—is February 2025 the latest data sample that the minister has? If not, when and where was the latest positive test result taken?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:44): I am happy to take that on notice and bring back a response.

SA FISHING APP

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:44): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister inform the chamber about the updated SA Fishing app that was released last week and why it is important to South Australia's recreational fishing community?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:45): I thank the honourable member for his question. The original SA Fishing app was released in 2013 and has been a great way of getting information into the hands of recreational fishers right across the state, delivering trusted information when and where fishers have needed it. Times have moved quickly since the app's 2013 launch, not least in a technological sense, and the app needed a refresh and update to ensure it continued to be an important and relevant source of information for fishers.

South Australia's recreational anglers now have access to the upgraded free SA Fishing app launched last week that has a range of features in a clean, modern and easy-to-use platform. While the app retains the features that were in the previous version of the app, the upgraded app features

a searchable catalogue of species with key information; easy-to-use voluntary in-app catch reporting for all species (mandatory snapper reporting for the South-East remains); the ability to report shark sightings, fish kills, illegal or suspicious fishing activity and detection of pest species; size, bag and boat limits for all species regulated in South Australia; a GPS map with highlighted fish enclosure zones and aquatic reserves; and important rules for fishers, such as permitted fishing gear, bait and burley information and more.

Fishers can continue to use the popular personal fishing diary record, saving their locations, catch details and the all-important pictures, of course, of their catch. A major new feature of the upgraded app is the ability to contribute to the sustainability and management of our state's fisheries by voluntarily reporting catch data. This will help enormously to inform fisheries management decisions by providing a clearer picture of where people fish, what species they catch, how much time people spend fishing and a range of other useful information.

South Australia's recreational catch data is largely taken from the five-yearly surveys of fishing activity, and that will continue to do its job in terms of giving fisheries managers a baseline and an accurate insight into recreational fishing activity in our state's waters. Of course, this data feeds into the larger body of work that is completed in the commercial sectors, to provide a framework whereby fishing effort and catch can be measured against what science and research tell us is sustainable, which is one of the reasons our state's fisheries management is recognised as a leader worldwide.

It goes without saying that the clearer our knowledge is on the state of our fish stocks the better, and that is why every South Australian can now easily and conveniently do their part just by recording their catch on the SA Fishing app. Again, I stress the voluntary nature of catch reporting. The only mandatory reporting that remains in place, as it has for some time, is the South-East snapper fishery, and it should go without saying why that is so important, given the snapper ban that is still in place across the rest of the state's waters.

While the app itself was in the process of being upgraded prior to the algal bloom, it has taken on even more importance now, to gather as much information as possible on fish stocks as we continue to assess the extent of the impact to our marine environment. Importantly, the app also provides the ability to make reports to Fishwatch, including reporting a shark sighting, illegal or suspicious activity, fish kills, and finding a pest species.

All data collected by the app is handled according to privacy laws and cannot be accessed by third parties, and of course personal fishing data will never be made public. I encourage members in this place and members of the nearly 360,000-strong SA recreational fishing community to download and use the app whenever they may be fishing.

YOUTH JUSTICE REFORMS

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:48): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs regarding youth justice reform.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: On 18 August 2025, the *National Indigenous Times* reported that South Australia's proposed legislation targeting street gangs has drawn strong criticism from legal and Indigenous advocacy groups, including the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement and the National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Legal Services. The article highlights concerns that the draft bill would allow police to impose control orders on children as young as 10, based on clothing, associations or unproven allegations.

Critics argue that this undermines the presumption of innocence, and the Law Society has also raised concerns that the proposed legislation could disproportionately criminalise Indigenous and vulnerable children and that it should include adequate safeguards so that children are not unreasonably criminalised. My questions to the minister are:

1. Can the minister outline which Aboriginal organisations were consulted in the drafting of this legislation and what safeguards are in place to address the Law Society's concern

that the proposed government legislation could disproportionately criminalise Indigenous and vulnerable children?

2. In addition, can the minister also explain: how does the government justify allocating \$3 million to youth rehabilitation while simultaneously introducing legislation that may increase youth incarceration rates, particularly among Aboriginal children?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:50): There are a number of questions in the honourable member's contribution. In relation to consultation, the honourable member mentioned the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement, who were certainly consulted and who provided valuable feedback in relation to the proposed legislation. Also, the State Voice was consulted and also provided very valuable feedback in relation to draft legislation. I have given notice today that I will be introducing legislation tomorrow, and I will outline some of that in my second reading speech. I commend that to the honourable member, as that will go through some of the changes that have been made as a result of that consultation.

In relation to a specific question the honourable member asked about the ability for a control order based on someone's clothing, I think that stemmed from a very fundamental misunderstanding of how this law works. There was never an ability for a control order to be placed on what someone wears. That has never been a part of the bill, and it won't be when it is out for consultation. It's not part of anything that will be introduced to parliament.

RELEASE OF VIOLENT OFFENDERS

The Hon. S.L. GAME (14:51): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Attorney-General regarding the recent release of a convicted child rapist from a South Australian prison.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.L. GAME: On Monday 4 August, a man who raped a child and who is now facing up to 70 years in prison after pleading guilty to six other violent rape charges was released from a South Australian prison. Under what *The Advertiser* called an honesty policy, the man was taken to a secret location by SAPOL, ahead of his interstate court date for sentencing. In *The Advertiser's* report, victim Mike Worsman asked why the man couldn't be sentenced while in prison rather than be released, warning that the offender could, and I quote, 'quite easily evade authorities'.

In the report, SAPOL said community safety was paramount, while the South Australian Premier said that he was unable to divulge what measures SAPOL was taking to monitor the man while he remained in South Australia following his prison release. The Premier told Channel 9 that the offender was being, and I quote, 'actively monitored in a way that South Australians can have a lot of confidence'. My questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. Should South Australian families tolerate a child rapist being released into the community?

2. How can the Attorney-General guarantee South Australian parents that this violent criminal posed no threat to their children during the time he was free in our state?

3. What law was the government observing when it refused to ease public concerns by outlining the measures SAPOL was taking to monitor the serial offender while he remained in South Australia?

4. If the government claims the public is being kept safe from violent offenders, does the government concede it has a duty to reveal how SAPOL is carrying out this important task and that releasing details would help allay community fears?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:53): I thank the honourable member for her question. I am certainly hoping that the honourable member is not suggesting we should reveal operational matters that SAPOL undertakes. I think SAPOL do a remarkable job in

keeping South Australians safe. I think they are, if I remember correctly, the second oldest police force in the world and have for many, many years kept South Australians safe. I think they continue to do a remarkable job in doing that.

Certainly, SAPOL operational matters in relation to how they conduct themselves in particular cases that may still be alive is not something I am going to delve into. I don't think the honourable member would expect that, particularly if there is any way—and I don't know if that is the case in this case—that could actually jeopardise South Australians' safety. I think that would be an absurd thing to do.

In relation to keeping South Australians safe in general from dangerous child sex offenders, we now have the toughest laws of anywhere in Australia in relation to child sex offenders. We have changed legislation in a whole range of ways to increase the penalties that can be imposed on child sex offenders in South Australia, but one really important reform that we have undertaken in South Australia is indefinite detention of serious child sex offenders.

Laws have now come into place in South Australia that we see nowhere else in Australia that, if a person receives jail time for a second serious child sexual offence, they will be in jail for the rest of their lives unless they can prove they are no longer a threat. They will need to have two independently appointed by the court medical assessments that they can now control their sexual instincts. If they can't do that, they will never get out of prison. So, in terms of keeping South Australians safe from dangerous child sex offenders, we take this extraordinarily seriously and we have the toughest laws in the whole nation.

ELECTORAL SERVICES

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (14:55): I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to addressing questions to the Attorney-General regarding electoral services.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD: Yesterday, the presiding officer in the other place made a statement on the resignation of the member for Mount Gambier and his decision not to issue a writ for a by-election in that district prior to the March 2026 election. He made this decision based on a number of statements, which are available in *Hansard*. He also made mention that the people of Mount Gambier are in 'the enviable position of having two highly regarded and senior members of the Legislative Council'. He then named the Hon. Clare Scriven and the Hon. Ben Hood, the second-best looking Hood in the Legislative Council.

As the minister responsible for the Electoral Commission, can the Attorney-General please outline for the record how representation for constituents of Mount Gambier would work in practicality by answering the following questions:

1. Is the Attorney-General aware if the Crown Solicitor provided advice to the presiding officer of the other place regarding his decision not to issue a writ for a by-election in the seat of Mount Gambier?
2. Who now signs representations on behalf of Mount Gambier constituents and with what authority?
3. Has the Attorney been approached to provide any additional resourcing to the electorate office in Mount Gambier in the absence of a member of parliament and, if so, will this be done?
4. Are any current elected members of parliament permitted to access constituent files and work in conjunction with electorate office staff in an electorate office that they have not been elected?

The PRESIDENT: Just before you answer, Attorney, it is clear in the standing orders that you really should not quote from the current sessions anything that has been said in the other place.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:57): I thank the honourable

member for his questions. In relation to any advice, the honourable member would appreciate that we don't talk about legal advice that is or is not provided.

In relation to the questions in relation to electorate offices, my understanding is the electorate offices sit within the Department of Treasury and Finance and the operation of the electorate offices is, understandably, completely and entirely separate from the Electoral Commission. Not having a member in place has occurred a number of times already in this session of parliament. We have seen three Liberal members—for a variety of reasons that I am happy to go into in great extent and at great length—in the lower house alone this term resign from parliament: a former leader, the former member for Dunstan, Steven Marshall; a former Deputy Premier in Bragg, the Hon. Vickie Chapman; and another former leader of the Liberal Party in the seat of Black, who resigned for various reasons, as I understand it, most recently, for a by-election.

I am happy, if maybe there is a supplementary question, to go into further details about the reasons for those resignations, but my understanding—although the Department of Treasury and Finance are the ones responsible for electoral services—is that, where there is a period of time where there is not a member of parliament, and that has obviously occurred on all of those occasions where someone has resigned before a new member comes in, the electorate officers in those offices remain in place and can continue to serve those communities. It is my understanding that that is what will happen until a new member for Mount Gambier is elected at the general election in March next year.

EXTREME WEATHER RESPONSE

The Hon. T.T. NGO (14:59): My question is to the Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services. Can the minister tell the council about our emergency services response to the recent extreme weather events?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:59): I thank the member for his question and for his interest in our recent extreme weather event. Firstly, I would like to acknowledge the extraordinary efforts of our emergency services volunteers in the face of last week's severe weather event, an event that tested the resilience of our communities.

As every member in this chamber would know, in the early hours of Friday morning, a powerful cold front swept through South Australia, impacting the Adelaide metropolitan area, Mount Lofty Ranges, Yorke Peninsula, Mid North and the South-East. At 6.35am the BOM issued a severe weather warning, including a fast-moving tornado and destructive wind cell. Two tornadoes were confirmed in Adelaide's northern suburbs, Para Hills and Elizabeth, causing significant damage and distress. A wind gust reached up to 106 km/h at Outer Harbor and 96 km/h at Adelaide Airport, with similarly destructive speeds recorded across the state.

According to the SES, by 6.30pm more than 535 emergency jobs had been lodged, with 494 requests for assistance, including 100 active cases. The MFS and the CFS were also very busy on Friday, with hundreds of jobs allocated to them each. These were unprecedented conditions, and our volunteers and emergency services personnel responded with remarkable courage, professionalism and speed. I want to especially commend the new members of the Gawler SES unit, who were deployed to their first major event. Despite being new to the role, they performed with exceptional skill and composure, embodying the spirit of the service that defines our emergency services.

Thankfully, five new storm trailers that were provided by the state government, fitted with the latest equipment, had rolled out across our SES units in Cleve, Port Augusta, Gawler, Hawker and Renmark just weeks earlier—the last of our 50 new trailers that have been provided to the SES. These enclosed trailers, easily towed by quick response vehicles, bring vital equipment directly to emergency locations, improving safety and efficiency in the most challenging conditions. Each trailer is equipped with a generator, lighting system, extendable mast, pole saw, handwash tank and toolboxes, ensuring our volunteers have the tools they need when they need them the most. This investment strengthens our emergency response capabilities for Eyre Peninsula, the Riverland and Flinders Ranges.

Our dedicated volunteers serve year round, often in the toughest of conditions. The Malinauskas government knows that providing them with the right equipment is not just practical, it is essential, and that is why we continue to invest in our emergency services. Thank you to everyone who put on a uniform and braved the harsh conditions and to those coordinating from the headquarters as well. Thank you to each and every one of you.

WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:05): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney questions regarding the recent judgement of the case of Australian Taxation Office whistleblower Richard Boyle.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: This week in Adelaide, the long-running case of the ATO whistleblower, Richard Boyle, finally came to a close, eight years after he had first raised concerns over the heavy-handed debt collection tactics within the tax office. Though Mr Boyle avoided conviction and prison time by receiving a 12-month good behaviour bond, the Human Rights Law Centre and Whistleblower Justice Fund have put out a joint press release condemning his ongoing prosecution. I quote from Associate Legal Director at HRLC, Kieran Pender:

While it is welcome that Boyle will avoid jail, he should never have been prosecuted, and his case clearly demonstrates how our laws are failing to protect people who bravely speak up.

The ABC has also reported, as has *The Guardian* over the weekend, noting that beyond leaving him 'broken, physically, mentally and financially' Mr Boyle's case has 'become a national symbol of the failures in how whistleblowers are treated'. My questions to the Attorney are:

1. Is the government considering further strengthening our state's whistleblower laws to provide genuine safeguards for individuals acting in the public interest?
2. Will the Attorney-General commit to raising this issue at the next meeting of attorneys-general?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:06): I thank the honourable member for her question. The judgement has only been handed down—I think it might have been at the end of last week that a decision was made. It will be carefully examined. I will seek a briefing on the matter in relation to its effects or ramifications. These things need careful balance: the public interest in having people being able to raise issues and also the protection of information that people get as part of their employment. It is a balancing act. I am happy to have a look at what advice I get in relation to this and take appropriate steps.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Franks, you have a point of order.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Yes, Mr President. Ten minutes ago you made a ruling calling to order the Hon. Ben Hood under standing order 109, stating that it was actually—

The PRESIDENT: No, it was actually 188 I think.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I have 109 in front of me.

The PRESIDENT: The one I quoted from was, I think, 188.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Which was regarding not quoting from debates of the other place. The full text of 109, after talking about facts or questions made 'including quotations from *Hansard* of the debates in the other House', goes on to say, and I quote, 'except by leave of the Council and so far only as may be necessary to explain such Question'. Did the Hon. Ben Hood have leave of council and did he indeed use that quote to explain his question? That seemed to me to be what happened, so I ask you again to re-evaluate that point of order.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Clerk has informed me with his learned advice that leave was granted, so under 109 it was appropriate, so you can disregard my ruling.

The Hon. B.R. Hood interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: I will just revoke what I just said. We were quoting from 188:

No Member shall quote from any debate of the current Session in the other House of Parliament or comment on any measure pending therein unless such quotation be relevant to the matter then under discussion.

I think the point the Clerk was making was that during question time—

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I am referring to 109, which is in the standing orders for question time.

The PRESIDENT: Well, you win at 109; I win at 188. Play on.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: On that point of order, can you just clarify for my satisfaction: did the Hon. Mr B. Hood have leave of the council to make a short, brief statement before asking a question, and is that distinct from getting leave of the council to repeat what has happened in the other place, as recorded in *Hansard*?

The PRESIDENT: Given we have opened the Pandora's box here, the Clerk and I will spend some time discussing this later today. We will move on with question time, and I will get back to you.

LIV GOLF

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:10): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking questions of the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing on LIV Golf.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: The future location of the LIV Golf tournament is now uncertain, with the current agreement with the Grange Golf Club expiring in 2026 and the club not keen to continue for the 2027 event. The government rushed legislation through parliament to seize control of the Adelaide Parklands for the new North Adelaide Golf Course. The Premier promised that it would cost \$45 million, but this will not be ready until 2028 at the earliest. My questions to the minister are:

1. Can the government promise South Australian taxpayers that no additional money is needed to be put on the table for the LIV Golf 2027 event?
2. Can the minister advise the chamber how much taxpayer money has been spent on the event since its inception?
3. Has the government put a cap on the budget for the North Adelaide Golf Course project?
4. Are the costs of \$45 million, as has been touted by the Premier previously, indicated in Australian dollars or in US dollars?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:11): I thank the member for her question. As she would be aware, this is an area that falls under the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. I am not surprised that those opposite are talking down an investment in public facilities like the North Adelaide Golf Course. This is a project that is a world-class venue. It is a course that South Australians will be proud of and enjoy at a local level, but some of the greatest in the world will also enjoy this incredible facility.

NAIDOC AWARDS

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:12): My question is for the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Will the minister inform the chamber about the winners of the 2025 Murray Bridge NAIDOC Week Awards?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:12): I thank the honourable member for his question. As I have mentioned a couple of times in this place, NAIDOC Week is one

of my favourite weeks of the year and a really important way to recognise the contribution of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people across this country but particularly in South Australia.

This year, we celebrated 50 years of NAIDOC as we know it today. This year's theme, 'The Next Generation: Strength, Vision and Legacy', not only honoured 50 years of the current NAIDOC tradition but empowered the next young generation of young leaders. As we know, NAIDOC began 50 years ago as a movement for recognition and rights, sparked by communities who wanted to build a future with justice and equity. Each year, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander leaders are formally recognised for their contributions to their community through NAIDOC Awards. This year there were dozens of individuals across our state who were awarded, including 11 remarkable leaders who are celebrated in the Murray Bridge NAIDOC Awards.

Gordon Rigney took home the Male Elder of the Year award not only for his work at the Aboriginal Community Controlled Health Service but also as a staunch supporter of his own elders. Gordon, known for his community focus, passion, cultural respect and leadership, thanked his elders and ancestors while highlighting the privilege he feels supporting elders. This tied into his message for the next generation, encouraging younger ones to remember to listen to their elders as they are the ones who led us to where we are today.

Michelle Brown, or Aunty Mush as she is known to those who know her well, was awarded female Elder of the Year, recognising her astonishing 43 years of work in Aboriginal education. Often not immediately visible in a role, Michelle has worked tirelessly advocating for and improving how schools and staff make decisions and provide services for Aboriginal families. Though she has operated behind the scenes, it is wonderful to see her being publicly recognised for this important work.

Female Young Person of the Year went to Willow Sharrad, a musician who uses her music to share her voice and her story to uplift others. Willow has been described as a strong role model who deserves to be recognised for the way she carries herself, supports others and continues to give back to the community in her own unique and beautiful way.

Jacqun Angie pushed out multiple other nominees to receive Male Young Person of the Year Award. He is described as a kind and caring, respectful young man, and participates in the Clontarf Academy Program that runs in schools to help Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander boys and men build character, life skills and improve their job prospects.

Workers of the year are often awarded to individuals who work within the Murraylands Indigenous community, but this year two professionals were awarded. Kedeisha Kartinyeri of KML Business Solutions was the Female Worker of the Year as one of a small number of qualified Aboriginal accountants around the country. Kedeisha has supported other Indigenous professionals and Aboriginal-owned businesses through public advocacy and involvement with the Australian Centre for Business Growth. Kedeisha was also the first Aboriginal appointee to the board of the State Library of South Australia. Male Worker of the Year was awarded to plumber Kiya McPail, who was described as a consistent, reliable, respectful, honest and humble operator. He has used his opportunity to express his desire to see more young Indigenous people take up trades and provide services to their community.

Sports People of the Year Award was given to Josiah Angie for his success on the football field, after being selected to represent the River Murray association side, as well as the basketball court, playing for the Falcons. Robert Coyne-Beck was also awarded for sporting efforts as a rugby league player representing South Australia at national competitions, displaying his talent and culture at an elite level.

Guided by the 2025 National NAIDOC Female Elder of the Year finalist, Aunty Ellen Trevorrow, Mardawi Aboriginal Corporation took home the Artist of the Year Award as a collective for their work in elevating and professionalising the tradition of weaving. While sharing Ngarrindjeri cultures and story, the team campaigns for representatives and fair wages for artists.

Finally, Zakariyah Sumner and Andre Kropinyeri, two young people between the ages of five and 11, were presented with the encouragement awards. Zakariyah often performs Welcome to

Country ceremonies at Mypolonga Primary School or other local sporting clubs and is also part of the design team working on Nunga shirts for their school.

Andre has been described as a leader in the making for his determination both on and off the football field and in the classroom and loves learning cultural practices from his grandfather. It is incredibly inspiring to see young people displaying and educating their communities on their culture, showing that the future is in safe hands. I congratulate all the winners highlighted in the Murray Bridge NAIDOC Awards and look forward to informing the chamber of contributions of Aboriginal people to this state in the future.

HOMOPHOBIA IN SPORT

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:18): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question without notice to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing on the topic of homophobia in sport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Last month, the Adelaide Crows footballer—I note your tie, Mr President—Izak Rankine was handed a four-game ban from the AFL for his homophobic remark to a Collingwood opponent in round 23. Speaking at a media conference yesterday, Rankine announced that he will personally apologise to his teammates and the AFL squad for his use of the slur. Rankine is the sixth AFL-listed player banned for an on-field homophobic comment in the last 16 months. I asked the minister in the last sitting period whether she had had any discussions with the AFL about this matter, and she advised that she had been in contact with the Crows and asked them what steps they are taking. My questions to the minister, therefore, are:

1. Can she provide this chamber with an update on any discussions she has had with the Adelaide Crows or the AFL about eliminating homophobia in football?
2. What action has the Malinauskas government and the minister taken on this matter since the last sitting period?

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 member for his question. As I have highlighted before, sport is a space for everyone to be able to participate and feel safe. As I have also highlighted and provided connection with the member, and with the Crows as well, to get that feedback, I have been very clear that if there are ideas and ways that we can move forward, I am all ears.

I believe the Crows also are interested in hearing that feedback as well, and that is the advice I have received. I am open to having those conversations further, so I welcome your advice. I welcome bringing the Crows and yourself together to be able to continue those conversations as well, because I think we learn best when we listen, and I welcome that feedback.

PRISON COMMUNICATION

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:20): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services on the topic of prison communication.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: *The Advertiser*, on 17 July 2025, reported that domestic violence perpetrators are exploiting prison communication loopholes to coerce victims, yet this government has failed to enforce safeguards, allowing repeated breaches of intervention orders. To quote:

Henry Shepherdson was able to phone his then-partner 149 times from prison to pressure her into dropping charges.

That's 149 failures to intervene, 149 times the system failed to protect a mother and her child. My questions to the minister are:

1. How does the minister justify ongoing breaches of intervention orders by violent offenders using prison phones, mail and third parties to coerce victims?

2. Why hasn't this loophole been closed?
3. What does the minister say to the mother of baby Kobi, who was coerced into dropping charges, then only for her child to die?
4. What has been done to stop perpetrators from contacting victims from behind bars?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:22): I thank the member for his question. The department works closely with organisations like SAPOL, and also obviously Embolden, which you have mentioned today. These groups provide a great advocacy for victims of domestic and family violence. That is also why the department works closely with SAPOL and the courts in relation to exchanging information about intervention orders.

When offenders and alleged offenders come into the custody of DCS, we use a series of mechanisms, as I am advised, to identify them with warning flags and take steps to block them from contacting victims through telephone visits and mail contact as well. I am advised also that the department and SAPOL have committed to collaborating to ensure DCS can block prisoners from contacting protected persons from within custody, in breach of intervention orders, which carry significant additional penalties as well.

PRISON COMMUNICATION

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:23): Supplementary: is it still the case that under the existing framework there is also a positive obligation on victims of all offences to effectively notify that they don't wish to have contact with any perpetrators in prison?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:23): I am happy to look into that further. Obviously, the rights of the victims are always paramount, and ensuring that they can be protected as much as possible, so I am happy to take on notice and find out more information in regard to that procedure and how it works and provide that back to the honourable member.

PRISON COMMUNICATION

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:23): Supplementary: will the minister commit to a full independent review into these failures and make the findings public to restore trust in the correctional system?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:24): As I have highlighted, there is always an opportunity to talk through this with the appropriate bodies, as has happened in this situation.

PRISON COMMUNICATION

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:24): Supplementary: what work is Corrections doing with perpetrators to work with them while in prison to change those behaviours?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:24): I understand, during the time that I have been in this role, that learning from victims has been a really crucial part of what we could be doing differently. When we have people in the care of custody we should be thinking not only about their rehabilitation but also the opportunities and learning from the experiences and how we communicate with victims.

This is something I want to focus on more and learn more about how we can make those changes, because I think what we want as a community is to make sure that when we have people come into our prison system that when they leave they have new skills and have been rehabilitated to be better members of our community because we do not want new victims created when they do come out.

As a government, we are keen, obviously, to think about what we can do differently. We have invested heavily already in rehabilitation programs like Work Ready, Release Ready but we can

never forget the story of the victims as well. I am most happy to take on any advice from other people as well, what they have heard and what we could be doing differently.

PRISON COMMUNICATION

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:25): Further supplementary: does that include considering access to services pre-sentence, given that inmates do not qualify before sentencing for access to those services?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:25): The member touches on a very interesting topic. This is something that is being discussed across the nation. I think it is probably a matter that is a challenge around the world in regard to those services that are available prior to someone's sentencing.

The issue of remand is probably one of the most discussed topics we have at the moment, and it is something that I have been really interested in since starting in this role. I have established the cross-government remand group to further these discussions: what can we be doing differently? We have a high remand population and what services are appropriate for someone who hasn't yet been through the courts and been found guilty?

Something that has been proposed to me in the sense of someone undertaking those rehabilitation programs when they haven't yet been found guilty is seen as a sign of guilt is how it has been explained to me. Whether there are options that could be provided that are outside of other rehabilitation, such as life skills, or other general rehabilitation programs that could be looked at, again, I am happy to take on feedback.

Just recently last week, we had a stakeholder group where we brought together NGOs from across the sector that do provide not only these rehabilitation support services but services throughout remand within the prison and once people are exiting our prison system. That NGO group and discussions that went for half the day was an incredible experience where we brought government representatives along to hear firsthand what NGOs are experiencing.

I have also had the opportunity to sit in our prisons—with 20 women in our women's prison and over 20 men in our men's prison—to hear what that experience is for them. I am very much wanting to hear what we can do differently. We have tried to work across government. We are not working in a silo. We know this is more than an issue of corrections, that we have to be looking at what we are doing in housing and all those other areas as well. We are looking at that closely and finding out what supports could be provided in the system.

Matters of Interest

BRUSSELS SPROUTS

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (15:28): Brussels sprouts, my favourite vegetable, are a famously polarising food. In my experience, few people are brussels sprouts agnostics. A brief sweep of *Hansard* reveals that many members over the years have made glowing reference to brussels sprouts. The Hon. Ian Hunter, for just one example, has declared his deep affinity for brussels sprouts on at least one occasion. Other members, however, have mentioned brussels sprouts as an especially disliked food. Shame!

This characteristic divergence in opinion is understood to be attributable to the way that individuals experience taste. Researchers have managed to pinpoint the specific gene that makes people more or less likely to experience a strong bitter taste response to a particular chemical, one that is found especially in vegetables from the *Brassica* family.

For anyone who shares my great enthusiasm for brussels sprouts, the next time you are digging into a serve of them there is a decent chance that if you have bought South Australian you are sampling the produce of A.E. Cranwell & Sons, one of our state's major growers of brussels sprouts. I was very pleased to have the opportunity to tour their operations at Hay Valley and get to know the family.

I love visiting South Australian businesses and learning what they do. I have often found, especially within small and family businesses, that it is not only hard-won expertise but great passion and a palpable sense of self belief that drive their work. My visit to A.E. Cranwell & Sons offered a striking demonstration of this. The Cranwells have been in the growing business for at least six generations. They are an exceptionally hardworking and passionate group of people. Through skill and determination, over many decades they have carved out an excellent niche as brussels sprout specialists. After starting with seven acres, they now have over 160 acres of brussels sprouts.

During my visit, I was pleased to speak with three generations of Cranwells. Maurice, who is now 90 years of age, took over from his father and he would still be working today had he not stepped back to care for his wife. Maurice's sons, John and Robert, now helm the operation. Robert's daughter, Erin, and his son, Josh, are both already integral to the business and in line to succeed their father and uncle.

John is quick to emphasise that even for a successful farm horticulture is never an easy living; in fact, it is relentless hard work. The Cranwells' long endurance speaks to the fact that they have risen to each challenge they have faced. They have done this, John explains, simply by not quitting. He says:

We've worked really hard, unbelievably hard, and we don't even have to do what we used to do with horses and hoes. When I started, we used to hoe all our sprouts twice by hand—all 40 acres—because we didn't have pre-emergent herbicide. And despite the innovations we still work really, really hard.

South Australians should never take for granted the tireless work and the enormous contributions of our small and family growers. Their work significantly underpins our economy and, crucially, the strength and integrity of our global reputation.

South Australia is renowned for our clean, safe and advanced horticulture production. Recent figures from PIRSA show that the 900,000 tonnes of horticultural products produced in 2022-23 generated a farmgate value of \$1.17 billion. This success has people at its centre, people like Maurice, Robert, John, Erin and Josh, whose farm is not just their livelihood but a living testimony to the family's belief in themselves. John said: 'When I left school, I didn't think about money. I just wanted to come home and help my dad. That's why I am here.'

I was thrilled to be given a stalk of brussels sprouts to take home that day. I cooked them up with bacon and ate them, as I have done many times, and of course they were delicious, but this plate also came with a renewed appreciation for what goes into the food that graces our tables. I sincerely thank the Cranwell family for strengthening both my understanding of the experiences of our small and family growers and my appreciation of the magnitude of their impact on our state.

EMISSIONS REDUCTION

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:33): I stand to pay tribute to some school kids in Victoria who have realised that the time for sitting idly by when it comes to emissions outside schools has long passed. Those children are safeguarding their climate future. Those children have taken action to stop their parents idling in their cars outside the school gates.

Why is that important? Well, the transport sector is one of the most challenging aspects of Australia's economy to decarbonise. It contributes some 19 per cent of our greenhouse gas emissions and it is, sadly, one of the fastest growing emissions-producing sectors. Indeed, while it is not entirely the cause of the growth of the emissions in the transport sector, motor vehicles have been demonstrated to be the single biggest contributor to human health impacts.

Emissions are dictated by engine size, speed and type, as well as by accessory loads. Australian passenger vehicles tend to be larger, with 75 per cent of them having an engine size greater than two litres. Of passenger vehicle sales in the 2024-25 financial year, 54.5 per cent were SUVs. They are often purchased as a family car due to perceptions about convenience and capacity, and so they are frequently the cars that are left idling outside the school gates by those caregivers as they wait for the children to finish school. They are there at the morning drop-off and they are there at the afternoon drop-off, and so it is hardly surprising that spikes in pollutants have been recorded outside school drop-off points at those particular times.

Indeed, a recent study, done by the University of Melbourne and Deakin University at three different schools in Melbourne's inner west, ran a hands-on awareness-raising session for students, who then went on to educate their parents about why it was important for them not to leave the engine idling during pickup and drop-off. Students wrote speeches, they made posters and they talked about these issues with their parents and their caregivers. In a really short space of time, they achieved reductions of 40 per cent in afternoon emissions and 18 per cent in morning emissions. That means small changes can have a big impact and also that small changes really can happen. It is so important that we focus on schools, and I really pay tribute to those children for taking control of their futures.

Those children are more impacted by those emissions as well. Quite literally, children breathe in and out more often than adults do, and with a greater surface area to volume ratio of their lungs than adults have, and so they are more directly impacted than the adults are by those emissions. They also tend to be shorter than adults, meaning their air intake is literally closer to the exhaust pipe than that of most adults.

So it is good for their health and, in a proportionate way, it has been impacting most negatively on their health. Indeed, detrimental health impacts are observable in children, even with low levels of emissions. I have to say, as an interesting side note, reducing diesel emissions has been shown by another study to have a positive impact on the quality of air inside the school buildings, as well as outside.

I do commend these students. We often say that children are the future, but children will inherit the future, and they are shaping a future that is far more climate-safe than the current future that we look to leave them. Indeed, they carry not just the physical health burden but also the mental health burden. Evidence shows us that, right across Australia, South Australians and Victorians share the highest mental health burden directly associated with higher temperatures. Young people feel incredibly betrayed and not reassured as they watch governments sell their future down the drain to appease multinational fossil fuel giants. Indeed, it is time we started taking action in the way that these children have.

MALINAUSKAS LABOR GOVERNMENT

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (15:37): Today, I rise to speak on a matter of interest regarding inconsistency: inconsistency within the government and inconsistency within the Labor Party. I am pretty happy that I get to use a *Star Wars* reference in this. There is going to be one fellow who does pop up from time to time in this matter of interest, and that is the Hon. Tom Koutsantonis—or, as some people in the Labor Party internally refer to him, Lord Vader, the emperor's bodyguard taking care of emperor Malinauskas.

I want to reflect on a few inconsistencies that we have seen pop up over the last little while. First of all, I want to go to the issue of the Mount Gambier by-election. There was bit on the radio today, with the Speaker, the Hon. Leon Bignell, talking about why we did not want to have a by-election in Mount Gambier. He referred to the cost and the fact that, whoever was the new member for Mount Gambier, if you did have a by-election, they would only be in the parliament for about six days. Funnily enough, they were exactly the same talking points that the Premier was using last week.

We know that the Speaker should be Independent—that was actually something the opposition did back during the Marshall Liberal government: put the Speaker in as an Independent—but now we learn that the Independent Speaker, Leon Bignell, is rejoining the Labor Party. There is the first inconsistency. Then I saw that, when the Hon. Leon Bignell was speaking on the radio today, he was referring to the fact that in 2018 and in 2022 the people elected Troy Bell to be the member both those times, knowing that he had these issues hanging over his head. It was almost like he was saying to the people of Mount Gambier, 'You made your bed and you should lie in it. Bad luck; you don't get representation for six months.'

I just do not think that really is good enough from this government because there is another inconsistency and that is, if this was a metro seat calling for a by-election within six months, you could almost guarantee that we would not be having this conversation—we most definitely would not

be. We would be rushing to a by-election, but, regionally, 'Hey, look, those guys can go without it for six months. Don't worry about it.'

Then we get back to the fellow I was talking about before, the Hon. Tom Koutsantonis, and his X post about me only a week or so ago. I think it referred to me as 'the brave Ben Hood, ready to jump back in to the Mount Gambier preselection if there would be a by-election', no matter how many times I have said, blue in the face, that I would not be standing for Mount Gambier. It is quite amazing how the Hon. Tom Koutsantonis can make up a story, pitch it to the media and then tweet about that story like it was actually a story.

The inconsistency in that is that Labor have actually done that to their own members. Mr Ryan Harrison from Unley, who was the candidate for Unley, got shafted and told to step aside for someone else. There is another inconsistency. It is not happening from the Liberal Party side, but certainly from the Labor Party side, and if we were to continue on with the Monty Python reference that the Hon. Tom Koutsantonis did, I would say that he is 'not the Messiah, he is a very naughty boy'.

His fascination with the Liberal right, again, is a little bit of an inconsistency. The Liberal Party is a party of membership. They get to come into their SCCs and FECs and our AGMs and our state council meetings and debate policy that matters to them, and they get listened to, not like the Labor right faction. In 2023, the Labor right faction, known as Unity and backed by the shoppies, was formally incorporated as Labor Unity SA Incorporated. Its constitution actually names three people—the Hon. Reggie Martin, Josh Peak and Jordan Mumford—as the foundation members and gives them 51 per cent of the voting power, with all ordinary members combined limited to 49. That means that three people hold permanent control over the Labor right. Now, if that is not a takeover, I do not know what is.

For the Liberal Party, our members get to have a say. It is not the backroom of a Chinese restaurant determining who is going to be preselected or not. It is the inconsistency of this government. It is the inconsistency of Labor that I have an issue with today. But, going back to the Hon. Tom Koutsantonis, who I think is just looking for a little bit of relevance, we are approaching March 2026 and he will be put back in his box at some point as we get closer to the election because they do not want him upsetting the applecart.

OPERATION BABYLIFT

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:42): Fifty years ago, as the Vietnam War drew to a close, Saigon was engulfed in crisis. Orphanages overflowed with children, many abandoned or orphaned by the conflict, facing hunger and an uncertain fate. In response, Australia and its allies acted with extraordinary resolve, airlifting nearly 3,000 infants during the chaotic final days of the war. Most were sent to North America, but around 300 came to Australia, where they found new families and futures. This mission became known as Operation Babylift.

The Royal Australian Air Force, Qantas crews and volunteers worked tirelessly, some even sacrificing their lives to evacuate these children. Babies were carried in cardboard boxes, strapped into plane seats or held by caregivers on perilous flights to safety. It was a beacon of hope, driven by the belief that every child deserves a chance to thrive.

But what became of these children as they grew into adulthood? The outcomes for Babylift adoptees are diverse and often complex. Many describe loving upbringings, yet some wrestled with identity, cultural disconnection and the pain of searching for birth families. Today, I want to share two stories that reflect the mission's lasting impact.

One is that of Chantal Doecke, who arrived in Adelaide as a newborn just days old on a Qantas flight from Saigon on 5 April 1975. Born premature with her umbilical cord still attached, Chantal was placed in a shoe box on the plane, not expected to survive the journey, yet she defied the odds, thriving in the care of her adoptive family.

Now a mother of four and a grandmother, Chantal has built a vibrant life surrounded by love. Raised with warmth, love and security, Chantal still carries a quiet ache, longing to know her origins and the fates of her biological parents. Recently, with the help of ancestry.com, she made a life-changing discovery: she had a twin brother living in Brisbane. Their emotional reunion 50 years after

their separation brought answers to long-held questions and strengthened her connection to her Vietnamese heritage. Though she has made several trips to Vietnam, her search for her biological parents continues.

Like Chantal, Suanne Prager's journey began in Saigon and led to a life of purpose in Australia. Suanne was three years old when she was airlifted, arriving malnourished and frail. Welcomed into a loving Adelaide family, she grew up to become a passionate advocate for refugee rights, sharing her story through community work and storytelling.

In 2007, Suanne reunited with her biological mother in Saigon, a moment of healing that deepened her pride in her dual identity. Her reunion with RAAF pilot Ian Frame, who had photographed her on the tarmac as a child, further cemented her gratitude for the mission that brought her to Australia.

Of course, Operation Babylift faced challenges. Some children were separated from living relatives due to the chaos of war and incomplete records. Yet despite these hardships, the mission remains a story of hope triumphing over adversity. Now in their 50s, these adoptees stand as living proof of compassion's power to transform lives. They are raising families, pursuing dreams and giving back to their communities. Chantal's reunion with her twin brother and Suanne's embrace of her heritage remind us of the mission's enduring legacy.

As we mark this 50th anniversary let us honour the courage of those who made Operation Babylift possible and renew our commitment to displaced children everywhere, ensuring that every child, no matter where they begin, has a chance to shine.

HON. F. PANGALLO

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:47): I want to say something that I never thought I would need to in this place. I must condemn the spiteful and slanderous personal attacks on me by the Premier and his faceless bully mates at SA Labor, which he controls.

After being diagnosed with stage 4 cancer I endured three months of gruelling radiation treatment. I never once took leave from my busy parliamentary schedule. I did not take a holiday in 2024. Instead, my family and I made a promise that when our neurodiverse son completed his double degree, with honours, at Flinders University—something a teacher once told him he would never achieve—we would celebrate with a family holiday in his grandparents' homeland. He achieved that with high distinctions. He was dux of Mercedes College in 2017. He was recognised for his outstanding dedication by the university. We are so proud of him. We were told he would never amount to anything in his life. For any parent, that is a terrible slur. Fortunately, my wonderful wife did not accept it and we guided him on the successful path he finds himself on today. Yet his life could have been so different.

At the same time, his brother was married in Greece. It was a double celebration and the first real opportunity for me to heed medical advice: recover, recharge and prepare for the challenges ahead. My holiday lasted six weeks, not two months as Labor falsely claimed. I continued to work remotely with my office and constituents every week, and I attended an international parliamentary conference at my expense. Other South Australian MPs of Greek descent were there as well, and I expect they will declare who covered their costs. Yet Premier Malinauskas chose to mock my age and upon my return his faceless Labor bullies smeared me online as lazy and complacent, holidaying at taxpayers' expense, all while knowing my circumstances and as I continue to recover.

I can count on one hand the number of sitting days I have missed since 2018. So is Labor flagging that public servants, and I am one, should not be paid if they take a holiday? Who moderates their reckless language online? I have a thick hide and you can attack me all you like on my record as a parliamentarian and a critic, but do not peddle lies with personal spite. I am not and never have been a bludger my entire working life.

The vile and baseless Tom Koutsantonis-led attack on Sam Telfer, who required urgent dental surgery yesterday, is another example of this arrogant government that has lost touch with the real issues like cost of living, housing affordability, ramping, the algal bloom, skyrocketing power bills and a massive \$50 billion debt. It is Labor at its lowest, deliberately cruel, personal and slanderous.

The Premier took his family overseas during the algal bloom crisis. I would never criticise him for taking precious time with his young family at taxpayers' expense, but he should extend that same fairness to others instead of mocking me and my recovery. He knows he can get away with it because of his carefully crafted good guy image, leaving others to fire the dirty shots. South Australians deserve better and deserve to know the truth. SA Labor's offensive tweet flies in the face of the Premier's crusade to address bullying on social media by banning young people from using these platforms. Adults do it too, Premier, and your political party is the master of these dark arts.

'Can you trust a Habib?' Remember that nasty racist one? Shouldn't political parties set the bar and behave responsibly online too? South Australians expect better. I will always work hard for the people I represent and I will continue to give everything I can, despite personal battles. To the Premier I say this: 'shame on you'. Attack my ideas, challenge my policies, criticise my record, but do not fan lies, do not make it personal and do not demean rivals recovering from a life-changing illness or those needing urgent medical treatment. If politics for you is only about power and ego, then enjoy it while it lasts because South Australians will eventually see through it.

FAIR GO FOR AUSTRALIANS

The Hon. S.L. GAME (15:52): On 24 July this year, the Electoral Commissioner of South Australia added the Sarah Game Fair Go for Australians to the Register of Political Parties. The party will stand candidates for upper and lower house seats at the next state election in March 2026. The registration of a new political party should come as no surprise to this chamber because new parties are a natural response to old parties who fail to respond to the genuine concerns of citizens. These concerns relate to fairness in the way government and courts decide who gets what, when and how relative to others, and who pays.

I chose to include 'fair go' in the party name because it is a uniquely Australian phrase which communicates my belief that the ability to succeed should be the result of hard work, contribution and loyalty to Australia, and not on who you know, ethnicity or membership of any particular group. When membership of a particular group is all that is needed to gain a benefit or any advantage over others, it causes division in society. It is the reason I will not support any race-based laws and have already introduced a bill to repeal the First Nations Voice Act 2023.

Targeted hiring practices in government based on gender, sexual orientation, culture and linguistic diversity are permitted by the Equal Opportunity Act 1984. These diversity, equity and recruitment (or DEI) programs are unfair to qualified applicants. They reinforce negative stereotypes and they serve to divide, not unify, people.

Race-based laws and DEI programs are just bad policy, but diversity, equity and inclusion programs are not the only bad politically correct policy. Labor governments in South Australia rank climate change, increasing population and Indigenous rights ahead of the needs of hardworking, contributing, loyal Australians. Every political party through its policies has a vision of the way it wants to see society organised.

In sport, a fair go means biological boys and men do not compete against girls and women in female-only events or share their change rooms, showers and toilets. In the hiring process, a fair go means individuals are hired on merit, not because they meet a quota. In the law, a fair go means sentencing principles are applied irrespective of the offender's identity or membership to a particular group.

In education, a fair go means allowing parents to be the chief decision-makers about the moral and ethical teaching of their children, not schools, bureaucrats and governments, so their children can develop into the people they were meant to be. It also means that the success of students should never be determined by their postcode nor their gender.

A fair go means better appreciating and backing our food and wine producers, like giving farmers the right to have stock-saving and crop-saving dams on their own properties during times of drought. A fair go means working with, rather than against, primary producers in regional areas by understanding their problems and actually listening to ideas from these people who are experts in their respective fields.

In health, a fair go means rural and regional individuals have the same health outcomes as those in metropolitan Adelaide. In families, a fair go means new laws are needed to prevent parental alienating behaviours, which cause harm to adults and is child abuse to the children affected. A fair go means a child born alive after a failed abortion is given the same care as a wanted child born alive. A fair go means that all children have the right to live, and it means parents have the right to be supported in raising their child and not be forced down the avenue of abortion.

A fair go means renters have access to rooftop solar electricity, like owner-occupiers who install rooftop solar and a battery already do, so they are not paying the highest electricity prices in the state. A fair go means electricity users are not forced to subsidise wind and solar farm operators when they do not produce electricity, which is most of the time. A fair go means having a government with the same awareness and support for men and men's issues, such as physical health and mental health, and calling out a culture that demonises masculinity and unfairly blames all society's ills on men.

One in four South Australians were born overseas. If these individuals and their families are to feel Australian and to contribute and to be loyal to the country, we must offer them a fair go to succeed. We must provide a level playing field in South Australia, where success is determined by application and effort, not identity—in short, a fair go for all.

INTERNATIONAL DAY FOR THE ELIMINATION OF VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:56): Some people question why our call for an end to violence against women is not simply a call to end violence altogether. It would be a fair question if there was not a simple, irrefutable answer. Women all around the world, even in modern, progressive democracies like Australia, are at massively greater threat in the family home than men.

We need to focus on the tragic fact that some women live their lives under a constant threat of violence, both sexual and non-sexual, and are being murdered. In many cases, women feel trapped. They often fear for their children, and the need to protect them makes them feel they need to remain in a toxic, violent relationship.

The International Day for the Elimination of Violence Against Women on 25 November puts the focus squarely on that totally obscene and unacceptable reality. It is a long, drawn-out name for an international day, but each word is important. While many may be drawn to the words 'violence' and 'women', it is important that this day calls for the absolute end to it. Nothing less than its complete elimination is acceptable.

Of course, dealing with violence of any nature is a legal issue and needs to be dealt with by the full force of the law. Sadly—and 'sadly' really is the best word to describe it—we also need to educate mostly men on how to react when angry. The list of adjectives for striking out violently against women runs a mile long: 'cowardly', 'cruel' and 'impotent' are high on the list, so is 'immature'.

If men cannot have an argument with a woman without resorting to violence, they obviously need to grow up. They also need to be removed from society. If they cannot control themselves or they feel some need to demonstrate their sense of control, they should be removed from the family home and then our free society. If they strike a woman during a domestic dispute, they should be locked up. We all know this, but it still continues. Cowards who cannot get their way resort to acts of extreme violence by going as far as killing their spouses and children. If they cannot control them, they lose all control. If they cannot have them, nobody will.

Too often when we hear of these heinous crimes men often say it makes them ashamed to be a man. There is no need for shame, because very few men would inflict this sort of pain and suffering on a woman under any circumstances. This is not about men in general; this is about violent people who do not know how to control themselves.

We have a list of things that we can do, but they are still not working well enough. We can educate, prosecute and separate men, but that is not working well enough as well. We need to change the culture of the way some men treat women. That is one of the reasons why 25 November is so important. It reminds us that this problem is still here and it reminds friends, family and neighbours to be on the alert and report behaviour before it goes too far. It reminds mates to talk to their mates and call them out for violent rhetoric and go even further when they know actual violence

is happening. We are not protecting our mates by allowing violence to continue; we are simply being an accessory after the fact, and sometimes even before it.

The International Day for the Elimination of Violence Against Women sends a message to all men and even women: you may not be the perpetrator of these insidious crimes, but sometimes you can help prevent them.

Parliamentary Committees

STATUTORY AUTHORITIES REVIEW COMMITTEE: INQUIRY INTO THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MUSEUM AND THE ART GALLERY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (16:00): I move:

That the report of the committee be noted.

The South Australian Museum and the Art Gallery of South Australia are statutory authorities. On 13 May 2024, the Statutory Authorities Review Committee resolved on its own motion to inquire into the South Australian Museum and the Art Gallery of South Australia. The board of the South Australian Museum was brought to the committee's attention because of the board's proposed new strategic direction, known as reimagining. The proposed reimagining was to be accompanied by a restructure of the South Australian Museum that would see a reduction in the number of scientific and collection positions within the Museum from 27 to 22. Further, the 22 scientific and collections positions would be reclassified at more junior levels.

The proposed strategic direction caused stakeholders to express concerns that the Museum's global scientific reputation would be damaged. Stakeholders also expressed concerns about the ability of the Museum to maintain its current and vital programs of service to state government and the community, particularly its repatriation program. Other concerns expressed the views that both the South Australian Museum and the Art Gallery of South Australia lacked suitable operational government funding and space for collections, storage and display.

The committee received 84 written submissions and heard from 23 witnesses. The committee visited the South Australian Museum and its offsite storage facility. The committee also visited the Australian and Powerhouse museums in Sydney and the Queensland Museum to hear about organisational restructures in these jurisdictions. The committee heard that the South Australian Museum has close to six million items in its biological sciences, human cultures and earth sciences collections. The South Australian Museum also houses globally significant First Nations collections.

The committee heard that the South Australian Museum has a first-class repatriation program and, in 2022-23, 40 Aboriginal ancestral remains were returned to country. The 2023-24 Annual Report of the South Australian Museum states that, during the 2023-24 period, 98 Aboriginal ancestral remains were also returned to country.

Prior to commencement of the committee's inquiry, the Premier halted implementation of the reimagining strategic direction for the Museum and accompanying proposed restructure and set up an independent review panel. The Premier's review panel released its findings and recommendations in September 2024. The result has been an injection of a further \$4.1 million into the South Australian Museum. Mr Kim Cheater, stepping down from his position as chair of the board of the South Australian Museum, has been replaced by Professor Rob Saint. Further, earlier this year, the former chief executive officer of the Museum, Dr David Gaimster, was retired from his position and has been replaced by acting director, Ms Clare Mockler. A new strategic plan for the Museum will be developed through a thorough and collaborative consultation process involving staff, donors, supporters and other stakeholders.

The Art Gallery of South Australia is home to a collection of over 48,000 works of art with a market value of over \$1 billion. The Art Gallery was reviewed by the committee against a backdrop of the state government's release of a 10-year cultural policy and a two-year delivery plan that was accompanied by an \$80 million funding commitment, including \$15 million specifically for the Art Gallery of South Australia. The committee has made 16 findings and 14 recommendations. The recommendations were that:

- both boards of the Museum and Art Gallery retain their status as statutory authorities;
- both acts and associated regulations be reviewed by state government in consultation with stakeholders for contemporisation;
- the Museum is to continue to implement the recommendations from the established Premier's review panel;
- best practice in governance be adopted by boards of the Museum and, indeed, the Art Gallery, especially with respect to financial reporting; and
- a review be conducted by state government, in consultation with stakeholders, into the financial sustainability of both the Museum and the Art Gallery.

On behalf of the committee, I would like to thank everyone who took the time to provide evidence to this inquiry. I also acknowledge and thank the members of the committee for their work during the inquiry, and it was quite a substantial amount of work. I would like to thank the Hon. Tammy Franks, the Hon. Dennis Hood, the Hon. Jing Lee and the Hon. Tung Ngo. I also wish to thank the committee staff for their assistance, in particular the researcher Merry Brown and, to some extent, also Peter Dimopoulos, secretary.

Finally, I would like to finish with these remarks. The South Australian Museum and the Art Gallery are cherished and respected institutions for many South Australians, and I hope that this inquiry has built on the work which has been done—and I think continues to be done—by the state government to ensure that there is confidence in these institutions. They are much-loved institutions in South Australia.

I think, to some extent, the Premier stepping in, in the way that he has done as this inquiry of the committee rolled out, really underlines exactly that point. I know, personally, this inquiry has given me much greater appreciation of world-class research, and specifically the world-class research which we do right here in South Australia, and the value that then has to the greater nation and indeed other nations in the world. To the historians, scientists and staff at the South Australian Museum and Art Gallery, and to the extent that I think it is possible some of those people might read *Hansard*, I would like to thank them for the work they do.

To the somewhat lesser chance that those scientists and historians interstate who work in our institutions over there might read this *Hansard*, the evidence that they gave to us, the insight that they gave to us, underlined the importance of our museums, in particular, in collating scientific evidence which then really informs how governments best institute policy, and best institute changes in a changing world like, for instance, what is happening with climate change and, indeed, what we can see off the coast of South Australia right now.

I think that starts at our learning institutions like our museums. It is not just somewhere to go on the weekend with the family, although you should. It is a fantastic place where learning—acquired, deep learning—has a real meaning and a real value. With that, I commend the committee's report to the council.

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

Motions

COLD CASES

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (16:09): I move:

That this council—

1. Notes that there are numerous cold cases involving Australians who have gone missing or have been murdered here and overseas, that remain unsolved.
2. Notes there are reported to be over 111 cold cases in Australia alone and many overseas cases involving South Australians.
3. Recognises the psychological impact, ongoing trauma and grief suffered by family members of victims.

4. Acknowledges that the family of South Australian Anthea Lily Bradshaw-Hall, murdered in Brunei on 21 July 1994, have been thwarted in their attempts to seek justice by law enforcement authorities in Brunei, the Australian Federal Police and South Australia Police; and
 - (a) calls on the Australian Federal Police to give SAPOL jurisdiction to conduct a fresh investigation and pursue prosecution, noting that an inquest in Brunei in 1998 found Anthea was murdered; there was no motive and that her husband Jefferey Hall remains the only suspect;
 - (b) calls on the South Australian government to post a reward of \$1 million for information which leads to a successful prosecution.

I rise to speak on my motion relating to Australians who have gone missing or have been murdered here and overseas yet their cases remain unsolved. Through the passage of time they become known as cold cases and authorities pay less attention to them unless there are startling breakthroughs.

In my time in this place, I have raised the tragic case of Adelaide grandmother and loving mother, Anna Jenkins, murdered in Malaysia in 2017. Nobody in government there or here even cared about her. An ordinary citizen of this country killed abroad, and our Department of Foreign Affairs, federal ministers, attorneys-general, SA Police and the Australian Federal Police hardly lifted a finger to get justice for Anna and her still grieving family. It was left to Anna's son, Greg, and daughter, Jen, to do their work to investigate what happened to their mum, eventually even finding her remains on a building site.

This is rough justice and it is still being played out as Greg continues his tireless quest in Malaysia to make the authorities there pay for their incompetence and corruption. He will not stop. For the families, the hurt will never be erased. They live with this every single moment of their lives, hoping for justice, hoping someone will listen to them, hoping someone will act and just do something to right the appalling wrongs that were served on them, hoping that those responsible are held accountable and brought to justice. If there is one thing they still cling to, despite all the setbacks, it is hope.

The case I want to raise here now is 31 years old. Somewhere, the killer of Anthea Lily Bradshaw-Hall is still at large. Somewhere overseas, her husband, Jefferey Hall, is still denying any involvement, even though there was enough to make him the prime suspect and only person of interest. Anthea, affectionately known to family and friends as Annie, married Hall in April 1994 in the Adelaide church she and her family attended. Tragically, 96 days later in July that year, she was being farewelled at the same church by family, friends and Hall at her funeral.

Hall went to the Sultanate of Brunei in June 1994. Anthea went to visit him on 12 July and was due to return to Australia 10 days later. On 21 July, Anthea was found deceased in a pool of blood in Hall's apartment. She had been strangled and stabbed several times. Hall found Anthea lifeless. He was interviewed by Brunei police and provided them with alibis that he was at work around the time of the murder. There was blood on his shirt, but Hall claimed it was as a result of trying to see if there was any sign of life.

There were reports from one witness of hearing a large fight and seeing a stranger outside the apartment block and Anthea standing on the balcony, but these statements were never verified or fully investigated. The police investigation went nowhere. An inquest in Brunei in 1998 found that Anthea had been murdered. The police could find no motive and the only apparent suspect was Hall, but police could not find any evidence to justify a charge.

Incredibly, not one person was called to give evidence to the coroner. You have to ask why. As you can imagine, Anthea's family—mum, Ros, dad, Martin, brothers Craig and Paul and extended members of that family—were devastated that it came to such an abrupt end, and shattered because despite all their efforts and pleas for justice from their own government and state and federal police for a fresh investigation, justice has been cruelly denied them and their daughter and sister, Anthea (Annie). The Australian Federal Police have failed this family, so, too, South Australia Police and the South Australian and commonwealth governments. There has been no will shown to do more.

A review of the case by the Australian Federal Police found there was insufficient evidence to substantiate charging Hall or anyone else, and that the likelihood of finding new, fresh and

compelling evidence was remote—case closed. The authorities here would not even consider posting a reward for more information, on the grounds that should anyone be charged for the murder by Brunei police they would face the death penalty and Australia opposes capital punishment. They have applied this reasoning even to the murder of Anna Jenkins, because Malaysia also has the death penalty.

But the Bradshaw family has refused to give up. Their determination and resilience are powerful, inspiring and quite moving. I have met Anthea's family. They are here tonight, and I welcome them to the Legislative Council. I cannot say how much I admire their resolve and perseverance to ensure Anthea's short life is not forgotten, even if they have been abandoned by their own country.

I would recommend members and this government to listen to the absorbing podcast, 'Just married: the Anthea Bradshaw mystery', produced by an excellent investigative journalist, Ben Avery from Channel 9, who has followed the case for over a decade. The episodes cover every conceivable angle to this crime, painting a compelling scenario of why there must be a fresh investigation. The interviews with Anthea's family are particularly touching and harrowing, giving us a glimpse of the ongoing trauma and grief that will never end, and how it has impacted on their lives, relationships and careers.

Mum Ros remains haunted by the way Annie's life was ended and describes how every night she goes to bed and curls up in the foetal position. The nightmares are never-ending for her dad, Martin, with his feelings of guilt as to why he was not there to protect his beautiful daughter. Her brothers are Craig and Paul. Paul, the youngest, says he cries every day for his big sister. Craig is their rock, but he too gets emotional each time Anthea's memory is discussed.

They speak fondly of her love of teaching and her last school, Fraser Park in Murray Bridge, where she taught underprivileged kids. 'There wasn't a bad bone in her body,' says Craig. They recall how she met Hall, a water polo player, while they were at Pembroke College and that they seemed to have a normal relationship, travelling the world together and with no obvious tensions. After their wedding, Hall found a job as a radiographer at a medical clinic operated by the Sultan of Brunei's family. Anthea would join him once she finished her teaching commitments in South Australia, hoping to find teaching work there.

Ninety-six days after her fairytale wedding, Anthea—Annie—was dead. The family and Hall tried to pick up the pieces of their shattered lives. It was the beginning of a search for the truth that would lead the Bradshaws to some dark places and heartbreaking roadblocks. What I know from meeting them is that they will not give up, and nor should they. The AFP can easily do something right now in passing the matter over to South Australia Police. The South Australian government can and should post a \$1 million reward. The State Coroner can conduct, and should have conducted, an inquest and do it properly, because in Brunei not one witness was called.

Annie was failed again here. It was the same for the Jenkins family. The Coroner can conduct, and should be conducting, a separate inquest here, which would be more thorough and unbiased, like the one in Malaysia in 2023 for the Jenkins family. Is there any hope of bringing anyone to justice? Former Director of Public Prosecutions Stephen Pallaras KC, a prosecutor I admired, said that there is and that a motive could be established for Hall, in that his homosexuality may have been discovered and he was acting to protect himself. Around that time, Brunei was planning to introduce the penalty of death by stoning for various offences, including sodomy.

As Mr Pallaras points out in his analysis, regardless of the strength of the motive, in criminal trials the prosecution does not have to prove any motive for the commission of a crime. He writes:

So the question remains, is there sufficient evidence to charge and prosecute Hall for murder? In my judgement the answer is clearly yes.

I would back Mr Pallaras' judgement, any day, over views provided by the AFP or SAPOL. Why are they not moving on this? At this point, I would like to seek leave to table Mr Pallaras' email to the Bradshaw family, with his analysis that I have just referred to.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: What of Mr Hall? Where is he and how does he react to the suspicions cast upon him? My understanding is that he still lives and works overseas in Japan and occasionally visits his family in South Australia. He attended Annie's funeral but, later, tensions arose within the family. He of course denies any responsibility and rejects being labelled the only suspect. He wrote to the family in 2012, expressing his painful personal experience and how Annie's murder affected him. Some of the things he says in that letter certainly raise eyebrows. He says, and I quote:

No matter who I have become and what I have done in my life since that day, I loved Annie with all my heart and could have never hurt her in any way. You must remember who I was and how close we were together. Is this true that you believe I am responsible? If so what has made you believe this after so many years?

He invites them to share any questions with him and then states:

I am afraid that the answers we truly seek, of who killed Annie, your daughter, your sister and my wife will never be found?

He seems quite sure of that. He goes on to say that he had contacted Brunei police but gave up hope. Hope of what? They were not doing anything. If Mr Hall is so concerned about finding the killer, why has he not joined the Bradshaws in seeking answers and a fresh investigation? Why has he not made calls for authorities to act, or written to the Sultan of Brunei, asking him to direct his police and coroner to conduct a more thorough investigation? In 2017, Hall's lawyer, Michael Sykes, wrote to *The Advertiser*, pointing out that his client was, and I quote:

...not a fugitive from justice and always maintained his innocence and co-operated with SA Police and Royal Brunei Police, who formed the view that he had a strong alibi defence which was supported by several witnesses who placed him at work around the time of the murder.

I seek leave to table Mr Sykes' letter and Mr Hall's letter to the Bradshaw family, along with a letter Craig Bradshaw wrote to Police Commissioner Stevens, asking that the case be reviewed and reopened.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Is there any hope of that happening—the case being reviewed and being reopened? I hope so. I will be writing to Commissioner Stevens and the Australian Federal Police here, urging them to work together on this. It will only take the AFP to agree to assign the matter to SAPOL. I will also ask the Treasurer and the Attorney-General to consider posting a \$1 million reward. Thirty-one years is a long time. Any further delays make a prosecution more difficult to mount.

But, in the interest of justice for the Bradshaws and their beloved daughter Annie, it must be seen to be done and not put in the too-hard basket by our authorities. Until it is, the pain, mental anguish and grief of the victims in all of this, the Bradshaw family, will continue. I seek leave to conclude my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ROBRAN, MR B.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (16:24): I move:

That this council—

1. Expresses its deep sadness at the passing of Barrie Robran MBE, a legend of Australian football and one of South Australia's most revered sporting icons;
2. Acknowledges Mr Robran's extraordinary career, including 201 games for North Adelaide, 17 games for South Australia, three Magarey Medals (1968, 1970, 1973), and his role in premierships in 1971 and 1972;
3. Recognises his induction into the Australian Football Hall of Fame in 1996 and his elevation to 'Legend' status in 2001, the first South Australian and the first player without AFL/VFL experience to receive this honour;
4. Honours his humility, courage and lifelong service to football as a player, captain, coach, selector, and mentor, including his contributions off the field to the North Adelaide Football Club and the broader football community; and

5. Sends its sincere condolences to his wife Taimi, sons Matthew and Jonathon, and all who knew and admired him.

I rise today to pay tribute to one of South Australia's favourite sons. Barrie Robran was a footballer of extraordinary talent, a man of genuine humility and a legend of our game who has left an indelible legacy on and off the field. Born in Whyalla in 1947—and Whyalla was the birthplace of many a great man, Mr President—Barrie rose to prominence on the back of great discipline and character, but also a rare football skill. He made his league debut for North Adelaide in 1967 and quickly became the standard by which others were judged. Over the course of his career, he played 201 games for North Adelaide and 17 for South Australia. He won three Magarey Medals, was named his club's best and fairest seven times and led his club to two premierships.

His 1972 performance in the Champions of Australia match, where North Adelaide defeated VFL premiers Carlton at Adelaide Oval, signalled his greatness to the national audience. He turned in one of the greatest performances of his celebrated career, dominating Carlton footballers who had just won the premiership in the nation's premier competition.

Barrie Robran's greatness went way beyond statistics. He had the rare ability to both dazzle and inspire. He was agile, courageous and a visionary reader of the game. He was one of those players who seemed to do things in slow motion, while others could not catch him. But Barrie Robran was known not just for how he played but how he carried himself—always gracious and a true gentleman of sport. Even after his devastating knee injury in 1974, he continued to give back to the game. He went on to coach his beloved North Adelaide, mentored younger players and served as a state selector.

I myself had personal experience with Barrie Robran when my son was four years old. We expected him to join the Sturt Football Club. We went to the Sturt-North game and my son made it quite clear that he did not want to join Sturt. Actually, Barrie Robran signed him up at the North Adelaide football ground. Barrie Robran was always there to encourage young supporters and fans and gave so much of his time to North Adelaide and the game of football.

In recognition of his extraordinary contribution, Barrie was inducted into the Australian Hall of Fame in 1996 and was named its 17th legend in 2001. He was the first South Australian to receive that honour without playing in the AFL or the VFL. Barrie was also a devoted family man. We extend our deepest sympathies to his wife, Taimi; sons, Matthew and Jonathan, who both played AFL football; and to all those who mourn his loss.

Barrie Robran is universally regarded as South Australia's finest footballer, but more than that he was a sporting icon who made our state proud. We honour his memory, celebrate his contribution and thank him for the joy he brought to generations of South Australians. May he rest in peace.

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

Parliamentary Committees

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: PETITION NO. 60, 2024, SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MUSEUM

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (16:28): I move:

That the report of the committee on Petition No. 60, 2024, on the South Australian Museum, be noted.

Petition No. 60 of 2024 was presented to the House of Assembly by the Hon. John Gardner on 28 August 2024. It sought an inquiry into governance, staffing, budgetary and other matters related to the SA Museum and its administration. The House of Assembly sent the petition to the Social Development Committee for its consideration.

The Social Development Committee received the petition on 5 June 2025, and the committee noted in its consideration of the petition that the Premier, the Hon. Peter Malinauskas, established an independent review of the South Australian Museum in April 2024 to inquire into the proposed restructure of the SA Museum and to examine the options going forward. The review panel reported on 19 September 2024, making six recommendations, all of which were accepted by the SA government, I am advised.

Following this review and the recommendations made, the South Australian government made commitments to support the SA Museum in developing its future strategy and committed \$4.1 million of funds over two years. During the time the independent review panel was inquiring into the SA Museum, the Statutory Authorities Review Committee resolved on 13 May 2024 to inquire into and report on the SA Museum and Art Gallery of South Australia. The SARC inquiry addressed other aspects of the SA Museum's administration, such as the role of the SA Museum Board, the funding program and the involvement of the community in the SA Museum's future.

The SARC tabled its report on 19 August 2025, making nine recommendations to assist the SA Museum in the future. The committee reviewed those two preceding inquiries, the recommendations made and the SA government's commitment to the future of the Museum. The committee determined that the terms for the inquiry requested by petition 60 of 2024 have been properly considered and addressed in the reports and recommendations of the preceding two inquiries and will not be further inquiring into the matter. I commend to the house the 50th report of the Social Development Committee.

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

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (UNIVERSITIES - CAPS ON VICE CHANCELLOR SALARIES) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:31): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Adelaide University Act 2023 and the Flinders University Act 1966. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:32): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Today, I seek to introduce a simple bill to cap the salaries of South Australian vice-chancellors and put them on par with our Premier. Australian vice-chancellors are some of the highest paid in the world, doubling and sometimes tripling the salaries of their US and UK counterparts. On 25 August *The Advertiser* reported that the University of Adelaide chief, Professor Peter Høj, earned a 24 per cent pay rise last year to between \$1.3 million and almost \$1.314 million, according to the university's annual report. Meanwhile, Professor David Lloyd earned \$1.303 million in 2024 and Flinders University vice-chancellor, Colin Stirling, earned a 9 per cent pay rise and earned over \$1.43 million during that financial year.

I understand that the salary being provided to the new vice-chancellor of the new merged Adelaide University has not yet been published. National Tertiary Education Union state secretary, Andrew Miller, who is locked in staff pay talks, criticised that 'unreasonable secrecy' and said, 'The university is a public entity, therefore all South Australians deserve to know how much the incoming VC is being paid.' I agree. The amount of \$450 million in taxpayer funds has been allocated to support the merger of the University of South Australia and the University of Adelaide.

The Greens have been advocating for some time that vice-chancellors' salaries should be capped, and we suggested they should be capped in line with the salary of our Premier. That salary is \$436,000 a year. Our Governor is paid \$495,000. When one considers the responsibilities associated with these roles—people who are, in effect, running our state—the salaries of our vice-chancellors do seem really out of step with community expectations.

The reality is that our universities are treating their vice-chancellors like they are CEOs. CEOs are often chosen for their ability to turn a profit and make money, but the rest of the university sector is plagued by low pay, poor job security, unpaid hours and employment law contraventions. Indeed, in 2022, vice-chancellor remuneration was at least seven times more than that of university lecturers, more than nine times that of a high school teacher, and over 10 times more than that of a primary school teacher.

Meanwhile, the average remuneration for university tutors, a job that has become highly casualised, insecure and often involves significant hours of unpaid work, is under \$23,000 per year,

less than 3 per cent of the average vice-chancellor's salary. Poor labour conditions are not just an issue for tutors; they are rife across the sector. The National Tertiary Education Union estimates that there is more than \$400 million in wage theft across the sector.

So why are we treating our universities like corporations, like degree factories? Why are we putting profits ahead of teaching, learning and research? Why are we paying our vice-chancellors almost three times as much as the Premier? We cannot continue to allow the corporate greed to run rampant in our universities. They are institutions of higher learning and they should be treated as such. There is a great deal more work that must be done to reform our university sectors.

Indeed, I am disappointed that when there was an opportunity to do this when we were setting up our new university, there was no enthusiasm from the Labor government, or indeed some of my crossbench colleagues, to actually deal with the issue of governance of our universities, to tackle exorbitant vice-chancellor and executive salaries, and also to ensure that students and staff had more of a say in the running of the new institution.

Universities must continue to be promoted as places of higher education, not simply as degree factories and money makers. I hope that members of all sides of politics will support this bill. Let's not forget that we are seeing these exorbitant vice-chancellor salaries at a time when students are paying through the teeth to go to university and when South Australians are in the midst of the worst cost-of-living crisis in generations. To see these salaries in excess of \$1 million is just obscene.

I think a lot of South Australians would be scratching their head and saying. 'These are public institutions. They getting a lot of taxpayer support. Is this really the best way to use taxpayer money?' I hope that all political parties will come on board and support this very straightforward and sensible proposition from the Greens.

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

WINE GRAPES INDUSTRY (INDICATIVE PRICES) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. S.L. GAME (16:37): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Wine Grapes Industry Act 1991. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. S.L. GAME (16:38): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

As I rise to speak on this bill, many South Australian wine grapegrowers are going under, facing financial ruin, and they are going under for two main reasons. The first is simple and straightforward: it is costing these growers more to grow their grapes than they are getting paid for their grapes. Their cost of production is higher than their returns for a number of reasons. To illustrate how far they have fallen, some red wine varieties grown in the Riverland were fetching up to \$700 a tonne before the Chinese tariffs, and last vintage the same growers were paid just \$150 a tonne. Predictions for the looming vintage suggest even lower price offers ahead.

The second reason many growers are sinking is that an unfair power imbalance is preventing them from making prudent financial plans. It is stopping them from budgeting and charting ahead. Essentially, growers are nurturing their vineyards, paying for all the inputs, such as water, fertiliser, labour costs, ultimately harvesting and everything else in between, without having a clear idea, let alone any degree of certainty, about what prices their grapes will fetch that season.

For some perspective, we are not talking about a handful of unlucky producers. For example, the Riverland-based Consolidated Cooperative Winery (CCW) alone currently represents 494 members. That is 494 growers plus their families. That is 494 small businesses in South Australia, and together they grow around 200,000 tonnes of wine grapes annually, plus other Riverland growers who are not CCW members. Under the current arrangements, many of these growers are dutifully and expertly tending their vineyards during the latter part of the year when inputs largely determine the quality of crops.

But—and this gets to the heart of the legislation—oftentimes they are being forced to wait until December, January and even February to find out what they might get paid for their grapes. This minimum payment figure per tonne, distributed by wineries to every contracted grower, is known as the indicative price. It is what growers will receive approximately for their grapes that particular vintage. As it stands, growers making crucial financial decisions in August, September and October about how much money to spend on producing their grapes have little idea what to expect in December, January and February, when wineries typically decide to release their indicative prices.

However, if growers had earlier notice of what prices per tonne their grapes were likely to fetch, they would suddenly have a powerful new business management tool. This tool would allow them to make a crucial decision two or three months earlier: whether to opt out of the coming vintage or press ahead. Armed with this information, undoubtedly some would indeed decide against producing a crop and spending thousands of dollars on grapes destined to fetch less than their overall cost of production. For others, the prices offered might convince them to forge ahead as usual.

The majority of growers do not own their own water. They lease it in, and it is their biggest cost. Not knowing what the indicative prices are, some growers are forced to go into debt or extend overdrafts to lease enough water to take crops to maturity in February, March and April, only to find those grapes must be left on vines to rot because they cannot afford the harvesting costs. Additionally, pumping water for six months onto a crop that never gets harvested makes zero environmental sense. It would be better if that water remained in the River Murray.

Having prices from processors by 30 September each year—a condition this bill enshrines in law and a condition backed by the Riverland's two biggest grapegrowing representative groups—would stop the bleeding for many growers. It would ensure they are not pointlessly ploughing more money into loss-making crops. By doing so, it would enable them to potentially ride out a bad year, minimise their debt and remain in the industry in the medium to long term.

The Riverland is struggling financially. Wine grapegrowing remains the main financial driver of the region, but our recent discussions with industry figures, including growers and even with the local government leader from the Riverland, confirm our worst fears: people are exiting the industry. Our stakeholders are predicting an increase in the number of rural properties on the market due to grapegrowing becoming unsustainable. The absence of a functioning and successful grapegrowing industry will have serious ripple effects on the local economies. The situation is not dissimilar to what we have seen with the algal bloom crisis currently impacting several South Australian communities.

We have seen the Malinauskas government already acknowledge the seriousness of financial problems created by this algal bloom disaster and deliver financial support to impacted businesses. But in the case of this bill, Riverland grapegrowers are not asking for any taxpayer-funded handout. They are just requesting a simple change to the grower-processor dynamic, aimed at giving them options. This change will not cost taxpayers a cent.

It is important members know that local growers back this legislation and are, in fact, writing to the Premier, to the Leader of the Opposition in this house and to other South Australian politicians, pleading for their non-partisan support. The Riverland Wine Grape Growers Association has told of the desperation among its membership, which is why this bill must be supported by this house and the other place, and swiftly. If this indicative pricing condition becomes law, it will give growers hope for future vintages and hope that they can make better informed decisions, which may allow them to remain in the industry with their dignity intact, and it will mean they do not have to unnecessarily plunge even further into debt.

A quote in an *The Advertiser* story last week summed up the current grower/processor relationship perfectly. Riverland grapegrower and Riverland Wine Grape Growers Association chair Amanda Dimas said, and I quote, 'Not knowing prices until a week before harvest was just mind boggling for me.' She said, 'Waiting until harvest to find out what prices to expect meant—and I again quote—'that you couldn't make the decision whether to supply or not to supply. We were price takers in the end', she said.

Much has been made of a Senate committee and a separate federal review into the existing wine grape purchasing scenario. Indicative pricing was raised multiple times through these processes, along with other factors negatively impacting the industry, including a mandatory code of

conduct. That is all well and good, but the earliest this code could be in place is after the 2027 vintage. For many growers relying on change for their financial survival, that will be too late. And what of the much-hyped resurgence in wine sales post the China tariffs? Tanks are still full and the global trend, including in China, of people drinking less wine continues. Sales figures are misleading, because growers living in Australia's biggest wine grapegrowing region have not seen any change to their fortunes since the tariffs were removed.

During our fact finding to develop this bill, we were told that up to one in two full-time Riverland grapegrower families are currently on Farm Household Allowance, which provides support for Australian growers and farmers who are experiencing financial hardship. If the actual figure is even half that, it would still be alarming, given how many grapegrowers are in the region.

As a related side note, the Department of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries Farm Household Allowance dashboard paints a startling picture of the disastrous state of South Australia's primary production industries. Around 1,020 South Australian farmers are currently receiving FHA, the most in the nation, eclipsing Victoria's number of 910 and the NSW figure of 820. Since July 2024, a total of 630 South Australian farmers have been granted FHA, meaning our figure has jumped by over 160 per cent in the last 13 months.

In drafting this legislation to help our grapegrowers, we tried to go further by including a second interim measure raised with the Senate inquiry, which was the final decision of expert determination called in to resolve pricing disputes being binding. But we decided instead to focus on indicative pricing due to the urgent need for grapegrowers to have a game changer, the difference between survival and economic disaster.

This measure, indicative prices by 30 September each year, is a relatively humble change but one that growers recognise could make a tangible, immediate difference. Growers and their families cannot wait for federal changes that may or may not be implemented sometime in the future. This is meaningful change we can make here and now. If mental health and the preservation of functioning family units matter in places like Whyalla and Port Pirie and communities impacted by the algal bloom disaster, they should also matter in South Australian grapegrowing regions like the Riverland.

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

Motions

GENDER EQUALITY

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:48): I move:

That this council—

1. Notes that South Australia has a proud history of advancing gender equality;
2. Recognises that despite this progress, significant challenges remain, including the gender pay gap and lower levels of workforce participation for women compared to men;
3. Acknowledges that, in opposition, the now Malinauskas Labor government supported the Gender Equality Bill 2021;
4. Notes that at the second reading of the Gender Equality Bill 2022, the government did not support the bill and confirmed its plans to introduce similar legislation;
5. Notes that this commitment formed part of Labor's pre-election policy platform;
6. Observes that the South Australian Women's Equality Blueprint 2023–2026 includes as a key action the introduction of an equality bill;
7. Notes the findings of the Gender Pay Gap Taskforce, including recommendation 3, which calls for action to reduce the gender pay gap in the public sector; and
8. Calls on the government to honour its commitment and introduce a gender equality bill without further delay.

On 18 December 1894, the South Australian Parliament passed the Constitution Amendment (Adult Suffrage) Act, giving women the right to vote and the right to stand for election to parliament. South Australia was the first electorate in the world to give equal political rights to both men and

women. It would be another eight years before the commonwealth caught up, giving women the right to vote in federal elections through the Commonwealth Franchise Act of 1902.

Here is another homegrown first: the late Dame Roma Mitchell was the first female governor of any Australian state, namely, ours. She was also the first woman in Australia to be appointed Queen's Counsel, the first in Australia to be appointed as a judge of the Supreme Court of South Australia, and the first female chancellor of an Australian university, the University of Adelaide. Dame Roma, as we all know, was a trailblazing advocate for the rights of Australian women, including equal pay.

Under Don Dunstan, SA introduced equal rights for women and passed anti-discrimination laws. He appointed the first women's adviser, Deborah McCulloch, in 1976, and through the Women's Advisory Unit legislated the Sex Discrimination Act and established the Equal Opportunities Commissioner and advisory panel. It was Don who appointed Dame Roma to the Supreme Court, and his was the first government in the world to make rape within marriage a criminal offence.

The state government established the South Australian Gender Pay Gap Taskforce in September 2022 to provide high level advice to the Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic, Family and Sexual Violence in the South Australian government on issues related to the gender pay gap. The Australian Bureau of Statistics reported that the gender pay gap in South Australia was, as at November 2024, still 10.1 per cent. Again, based on 2024 data, on average women have had to work 50 additional days into the new year just to earn what their male counterparts earned last year.

On the issue of domestic, family and sexual violence, that, too, as we know, is a driver of financial insecurity for women. It has been reported that 39 per cent of women in SA have experienced physical and/or sexual violence. Sadly, as we know, women believe they simply cannot afford to leave an abusive relationship. We know it takes about six to eight attempts to leave one of those relationships before you actually make it out those doors.

In its final report of 2024, the task force that I referred to recognised the key drivers of the gender pay gap across Australia identified in the KPMG She's Price(d)less report and the percentages that they contribute to the gap, including gender discrimination and a systemic undervaluation of women's economic contribution at 36 per cent; women's limited participation in the workforce and women spending 81 per cent more time in unpaid work than men at 33 per cent; and gender segregation, which means more men in higher paying roles and industries such as defence and manufacturing, and more women in lower paid sectors such as early childhood education, aged care and hospitality at 24 per cent. As the task force noted:

This gap has lasting impacts on women's economic security.

The gap starts from the moment a woman enters the workforce and accumulates over a working life to a significant wealth gap by retirement.

Closing the gender pay gap is an important step for South Australia to become a fair and inclusive state in which women and girls can equally and actively participate in the economy and all aspects of community life.

The task force also found that the gender pay gap not only affects women on an individual level, it reinforces gender inequality through ongoing discrimination faced by women and the unequal distribution of power, resources and opportunities between men and women. It says research also shows that reducing the gender pay gap would result in an increase in workforce participation and productivity and add a whopping \$128 billion to Australia's economy.

I have spoken in this place on lots of issues, as has my colleague the Hon. Tammy Franks and others in this place, about issues relating to gender equality and the impacts that it has, predominantly on women, and every one of those campaigns, whether it is period poverty or anything else, is supposed to demonstrate that when we target young girls at an early enough age, and we foster and nurture them, then they are more likely to not be faced with many of the battles that our mums and grandmas were faced with.

But we still find ourselves here today, in 2025, talking about things like period poverty. We still find ourselves talking about a 10.1 per cent gender pay gap in South Australia and, frankly, as I have said before, the buck stops with us, because we are the ones who are meant to set the gold

standard, and we are the ones who set the bar as high as it ought to be, to ensure that every person is earning equal to their male counterparts. I would hasten to say that, outside of people working in our roles, there would be plenty—and I know, based on the commentary I get on social media, that not everyone buys this argument that women are paid less than men, but the statistics and the outcomes of those government reports that I have just referred to speak for themselves.

It is for that reason that in 2022 I introduced the bill in this place, the Gender Equality Bill, based on the Victorian model, which we know has now been tried and tested and is doing extraordinarily well under the helm of our former commissioner from here in South Australia, Niki Vincent. That bill that was proposed to establish a state gender equality commission and create an action plan to address inequities such as gender pay gaps in the public sector was rebuffed by the government. It mandated that relevant entities such as public sector agencies and councils meet equality targets set by regulation.

As I said at the time, if the issue of gender is not important enough to warrant a dedicated standalone equality commission and action plan, then I do not know what is. The opposition at the time, the current government, supported that first bill. When they came into government I reintroduced the same bill. They opposed my bill and they opposed it on the basis that they were working on their own proposal.

I have had those meetings with the government and with the minister and I know the commitments that have been given to stakeholders and industry groups outside of this place and to me in terms of the timing of that bill and they have not been met. It concerns me greatly that we are about three minutes away from an election, relatively speaking, and we have not seen a bill introduced into this place that addresses not just the commitments that this government gave, which are outlined in the motion itself, but also the recommendations of the task force, which clearly points to the need for one of these models in South Australia.

As I said, when the government knocked that bill out, after having supported it, those commitments were given and they were given on the basis that this was a priority for this government and that we would see a proposal through this side of the election. I was sceptical because I know how politics works, but I have patiently monitored the progress and I have patiently taken part in those discussions and I can tell you either the priorities have changed or something has gone wrong because, as I said, the clock is well and truly ticking and nothing of what I have discussed today has found its way before us in this place.

It is not rocket science. As I said, we set the bar and we set the standard, and in the absence of standards in the public sector there is not much to convince other businesses to invest in incentives that result in equal pay amongst genders. I am really hoping that, in response to this motion, the minister will find herself in the position to share with us some positive updates about a piece of legislation that was meant to be, and is meant to be, central to this government's commitment to gender equality.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. R.P. Wortley.

Bills

CLIMATE CHANGE AND GREENHOUSE EMISSIONS REDUCTION (INTERGENERATIONAL EQUITY) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:58): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Climate Change and Greenhouse Emissions Reduction Act 2007 and to make related amendments to the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:59): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill includes a trigger which, when reached, mandates the completion of a child rights impact assessment, requiring the health and wellbeing of young people in this state to be taken into account.

Those young people in this state, of course, are confronted by a global issue, that of climate change. They know that they are being betrayed. They do not feel reassured as they watch governments sell their future down the drain to appease multinational fossil fuel giants. It is time not only that they take a stand but that we support them when they do.

If South Australia is indeed serious about hosting COP31, we should aspire to demonstrate through our actions our worthiness to host it, by legislating to ensure that we take climate action at every possible step. Talk on climate action is cheap. Actions will speak louder than those words, but those words, if in legislation, will create the change we need. If we are to be on the right side of history, able to look our children or grandchildren in the eyes and tell them we did everything we could, this is one good step along the road to putting ourselves in that position.

This is a simple bill, but with it we can reduce the number of young people who feel the same way as the child quoted in an international study who said: 'I don't want to die, but I don't want to live in a world that doesn't care about children and animals.' The Hon. Connie Bonaros has just been talking about women and gender equity, and we know that we have a proud history here in South Australia of leading the way. I was caused to reflect that one of the well-known suffrage movement women who created change in this state, Mary Lee, often commented that it is our duty to leave this world better than we found it.

Of course, at the moment we are not leaving a world better than we found it for future generations, and there is so much more that we could be doing. That is why I rise today to introduce the Climate Change and Greenhouse Emissions Reduction (Intergenerational Equity) Amendment Bill. It is my hope that with this bill South Australia can accomplish what our federal parliament has recently failed to achieve in the context of climate change and intergenerational justice.

Why shouldn't we? South Australians can be rightly proud of our history of innovation across both legislation and renewable energy as a response to climate change. Many of these innovations have addressed justice across communities as well as across generations, and this bill aims to achieve both of those things, specifically with regard to climate change and young people, both current and future.

In 2023, Senator David Pocock took a climate change amendment bill to the federal parliament. Despite considerable support right across the nation from the community, the final recommendation of the Environment and Communications Legislation Committee standing committee was disappointing. It recommended that it not be passed, not because it would not have a wonderful impact but because the abstract nature of some aspects of the bill, such as the need to consider 'emotional, spiritual and cultural health', was not possible, according to that committee.

Additionally, that committee also cited the existence of a National Children's Commissioner, who advocates for children and young people, saying essentially that this in and of itself was enough to ensure that the needs of current and future generations are taken into account with regard to climate futures. The evidence shows us that this is simply not the case. Those are straw man arguments. They are distractions when we need to actually full on face the fact that we are heading for destruction.

Given the decisions made by successive governments on projects with significant scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions, the advocacy of the National Children's Commissioner, whilst strong and clearly well intended, seemingly continues to go unheeded. There is no force to them. Children and young people are rightly frustrated by those decisions. Children and young people should not need to have another person advocating for them every time a major project is proposed. This bill will ensure that every time a major project is proposed there will be a structure where the parliament ensures that the climate impact is considered. The system should be set up well enough that their needs are automatically considered, and this bill will effect that change.

On a positive note, that federal committee did acknowledge the negative health impacts of climate change on current and future generations, as well as the broad support that the bill has received right across the Australian community. The Australian Public Law society noted that the proposed Pocock bill was able to overcome the limitations of the judicial system in addressing climate change-related harm, as well as noting the importance of the bill in the absence of a human rights charter embedded within our national constitution.

Earlier this year, another MP, the Independent member for Mackellar, Sophie Scamps MP, took a similar bill to the federal parliament. Her bill sought to mandate consideration of the long-term impacts of decision-making and outlined, and I quote, a 'future generations principle' by which decision-making was to be made such that the needs of the present are met without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. In her speech to the federal parliament she noted that our current political system prioritises what she termed 'immediate political objectives'. Indeed, far too often in politics, that is what prevails. That bill was on the table when parliament was prorogued before the recent federal election and to date has not yet been further progressed.

Tellingly, in the Sharma v Minister for the Environment case in 2021, the judge found that the federal minister did indeed have a duty of care to young Australians and that she should be reasonably able to anticipate that the carbon dioxide emissions caused by the extension to the Whitehaven Coal Vickery coalmine would contribute to the harms caused by climate change.

We know—we well know—that Australia is a signatory to the CRC, the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, under which the best interests of the child are a primary consideration, and the rights of the child to, amongst other things, life, survival and development; the highest attainable standard of health; and an adequate standard of living are recognised. In fact, jurisdictions around the world have used legislation to embed the need to consider the children of both the current and future generations in their decision-making. South Australia can do this.

We just need to look to places such as Wales. Wales has a Future Generations Commissioner. Portugal recognises the right to a healthy environment in its constitution. Hungary has a Parliamentary Commissioner for Future Generations. The Norwegian constitution recognises the right to an environment conducive to health and the need to ensure that the right to access natural resources plays out in such a way that the right of future generations to do so is also safeguarded. In Brazil, in the case which recognised the 2024 rights of the Amazon rainforest, the rights of future generations were mentioned multiple times in that judgement.

My hope, and I believe the hope of young people right across our state, is that this bill can help us make the significant shift that we need to take politics from the short term to the long term and to ensure that our thinking is always about young people and about those who are not even here yet. We can do this by putting young people—current and future generations of children—at the forefront of our decision-making and embedding them in our parliamentary processes. Making decisions with an eye to future generations will benefit all South Australians, regardless of our age.

A recent University of Adelaide study concluded that South Australia and Victoria had the highest share of the mental health burden linked to high temperatures, while another international study of some 10,000 young people, including 1,000 from Australia, found that respondents from all those countries surveyed were worried about climate change. We know that anxiety and fear around climate change is not just real but palpable with young people.

Some 59 per cent were very or extremely worried, and 84 per cent were at least moderately worried. That is 84 per cent who are at least a little bit worried—and why shouldn't they be? More than 50 per cent reported feeling sad, anxious, angry, powerless, helpless and guilty. They did not simply report feeling one or more of those emotions, though. Every single one of the more than 50 per cent reported feeling all of them—that is, sad, anxious, angry, powerless, helpless and guilty. More than 45 per cent of respondents said their feelings about climate change impacted negatively on their daily lives and on their functioning.

Many reported a high number of negative thoughts about climate change. If you do not believe that is enough reason for us to act, some 75 per cent of those 10,000 young people who were surveyed said that they think the future is frightening and 83 per cent said that they think people have failed to take care of the planet. And you know what? They are right on both counts.

Perhaps most importantly for us here in this council today who are faced with the responsibilities of decision-making that impacts not just the here and now but current and future generations of children, the perception of respondents was that governments are responding poorly to climate change. Those young people typically felt more betrayed than reassured by our responses to the climate emergency. We have declared a climate emergency here in South Australia. What are we really doing about it?

Climate anxiety and distress, of course, correlated with perceived inadequate government response and associated feelings of betrayal. If we want a healthy democracy, we need a healthy planet and we need to actually start putting children and young people, the current generations and those to come, at the forefront of our processes.

Climate anxiety, of course, is recognised by experts as rational, but long-term exposure to climate anxiety, combined with governmental failures to adequately act, creates a significant psychological stressor, and this can lead to mental illness. Furthermore, government failure to act is perceived by young people as betrayal and abandonment, and we know that for a healthy democracy that is a terrible warning sign.

An important part, of course, of international environmental law is the precautionary principle, which aims to ensure that the lack of full scientific certainty should not be used as a reason to delay action where there is a risk of serious or irreversible harm to the environment. The sixth IPCC report, published in 2023, states unequivocally that:

There is a rapidly closing window of opportunity to secure a liveable and sustainable future for all.

And that was in 2023. When we consider that a child born in 2020 in Australia will experience four times as many heat waves, three times as many droughts and 1½ times as many bushfires as those who had what can be considered now to be the good fortune to be born in the 1960s, we should have no choice but to act and put that precautionary principle into place immediately through this bill.

It is not just about significant mental and physical health impacts that will come with worsening and inadequately addressed climate change, though, it is also, of course, about the economic consequences of climate change. We could do well to remember that those economic consequences are more than simply numbers on a spreadsheet. Economic consequences are lost livelihoods. They are reduced quality of life. As we face the algal bloom, which has been caused by a marine heatwave, which is part of climate change, we can see this playing out in front of our very eyes. There are missed opportunities for sustainable growth. These are all things for current generations, but they will hit those future generations even harder.

Finally, the ICJ has recently released its opinion in the case taken before it, which was led by Vanuatu. ICJ President, Yuji Iwasawa, said the climate must be protected for present and future generations and the adverse effect of a warming planet:

...may significantly impair the enjoyment of certain human rights, including the right to life.

The principles of environmentally sustainable development (ESD), which depend on using, conserving and enhancing the community's resources so that ecological processes, on which life depends, are maintained and that the total quality of life now and in the future is not degraded and is readily available for us all to enjoy, already feature in over 60 pieces of legislation in our nation.

I do look forward to debating this bill before we rise in this particular session of parliament, and I hope that this parliament, which aspires to host a COP, will choose to recognise the needs and the rights of current and future generations of young people.

The bill is simple. It uses the parliamentary processes and the Public Works Committee to ensure that, when we make major decisions—and those major decisions in the bill are codified—we consider those future generations and the impact that it will have on them. I think it will go not a small way to ensuring that not only do we actually actively act to address global warming and climate change but that we reassure all South Australians that we were genuine in our commitment when we declared that climate emergency, that we will take action and that we will take action as early as possible.

I want to thank Cielo Essling, who was an intern in my office, a young person who has a mind to the future and who actually did quite a body of work that led to the creation of this bill. With that, I commend the bill.

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

*Motions***AUSTRALIAN REFUGEE ASSOCIATION**

The Hon. J.S. LEE (17:15): I move:

That this council—

1. Congratulates the Australian Refugee Association (ARA) for celebrating its 50th anniversary in 2025;
2. Acknowledges that since 1975, ARA has supported over 96,000 refugees, providing essential services to help them become independent citizens and empowering newly arrived communities to participate actively in all aspects of life in Australia;
3. Recognises that ARA supports newly arrived individuals in a variety of ways including health, employment, connection to community, migration support as well as targeted youth programs to engage and empower young people; and
4. Commends the leadership of CEO Chris Chalubek, the former CEO Deb Stringer, board chair Kathy Kingston, and the past patronage of former South Australian Governor His Excellency the Hon. Hieu Van Le AO along with the dedication of the board, management, staff and volunteers in making ARA's mission a success.

It is a great privilege to rise today to move this motion to congratulate the Australian Refugee Association (ARA) for celebrating its 50th anniversary in 2025. This is a truly remarkable milestone in the life of an organisation that has profoundly shaped the lives of tens of thousands of individuals and families.

The Australian Refugee Association was born out of a vision of a society that welcomes those fleeing persecution, war and hardship and offers them not only safety but dignity, opportunity and belonging within a democratic society. Many honourable members may be aware that there are 123.2 million forcibly displaced people worldwide. Of these, 36.8 million are deemed refugees and, shockingly, 2.3 million children were born as refugees between 2018 and 2024.

The UNHCR states that Australia continues to play a prominent role in regional protection efforts. The history of Australia's refugee program can be traced back at least 170 years. The first easily identifiable group of refugees were Lutherans who began settling in South Australia from 1839 to escape restrictions on their right to worship. During the 19th century other settlers included Hungarians, Italians and Poles leaving situations of religious and political persecution. The post World War II period also saw the arrival of nearly a million refugees and people in humanitarian need.

In terms of more recent data, as of 2024 Australia hosts tens of thousands of refugees, asylum seekers and stateless individuals and remains a critical partner in advancing international protection and solutions in the Asia-Pacific region.

Since its beginning as a grassroots movement of dedicated volunteers in 1975, ARA has supported more than 96,000 refugees, helping them to rebuild their lives in their new home and become active, empowered independent citizens who participate in all aspects of life in our society. This is not just a number. Behind each of those 96,000 lives is a story of courage, resilience and transformation. ARA has provided vital services to individuals and families as they navigated the challenges of resettlement, language and cultural barriers, employment and education. It has done so with compassion, professionalism and unwavering commitment to human dignity.

I would like to take a moment to reflect on the incredible history and legacy of ARA and provide a glimpse into its many achievements over the past five decades. In June 1975, in response to a humanitarian crisis following the end of the Vietnam War, a group of concerned citizens gathered in the living room of Peter and Barbara Engelhardt, forming the Indo-China Refugee Association (ICRA).

This year marks the 50th anniversary of the fall of Saigon. I have attended many memorial services and significant events hosted by the Vietnamese Community in Australia SA Chapter, the Vietnam Veterans Association and other Vietnam veterans organisations, and during those commemoration services all the speakers made moving speeches and painted a vivid picture of the darkest hours and horrifying conditions the South Vietnamese people faced following the fall of Saigon in April 1975.

Thousands of people from the Indochina region were fleeing war and oppression, and ICRA quickly became the national voice, promoting the intake of refugees and providing resettlement services and support. ICRA was incorporated in November 1975 and the first 50 Vietnamese refugees settled in Adelaide by 1976, supported by ICRA to find housing and jobs within just six months.

The pioneering founder of ICRA achieved remarkable outcomes: welcoming and supporting refugees, setting a national precedent of effective and compassionate resettlement, establishing programs for unaccompanied minors and war orphans, and helping to provide safe housing, mentorship and education for many young Vietnamese children. I know that the Hon. Tung Ngo has recounted many stories about people he knows personally and also his family.

Under the leadership of the organisation's first CEO, Kevin Liston, ICRA extended its services throughout the 1980s. To reflect the broader mission, ICRA officially became known as the Australian Refugee Association in 1994. In 1990, ARA helped establish STTARS, which is the Survivors of Torture and Trauma Assistance and Rehabilitation Service, and I believe most members would know about its strong advocacy.

Around this time, ARA also launched a dedicated employment service for CALD communities, becoming South Australia's only specialist provider under the job network system. ARA continues to be very active and innovative in this space, establishing training programs that assist individuals gain their driver's licence or white card, and providing workshops and tailoring support to help new arrivals overcome barriers to employment.

I have also seen the benefits of their business program, which helps small home-based businesses set up their own business, and those skills are also transferable to employment. Today, ARA is the largest settlement, engagement and transition support provider in South Australia, supporting over 6,000 refugees from more than 50 countries each year. With 80 per cent of its staff coming from a refugee or migrant background, their lived experience and cultural understanding is central to ARA's responsive, client-centred and community-focused services.

This success and wideranging impact would not have been possible without outstanding leadership that has guided ARA to evolve and adapt over the years. I wish to first acknowledge the chairperson, Cathy Kingston, who first joined the board in 2018 and was then appointed as chair in 2024, who has a strong commitment to human rights and social justice. I also acknowledge all the previous chairs who have contributed to ARA's success.

Many honourable members will also know the former CEO, Deb Stringer, who retired from the role last year after leading ARA for six years. Deb was instrumental in strengthening ARA's capacity, leading the organisation through a period of tremendous growth. We should commend Deb for her dedication, building on ARA's legacy of compassion and courage. I got to know Deb really well. I remember one particular year during Refugee Week, I ran into her four times. She is an incredible lady.

ARA is now under the leadership of the new CEO, Chris Chalubek. I want to congratulate him on being appointed and I trust that his passion and experience will continue to steer ARA with integrity and purpose. I also want to acknowledge the wonderful deputy CEO, Semira Julardzija. I have got to know Semira through many multicultural events. She is a fantastic contributor to ARA and also to our broader multicultural community.

Speaking of the 50th anniversary of the fall of Saigon, I want to take this moment to honour the past patronage of His Excellency the Hon. Hieu Van Le AO, former Governor of South Australia. Because of his own personal journey as a refugee, he brought a wealth of experience and has been instrumental in helping guide ARA in its advocacy and service delivery. Finally, a special thank you to all past and current board members, management, staff and volunteers for their tireless efforts and lasting contributions to ARA's mission to creating an inclusive and welcoming society.

As a first-generation migrant myself, I am proud to be an Australian. At the same time, I cherish my own cultural heritage. I am incredibly grateful for the opportunity that Australia has provided me and my family. We have come such a long way since the White Australia policy was revoked in the 1970s. I truly believe that multiculturalism and diversity are our greatest strength. It is

unfortunate that some people do not think that way, but I think all of us have the responsibility in parliament to ensure that the harmonious assistance between different communities is valued.

We are incredibly fortunate that our diverse multicultural communities contribute to every aspect of our economy and our society. I believe that we all aspire to live in a better community, a community that is characterised by trust, respect, open communication and shared values, fostering an inclusive and harmonious environment where people feel valued and connected.

I have spoken many times in this parliament about Refugee Week. I just want to reinforce that refugees bring a lot of contributions, resilience and cultural richness to our society, and we should treat them with great respect and humility. Refugee Week highlights the positive aspects of diversity and an inclusive society that opens our arms to refugees, ultimately making sure that they can participate in our society in a meaningful way. Organisations like ARA play a vital role in ensuring this diversity is not only celebrated but supported.

International conflicts and global uncertainties remain. Australia has a role to play in offering sanctuary and support, but refugee resettlement is not without its challenges. It requires coordinated policy, adequate resources and community goodwill. It requires us as legislators and leaders to ensure that our systems are fair, humane and responsive to the realities faced by displaced people. ARA's work will remain essential in helping new arrivals integrate, thrive and contribute to our shared future.

I recently participated in a Youth Ambassador Program organised by ARA. I want to commend them for their investment and, in promoting young people, shaping the future of our state. It was really wonderful to meet so many inspiring, passionate young people at ARA's recent youth leadership event in August.

I look forward to formally celebrating ARA's 50th anniversary in November this year with many honourable members in this house, I am sure, to reflect on the association's wide-reaching achievements and the tangible impact it has had for so many lives. It is an honour to move this motion today to recognise the Australian Refugee Association and its mission of empowering courageous people in their journey to settle in Australia. Congratulations once again on a remarkable five decades, and I wish ARA every success in the many years ahead.

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

RURAL ROAD SAFETY MONTH

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (17:28): I move:

That this council—

1. Notes that September is Rural Road Safety Month;
2. Realises that rural road crashes account for more than 65 per cent of the Australian road toll;
3. Thanks the Australian Road Safety Foundation for the work they put into their annual campaign to spread awareness;
4. Commends the former Marshall Liberal government for injecting an enormous amount of money towards upgrading rural and regional roads; and
5. Calls on the Malinauskas government to continue that investment in upgrading our rural and regional roads.

It is a privilege to stand today to move this motion that recognises September as Rural Road Safety Month. I am sure there are not many people in this room who have not been in some way touched by the road toll or have had people close to them who have been injured on our roads, even more so from a rural and regional perspective. We know that rural road crashes account for more than 65 per cent of Australia's road toll.

I congratulate the Australian Road Safety Foundation as it launches its rural road safety campaign to raise awareness about the additional risks that drivers face when travelling on rural and remote roads across this country. The rate of serious injuries is almost double those that occur in major cities. The ARSF rightly points out that on rural roads the risks are real. These roads are long, they are unforgiving, and you are far from help if you get stuck. We know that, because of our backlog

of road maintenance, these roads, their shoulders, the conditions of these roads, are only continuing to get worse.

As a dad of an 18 year old who likes to go and visit her friends outside of the Mount Gambier area, I know that my wife, Elle, and I are very concerned when Neave hits the road, and we always make sure that we give her an extra hug and tell her to be very, very careful and very, very sensible whenever she is out there. I know that every parent would be doing exactly the same.

Last year, 1,306 people were killed on Australian roads and 810 of them were on rural roads, which equates to almost two out of every three road incidents. In 2025, we have already reached 57 road fatalities, with 33 of them occurring in regional and rural areas. This is someone's mum, their dad, their son, their daughter, and it is heartbreaking. I had to sit with a mate when they had to hear the news that their brother had passed away in a road crash. It is devastating and it never ever leaves the families that have to endure that.

I reflect that we are told that our cars should be roadworthy in this state, but it is very important that our roads are car-worthy as well, because coming unstuck is not just maybe checking your mobile phone or doing the wrong thing in terms of drink driving; it can be because of the condition of the road. Just a momentary lapse of attention can mean the difference between getting home to see your family or not.

In regard to this motion, it does realise that rural road crashes account for more than 65 per cent of the road toll. It also commends the former Marshall Liberal government for injecting an enormous amount of money towards upgrading rural and regional roads. A significant amount of money was pumped into rural and regional roads under the former Marshall Liberal government, and I saw the result of that, most especially down in the South-East. It is disappointing that we have seen a pullback in regard to regional road safety projects from this current government.

The 2025-26 state budget committed \$110 million to road safety; however, a mere \$7.5 million of that has been dedicated to regional road safety infrastructure. In 2024, of the \$310 million for funding for regional roads, \$250 million was allocated to upgrade the South Eastern Freeway between Mount Barker and the city—hardly what you would call regional. Of course, those things need to be done, but if we are talking about funding for regional roads there needs to be an equitable amount getting put into ensuring that they are safe.

We also saw a whopping \$40 million allocated towards a roundabout upgrade in Mount Barker, which came out of the regional road funding. Again, I love Mount Barker and have a few friends up there, but it is not particularly regional. We need to have dedicated investment into road maintenance in our regions. It should not take constantly banging on the minister's or government's door to ensure these things happen. It should not take having to spin up a forum and shine a light on these things to get some action on things like the Southern Ports Highway.

Almost a year ago to the day, I set up community forum in Beachport because the locals were just sick of the Southern Ports Highway being an absolute roller-coaster. Caravaners and tourists were essentially telling people to stay away, to not go on this road. I spun up that community forum. We had about 100 people in the room, and it was only then that the government said, 'Okay, we will chuck \$18 million behind it to do something with that road.' I certainly thank the government for doing that, but it is a little bit too little a little bit too late. Road safety is a shared responsibility. It is incumbent on all levels of government to ensure that roads are maintained to minimise accidents occurring. Every time you get behind the wheel or use the road, you do hold your own life and someone else's life in your hands. I encourage everyone during September, during this Rural Road Safety Month, to look out for yourself and to look out for others.

I also want to do a quick shout-out to Darren Davis and Debbie Davis from the Get Home Safe Foundation. For years Debbie and Darren have been at the coalface of telling people about road safety, ensuring that people get home safe, and I was really proud to co-convene and chair the South-East Regional Road Safety Alliance with Darren. He is an absolute legend, and Debbie is an absolute legend as well. I thank them for their commitment to road safety and, again, I urge everyone during September—and, indeed, every month—to look out for yourself and look out for others on the road. Make sure you get home safely to see your family.

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

SOUTH COAST ALGAL BLOOM

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (17:35): I move:

That there be laid upon the table of this council by the Leader of the Government within seven sitting days of the passing of this resolution the following documents:

1. All budget proposals or funding requests submitted by the Department for Environment and Water (DEW) to the Treasurer from 1 November 2024 to present;
2. All internal proposals developed by DEW regarding responses to the current harmful algal bloom that were not submitted to the Department of Treasury and Finance (DTF) from 1 November 2024 to present;
3. All internal memoranda or briefing notes produced by DEW relating to the current harmful algal bloom from 1 November 2024 to present;
4. All documents prepared by, for, or received by the Chief Public Health Officer or their staff that relate to public health advice concerning the current harmful algal bloom, including but not limited to risk assessments, health alerts, interagency communications, or advice to ministers from 1 November 2024 to present.

I rise to speak to this motion, which is essentially calling for accountability. Under the standing orders of the South Australian Legislative Council, this wonderful place that we sit in here, any member may move a motion to compel the production of documents by the government and, if agreed to, the motion carries the authority of the council requiring the Leader of the Government to table the requested materials within a specific timeframe.

This motion seeks to compel the production of key documents relating to the government's response to the current harmful algal bloom affecting the South Australian marine environment. The outbreak of the harmful algal bloom (HAB) was first widely reported after surfers at Waitpinga Beach on the southern Fleurieu Peninsula experienced skin irritation in mid March. In the following months, following the identification of the algal bloom, there has really been a clear lack of information and leadership from this Malinauskas government. The government response has been disorganised, it has been slow and it has been disproportionate to the magnitude of the impact of this harmful algal bloom, and it continues to show a lack of understanding or support for the affected businesses, largely in regional communities, with some already suffering due to prolonged drought.

Once again, this government is too focused on appearance rather than action, and it is hardworking people who are ultimately bearing the brunt. The South Australian public deserves answers. They certainly deserve transparency and they do not deserve being kept in the dark. We obviously have freedom of information laws in this state and, indeed, in this country, but they are often slow, they are often frustrated by government, and they are often redacted. Many, many things are cabinet-in-confidence, many things are commercial-in-confidence, and sometimes, just sometimes, we need to utilise the standing orders here in the Legislative Council to ensure that what the public need to know is open and transparent, and a light is shone upon it. That is what this motion aims to do.

I hope that the crossbench and the government—although I doubt it—will support the passing of this motion, so that we can get to understand what is behind this harmful algal bloom, what are the directions that the government have been receiving by their departments, so that we hopefully can be better prepared in the future should one of these harmful algal blooms come again.

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

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN ALGAL BLOOMS

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

1. That, in the opinion of this council, a joint committee be appointed to inquire into and report on the harmful algal blooms in South Australian marine and coastal environments, with particular reference to:
 - (a) contributing environmental, land management or water quality factors;

- (b) ecological, economic, cultural and social impacts of algal blooms including impact on community health and wellbeing;
 - (c) the cultural and economic impacts on Indigenous communities, including any loss of access to cultural practices;
 - (d) the coordination of state government responses, including agency responsibility, industry engagement, scientific advice, and public communications;
 - (e) the current support and recovery arrangements for impacted industries and communities;
 - (f) the adequacy of long-term monitoring, forecasting and prevention strategies;
 - (g) the adequacy of research functions, rehabilitation and recovery planning;
 - (h) any other related matters.
2. That, in the event of a joint committee being appointed, the Legislative Council be represented thereon by three members, of whom two shall form a quorum of council members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee.
 3. That members of the committee may participate in the proceedings by way of telephone or videoconference or other electronic means and shall be deemed to be present and counted for purposes of a quorum, subject to such means of participation remaining effective and not disadvantaging any member.
 4. That this council permits the joint committee to authorise the disclosure or publication, as it thinks fit, of any evidence or documents presented to the committee prior to such evidence being reported to the council.
 5. That a message be sent to the House of Assembly transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto.

(Continued from 20 August 2025.)

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:39): Noting the time, I rise briefly to indicate my support for this motion and also my support for the amendment that the opposition has proposed and circulated outside the chamber, that no doubt they will move at some stage.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (17:39): I rise on behalf of the opposition to indicate our support for this motion moved by the Hon. Robert Simms; that is, to establish a joint committee to inquire into and report on the harmful algal blooms currently facing our state waters. As we all know, this bloom has spread throughout the marine environment of this state and has been nothing short of devastating. The coastal ecology, recreational and commercial fishers, coastal towns, the tourism industry and Indigenous communities have all suffered as a result.

The government's response to this challenge was slow. It is important that we learn as much as possible from this experience and, more importantly, plan so that there is better response to any future harmful bloom outbreak. It is worth remembering that the early response was heavy on hope and light on action.

The communications revealed through an FOI request that government departments had no strategic organised plan of addressing inquiries from concerned constituents, bashing them back and forth between ministers in a clearly ad hoc manner. Some weeks after detection of the bloom, there was still confusion about which minister should assume responsibility for various tasks. The opposition suggests that the above motion would be improved with the following changes and therefore I move to amend the motion as follows:

After subparagraph (g) insert new subparagraph (ga) as follows:

- (ga) the ongoing economic viability and ecological sustainability of the commercial and recreational fishing sectors;

Again, the opposition supports the establishment of a joint committee to capture lessons from this event, to learn from the response and to investigate more effective options on harmful algal blooms into the future.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (17:42): I rise to say that the government members will be supporting the motion of the Hon. R.A. Simms to set up this joint committee. We will not, however, be supporting the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. It is our view that the

amendment is so broad and so incredibly complicated that we will not be able to report by the end of this year. The whole fishing industry? The sustainability of it into the future? That is going to take a long time and will detract from the investigation into the algal bloom. For those reasons, we will be supporting the establishment of the committee, but not supporting the amendment.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:43): I rise to indicate my support for the establishment of this committee. I think we will have plenty of opportunities to speak further on this so I will not keep people here in terms of some of the issues that we would like to canvas in relation to the algal bloom. I note that there is an amendment to this. I take on board the comments just made by the Hon. Ian Hunter in relation to the breadth of that, but I think we are sensible enough to know how to rein those things in.

I also appreciate that, notwithstanding the fact that this amendment may not be successful—an amendment which I am supporting on the understanding that we know what we are dealing with when we talk about the viability and sustainability of commercial and rec fishing sectors in the context of algal blooms—it is an issue that inevitably is going to be canvassed by this committee anyway because, with respect, these things go hand in glove and you cannot be looking at this issue without considering the impacts it is having on commercial and recreation fishing sectors in South Australia.

I think regardless of whether it is in there or not this is going to be one of the issues that is going to be canvassed by the committee, and I think that we are sensible enough to know what that remit would look like in terms of not getting out of hand and being here for 75 years looking at the commercial and recreational fishing sectors. With those words, I indicate my support for the committee and the amendment.

The Hon. J.S. LEE (17:45): I rise today to speak in support of the motion to establish a joint committee to inquire into the deeply concerning issue of harmful algal blooms in South Australia. As many members have highlighted, the impact of the algal bloom is wideranging. It has affected not only our ecological systems but also our economy, our culture and the social fabric of coastal and regional communities.

I just want to take a moment to particularly highlight the impact on small businesses and the tourism sector, which are often the first to feel the effects of environmental disruptions but the last to receive targeted support. Whether it is a family-run seafood business, a regional tour operator or a coastal cafe, those enterprises are deeply connected to the health of our marine environments and deserve to be part of the conversation.

I have spoken with tour operators like Mark Koolmatrerie from Kool Tours, who has seen the impact of this bloom stretch across the books well into next year. His business is built on sharing the beauty of our coast and the cultural significance of the environment, but when the environment suffers so too does the ability to operate, to employ people and to connect people with place. Mark's story is one of many, and it underscores why this inquiry must be grounded in lived experience.

The motion also addresses the need for better coordination of state government responses, from agency responsibility to industry engagement, scientific advice and public communication. This is a critical point. Looking ahead, the motion calls for scrutiny of long-term monitoring, forecasting and prevention strategies. These systems are vital to building resilience and ensuring that we are not caught off guard. Prevention is always more effective and more affordable than a recovery.

I understand that the amendment moved by the opposition is well intended. However, I feel that the scope of the current terms of reference drafted by the mover, the Hon. Robert Simms, is adequate enough to actually be canvassed during the committee stage, so my approach is to support the motion in its original form. With those remarks, I commend the motion.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (17:47): I thank all members for their contributions and for their support of this inquiry. I do think the fact that all political parties have spoken in favour of this demonstrates that this is an issue that transcends politics. It is something we are all concerned about. I look forward to this committee getting off the ground and being able to really look into the state government's response, what has been done at an industry level and at a departmental level, and also looking at what we can do to prevent this from happening in the future.

I note the amendment that the opposition is seeking to advance. I am not supportive of that, and that is simply because I have deliberately kept the terms of reference broad enough to capture a whole range of impacted industries. Indeed, if you look at the terms of reference, you will note that they include the 'Ecological, economic, cultural and social impacts of algal blooms including impact on community health and wellbeing.'

That, I think, includes the fishing industry as well as small business, as well as tourism, as well as all of the other impacted industries. I worry that if we start singling out individual sectors or industries in the terms of reference that could create a disproportionate focus on one area at the expense of others.

I think the point the Hon. Mr Hunter made is a fair one—that it is already a significant endeavour to get a committee like this up and running within the duration of this parliament. We do not have long left, and so to throw in something else that is a really substantial area of focus does run the risk, I think, of us running out of time and not being able to give the algal bloom matter the focus that it deserves. So I will not be supporting the Liberals' amendment, but I welcome the broad support for this inquiry and look forward to working with all political parties to get it off the ground.

The council divided on the amendment:

Ayes7
Noes.....10
Majority3

AYES

Bonaros, C.
Girolamo, H.M.
Pangallo, F.

Centofanti, N.J. (teller)
Hood, B.R.

Franks, T.A.
Hood, D.G.E.

NOES

Game, S.L.
Lee, J.S.
Ngo, T.T.
Wortley, R.P.

Hanson, J.E.
Maher, K.J.
Scriven, C.M.

Hunter, I.K.
Martin, R.B.
Simms, R.A. (teller)

Amendment thus negated; motion carried.

CASHFLOW IN DROUGHT

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

That this council—

1. Recognises that access to cashflow remains a critical issue for regional businesses during this prolonged drought, as identified by the opposition, industry and the drought commissioner;
2. Agrees with South Australian farmers that the current Regional Investment Corporation (RIC) loan rate of 5.18 per cent is not 'low interest' as is the organisation's primary function;
3. Calls out the RIC for not fulfilling its obligated vision and purpose of supporting a strong and sustainable agricultural sector in Australia—which includes South Australian farmers doing it tough; and
4. Urges the state government to ensure that our farmers and regional businesses have access to genuine low and no-interest concessional loans during this continued period of hardship.

(Continued from 20 August 2025.)

The Hon. S.L. GAME (17:55): I rise to support the motion of the Hon. Nicola Centofanti regarding cashflow in drought. This motion recognises the crucial role cashflow plays in the survival of drought-impacted regions and rural businesses across our state. It also notes that the current

5.187 per cent interest rate offered by the federal government's Regional Investment Corporation is not low and, as such, fails to allow RIC to carry out its primary function.

The motion urges the state government to take action to give farmers and regional businesses access to genuine low interest and no interest loans during this difficult period. My office's recent dealings with rural South Australians, particularly across the South-East and the Riverland, have reinforced the dire straits many food and wine producers currently find themselves in. Rain over the past few weeks has been welcome but, as mentioned, has not suddenly transformed disastrous seasons and situations into prosperity and positive outlooks.

Naturally, any funding to assist farmers facing financial disaster is welcome, but again I question the government's targeting of taxpayer resources. In our recent discussions with South-East farmers, the continued focus on financial counselling was questioned. We were told that producers instead need immediate and more tangible help. That view was supported by veteran southern grazier Richard Howard, who told the ABC recently that interest rate subsidies and interest rate relief would be the biggest and best benefit.

Unfortunately, the Prime Minister seems to share the same tin ear that afflicts our state government. He widened eligibility of RIC funding, without seemingly realising that current RIC loans are basically the same product as commercial bank loans.

In that same ABC article I referenced, farmer Emily Morgan said a two to 3 per cent low-interest loan would help her family operation get through this difficult period. That would seem a simple enough request, given that lowering the interest currently offered by RIC would cost taxpayers nothing. It is not just another South Australian government handout. Mrs Morgan told our office that she supports the motion we are discussing today.

In recent weeks, my office has spent many hours working on a bill with Riverland grapegrowers that aims to help them survive the current crisis gripping their industry of unsustainably low prices for their grapes and have delayed pricing forecasts preventing them from making informed input and management decisions. They, too, could also benefit from low or no interest rate loans, although for many their debt levels are already problematic. National Farmers' Federation President, David Jochinke, told the ABC about the urgent need to get RIC funding on the ground. Addressing this interest rate anomaly would seem a sensible way to achieve this goal and to start helping farmers and producers more effectively.

The Hon. T.T. NGO (17:58): I move the amendment standing in my name:

Paragraph 1:

Leave out 'as identified by the opposition, industry and the drought commissioner'

Leave out paragraphs 2 to 4 and insert new paragraphs as follows:

2. Agrees that lowering the current Regional Investment Corporation (RIC) loan rate of 5.18 per cent would be helpful to some South Australian farmers;
3. Acknowledges that the RIC supports a strong and sustainable agricultural sector in Australia, including South Australian farmers doing it tough; and
4. Acknowledges that the state government's \$73 million Drought Support Package has provided assistance to thousands of farmers during this continued period of hardship.

As the honourable member's motion recognises, the prolonged drought is creating major challenges for both farmers and regional communities across the state. The state government is aware that significant parts of the state are still living in drought conditions, experiencing either the lowest rainfall on record or severe rainfall deficiencies over the last 18 months.

The good news is that in recent months we have seen some rain across South Australia, with many regions receiving above average rainfall for the month of July. Although some regions are close to receiving their average six-month rainfall, we know that drought has long-lasting impacts, and we are aware that, even when the drought does break, the consequences will be ongoing.

One of those long-term impacts is cashflow. After a failed season it is difficult to meet the high input costs required for the next season. This is why the Regional Investment Corporation (RIC) drought loans exist. The RIC is a commonwealth government-funded loans specialist designed for

the purpose of supporting farm businesses and farm-related small businesses. The RIC provides various loans to help farm businesses, whether they are just starting up or well established.

One of the loans available is a drought loan. This is specifically for drought preparedness, management, recovery activities and refinancing existing debts. We can now have peace of mind regarding the continuation of the RIC after 30 June next year in view of the recent announcement from the federal agriculture minister, the Hon. Julie Collins MP and the Prime Minister, who have confirmed an additional \$1 billion in funding for the RIC.

It is difficult to determine the average interest rate charged to farmers by banks because rates vary significantly. Factors such as the bank, the type of loan and the borrower's risk profile significantly influence the interest rates charged. According to the advice I received, interest rates charged by banks to farmers are between 7 per cent and 10 per cent; however, anecdotal evidence from conversations with farmers suggests that some farmers with low risk profiles may be provided low interest rates of around 6 per cent.

The state government has written to the federal Minister for Agriculture, the Hon. Julie Collins MP, on various occasions in respect of commonwealth government drought support. In July we sent correspondence advocating on several issues relating to drought support, including lower interest rates to be applied by the Regional Investment Corporation.

Although a lower interest rate would be preferable, it is incorrect to say that 5.18 per cent is not low interest, as it is lower than commercial rates charged by banks. It is also incorrect to say that the RIC does not fulfil its obligation to support a strong and sustainable agricultural sector in Australia and South Australia. I have been told that to date 3,400 loans have been supported through the RIC. This is more than \$3.6 billion in funds that has been provided to support farmers across Australia.

The state government's support has been carefully designed to complement existing support provided by the commonwealth, including the Regional Investment Corporation loans. In respect of the state government's drought support a \$73 million drought support package has been rolled out, providing support to thousands of farmers across the state, which includes:

- over 3,100 producers being approved for funding to help them purchase equipment and other infrastructure to assist with drought management and preparedness on their farms;
- the Connecting Communities Events grant being approved for funding for 147 community events, with 100 events already held across the state;
- 595 people receiving financial assistance through the Rural Business Support Relief Fund grant for essential costs like council rates, utility bills, vehicle bills and school fees;
- 1,473 farms receiving over 13,000 tonnes of donated fodder through the government's Donated Fodder Transport Drought Assistance Scheme;
- the Active Club Program Regional Drought Relief supporting 630 regional sport and recreation clubs to date, helping to deliver accessible and affordable opportunities for their communities to stay active; and
- 6,390 students from 111 schools receiving funding to attend school camps and excursions.

The state government continues to work closely with the industry and the commonwealth government to ensure that support for South Australian farmers is tailored and effective. I commend the amendments to the chamber and hope honourable members support them.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (18:05): I rise to support the principle of this motion, and I thank the Hon. Nicola Centofanti for her ongoing commitment to ensuring that during this drought, through which people are really struggling and suffering, we do the best that we can. Ensuring that there is real access to assistance through low or no-interest loans is surely something this government should be making sure is happening. Currently, that is not the situation, so the principle of this motion is sound.

I gather that the Labor Party has circulated this morning—this morning—some amendments to this motion. I will be supporting the first of the Labor Party amendments, but I will not be supporting amendment No. 4 to the fourth part of the Hon. Nicola Centofanti's motion, which urges the state government to ensure that our farmers and regional businesses have access to genuine low and no-interest concessional loans during this continued period of hardship, which are the words that the government seeks to strike out, and is the very point of this motion and the very thing that we should at the very least be doing for those struggling through the drought.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (18:06): I thank all honourable members for their contributions to this motion today, the Hons Sarah Game, Tammy Franks and Tung Ngo. I note amendments put by the Hon. Tung Ngo that were emailed out this morning. We on this side of the chamber are happy to support his changes to paragraph 1, but that is where that support promptly stops.

I am disappointed in the majority of the government's amendments, and I want to place on the record once again my empathy for the Hon. Tung Ngo for having to draw the short straw again on standing up and presenting such a weak set of amendments to this motion, which is aimed at a sector doing it, can I say, incredibly tough.

To say it would be helpful if the RIC rates were lower is a gross understatement and undervaluing the reality on the ground for regional communities currently facing this drought. If this is the level of advocacy coming out of the minister's office, and indeed the Malinauskas Labor government, to federal agencies that could and should be doing better to support our farmers, then I am unsurprised that nothing has been done. I am disappointed, but not at all surprised.

This motion is about one simple truth: our farmers and regional businesses cannot survive without cashflow. They are not looking for handouts, they are asking for a fair go, a hand up and for access to genuine low and no-interest concessional loans so that they can keep their businesses, their communities and their futures alive. The RIC is not currently fulfilling its purpose, offering rates that are no different to a bank. Meanwhile, families are desperate for relief and South Australians cannot afford more delay. Other states have acted and our farmers deserve no less. I commend the motion to the chamber.

The PRESIDENT: The first question I put is that the amendment to paragraph 1 in the name of the Hon. T.T. Ngo be agreed to.

Question agreed to.

The PRESIDENT: I put that the next group of amendments in the name of the Hon. Mr Ngo be agreed to.

Question resolved in the negative; motion as amended carried.

FISHERIES MANAGEMENT ACT REGULATIONS

Orders of the Day, Private Business, No. 33: Hon. R.B. Martin to move:

That the regulations under the Fisheries Management Act 2007 concerning demerit points—miscellaneous, made on 12 December 2024 and laid on the table of this council on 4 February 2025, be disallowed.

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (18:10): I move:

That this order of the day be discharged.

Motion carried; order of the day discharged.

Bills

NORTHERN PARKLANDS BILL

Introduction and First Reading

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

**RADIATION PROTECTION AND CONTROL (COMMENCEMENT OF PROCEEDINGS)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Introduction and First Reading

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

At 18:13 the council adjourned until Thursday 4 September 2025 at 14:15.