

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday 12 November 2025

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. Benjamin Cameron Franklin) took the chair at 10:00.

The PRESIDENT read the prayers and acknowledged the Gadigal clan of the Eora nation and its Elders and thanked them for their custodianship of this land.

Announcements

LUNCHTIME CONCERT SERIES

The PRESIDENT (10:02): I advise honourable members that from 12.45 p.m. to 1.30 p.m. today talented musicians from the Sydney Youth Orchestras will be performing in the Fountain Court as part of our lunchtime concert series. Today is the sixth and final concert of the year. The series has run throughout 2025 and featured talented artists from the Sydney Conservatorium of Music, Musica Viva, the United States Navy Band and, of course, Sydney Youth Orchestras. I am pleased to say that the series has attracted over 1,000 visitors to Parliament to enjoy the concerts that have ranged from classical to contemporary music and included strings, woodwind, brass, classical guitars and vocal performances. Today's festive musical program is entitled SYO Tidings of Joy and will feature a number of Christmas hits, including *Carol of the Bells*, *Silent Night* and *We Wish You a Merry Christmas*. I look forward to seeing members there.

Motions

ETHICAL CLOTHING AUSTRALIA

The Hon. Dr SARAH KAINE (10:03): I move:

- (1) That this House notes that:
 - (a) Ethical Clothing Australia Week ran from 7 October to 14 October 2025 and is dedicated to recognising the people who make our uniforms, personal protective equipment and clothing;
 - (b) the week was celebrated at events across Australia, including in Sydney; and
 - (c) the Sydney event "Ethical Manufacturing Matters: Human Rights", chaired by Clare Press, brought together a panel of industry leaders with unique insights and experience in the ethical manufacturing sector, including:
 - (i) Rachel Reilly, National Manager of Ethical Clothing Australia;
 - (ii) Beth Macpherson, National Compliance Officer, Timber, Furnishing and Textiles Union;
 - (iii) the Hon. Dr Sarah Kaine; and
 - (iv) Alison Rahill, co-founder of Domus 8.7.
- (2) That this House acknowledges that 2025 marks 25 years of Ethical Clothing Australia protecting local workers and championing fair, local and transparent manufacturing in Australia's textile, clothing and footwear industry.

Motion agreed to.

NSW OMBUDSMAN

The Hon. CAMERON MURPHY (10:04): I move:

- (1) That this House recognises the fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the NSW Ombudsman, marking half a century of service dedicated to fairness, integrity and public accountability in New South Wales.
- (2) That this House acknowledges the historical significance of the Ombudsman Act 1974, which came into effect on 18 October 1974, and the pioneering efforts of the Hon. John Maddison, then Minister for Justice, in championing the creation of an independent oversight body.
- (3) That this House commends the NSW Ombudsman's office for its evolving role over five decades, from handling individual complaints to proactively identifying systemic issues, monitoring legislative powers and promoting open government and human rights.
- (4) That this House pays tribute to the eight Ombudsmen who have served since 1975, each contributing to the development and credibility of the office, beginning with Kenneth Smithers, CBE, and continuing through to the current Ombudsman, Paul Miller, PSM.

- (5) That this House celebrates the office's commitment to independence, procedural fairness and accessibility, as defined by the Australian and New Zealand Ombudsman Association's six essential criteria.
- (6) That this House recognises the office's contributions to improving public administration including of policing, prison systems, disability services, child protection, covert operations and whistleblower protections.
- (7) That this House further notes the importance of the Ombudsman's "own motion" powers, enabling investigations into systemic issues without requiring a formal complaint, and the recent reforms allowing greater transparency through public reporting.
- (8) That this House expresses gratitude to the staff of the NSW Ombudsman's office, past and present, whose dedication and professionalism have upheld the principles of justice and fairness for the people of New South Wales.
- (9) That this House encourages continued support for the NSW Ombudsman's work, especially in an era of increasing complexity, evolving community expectations and rapid technological change.

Motion agreed to.

TRIBUTE TO MR DAVID CAREY

The Hon. CAMERON MURPHY (10:04): I move:

- (1) That this House notes with sadness the passing of Mr David Carey on 14 October 2025, aged 70, a well-respected long-time resident of Potts Point.
- (2) That this House acknowledges Mr Carey's distinguished service as:
 - (a) former Federal Secretary of the Community and Public Sector Union (SPSF Group);
 - (b) executive member of Public Services International; and
 - (c) dedicated member of the Kings Cross branch of the Australian Labor Party.
- (3) That this House recognises his lifelong commitment to the labour movement, public service advocacy and social justice, as well as his enduring support for the South Sydney Rabbitohs and Newtown Jets.
- (4) That this House extends its sincere condolences to his son Daniel, his family, comrades and friends.
- (5) That this House notes that a celebration of Mr Carey's life was held on Tuesday 4 November 2025 at the South Chapel of Eastern Suburbs Crematorium, Matraville, where many prominent members of the union movement and the Labor Party gathered to bid him farewell.

Motion agreed to.

REPUBLIC OF TÜRKİYE PROCLAMATION

The Hon. CAMERON MURPHY (10:05): I move:

- (1) That this House notes that 29 October 2025 marked the 102nd anniversary of the Proclamation of the Republic of Türkiye.
- (2) That this House acknowledges the enduring friendship and diplomatic relations between Australia and the Republic of Türkiye.
- (3) That this House recognises the contributions of the Turkish Australian community to the cultural, social and economic fabric of New South Wales.
- (4) That this House thanks the Consul General of the Republic of Türkiye, Ms Belgin Ergüneş, for hosting a commemorative reception to mark this significant occasion.
- (5) That this House further notes that a number of members of the New South Wales Parliament were in attendance including:
 - (a) Ms Lynda Voltz, MP, member for Auburn;
 - (b) the Hon. Cameron Murphy, AM;
 - (c) the Hon. Anthony D'Adam;
 - (d) the Hon. Rod Roberts, Acting President of the Legislative Council;
 - (e) Ms Donna Davis, MP, member for Parramatta;
 - (f) Ms Robyn Preston, MP, member for Hawkesbury; and
 - (g) the Hon. Greg Piper, MP, Speaker of the Legislative Assembly and member for Lake Macquarie.

Motion agreed to.

GOUGH WHITLAM: THE VISTA OF THE NEW

The Hon. CAMERON MURPHY (10:05): I move:

That this House notes that:

- (a) Troy Bramston launched his new book on 28 October 2025 at Unions NSW entitled *Gough Whitlam: The Vista of the New*, and that the book offers a powerful reflection on the life and legacy of the late Prime Minister Gough Whitlam;

- (b) the launch featured former Premier and Foreign Minister of Australia the Hon. Bob Carr in conversation with author and journalist Troy Bramston where they discussed the lightning speed and depth of change during the short reign of the Whitlam Government, along with reflections about his style and personal traits;
- (c) this new book recognises the significance of the newly uncovered archival material and interviews presented in the book, which provide fresh insight into Mr Whitlam's early life, his rise through the Australian Labor Party and his contributions beyond political office;
- (d) the launch was extremely well attended with a number of prominent members of the Labor party present, including Dom O'Farrell, General Secretary; the Hon. Sophie Cotsis, Minister for Industrial Relations, and Minister for Work Health and Safety; and the Hon. Cameron Murphy, AM; and
- (e) on this fiftieth anniversary since the dismissal this House recognises the enduring impact of Gough Whitlam's leadership and vision on Australian society and public life.

Motion agreed to.

MACQUARIE UNIVERSITY CONSTITUTIONAL LAW EVENT

The Hon. CAMERON MURPHY (10:05): I move:

- (1) That this House notes the fiftieth anniversary of the dismissal of the Whitlam Government, a pivotal moment in Australian constitutional history.
- (2) That this House recognises the enduring significance of prerogative powers and other rarely invoked executive mechanisms that, while often invisible in everyday governance, can decisively shape political outcomes during times of crisis.
- (3) That this House commends Macquarie University's Faculty of Arts for convening the "Blackshield x Arts After Dark: Powers Hidden in Plain Sight" event, which brings together legal, political and media experts to examine the role of hidden constitutional powers in contemporary Australia.
- (4) That this House pays tribute to the late Emeritus Professor Tony Blackshield for his distinguished contributions to constitutional scholarship and public understanding of the law.
- (5) That this House:
 - (a) notes that Her Excellency the Hon. Margaret Beazley, AC, KC, Governor of New South Wales, will deliver the keynote address at the event; and
 - (b) acknowledges her distinguished legal career, including her historic appointment as the first female President of the New South Wales Court of Appeal.
- (6) That this House further notes the event will include the participation of Associate Professor Shireen Morris, Associate Professor Ian Tregenza and Professor Peter Greste in a panel discussion, with their expertise in constitutional law, political theory and journalism respectively.
- (7) That this House celebrates the fiftieth anniversary of Macquarie Law School and its ongoing impact on legal education and public discourse in New South Wales.
- (8) That this House encourages all members of the public, especially students and legal professionals, to engage with events and discussions that illuminate the workings of Australia's constitutional framework and promote civic awareness.

Motion agreed to.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE NETBALL

The Hon. CAMERON MURPHY (10:06): I move:

- (1) That this House notes that an important netball event was held on Wednesday 22 October 2025 in the Speaker's Garden of Parliament House featuring Liz Ellis, AO, former captain of the Australian Diamonds, alongside players from the NSW Swifts and Giants Netball.
- (2) That this House recognises the value of this event in promoting community engagement, sporting excellence and participation in netball through interactive skill-sharing and friendly competition.
- (3) That this House commends the contribution of Liz Ellis, AO, and current elite players in inspiring the next generation of athletes and fostering a love of netball among young people.
- (4) That this House thanks Netball Australia for providing a portable goal so that members of Parliament in attendance could test their netball skills.

Motion agreed to.

OLYMPIC GAMES NETBALL

The Hon. CAMERON MURPHY (10:06): I move:

- (1) That this House notes that:
 - (a) Netball Australia is campaigning for the inclusion of netball in the 2032 Brisbane Olympic Games; and
 - (b) netball is played by over 20 million people across 117 countries, with 48 nations holding an official world ranking, demonstrating its global reach and popularity.

- (2) That this House recognises that netball is not solely a Commonwealth sport, but one with international recognition, including acknowledgement by the International Olympic Committee [IOC], its own World Cup competitions and consistent inclusion in the Commonwealth Games.
- (3) That this House acknowledges that netball is broadcast in more than 100 countries, including on platforms such as the All Women's Sports Network, and that the 2025 Suncorp Super Netball competition achieved a global broadcast reach of 300 million viewers.
- (4) That this House affirms that netball exemplifies Olympic values such as speed, teamwork, athleticism and inclusivity, and requires a unique skill set from some of the world's most elite athletes.
- (5) That this House notes that netball is Australia's most popular female team sport, with over one million participants, and that its inclusion in the Brisbane 2032 Olympic Games would carry significant cultural relevance and national pride.
- (6) That this House recognises that Queensland already possesses the infrastructure necessary to host Olympic-level netball competition, making its inclusion logistically feasible and cost-effective.
- (7) That this House further notes that while men's netball is still developing, it is one of the fastest-growing male participation sports in Australia and that Olympic inclusion would provide visibility for boys and men, and improve participation by them.
- (8) That this House acknowledges that the IOC requires overall gender balance across the Olympic athlete cohort, not within each individual sport, and that netball's inclusion would help offset male-dominated events.
- (9) That this House calls on the Australian Olympic Committee and the Brisbane 2032 Organising Committee to consider the inclusion of netball as an Olympic sport at the 2032 Games.

Motion agreed to.

IRISH PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

The Hon. CAMERON MURPHY (10:07): I move:

- (1) That this House congratulates Catherine Connolly on her election as the tenth President of Ireland, following the presidential election held on 24 October 2025.
- (2) That this House notes that President-elect Connolly, an independent candidate supported by a coalition of progressive parties, secured a decisive victory with over 63 per cent of first preference votes.
- (3) That this House acknowledges the historic nature of her election, marking a significant moment in Irish political life and public engagement.
- (4) That this House recognises the longstanding and enduring ties between New South Wales and the Irish people, underpinned by shared history, culture and values.
- (5) That this House reaffirms the New South Wales Parliament's commitment to strengthening the bonds of friendship, cooperation and mutual respect between New South Wales and Ireland.
- (6) That this House wishes President-elect Connolly every success in her term of office and looks forward to continued collaboration between our communities.

Motion agreed to.

HUMAN RIGHTS LEGISLATION

The Hon. CAMERON MURPHY (10:07): I move:

That this House notes that:

- (a) on 23 October 2025, 63 community and legal groups were represented at the Jubilee room of New South Wales Parliament as part of a campaign in support of a human rights Act;
- (b) those present received a briefing on the bill for a human rights Act to be introduced by the member for Newtown in the Legislative Assembly;
- (c) the coalition for a human rights Act announced that they were seeking a committee inquiry into a human rights Act for New South Wales; and
- (d) a number of members of Parliament were in attendance in support of the campaign, including:
 - (i) the Hon. Cameron Murphy;
 - (ii) the Hon. Stephen Lawrence;
 - (iii) Ms Sue Higginson, MLC;
 - (iv) Jenny Leong, MP; and
 - (v) Kobi Shetty, MP.

Motion agreed to.

SINN FÉIN DELEGATION

The Hon. CAMERON MURPHY (10:08): I move:

That this House notes that:

- (a) a high-level political delegation from Sinn Féin visited New South Wales from 22 October 2025 to 25 October 2025, which included:
 - (i) Senator Conor Murphy, Sinn Féin Leader in the Seanad Éireann;
 - (ii) Mr Sam Baker, General Secretary of Sinn Féin;
 - (iii) Mr Barry Corr, Sinn Féin representative in Australia; and
 - (iv) Mr Ken O'Connell, former General Secretary of Sinn Féin.
- (b) the delegation attended a number of successful events during their visit, including a mass meeting and lunch with the Maritime Union of Australia on 22 October 2025, a briefing with the NSW Parliamentary Friends of Ireland at New South Wales Parliament and a briefing with Unions NSW at their executive meeting on 23 October 2025;
- (c) the delegation addressed a business lunch in their honour in Sydney and attended a community function at the Gaelic Club on 24 October 2025;
- (d) the delegation discussed the importance of campaigning for a united Ireland and the continued disenfranchisement of the Irish diaspora who are prevented by residency requirements and other practical obstacles from voting in Irish elections; and
- (e) the delegation also visited Western Australia and Victoria during its visit to Australia.

Motion agreed to.

GRADDLE CREEK BRIDGE

The Hon. STEPHEN LAWRENCE (10:08): I move:

That this House notes that:

- (a) the Graddle Creek Bridge officially began construction on Tuesday 28 October 2025, with State member for Orange Phil Donato, MP, Parkes Shire Mayor Neil Westcott, and Duty MLC for Orange, the Hon. Stephen Lawrence in attendance;
- (b) the \$8.14 million project was jointly funded between the Government and Parkes Shire Council and will deliver a straighter and safer approach for the more than 260 vehicles which use the bridge every day;
- (c) the McGrane Way is a designated regional road train and AB-triple route, which links the Parkes, Lachlan and Narromine shires; and
- (d) with construction now underway, the new bridge is expected to be open to traffic by late 2026 and to deliver a quicker, simpler and more cost-effective route for local freight operators.

Motion agreed to.

BURRABADINE CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY SCHOOL

The Hon. STEPHEN LAWRENCE (10:08): I move:

(1) That this House notes that:

- (a) 17 students from Burrabadine Christian Community School graduated the NSW Rural Fire Service Secondary School Cadet Program on 17 October 2025;
- (b) the 17 October 2025 event was held at Orana Fire Control Centre and was attended by:
 - (i) RFS Assistant Area Commander Western Region, Superintendent Danny Busch;
 - (ii) RFS Orana District Assistant Mark Pickford;
 - (iii) Burrabadine Christian Community School Principal Mrs Kylie Bull;
 - (iv) Duty MLC for Dubbo the Hon. Stephen Lawrence;
- (c) the program ran for eight weeks, teaching students to examine fire behaviour, learn essential fire safety techniques, and further appreciate the work that emergency services do across New South Wales; and
- (d) the students also learned firefighting skills and further values, including teamwork, confidence and leadership.

(2) That this House congratulates:

- (a) the 17 students on their graduation and the NSW RFS Orana team on helping deliver the eight-week course; and
- (b) Principal Mrs Kylie Bull and staff at Burrabadine Christian Community School on their enthusiastic support of the Secondary School Cadet Program.

Motion agreed to.

AUSTRALIAN RECORDING INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION AWARDS

The Hon. Dr SARAH KAINE (10:09): I move:

(1) That this House notes that:

- (a) the 2025 ARIA Awards are being held on Wednesday 19 November 2025 in Sydney at the Hordern Pavilion; and
- (b) New South Wales has the highest number of ARIA nominations of any State.
- (2) That this House congratulates the New South Wales nominees, including:
 - (a) The Kid LAROI;
 - (b) Boy Soda;
 - (c) Imogen Clark; and
 - (d) Yours and Owls Festival.
- (3) That this House notes the Government will host the inaugural NSW Music Prize, the largest prize for music in the country, to celebrate the State's exceptional contemporary musicians and give them a career-boosting cash injection.
- (4) That this House recognises the efforts of the Government to grow the sector in the face of significant headwinds, including competition from international artists on streaming services by:
 - (a) introducing "Michael's Rule" to incentivise international touring artists to book local supports;
 - (b) initiating venues upgrade grants for operators to install soundproofing and get their venues gig ready;
 - (c) reforming the noise complaints system so single serial noise complaints can no longer shut down a venue; and
 - (d) delivering recording, touring and promotion grants to help artists and bands create new work, grow audience and build their careers.

Motion agreed to.

AUSTRALIAN SOUTH EAST ASIAN NETWORK

The Hon. ANTHONY D'ADAM (10:09): I move:

- (1) That this House notes that on 14 October 2025 the Australian South East Asian Network launched its constitution, as well as the Michael Kirby ASEAN Award, and the ASEAN Economic Council, here at New South Wales Parliament and:
 - (a) the event was sponsored by:
 - (i) the Hon. Jihad Dib MP;
 - (ii) the Hon. Janelle Saffin, MP;
 - (iii) the Hon. Anthony D'Adam;
 - (iv) Julia Finn, MP;
 - (v) Mark Coure, MP;
 - (vi) Donna Davis, MP; and
 - (vii) Tri Vo, MP.
 - (b) was attended by:
 - (i) the Hon. Michael Kirby, AC, CMG;
 - (ii) the Hon. Susan Carter;
 - (iii) Greg Warren, MP;
 - (iv) Mark Hodges, MP;
 - (v) Robyn Preston, MP;
 - (vi) the Hon. Philip Ruddock, AO;
 - (vii) Craig Foster, AM;
 - (viii) Dr Patricia Jenkins;
 - (ix) Professor Fleur Johns, head and dean of the University of Sydney School of Law;
 - (x) Professor Stephen Rodda, Pro Vice-Chancellor Industry and Innovation at the University of New South Wales; and
 - (xi) Professor Greg Fox.
 - (c) board members in attendance included:
 - (i) chair, Angela Matrippolito;
 - (ii) founder and CEO, Sawathey Ek, OAM;
 - (iii) Thiru Arumugam;
 - (iv) Mithun Chakraborty;

- (v) Davy Ek;
 - (vi) Jane Li;
 - (vii) Tristan Manwaring;
 - (viii) Rox Molavin;
 - (ix) Bilal Mustafa; and
 - (x) Andrew Nevill.
- (d) the following people were admitted as community ambassadors:
- (i) from the Indian community, Mithun Chakraborty;
 - (ii) from the Cambodian community, Davy Ek;
 - (iii) from the Burmese community, Phyu Han;
 - (iv) from the Indonesian community, Angela Johnson;
 - (v) from the Burmese community, Dr Kyaw-Myint Malia;
 - (vi) from the Pakistani community, Bilal Mustafa;
 - (vii) from the Indonesian community, Ani Rajagukguk; and
 - (viii) from the Indonesian community, Churlya Wurfel.
- (e) the following people from different communities prepared the joint choreography of performers:
- (i) from the Filipino community, Emerita Chua Agostino;
 - (ii) from the Indian community, Pallavi Bhagavath;
 - (iii) from the Khmer Krom community, Phina Camilleri; and
 - (iv) from the Burmese community, Eaint Monh Min.
- (f) community leaders in attendance included:
- (i) Dr Mariam Joseph, Assyrian Australian League Association;
 - (ii) Mainul Haque, OAM, Bangladesh Community ACT;
 - (iii) Tristan Manwaring;
 - (iv) Wally Mehanna, Canterbury-Bankstown Chamber of Commerce;
 - (v) Purzi Suanding Molintas, attaché of Philippine Department of Tourism;
 - (vi) Daniel Mo, Orox Global;
 - (vii) Melanie Morrison, Sydney Peace Foundation;
 - (viii) Jessica Mudditt, publisher and editor;
 - (ix) Sanam Mukhtar, Pakistan Association Australia;
 - (x) Maung Maung Myint, senior ambassador, Burmese Community Development Collaboration;
 - (xi) Greg Paul, ambassador, United for Human Rights;
 - (xii) Siv Reach, senior ambassador from Khmer Krom Cultural Centre of NSW Inc;
 - (xiii) Timothy Roberts, NSW Council for Civil Liberties;
 - (xiv) Sourina Simmalavong and Sumana Viravong;
 - (xv) Bountham Vongsaya and Deth Sysengrath, senior fellows from Lao Community Advancement NSW Co-op; and
 - (xvi) Mon Zin, ambassador from Heart Beams Rising.
- (g) the following individuals and organisations received an award and/or medal from ASEAN:
- (i) AFA - ASEAN Founder Award, community category, Burmese Community Development Collaboration;
 - (ii) AFA - ASEAN Founder Award, individual category, Jane Li;
 - (iii) AFA - ASEAN Founder Medal, Andrea Nevill;
 - (iv) inaugural recipient of MKA - Michael Kirby ASEAN Award, Aiden Ek;
 - (v) eminent leaders invited as honorary recipients: Professor Sev Ozdowski, AM, former Human Rights Commissioner, and former chair of the Multicultural Council of Australia;
 - (vi) Hugh de Kretser, President of the Australian Human Rights Commission; and

- (vii) the Hon. Justice James Edelman, AC, current sitting justice of the High Court of Australia, was appointed as the network's honorary patron at this event.
- (2) That this House recognises that:
- (a) this event was a significant moment for community members from South-East Asian descent;
 - (b) ASEAN is a newly emerging organisation that plays a vital role in fostering collaboration among people and institutions from diverse backgrounds;
 - (c) ASEAN performs exemplary leadership in advancing and promoting multiculturalism, human rights and social cohesion across the Australian community; and
 - (d) ASEAN has been congratulated by eminent Australians, including High Court justice the Hon. James Edelman, AC, who in a letter to founder and CEO Sawathey Ek, OAM, recognised the organisation's objectives to "build advocacy platforms to promote Australian values, social cohesion, social integration and inclusion through intercultural/interfaith dialogue amongst vulnerable communities from CALD/Indigenous Australian backgrounds".

Motion agreed to.

AUSTRALIAN WORKERS' UNION

The Hon. MARK BUTTIGIEG (10:10): I move:

- (1) That this House notes that:
- (a) on 29 October 2025 the Australian Workers' Union [AWU] New South Wales Branch Delegates Conference was held in Penrith; and
 - (b) the Hon. Mark Buttigieg, MLC, had the honour of presenting the AWU Safety Award to delegates from Bekaert Wire Ropes.
- (2) That this House further notes that:
- (a) AWU delegate Jason Phillips, as well as several workers onsite, witnessed the unsafe removal of asbestos sheeting from their workshop roof by contractors smashing asbestos and throwing pieces from the roof into a truck causing asbestos dust;
 - (b) the AWU responded immediately to the issue; and
 - (c) the site health and safety representative Jordy Burgman as well as organiser Ben Horan provided a potential exposure check, ensured the removal of the contractors from the site, conducted rigorous air and swab testing as well as a controlled, safe removal of asbestos.
- (3) That this House congratulates:
- (a) Jason Phillips, Jordy Burgman and Ben Horan, as well as all AWU members onsite, on their vigilance and leadership in keeping workers onsite safe; and
 - (b) AWU NSW branch secretary Tony Callinan and all members and delegates continuing the fight to keep workers safe.

Motion agreed to.

MARY'S HOUSE WALK

The Hon. RACHEL MERTON (10:10): I move:

- (1) That this House congratulates Mary's House Services on the resounding success of the Mary's House Walk 2025, held on Sunday 26 October, which saw a sea of supporters traverse an 8.8 kilometre route through the North Shore.
- (2) That this House notes that the Hon. Rachel Merton, together with Tim James, MP, and the North Sydney Bears, joined volunteers and participants in this powerful demonstration of solidarity with women and children escaping domestic and family violence.
- (3) That this House recognises Mary's House Services, a not-for-profit organisation that has provided over 16,500 safe nights of refuge accommodation and expert community programs since opening nine years ago, for raising critical funds to expand:
- (a) social worker care;
 - (b) safety planning; and
 - (c) support services.
- (4) That this House:
- (a) notes the walk's clear message: that our community says no to domestic and family violence; and
 - (b) urges continued support for Mary's House in addressing this national crisis.

Motion agreed to.

MANISHA GAZULA

The Hon. RACHEL MERTON (10:11): I move:

- (1) That this House notes World Teachers' Day on 31 October 2025, recognising all the outstanding educators across New South Wales.
- (2) That this House further notes that:
 - (a) Mrs Manisha Gazula, principal of Marsden Road Public School in Liverpool since 2016, has transformed student outcomes;
 - (b) Principal Gazula's "Marsden Way" of explicit teaching and high expectations has resulted in excellent results, including:
 - (i) NAPLAN results show 60 per cent of students achieving above average reading growth up from 37 per cent;
 - (ii) writing proficiency above State averages; and
 - (iii) 70 per cent strong numeracy progress despite one in five students from refugee backgrounds.
 - (c) Principal Gazula was recognised with a 2018 regional award and a 2019 executive award; and
 - (d) during Public Education Week, the Hon. Rachel Merton visited Marsden Road, donated classic books to the library and celebrated Mrs Gazula's decade of leadership.
- (3) That this House congratulates Mrs Gazula and New South Wales' 170,000 teachers who transform classrooms and help shape our children's future.

Motion agreed to.

CRAIG THOMAS

The Hon. MARK LATHAM (10:11): On behalf of the Hon. Mark Banasiak: I move:

- (1) That this House notes that Craig Thomas has served with distinction for 15 years as president of 4WD NSW and ACT Inc, during which time he has provided exemplary leadership to the four-wheel drive community in New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory.
- (2) That this House recognises the key milestones achieved under Craig Thomas's presidency, including his:
 - (a) representation of the association on the Australian Confederation of Motor Clubs executive committee as president, thereby providing a united voice for motor clubs and four-wheel drive interests across the State;
 - (b) role with the association on the Vehicle Standards Working Group for modified vehicles, including forward-facing lamps and suspension changes, which ensures that the regulatory regime recognises responsible four-wheel drive vehicle use;
 - (c) advocacy and submission on behalf of the association to the parliamentary Select Committee on Access Restrictions to Public Lands and Waterways, highlighting concerns at the closure of State forest tracks, the consolidation of camping areas in national parks and the need for transparent land management decision-making;
 - (d) leadership in forging strategic partnerships for member benefits, such as the 2021 partnership between Club 4X4 and 4WD NSW and ACT Association to deliver preferential benefits and insurance for members, thereby strengthening the value proposition for affiliated clubs; and
 - (e) fostering of community service and environmental initiatives such as the "Straps Up High" project coordinated by the association, which saw donation of equipment diverted from landfill and used for wildlife parks, demonstrating the association's commitment to sustainability and shared public land stewardship.
- (3) That this House commends Craig Thomas for his unwavering voluntary commitment and leadership over the 15-year period, acknowledging that under his stewardship the association has grown in influence, improved training and safety outcomes for 4WD club members, deepened relationships with government and land managers, and advanced responsible and sustainable four-wheel drive access across New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory.

Motion agreed to.

FORT STREET HIGH SCHOOL

Ms SUE HIGGINSON (10:12): I move:

- (1) That this House congratulates the Fort Street High School students and staff on their interest in environmental issues, including contamination in Botany Bay, habitat loss of Tapanuli orangutans in Malaysia and the protection of koalas in New South Wales.
- (2) That this House commends the Fort Street High School Environment Committee for recently hosting a Lorax-themed fundraiser for the school community, raising \$685 to put towards conservation in New South Wales.
- (3) That this House recognises the dedicated work of students involved in the environmental committee, including:
 - (a) Dhruv Singh;
 - (b) Anthony Yu;

- (c) Cara Zhong;
- (d) Oliver Williams;
- (e) Terence Kang;
- (f) Emidori Lum;
- (g) Aiden Sen;
- (h) Claire Yu;
- (i) Ella Wu;
- (j) Reece Chan; and
- (k) Alisha Gupta.

Motion agreed to.

FOODBANK HUNGER REPORT

Ms ABIGAIL BOYD (10:13): I move:

- (1) That this House notes the release of the *Foodbank Hunger Report 2025* on 5 November 2025, which explores the current hunger situation in Australia and found that:
 - (a) one in five Australian households are living in severe food insecurity, frequently skipping meals or going entire days without eating;
 - (b) overall, one in three or around 3.5 million Australian households are facing some level of food insecurity;
 - (c) working-class Australians continue to experience high rates of food insecurity, with people with disability, single-parent households, renters and people on low incomes most prominently affected;
 - (d) 67 per cent of households with a person with a disability are experiencing food insecurity, with 50 per cent of those in the severe category;
 - (e) 40 per cent of households reliant on part-time or casual work are experiencing food insecurity, and that these households remain significantly more likely to have experienced food insecurity in the past 12 months than the average Australian household;
 - (f) in New South Wales, 37 per cent of regional households and 31 per cent of metropolitan households are experiencing food insecurity, with both categories having increased since 2024;
 - (g) the cost-of-living crisis remains the primary contributor to food insecurity, cited by 79 per cent of food insecure households, and housing was cited by 45 per cent as the second most pressing concern;
 - (h) while awareness of food relief services is continuing to grow, this has not translated into higher access rates, with just one in four food insecure households accessing formal food relief; and
 - (i) embarrassment and the belief that others are in greater need continue to be the main barriers preventing people from seeking assistance.
- (2) That this House further notes that:
 - (a) the special rapporteur on the right to food defines the right to food as having regular, permanent and unrestricted access (either directly or by means of financial purchases) to quantitatively and qualitatively adequate and sufficient food corresponding to the cultural traditions of the people to which the consumer belongs, and which ensure a physical and mental, individual and collective, fulfilling and dignified life free of fear;
 - (b) it is a core obligation of all levels of government to take the necessary action to mitigate and alleviate hunger, including during times of crisis and disasters;
 - (c) as a party to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Australia is legally required to take whatever steps are necessary to ensure that everyone is free from hunger;
 - (d) in launching the *Foodbank Hunger Report 2025*, Foodbank's CEO, Ms Kylea Tink, said that hunger in Australia has become "mainstream", and that "the cost-of-living measures that the Federal Government tried to provide" did not "translate to food on the tables"; and
 - (e) Foodbank is calling on the Australian Government to adopt a tax incentive to make it easier for farmers, growers and manufacturers to donate edible, surplus produce, instead of sending it to landfill, to increase the amount of donated food available.
- (3) That this House acknowledges with concern the rising levels of food insecurity across Australian communities.
- (4) That this House affirms that it is a basic human right for everyone in our community to have regular, permanent and unrestricted access to adequate food.
- (5) That this House calls on the Government to urgently address this crisis by providing cost-of-living relief to New South Wales communities and investing in evidence-based measures that tackle the drivers of food insecurity and economic inequality.

Motion agreed to.

MAITLAND BUSINESSES

The Hon. AILEEN MacDONALD (10:13): I move:

- (1) That this House notes that:
 - (a) *The Maitland Mercury* reported on 17 October 2025 that Maitland has been named among the top 25 places in Australia, and fourth in New South Wales, to start a business, according to a study by financial software company Reckon;
 - (b) the study analysed 17 indicators across four key categories: talent pool, business landscape, internet speed and cost of living, with the Maitland-Newcastle region ranking fourth in New South Wales behind Sydney, Wollongong and Albury-Wodonga;
 - (c) the region performed particularly well in internet connectivity and workforce capability, recording a 65.5/100 internet speed score and 52.2/100 talent pool score, demonstrating its strong foundations for business innovation and digital capacity;
 - (d) Maitland's growing population, projected to reach 144,000 people by 2041, together with its proximity to major markets and training opportunities, is positioning the city as a key growth hub for small and medium enterprises across the Hunter; and
 - (e) the continued expansion of local entrepreneurship and employment opportunities in Maitland contributes significantly to the economic vitality of the broader Hunter and country north regions.
- (2) That this House:
 - (a) congratulates the Maitland-Newcastle region on being recognised among the top business growth areas in New South Wales and Australia;
 - (b) commends local business owners and chambers of commerce for their contribution to innovation, employment and regional prosperity;
 - (c) recognises the vital role that small businesses play in sustaining vibrant communities; and
 - (d) encourages continued investment, infrastructure and policy support to maintain Maitland's momentum as one of the State's most promising business destinations.

Motion agreed to.

FORMER MAITLAND HOSPITAL SITE

The Hon. AILEEN MacDONALD (10:13): I move:

- (1) That this House notes that:
 - (a) *The Maitland Mercury* on 24 January 2025 reported that consultation on the future of the old Maitland Hospital site was to begin before mid-2025, following statements by the member for Maitland that community consultation would occur prior to June 2025;
 - (b) it has now been over three years since the majority of the former Maitland Hospital campus ceased operation following the relocation to the new Metford facility, and the High Street site has remained largely unused apart from limited community and mental health functions;
 - (c) Councillor Mitchell Griffin and Mayor Philip Penfold of Maitland City Council have since publicly called on the Government to initiate the long-promised consultation process and begin planning for the site's future, citing growing community concern that the precinct risks falling into disrepair;
 - (d) the community has expressed strong interest in contributing ideas for adaptive re-use of the historic hospital site, which has served the Maitland region since the 1840s; and
 - (e) the Hunter New England Local Health District has stated that the site's future use will be determined in line with New South Wales Government policies and guidelines, with local stakeholders to be consulted.
- (2) That this House:
 - (a) acknowledges the historical and civic significance of the old Maitland Hospital site to the Hunter community;
 - (b) calls on the Government and Minister for Health to expedite the commencement of genuine consultation and planning for the site's redevelopment;
 - (c) urges that any future use of the site preserve its heritage character while providing tangible community benefit; and
 - (d) recognises the leadership of Maitland City Council, Mayor Philip Penfold and Councillor Mitchell Griffin in advocating for timely action and community involvement in shaping the site's future.

Motion agreed to.

MAITLAND ATHLETES

The Hon. AILEEN MacDONALD (10:14): I move:

- (1) That this House notes the outstanding achievements of Maitland athletes Finn Carlson, Sophie Miller and Scarlett Crouch, who represented New South Wales at the Australian All Schools Championships in Ballarat last weekend.

- (2) That this House further notes that:
- (a) Finn Carlson captained the under-15 New South Wales All Schools Boys team to victory over Queensland, led his team with maturity well beyond his years, and was named Player of the Final, earning gold for New South Wales and selection in the Australian Merit team;
 - (b) Sophie Miller competed in the under-12 girls New South Wales team, contributing strongly throughout the tournament and securing a silver medal;
 - (c) Scarlett Crouch, also representing New South Wales in the under-12 girls team, delivered consistent and determined performances, likewise earning a silver medal alongside her teammates;
 - (d) Maitland Touch Association continues to demonstrate exceptional strength across all age groups, following recent success at the NSW Country Championships in Mudgee, where the club claimed the club champions title and earned major wins in the men's 20s and women's 40s divisions, supported by strong representative results across the region; and
 - (e) Maitland is home to one of the largest contingents of youth players in the Hunter, with 43 local representatives competing in Hunter Hornets teams at the National Youth Championships, and many more selected through school-based pathways, reflecting the community's deep commitment to supporting young people.
- (3) That this House acknowledges:
- (a) the dedication of the athletes' families, coaches and volunteers, whose consistent encouragement and guidance help young people build confidence, discipline and resilience;
 - (b) the important role that accessible community sport plays in keeping young people engaged, connected and supported in positive environments; and
 - (c) the pride felt across Maitland and the wider Hunter region in celebrating the hard work and achievements of these young athletes.
- (4) That this House congratulates Finn Carlson, Sophie Miller, Scarlett Crouch and the entire Maitland Touch Association on their excellence, teamwork and contribution to their community, and wishes them every success in their future sporting endeavours.

Motion agreed to.

CRITICAL MINERALS MINING

The Hon. TANIA MIHAILUK (10:14): I move:

- (1) That this House congratulates the Albanese Labor Government on the signing of the United States-Australia Framework for Securing Supply in the Mining and Processing of Critical Minerals and Rare Earths, valued at \$8.5 billion United States dollars.
- (2) That this House notes that through the agreement, New South Wales sites such as the Sunrise Energy Metals project near Fifield, the RZ Resources site near Wentworth, and others, have the potential for capital investment, delivering significant opportunities for our State's mining, manufacturing, and regional employment sectors.
- (3) That this House acknowledges that New South Wales is home to 21 of the 31 minerals on the Australian Government's Critical Minerals List and four of the five minerals on the Strategic Minerals List, providing our State with a unique competitive advantage to attract global investment and build resilient supply chains in critical minerals and rare earths natural resources.
- (4) That this House calls on the New South Wales Government to ensure that excessive environmental green tape does not impede or delay exploration, extraction, domestic processing or the large-scale capital investment required to secure New South Wales's role as a national leader in the critical minerals and rare earths sector.

Motion agreed to.

Documents

UNPROCLAIMED LEGISLATION

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: According to standing order, I table a list detailing all legislation unproclaimed 90 calendar days after assent as at 11 November 2025.

POLITICAL LOBBYING

Variation of Order

The PRESIDENT: According to Standing Order 53, I table a request received on Tuesday 11 November 2025 from The Cabinet Office to vary the scope of an order for papers, together with a response from the member who moved the order, the Hon. Jacqui Munro, not agreeing to the request. I inform the House that according to standing order, as no agreement was reached, the original order stands with the original due date.

*Business of the House***POSTPONEMENT OF BUSINESS**

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: I postpone business of the House notice of motion No. 1 until the next sitting day.

*Bills***CRIMES AMENDMENT (DEFENCE OF DWELLINGS AND OTHER PREMISES) BILL 2025****First Reading**

Bill introduced, read a first time and ordered to be published on motion by the Hon. John Ruddick.

Second Reading Speech

The Hon. JOHN RUDDICK (10:32): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I speak in support of the Crimes Amendment (Defence of Dwellings and Other Premises) Bill 2025. The reasoning behind this bill is the doctrine known as castle law, which holds that a householder's home, whether that householder is an owner or a tenant, is their castle and the occupier gets to set the rules in their castle. They get to choose who comes into their castle and they get to choose when someone is asked to leave their castle. Castle law also recognises that the home owner has a legal right to defend their property and their life from an invader without having to fear being criminally prosecuted for defending themselves.

Castle law has its origins in the laws of the Roman Republic. Within the *Twelve Tables*—the foundation of Roman law—a householder was permitted to assault an unarmed intruder if a home was invaded during the night, and if the intruder invaded during the day but with a weapon, the householder was also permitted to use force to defend themselves. In 1628 Sir Edward Coke, the most revered English jurist of all time, said, "For a man's home is his castle, and each man's home is his safest refuge." The British Prime Minister William Pitt the Elder said, in 1763:

The poorest man may in his cottage bid defiance to all the forces of the Crown. It may be frail—its roof may shake—the wind may blow through it—the storm may enter—the rain may enter—but the King of England cannot enter!

Across Western Europe and parts of Australia, violent unprovoked street crime and home invasions are escalating. We are told that we do not need the right to defend ourselves because that is what the police are for. Violent crime occurs in seconds and, at the very best, the police will be there in 10 minutes, when the damage has already been done. We cannot outsource our highest priority—our personal safety—to a government agency. Police cannot always be everywhere at once. Community safety cannot be left solely within the remit of the State. Individuals must have the means to defend themselves and their property without fear of legal persecution from the New South Wales police.

There are provisions in part 11 of the New South Wales Crimes Act that confer some rights to self-defence, but in numerous real-world cases this has resulted in the lives of good people being destroyed, reputations being ruined and many hundreds of thousands of dollars being wasted in courtroom battles—and for what? For defending one's life, family and property. This bill supports an individual's right to use force, including disproportionate force, to protect against violent intruders on their own property that pose a threat to their person, their property and their family.

Of course, the best aspect of this bill is the deterrent effect. Home invaders today can sense that the law currently sides with them, so the consequences of breaking into a home may not need to be overly feared by them. If this bill becomes law, there will be a reduction in crime. This reform is especially vital for residents in regional and remote New South Wales where the nearest police officer may be hours away and unable to render aid whereas, really, the police need to be there in seconds or minutes. The law in New South Wales has favoured the offender over the ordinary citizen who dares to defend themselves in the split-second moment of being shocked to learn an unknown person has broken into their home. The home owner does not know if the unknown person has a knife or if they are smashed on methedrine or some other substance. In that split second, the home owner will not be able to soberly and judiciously assess the magnitude of the threat; they will be fearing for their life.

This bill does three important things. First, when an intruder violently breaks into your home—whether the householder lives in a freestanding house, a unit, a hotel room, or even a vehicle they call home—the law will stand with the resident and not the criminal. If a householder acts to protect themselves or another person from an intruder, they should not fear becoming the accused. The legal reforms present in the bill support the judgement of the resident to determine how much force must be used to eliminate the threat. Second, the bill modernises our

self-defence laws to recognise that ordinary people have the right to carry basic nonlethal means of protection, such as pepper spray, provided that they are over 18, have no criminal convictions and are not the subject of an apprehended violence order. We let people buy alcohol, drive cars and run businesses, but we somehow think they are not responsible enough to carry a defensive spray. It is absurd.

This bill proposes following exactly what our friends in the Northern Territory are doing: a 12-month trial of pepper spray. Has anyone heard of pepper spray-carrying gangs running about since the trial began in September? No. The trial is working. This Northern Territory trial started on 1 September this year. Consumer demand has been very high. Shops sold out within days. People want to carry pepper spray so they can protect themselves. Was the demand driven by criminals acquiring pepper spray to use it as a weapon? No. It was ordinary citizens who did not feel safe without it. Western Australia has permitted the purchase of pepper spray since 1999, which is more than a quarter of a century ago. Liberal and Labor governments have come and gone in that time, but none has chosen to repeal this defensive measure. This bill will permit citizens of New South Wales to acquire pepper spray so that, if a young woman has to walk from a train station to her home at night, she can have some pepper spray in her handbag and fend off an attacker. Why do we want to leave vulnerable people defenceless?

Third, this bill sends a clear signal that this Parliament values the safety, liberty and peace of mind of law-abiding citizens more than the comfort of violent offenders. The right to self-defence is not an American import. It is a fundamental human right which predates our criminal code, but I will address the reality of why this bill is needed beyond philosophical principles. I want to address some real-world examples in New South Wales. The first involves a farmer named David Dunstan. Mr Dunstan and his wife and three young children live at Bungowannah in the New South Wales Riverina, 30 minutes away from the nearest police station. At 3.30 a.m. on 14 September 2017, Mr Dunstan awoke to find an intruder, who had a knife and a club, attempting to enter his home. Mr Dunstan's young children were asleep.

Mr Dunstan was not to know, but the same intruder had attempted to enter another nearby farmhouse earlier that night and had been chased off with a hockey stick. As a farmer, Mr Dunstan had three legally owned firearms. He went to his safe and took out a gun, but he wisely decided to keep it unloaded. The gun had no power, but it was an effective prop. Mr Dunstan diplomatically convinced the intruder to lay down his weapon and to then get into Mr Dunstan's car. Mr Dunstan drove him to a police station. The intruder was not harmed by Mr Dunstan in any way. Mr Dunstan should have got an award from the police. However, at the police station Mr Dunstan was treated like the criminal. His guns and his licence were taken from him and he was threatened with criminal charges for using an unloaded weapon to defuse a potentially very bad situation. The charges were eventually dropped and his guns returned, but only after media interest and the support of a legal defence fund.

Another example is that of Elaine Tan. On 30 July last year Elaine, who was pregnant, was sleeping alone in bed. Her home was violently breached by armed intruders, who had illegally entered her backyard via her neighbour's property. The police, although called immediately, arrived too late to prevent the horror which unfolded. Despite the urgency—and Elaine frantically informing the police that she was pregnant, frightened and alone—help did not come in time. During the incident Elaine's property was violently invaded and vandalised. The two men were twice her size and armed with blunt weapons. In the chaos of the brutal attack, Elaine was slapped, bashed, pushed, kicked, hit and assaulted with weapons. Elaine was utterly defenceless against two physically strong criminals. She suffered horrific physical and psychological injuries in the attack, and she lost her unborn child. She recently told my office there has not been a day since where she has not cried herself to sleep thinking of her child. Elaine was later told that due to the trauma and the resulting injuries, it is not known whether she can ever safely fall pregnant again.

I am resolved to ensure that no other woman or family endures such a heart-wrenching tragedy in their own homes ever again. Criminals will think twice before forcing their way into a home if they know the occupant has both the means and the legal right to defend themselves. That is how violent crime is deterred. The police do their job but they are limited; they cannot be at every home, at every moment. The law must trust citizens to act reasonably in the face of danger. A recent petition on castle law in Queensland, sponsored by the Katter Australia Party, received over 120,000 signatures. In Victoria a similar petition, sponsored by my Libertarian Party colleague Mr David Limbrick, received 22,000 signatures, and is similar to the petition I presented in this place yesterday. I thank Councillor Kelly James from Moree Plains Shire Council for helping to sponsor that petition. I commend the bill to the House.

Debate adjourned.

EVIDENCE BASED AVO AMENDMENT BILL 2025

First Reading

Bill introduced, read a first time and ordered to be published on motion by the Hon. Mark Latham.

Second Reading Speech

The Hon. MARK LATHAM (10:42): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill is simple, but entirely necessary in its impact. It is designed to ensure private apprehended violence order [AVO] applications in New South Wales only proceed on the basis of prima facie reasons for their acceptance, processing and consideration. That is why it is called the Evidence Based AVO Amendment Bill. It makes a one-sentence change to the Crimes (Domestic and Personal Violence) Act 2007 at section 48, "Making a private application for an order". At subsection (2) (a), after the words "a person for whose protection the order would be made", it inserts:

whereby, they then need to receive approval for the application from a Judge of the Local Court, and in granting approval for lodgement, the Judge must be able to identify evidence the NSW Police failed to consider or did not consider reasonably that justifies lodgement of the application

Let me explain why the change is necessary. It is rare for a parliamentarian to propose law reform with oneself as exhibit A, but that is what I do today. My circumstances are well known. On 14 July this year, with no prior notice from the police or the Local Court, Liam Mendez from *The Australian* marched up my driveway in south-west Sydney holding a laptop showing a privately lodged AVO application made by Nathalie Matthews. The application made ridiculous, fabricated, totally invented claims of sexual assault and intimidation against me. It had been leaked to Mendez via the member for Miranda.

I told him that it sounded like a joke and he had the wrong bloke, but he persisted in reading out the material. I said, "Mate, one day you will be embarrassed by taking that rubbish seriously." That day came about last month when Ms Matthews' lawyer drew up an agreement—that I have now signed—for her to withdraw her application from the Sydney Local Court and to pay me costs. I am sure her lawyers recognise that, given the false nature of her claims, there was no way she could go anywhere near a witness box. In the case of the interim AVO she was seeking, under cross-examination it would have been a demolition job. It would have been a total train wreck. That is why her interim AVO application was withdrawn two weeks ago.

As I said at the outset, messages I exchanged with Ms Matthews and other documents show that everything we did was consensual and, in most cases, initiated by her. After we broke up on 27 May, when she punched me in the head in a zombie-like drunken and drugged attack, the next day she sent me gifts and, later, several messages of contrition, including one captioned "In case you've forgotten how good I look." There were no claims of mistreatment of any kind until I totally ignored her at the Wyong racecourse on 24 June—a cardinal sin. After that she collaborated with the member for North Sydney and the member for Miranda to write up the false allegations, now abandoned at her financial cost. Ms Matthews, as the aggrieved party, had her phone impounded for 10 days by the New South Wales police, who examined its thousands of messages and images. Following that examination, the police decided no action was warranted. However, the current law allowed Ms Matthews, out of vengeance, to lodge a private AVO application, using court privilege, to make false, malicious and defamatory allegations. Surely that is wrong and an abuse of the law. This bill seeks to close that loophole.

In my case, as someone with a public profile who gives the fake news media a good old bagging, the matter took on a life of its own. People said to me, "You can't be handling the pressure of this all too well. It seems so horrific." I have been around a long while and I have the hide of a rhino. I love the smell of battle in the morning. I have been seasoned that way after decades of political conditioning. People expected me to be in the fetal position in the corner. I was not, but what about those men who have not got the hide of a rhino who have been faced with the same, albeit less public, situation? What about those who end up in the fetal position in the corner because of manipulation and abuse of process? Of course, it is somewhat embarrassing for me to talk about this matter in a parliamentary forum, but I have seen firsthand how the law is wrong and how it can be abused. It is on that basis that I bring this bill before the House today, so others do not have the same experience. I urge it be considered by the Attorney General, in particular.

The New South Wales police and the State sponsor 50,000 AVOs per annum. That is 1,000 a week, or one every 10 minutes. In the time that I have been speaking, they are almost ready to issue another one. If someone seeking an AVO cannot receive help from the police, they must have a very weak or dubious case. Why should they, a scorned partner, have the ability to lodge with the Local Court, in revenge, a document containing false allegations that the police themselves did not take seriously? Should there not be a checking process and a safeguard against that type of abuse? The applicant should have to go before a magistrate or, as we now call them, a Local Court judge to point out something significant the police missed or did not consider reasonably. Only then should they get permission to lodge a private AVO application and have it processed in the normal way.

Over the past 20 years two things have changed that warrant the legislative safeguard proposed in my bill. The first is the iPhone and the messaging capabilities that come with it. As a colleague pointed out to me very

early on, 20 years ago such disputes were a matter of he-said, she-said but now the messages show the truth. The police had Nathalie Matthews' phone for 10 days and, because of the constant contact she had with them, they went through it systematically. When the police officers at Day Street Police Station knocked her back, she went to other police stations shopping around the same claims, but there was still no police enthusiasm for an AVO or even any questioning of me. I was not questioned about any of the allegations by the New South Wales police. This is the new era in which we live. The Parliament can be increasingly confident that police officers will do their job thoroughly and professionally. They have all the messages available to them to examine.

The second change is the public profile and importance now accorded to domestic violence and sexual assault allegations. In the public arena, women are encouraged to come forward. In many cases, that has helped avoid further tragedy. But inevitably there are also instances of false allegations, themselves supposedly illegal under our domestic violence laws. That fact is stated very clearly on the private AVO application form that the member of Miranda, the member for North Sydney and Matthews filled out. It states:

It is an offence under the Crimes (Domestic and Personal Violence) Act 2007

...

to make a statement in this application that you know is false or misleading in a significant respect.

This can involve a jail sentence. The House can judge whether Ms Matthews has broken that law.

Importantly, I am told that, other than Indigenous women in western New South Wales, hardly anyone is ever prosecuted for that breach. There is a skin colour-based inconsistency in the law that we need to address. I will say more on that later. Private AVO applicants, who are essentially white women in Sydney, know that nothing will happen to them if they lie in their sworn statements. They can say anything, fabricate any allegation, lie through their teeth with impunity and, in the case of a public figure, create a firestorm of false claims to attack, weaken and denigrate that person. Is that really how the New South Wales justice system should work? People can engage in public acts of revenge, creating an alternative universe of malice and lies, but escape punishment for perjury in what is supposed to be a key area of justice: domestic violence and sexual assault.

We have laws of perjury to protect the integrity of the system. If people are allowed to make those false claims, making the system suspicious of all claimants, it is a massive disrespect to the genuine victims of those crimes. That is one of the core problems: If these spurious claims are allowed to be processed through the system, it disrespects and weakens the authority of those women who have genuine domestic violence claims under New South Wales law. On 13 August Ms Matthews lodged a 30-page sworn statement of a witness to support her private application. That was on top of hundreds of previously private messages she leaked to *The Daily Telegraph* and a couple of other outlets to damage me. Every one of her claims presented to the Local Court was wilfully false, as disproven in the messages and documents I subsequently presented in my sworn affidavit. Let me go through them in some detail.

At paragraph 19 of her signed witness statement, Matthews accuses me of a serious matter inside Parliament House on 21 April 2024. Department of Parliamentary Services security records show that I was not in the building on 21 April 2024. It was a Sunday and there is no record of my security swipe anywhere in the building—not the carpark, not the entrance doors or my eleventh-floor office. She simply made it up. I was not in the building that day. At paragraph 31, Matthews accuses me of things after we supposedly came back from a race meeting in the Southern Highlands on 29 November 2024. The only problem is that I was at the final deliberative meeting of the Select Committee on the Proposal to Develop Rosehill Racecourse all day. It was racehorse related, but it was a parliamentary committee in this building not, as she claimed, coming back from the Southern Highlands on that day.

At paragraph 44, Matthews even betrays the memory of her late father, accusing me of things at my home on Sunday 6 October 2024. That day I had her and her family around at my place, hosting a barbecue three days after her father had died to help the family with their grief. We all watched the NRL Grand Final. What a reprehensible lie, yet so typical of the malicious and false claims that Matthews has made. We exchanged thousands of messages together in this consensual relationship. Yet, in her witness statement, Matthews does not lodge or cite a single message to support her claims. There were no complaints about anything and no unacceptable, aggressive, menacing comments by me in those messages. There was nothing. By contrast, I provided the court with scores of documents, messages and evidence to demonstrate my innocence.

In a private AVO application, Matthews claimed that she lent me four lots of \$20,000, which I was supposedly reluctant to repay. But, by the time of a witness statement, that claim had totally disappeared. There was no proof or reference to it made at all. Bizarrely, Matthews provided unaudited accounts, claiming I benefited by \$52,401.29 during our time knowing each other. But, when actual bank accounts are examined, most of the payments she said she made to me were actually the other way round: I made them to her. She was the net financial beneficiary by an amount of \$13,100 during the association we had. Not only is she dishonest but she has also

provided what looks like a bizarrely stupid set of accounts that just do not add up. Then there is a series of claims for things that I am supposed to have done in the second half of 2024 that, in fact, Matthews initiated 12 months earlier.

There was supposed to be an offensive item she was coerced into wearing. Yet on 25 August 2023, which was 12 months earlier, she sent me a photo from her Dubai apartment proudly displaying the item. In fact, it was the only thing she was wearing. In Matthews' account, the public was treated to her sordid claims about defecation and golden showers. The messages held by the court show her initiating both activities, with the former a message to me saying, "I am keen for it now. It's sexy." One can only wonder what was going through her mind to know I held all those WhatsApp messages proving my innocence. I had them, she had them and I have now handed them to the court. The police got to see them and they took absolutely no action.

For sure in life, we all know in our personal arrangements that rejection is not easy to deal with. But what is worse is to turn to lies and revenge, to perjure oneself or, for the matter for which Ms Matthews has already been charged, to engage in revenge porn to try to destroy an innocent person's life. We are talking about someone who is not well and who has engaged in this revenge out of reasons that are very hard to understand. Some form of abandonment syndrome has taken hold. Yet, incredibly, the New South Wales domestic violence and justice system has entertained and, I would say, facilitated this particular problem and syndrome that she has, along with claims in the media by those who believe this person to be credible and, of course, the man to be guilty. The presumption of innocence was wiped at every turn.

Back to her claims and the messages disproving them, there was a lie right from the beginning. Matthews claimed our initial contact was me ordering her to go to the races with me. In truth, on 28 July 2022, she wrote, "Is this the real Mark Latham—legend," later known as master? Why would she present falsehoods to the court, knowing that I have those online messages, that she has them, and that it was a simple matter for the court to have them, exposing her perjury? Even the police were roped into this industrial-scale deceit. At paragraph 53 of her witness statement, while being interviewed at the Day Street Police Station on 29 June this year, she claimed, "Detective Bourke left the room at one stage and, when he returned, he advised me he had just telephoned Mark about my attempting to get an AVO against him. He told me, 'Mark said that you're a liar.'" Obviously, no such thing happened. There was no such conversation. I did not know about the AVO until 15 days later, when the journalists marched up my driveway. In any case, the police would never behave that way.

The Parliament should be aware of what that means for the member for Miranda and the member for North Sydney. They enabled and set up allegations against another MP by someone who has wilfully lied about the New South Wales police. They were dealing with a fantasist, but they did not care about the obvious facts of the matter. They did not check with anyone in this Chamber, with me or anyone who knew me. They just wanted to damage me politically. Those two reckless Liberal MPs in the other place set about that course. Within a few weeks they abandoned Nathalie Matthews. Her lawyer, set up by the Liberal Party, also abandoned her as soon as she must have looked at the documents.

Then there is another absurdity. Matthews claimed that, as I was being interviewed by Chris Maher from Channel 7 on the other side of Macquarie Street on Saturday 28 June on the topic of MP pay rises in the budget, I broke from the interview for 10 seconds, turned around to look at the passing traffic, saw her car, started waving my arms at her to intimidate her and then resumed the interview. Obviously, no such thing happened. I was facing towards Martin Place and completed the interview with Chris Maher. Chris Maher himself has said he has no recollection of any such thing happening. Of course, it never did. Another crazy claim was at page 15 of Matthews' witness statement. She says that in November 2023 she "had low cash flow and I told him, 'Mark, I would need to go to the women's shelter,' and he made fun of me".

How could anyone take that seriously? She had apartments in Dubai and Sutherland with her husband, Ross. In reality, her only comment about women's shelters was to joke about scamming them for emergency payments and that she needed to park her \$100,000 car around the corner. This is someone who received, by her own admission in *The Australian* newspaper, \$145,000 from Richard White; used the Dubai system to avoid paying tax; squirrelled assets away from a husband; and ran four different businesses. She said they were lucrative businesses, and boasted of having a fortune from OnlyFans, again tax free. But supposedly I made fun of her when she said she needed a women's shelter.

The big point is that Ms Matthews has entered an alternative universe, hurt by rejection. Apparently, the only way she can deal with it is through a fantasy world of lies and revenge. But the bigger point for legislators is that the system has allowed it to occur totally unchecked. Two MPs in the other place have facilitated it. We are always told to believe the alleged victim, but what if the evidence overwhelmingly shows perjury by someone who has made up the whole set of allegations? The law needs to change to avoid that abuse of the system.

It is not fair to genuine victims of domestic violence in New South Wales to have their credibility questioned because other applicants, like the one I am talking about, have lied so badly. The only way to process such applications is based on evidence. If the police have been thorough and if an applicant before a Local Court judge cannot identify anything that the police have missed, that is where the matter should rest. The police decided not to sponsor an apprehended violence order—end of story. But if the judge assesses missed information, then a private application can proceed. That is the purpose of my bill before the House. The Matthews abuse cannot be repeated.

There are many men who have been in my situation but without the public profile and hysteria. The facts cannot simply be ignored. Matthews was allowed to present a false account to the New South Wales police, which they quite rightly rejected after 10 days of thorough examination of her telephone. But then, under the current law, she was allowed to present the same false account in the Sydney Local Court, and it was listed for hearing, with deliberate leaking to the media to slur me. I hope the House can understand how bad the Matthews-Petinos-Wilson lies have been. Three whole months—June and July of 2023 and May of 2024—have also been fabricated in the Matthews witness statement lodged with the court. It is not just single events she lied about, but the history of entire months was rewritten.

The PRESIDENT: Order! According to sessional order, proceedings are now interrupted for questions.

Visitors

VISITORS

The PRESIDENT: I welcome Ed Kitt to the Parliament of New South Wales. Ed is the British Deputy Consul-General and a very good friend to many members in this place.

Questions Without Notice

MINISTERIAL DISCLOSURES

The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE (11:00): My question is directed to the Leader of the Government. Has the Premier declared his close personal relationship with Mr Jim Minns, a solicitor with the Public Service Association, on all occasions when such declarations are required by the New South Wales ministerial code of conduct?

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE (Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Heritage) (11:00): I thank the member for his question. The Premier fulfills all of his disclosure requirements under the ministerial code of conduct, as do all Ministers. The Premier did so on this occasion.

The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE (11:01): That is an extraordinary answer. A journalist from *The Sydney Morning Herald*, Jordan Baker, sought to ask questions of the Premier in relation to that exact circumstance and was given the response that there was nothing to say.

The Hon. Sarah Mitchell: No response.

The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: No response. Those opposite would know that, where there is a direct personal relationship, there is an obligation to disclose—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Clerk will stop the clock. The Hon. Damien Tudehope will resume his seat. I made this point at the end of question time yesterday and I make it again today: I understand that we are in a new format, which is a lively format, but we must all give Hansard the opportunity to report correctly. The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: Only one conclusion can be drawn from the behaviour of the Premier and that answer. That is that the Premier did not make that disclosure. [*Time expired.*]

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE (Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Heritage) (11:02): The new format is interesting. We see that the Leader of the Opposition does not like it when Ministers just answer the question. He wants to cast aspersions and make all kinds of assertions. I continue to make the point that members on this side of the House follow the rules of the code of conduct, which is more than we can say for members opposite. The former member for Wagga Wagga is before ICAC, and the former Premier of the State declared zero personal interests when there was money being funnelled into that electorate and that member was taking money for visa dodges. There was a lot going on. Those opposite are now talking about something for which the Premier has fulfilled all requirements. They do not like it when we talk about them. [*Time expired.*]

Ms SUE HIGGINSON (11:03): This question has to be asked and I am not sure the answer is completely clear: Has the Premier disclosed his interest in relation to his brother and the fact that the laws introduced into this House by the Government will have a material impact on the work his brother does on a daily basis with the Public Service Association? There is no problem, and there are no aspersions being cast anywhere, in relation to the Premier's brother. The Premier's brother has a job; it is a very important job. He is the lawyer who represents corrections officers in relation to disputes regarding their conduct and behaviour within Corrective Services NSW. The laws that the Premier has said he discussed with his brother are before the House. Did he disclose or did he not? [*Time expired.*]

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE (Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Heritage) (11:05): It is good to see that Inspector Clouseau is on the case, asking what, when, where and how.

The PRESIDENT: Order! There are too many interjections in the Chamber.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: The answer is far more boring than those opposite wish, which is that we all adhere to the required disclosures, and everyone has done that. Just because they do not like the way in which I answer the question does not mean that they get to yell across the table and continue to be grumpy about it. Let us also remember that the Leader of the Opposition had to stand down in the middle of the election campaign because of failed disclosures.

The Hon. Damien Tudehope: Well, the Premier could stand down.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Yes, we can run down the time. They do not like it, but I really like this new format. We get to talk about all of the failures of members on the opposite side of the House, as those in glass houses try to throw stones.

NORTHERN RIVERS KOALA HABITAT

The Hon. PETER PRIMROSE (11:06): My question without notice is addressed to the Minister for the Environment. Will the Minister update the House on how the New South Wales Government is working with community groups to protect and restore koala habitat across the Northern Rivers?

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE (Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Heritage) (11:06): Here is a bit of nice news for a change. Those opposite might like to hear about it. The fantastic group known as Bangalow Koalas is a grassroots community group doing incredible work on the ground, rehabilitating native habitat for koalas and other endangered species across the Northern Rivers. They are a hands-on, community-based group full of passionate community volunteers who work with landholders, schools and other organisations to secure the future of koalas in the region. Their initiative aims to restore key koala corridors so they can move safely across the landscape. By restoring that habitat, they are helping to secure the future of koalas and dozens of other species. This weekend marks a significant milestone for Bangalow Koalas—the planting of their 500,000th tree at Possum Creek.

Over the past seven years, Bangalow Koalas has restored 545 hectares at 123 properties. That work has been done by over 3,000 volunteers across 171 planting events. As early as two years on, there is already evidence of koalas using the trees on many of those sites, and there have been increased sightings of koalas, including breeding females. The New South Wales Government has been happy to support that work, both in our small grants to Bangalow Koalas and, importantly, in purchasing almost 200,000 koala feed trees across the region for the organisation. What started in 2016 as a group of concerned neighbours has grown into a movement, showing that people can make a difference and save koalas. Working together, we are growing back their trees where they have been lost.

FORSTER PUBLIC SCHOOL MUSIC PROGRAM

The Hon. SARAH MITCHELL (11:08): My question is directed to the Acting Minister for Education and Early Learning. Noting that representations have been made to the Minister on behalf of teachers at Forster Public School who want to implement the Australian Children's Music Foundation program for their students, will the Minister provide the dedicated funding support that has been requested for that school?

The Hon. COURTNEY HOUSSOS (Minister for Finance, Minister for Domestic Manufacturing and Government Procurement, and Minister for Natural Resources) (11:08): I thank the member for the question. I will be honest: I have not read that piece of correspondence yet. I will certainly prioritise it, and I welcome any correspondence from my former school, Forster Public School. When I spoke at the Primary Principals Association, I ran into my former school principal. I give a shout-out to Mr Dickson. I still call him Mr Dickson. He assures me that I can call him Graham, but I do not feel comfortable doing that. I will continue to call him Mr Dickson. I take the representations in relation to the music program seriously. As the former Minister would

be aware, a broad range of programs are run across New South Wales schools. At the moment I have the privilege of getting an insight into some of those.

I give a shout-out to Cammeray Public School, which the Treasurer and I visited recently to speak about a school upgrade that has been sped up as a result of the reforms that the Government is pursuing—in particular, the business case reforms. We were treated to a pretty amazing display from the musical students. The principal assured us that this was just another day; it was not a special performance just for us. But it was an amazing showcase of the school band. That is what we see in our primary and high schools each and every day. We see amazing work undertaken by teachers in the classroom and also outside the classroom, particularly in creative subjects, including the arts, such as music and drama, and a range of other things. I will certainly take the substance of the question on notice and come back with a substantial response.

The Hon. SARAH MITCHELL (11:10): I thank the Minister for her answer, but I am a little bit concerned because the representations were sent to her in October by the fabulous Tanya Thompson, the member for Myall Lakes. She is sticking up for her school community in Forster. She wrote a really great letter on behalf of Forster Public School, which I am happy to give to the Minister. But Ms Thompson already got a response back from the Parliamentary Secretary, who said, "The Minister's asked me to respond, and she's actually not available to meet with you at this time to discuss it."

I am happy that the Minister is taking this on notice. I will hand the letter to her now if she wants to have a look. Tanya Thompson wants to meet with the Minister on behalf of Forster Public School if she can find time in her busy schedule to meet with her. The Minister should check what her Parliamentary Secretary is sending back to members before she says, "I'm not aware of it and I'll certainly look into it." It is all very well and good to say that she is interested in supporting kids, students and teachers; this is an opportunity for her to do it. I am happy to hand this to the Minister right now, and Tanya Thompson will be available to meet the Minister just as soon as the Minister is available.

The Hon. COURTNEY HOUSSOS (Minister for Finance, Minister for Domestic Manufacturing and Government Procurement, and Minister for Natural Resources) (11:11): I will certainly take the letter. The fact that the member wrote to me in October and received a response from the Parliamentary Secretary seems to show that the system is working. I hear members opposite laughing. Obviously none of them was a Parliamentary Secretary when they were in government or have not had the understanding—

The Hon. Penny Sharpe: And never will be.

The Hon. COURTNEY HOUSSOS: And never will be. I acknowledge the interjection. I receive communication about a range of issues in my capacity as the acting Minister assisting the Deputy Premier.

The Hon. John Graham: There will be a couple of letters coming at you.

The Hon. COURTNEY HOUSSOS: I acknowledge that interjection from the Minister for Transport. It is appropriate that members receive an appropriate response. One would expect that a Parliamentary Secretary would respond appropriately. I am happy to meet with them if I can find a time. [*Time expired.*]

The Hon. MARK LATHAM (11:12): It is very important for education Ministers to look after their old schools. It is not a pecuniary interest; it is a moral obligation because one of the reasons we are all here is the benefit of a good education, most of us from government schools. I went to Hurlstone Agricultural High School. I thank the Hon. Sarah Mitchell because when I made representations to her to say that Hurlstone should not be moved to Hawkesbury—which was a wild cock-and-bull scheme that the National Party had in the past—she stepped in to defend and protect my old school at Glenfield, where it remains today. It is the very best selective government school in south-west Sydney. The idea of sending it to Hawkesbury was abhorrent and ridiculous. Surely the Hon. Courtney Houssos should be stepping in at Forster to look after the school the way her predecessor looked after my old school. Moreover, the Minister should be presenting to the House the thing I requested a few weeks ago: evidence of improved academic results in New South Wales. [*Time expired.*]

GREYHOUND RACING NSW INQUIRY

The Hon. EMMA HURST (11:13): My question is to the Special Minister of State, representing the Minister for Gaming and Racing. Will he confirm the New South Wales Government will not be releasing the Drake inquiry report just prior to Christmas or New Year or early in January in an attempt to reduce media coverage and parliamentary scrutiny of this important report into the greyhound racing industry?

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM (Special Minister of State, Minister for Transport, Minister for the Arts, and Minister for Music and the Night-time Economy) (11:14): I thank the Hon. Emma Hurst for the question and her interest in this area. She has previously asked about the Drake inquiry report and I have reported to the House on those questions. I do not accept the premise of the question, but I have some information from the

Minister. As I have previously advised the House, the Drake inquiry report is the result of over 1,600 public submissions and more than 80,000 documents and material from 31 days of hearings. The report's findings and recommendations are being given the careful consideration and review necessary to determine the appropriate next steps. This consideration is part of the New South Wales Government's commitment to high standards of governance, integrity and animal welfare in the greyhound racing industry. The Government expects to make further announcements about the inquiry in due course.

The Hon. EMMA HURST (11:15): The Government's delay in releasing the report is absolutely absurd. The Government has had the report now for over three months. This is a taxpayer-funded inquiry. There is no reason why the report should be withheld from the taxpayers who paid for the inquiry to go ahead. This House has passed a motion calling for papers under Standing Order 52 to get a copy of the report, which the Government has refused to comply with, claiming that it was Cabinet in confidence. I have received advice that it is not considered a Cabinet-in-confidence document. The Animal Justice Party is trying again to get this report out. We are hearing from the industry that participants are shutting down some of their tracks. It looks as though the Government is helping to cover for the industry and allowing the industry to pre-empt what may be in that report. It is not the Government's job to protect the industry. [*Time expired.*]

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM (Special Minister of State, Minister for Transport, Minister for the Arts, and Minister for Music and the Night-time Economy) (11:16): The Hon. Emma Hurst is right that the report has been paid for by taxpayer funds and there is significant interest in it. I understand that the Minister or his office has talked to the member about the issues she has been raising in the House. I expect the report to be released, but at the appropriate time. I understand the Minister still needs to consult with colleagues in relation to the industry. It is appropriate to give the Minister time to conduct those consultations.

The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE (11:16): What an obfuscation that is. This Government has an absolute history of covering things up, whether it is workers compensation documents or Local Small Commitments Allocation documents. The Government gave us one set of LSCA documents and then gave us another set of documents sometime later—all of which were altered. Then there are the Moore Park documents. Where is the business case for them? This is a government which takes pride in making sure—

The Hon. Bob Nanva: Point of order: The Hon. Damien Tudehope has just made a reference to the order for production of the Moore Park documents. The item relating to that has been given precedence for debate today. As I understand it, the new sessional orders do not apply to rules for debate; they apply to rules for questioning. I suggest that the member has breached the rule in relation to anticipation with respect to debate.

The Hon. Chris Rath: To the point of order: My understanding is that the original question had nothing to do with any other item that is on the business list for today. Therefore, there is no anticipation. Also, I think that the Hon. Bob Nanva will find that the rule about anticipation no longer applies in the same way that it applied in the previous iteration of question time.

The Hon. Daniel Mookhey: To the point of order: The proper interpretation of the rules that were proposed by the Opposition and then adopted by the House is that the question is exempt from the anticipation rule. Therefore, the question can be asked and the two-minute answer can follow. But now we are in the general debate, where the broad rules about anticipation still apply. That is the point that the Hon. Bob Nanva is making: that, as a result, in the contribution in debate, it is still the case that we have to honour the anticipation rule.

The PRESIDENT: This is an interesting intellectual point and it is a worthwhile point of order. However, I do not uphold the point of order on this occasion. My ruling is that this hour is for question time. Therefore, the rule about anticipation refers to everything that is said within this hour.

The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: It is extraordinary that the Hon. Bob Nanva actually took that point of order because it reinforces the point that Government members would do anything rather than produce the documents that disclose the way they operate in government. The fact that the Hon. Emma Hurst has not been able to get her documents is pervasive. It is all over there! [*Time expired.*]

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM (Special Minister of State, Minister for Transport, Minister for the Arts, and Minister for Music and the Night-time Economy) (11:20): With the new standing orders, I really encourage the Leader of the Opposition to actually listen to the answer. The Leader of the Government said, "Ministers, including the Premier, have complied," and then the Leader of the Opposition gave his prepared speech anyway. When I said, "I expect this report to be released," he accused us of a cover-up. I encourage the Hon. Damien Tudehope to listen to the answer and not just turn up with the note he has been given beforehand. He has to actually listen.

The Hon. Sarah Mitchell: He has no notes. He is freewheeling.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I cannot hear the Minister.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: I accept the interjection from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that the Leader of the Opposition is freewheeling. That was a fair point. However, having heard answers given by the Leader of the Opposition when he was in government, I will not take that from the bloke who defended the shredding. I will not take that from him.

TIMBER INDUSTRY AND GREAT KOALA NATIONAL PARK

The Hon. MARK BUTTIGIEG (11:22): My question without notice is addressed to the Minister for Agriculture. Will the Minister update the House on how the New South Wales Government is supporting forestry workers during the creation of the Great Koala National Park?

The Hon. TARA MORIARTY (Minister for Agriculture, Minister for Regional New South Wales, and Minister for Western New South Wales) (11:22): I thank the member for the very important question and for his ongoing passion for supporting workers' rights in New South Wales. The Government is delivering on its election commitment to create the Great Koala National Park. When we announced the proposed boundary for the park on 7 September, we also committed to developing a comprehensive plan to support workers, industry and local communities during the period of transition. I am really pleased to advise the House that the worker support package has now been finalised and communicated to unions and affected workers.

The comprehensive package includes top-up redundancy payments to ensure affected employees receive four weeks of base pay per year of employment, capped at \$150,000. There is additional support for employees over the age of 45 in the form of three weeks of pay for every year after the age of 45, up to a cap of \$50,000. That is in recognition of the difficulties that may be faced by those over 45 in finding employment, particularly in that region, which the Government acknowledges. It includes education and training payments of up to \$9,000 to cover the costs of retraining and upskilling, and relocation assistance of up to \$45,000 to cover the costs of moving to find new employment if any of the impacted workers choose to follow that path. It also includes free access to mental health support and financial and legal guidance.

The Government remains committed to a sustainable industry. However, as we transition to create that very important national park to protect koalas and the environment in that part of the State, we are ensuring—as we have said from the start—that we look after the workers who are unfortunately impacted by the decision. The comprehensive package supports industry and workers to ensure that people have an above-minimum transition payment to help them through this period. That is exactly what the Government stands for: making sure that workers are looked after.

WORKERS COMPENSATION

The Hon. MARK LATHAM (11:24): My question is directed to the Treasurer.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Members will cease interjecting so I can hear the question.

The Hon. MARK LATHAM: I refer the Treasurer to the email he received from his former whistleblower Chris McCann on 30 May, which commenced with the words, "Hi, Daniel. I am suicidal and I see no way out." It went on to say, "My life is in your hands ... they will be covered in my blood." I also refer the Treasurer to the message I received from Mr McCann just yesterday, which said:

I hope when you look at Mookhey you remind him of how pathetic he was not to reach out to see how I was doing when I needed his support and help.

When will the Treasurer apologise for his mistreatment of Mr McCann, and do so personally?

The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY (Treasurer) (11:25): I thank the member for his question. I refer him to my previous answers about my interactions with Mr McCann. I refer to my respect for Mr McCann, but I will not be canvassing matters to do with the mental health of an individual in Parliament.

The Hon. MARK LATHAM (11:25): How hard is it in the circumstance to apologise without canvassing the issues? I have dealt with whistleblowers. One has a supreme responsibility to their care. Workers compensation is not just about financial savings; it is about human life. The Government is sponsoring a bill for 31 per cent whole person impairment. We know from the Boyd committee inquiry that that will lead to self-harm amongst some injured workers in New South Wales. Mr McCann, formerly a whistleblower, provided all the confidential documents on which the Treasurer tried to make his career. He deserves the decency of an apology. The Treasurer should be a man. He should stand up and apologise to someone who clearly has been mistreated. Maybe he had a brain snap. Maybe he did not care. But at least the Treasurer can give that man some comfort now with the apology he deserves. He was good enough to leak the documents to the Treasurer. The Treasurer made a big man of himself

in his political career. But that man has suffered badly through neglect and deserves an apology right now from the Treasurer.

LOCAL SMALL COMMITMENTS ALLOCATION

The Hon. CHRIS RATH (11:26): My question is directed to the Special Minister of State. A comprehensive list of election commitments under the Local Small Commitments Allocation [LSCA] for all 93 electorates, with the pre-election approval dates noted for each nominated project, was provided to the LSCA program office in the week prior to 14 June 2023. The Premier's office subsequently changed the projects listed for 21 of the 93 electorates, and Cherie Burton then provided that altered list to the program office on 28 July 2023. Why has the Minister approved grants funding for projects that were never election commitments, but were added by the Premier's office in July 2023?

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM (Special Minister of State, Minister for Transport, Minister for the Arts, and Minister for Music and the Night-time Economy) (11:27): I do not accept the premise of the question. As the member knows, the program office has been clear that the program has been administered off the list that was provided on 28 July 2023.

The Hon. CHRIS RATH (11:28): We are in an absurd situation where the Minister is relying on the list of projects—election commitments for the 2023 election—that was given to him by the LSCA program office. But who is the LSCA program office relying on? Where did they get the list from? It was from Cherie Burton. When we asked Cherie Burton, "Who gave you the list of election commitments?", what did she say? "I can't remember who gave me the list. It was given to me in hard copy." Cherie Burton and the Minister want us to believe that the whole list of election commitments for the 2023 election has just fallen off the back of a truck. That is the list that they are using, day in and day out, to roll out LSCA projects. Frankly, it is not good enough. The Minister should pick up the phone to Cherie Burton and get some clear answers.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM (Special Minister of State, Minister for Transport, Minister for the Arts, and Minister for Music and the Night-time Economy) (11:29): The member made error after error when asserting those claims. He said that a Federal MP had attended an opening. That was untrue. He said that the opening was at Ron Payne Park in North Epping, but he had the wrong place. It was actually a photo of North Epping Oval. He said a company limited by shares was not eligible. He was incorrect. It was not a company limited by shares; it was limited by guarantee. It was eligible.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Clerk will stop the clock. Wide latitude is extended during the discussion, so I am happy for interjections from time to time. However, Opposition members will not interject about what is appropriate for the Minister to talk about, as long as he is within the gamut of the standing orders. The Minister's comments have been within the standing orders.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: He said that Alex Greenwich was the decision-maker, which was clearly not the case. In trying to claim that this is about Independent electorates, he cited Independent electorates when there are Coalition electorates in the same circumstances. He repeatedly misquoted me and other members in the course of pursuing this issue. He ignored the Coalition's own program. He pretends to be innocent but, when we held the Hills Shire Council inquiry about developers, dollars, lobbyists and preselection, he sat on the Liberal local government organising committee— [*Time expired.*]

The Hon. MARK LATHAM (11:30): It is nice to have a cute, prepared answer attacking the Opposition. That is lovely practice! Short of breaking into song, that is what we expect of the Minister, but it does not hide what has gone on. The Minister should know better. He knows that the election promises of the Labor Party were set in stone. There was no changing them on election night. They were tabulated and given to the program office, but then Cherie Burton systematically changed the promises and updated them to curry favour with the crossbench in the other place and to keep the minority Government in office. That is clearly what happened. Honest John has this terrible moral dilemma: Does he live up to the fulfilment of his reputation for honesty or does he cover up for the Premier's office which, quite frankly, has been illicit and corrupt in doing this? That is public money, and the Minister should know better. Just as he has called out past crooked deals, from Eddie Obeid onwards, he should call out Cherie Burton right now.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM (Special Minister of State, Minister for Transport, Minister for the Arts, and Minister for Music and the Night-time Economy) (11:31): I thank the member for his discussion and for his advice. The upper House inquiry into this matter is ongoing, and committee members will have the opportunity to put those issues to the witnesses they call. They should do that; I encourage them to. But I discourage them from following the facts laid down by the Opposition Whip, which have been wrong time after time. I am entitled to point those things out. He has repeatedly misled the House, and he has never withdrawn those comments. That

is an obligation on the Government, but it is also an obligation on members. The member should withdraw those comments.

NARRABRI WATER SUPPLY

The Hon. ANTHONY D'ADAM (11:32): My question without notice is addressed to the Minister for Water. Will the Minister update the House on how the Minns Labor Government is delivering critical infrastructure for drinking water in New South Wales?

The Hon. ROSE JACKSON (Minister for Water, Minister for Housing, Minister for Homelessness, Minister for Mental Health, and Minister for Youth) (11:32): I am pleased to update the House on an issue previously raised in this Chamber that has been exercising my mind for some time, and that is the issue of PFAS water contamination in Narrabri. As members would know, NSW Health funded PFAS testing statewide for all local water utilities. Thankfully, in most of New South Wales, no PFAS or very little PFAS was detected. In a few cases—Narrabri being one—some of the bores that supply drinking water to the community were contaminated with PFAS. We have been working with Narrabri Shire Council to manage that for some time.

Unfortunately, more recently, PFAS was detected in one of the bores that was not originally contaminated, and it had to be taken offline, as was entirely appropriate. That required a more escalated and urgent intervention from the Government, and I am happy to update the House on its occurrence. Earlier this week we announced a \$4 million emergency intervention to support Narrabri Shire Council and ensure that safe drinking water could be provided for that community. That \$4 million has two key components. One is the delivery to Narrabri of a mobile treatment plant similar to the one Sydney Water is using at cascades in the Blue Mountains, which uses advanced, new technology to treat water and remove PFAS. The Government is commissioning that right now, and it will be available as soon as we can get it to Narrabri.

But that temporary mobile treatment plant is not the only solution we are delivering for Narrabri; we are also funding the identification and delivery of two new bore sites. We have already started the testing for those new bore sites. Unfortunately, PFAS was detected at some sites, but it was not at others. We will continue those investigations. We will find those alternative sites, and we will ensure that is delivered. I thank the Mayor of Narrabri, Darrell Tiemens, and the local member, Roy Butler, for working with us to deliver this solution.

WARATAH SUPER BATTERY

The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN (11:35): My question is directed to the Leader of the Government. I refer to reports, including one on the front page of *The Australian Financial Review* yesterday, that the BlackRock-backed Akaysha Energy has recently notified the Australian Energy Market Operator of a catastrophic failure at the new Waratah Super Battery on the Central Coast, meaning that the project will not be completed this year as was expected, and it will not be fully operational until next year at the earliest. What impact will that have on our power supply and power prices, particularly during times of high demand over summer?

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE (Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Heritage) (11:35): That is a really good question. Let us remember that the Waratah Super Battery came about as a result of Eraring Power Station indicating that it was going to close earlier in 2025. The previous Government procured and organised for the building of the Waratah Super Battery. It is something we are very proud of. It is one of the most powerful batteries in the world, and it is currently undergoing whole point testing as it is being fully commissioned. Akaysha Energy, the project developer, has notified the energy market of a temporary loss of capacity at the battery due to a transformer outage. The affected transformer has been safely de-energised, and all onsite personnel are safe. It is important to note, though, that the Waratah Super Battery, which was commissioned by the previous Government, is still operating at a 350-megawatt capacity and is actively bolstering energy security for the New South Wales grid.

Getting to the detail of the question on prices and the stability of the grid, they are not going to be impacted. That is because Eraring Power Station has been commissioned and is still working. With all of our coal-fired power stations, we have to watch out. They have quite a few outages, and they are part of the challenge in terms of what is driving energy prices. We are trying to fix the challenge with the transformer as quickly as possible. The battery is operating in the way it was originally commissioned to operate, which was to do some of the work, but it is not fully operational. The Government and the department continue to work to get it back on deck as quickly as possible. Energy prices and reliability will not be impacted by the change.

The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN (11:37): I thank the Minister for her answer. I am told that order times for the particular transformers needed on large battery storage projects like the Waratah Super Battery have stretched out to more than a year amid surging worldwide demand, so there are doubts that it can be finalised, even with the new adjusted timelines. The social licence for the whole experiment of running our developed, first-world economy on the whims of the weather is now on thin ice. Today *The Sydney Morning Herald* reported

that one-third of voters want to scrap the net zero target, and that figure will continue to move upwards as people struggle to pay their power bills going forward.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE (Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Heritage) (11:38): The answer on the Waratah Super Battery is what it is. In relation to the transition, when we first came to government the Parliament had a bipartisan plan to deliver the energy road map. Unfortunately, we do not have that bipartisanship now, which is pretty disappointing. It is very disappointing for regional New South Wales. It is also very disappointing for the future wealth and prosperity of the State if we do not support and deal with the energy challenges in front of us, which are separate from the emissions reduction challenges. It is actually about coal-fired power stations getting old, breaking down and causing surging prices in the wholesale market. Those are all of the issues that we are addressing when it comes to net zero and the need to pull all of this together. This is the exact plan that we are delivering. We have made extremely good progress in the amount of renewable energy sources that are in the system, including the rollout of batteries and booming technologies such as gas peakers and pumped hydro. All of those are part of the plan. *[Time expired.]*

The Hon. WES FANG (11:39): The issue that the Minister is ignoring is that a lot of the new technologies being rolled out are also being experimented upon to provide firming for our grid. The Waratah Super Battery is only one of the issues. Transgrid and EnergyCo are going to rely on grid-forming batteries. The Minister does not accept the fact that we need grid-forming batteries and synchronous condensers to provide stability in the grid. If the Waratah Super Battery is failing at this point, and if we have not received any of the synchronous condensers, then how on earth is the Government going to provide power? We need to provide industry, homes and businesses with cost-effective and reliable energy, but the Minister cannot even tell us about the reliability of the Waratah Super Battery. This is a massive issue for the State. *[Time expired.]*

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE (Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Heritage) (11:40): Where do I start? The Nationals plan is no plan. The Federal Nationals plan completely ignores the \$100 billion cost of replacing coal-fired power plants, but let us not go there. I remind the member that transformers are not new technology. They are actually quite old technology, and they work fine. Grid-forming batteries are being successfully rolled out right across the network. This is the technology of the future, and it is operating and working well. To talk about synchronous condensers is pretty hilarious given that those opposite voted against us getting synchronous condensers from Transgrid. It is very well for the National Party to say "no, no, no", but it has no plan for the future. It is basically condemning us to higher prices and less reliability. It keeps putting out slogans that frankly are not going to work.

The PRESIDENT: Before I call the Hon. Scott Farlow, I welcome a number of people to Parliament today, on the second day of our new question time format: students from Thomas Hassall Anglican College participating in the Legal Studies and the Legislature program conducted by the Parliamentary Education and Engagement team; Avani Bhat from Hurlstone Agricultural High School, who is currently doing work experience in the office of the Hon. Aileen MacDonald; and Isabella Metcalfe, who is currently studying law and psychology at Macquarie University and is also an intern in the office of the Hon. Sarah Mitchell.

APPIN PRECINCT DEVELOPMENT

The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW (11:42): I also welcome to Parliament all of the students and interns in the gallery. I also welcome the Deputy Consul-General, Edward Kitt. It is a pleasure to have him in the Chamber. My question is directed to the Minister for Water. I note that the cap of 2,499 new homes for the Appin (Part) Precinct and North Appin Precinct was based on information about Sydney Water's capacity to deliver wastewater infrastructure. Was the Minister, her office or Sydney Water consulted by the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces prior to his intervention in approvals for projects covered by this cap to give an advantage to Ingham Property Development Services Pty Ltd?

The Hon. ROSE JACKSON (Minister for Water, Minister for Housing, Minister for Homelessness, Minister for Mental Health, and Minister for Youth) (11:43): I thank the member for his question. I start by correcting the incorrect assertion in his question that Sydney Water infrastructure capacity was the lone factor that contributed to the cap placed on developments in that area. It is very clear that there has been a range of infrastructure underinvestment in south-western Sydney, including transport infrastructure. This has placed pressure on the Government's efforts to deliver housing. We have been very clear that housing has to be accompanied by infrastructure, and big infrastructure like water and transport take time to deliver. These decisions should have been made years ago, but they were not made. We are trying to catch up and get that infrastructure moving, particularly in south-western Sydney, but it takes time. We have been up-front and clear about the constraints on water, wastewater and transport in south-western Sydney.

We are not going to make the same mistake that the previous Government made of approving housing in areas where there is no infrastructure. We are all for housing. We are going gangbusters with our transport oriented development, infield housing, low- and mid-rise developments and new planning Act. Part of the plan is to not make the mistake of failing to invest in infrastructure. To correct the member, a combination of water, wastewater and transport is causing pressure. I am not involved in decisions relating to how housing is allocated under the cap. My sole focus is on doing everything I can to correct the mistakes of the previous Government and ensure that underinvestment is rectified. I am working with the Sydney Water capital plans to get projects moving. That is my sole focus. We are making progress but also recognise that there is more to do. We are going to keep going.

The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW (11:44): The Minister is right that wastewater is just one of the issues. There is a cap of 2,499 homes. On 29 August, the Housing Delivery Authority recommended that a proposal for 2,499 homes should be approved. What happened? This Government talks big about housing and says it wants to deliver more homes right up to the cap that was made because of wastewater concerns in the area. What did the Government do? It did not act on it. A curious and funny thing happened. Morris Iemma is a representative on this for one client who is perhaps not a beneficiary. He did not have a proposal ready to go, but then a curious thing happened. The application did not get approved or signed off by the Housing Delivery Authority, unlike the 29 other applications that the Housing Delivery Authority recommended for approval. Funnily enough, it goes back to—

The Hon. Penny Sharpe: Point of order: This new format for question time does not give members the right to make imputations against others during their contribution to debate.

The PRESIDENT: I would uphold the point of order if it concerned a member of the other place. However, we must remember that parliamentary privilege is exercised by members in this House. The Hon. Scott Farlow is merely exercising parliamentary privilege at this point.

The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW: For some reason, the Housing Delivery Authority revisited this again on 10 October. [*Time expired.*]

The Hon. ROSE JACKSON (Minister for Water, Minister for Housing, Minister for Homelessness, Minister for Mental Health, and Minister for Youth) (11:46): Members should put their tinfoil hats away. There is no conspiracy theory. It is pretty obvious what has happened here. It is unfortunate that a cap had to be placed on housing delivery in south-western Sydney. Why was this unfortunate decision required to be made? Because of the Opposition's infrastructure underinvestment. There is a direct link between that decision and the failure to invest in water, wastewater and transport. Year after year, we are desperately trying—

The Hon. Dr Sarah Kaine: Point of order—

The PRESIDENT: Order! There are too many interjections from Opposition members.

The Hon. Dr Sarah Kaine: The Opposition is clearly very excited about the new standing orders. I cannot hear a word that is being said from the backbench because of the wall of noise. Members have forgotten how to behave in question time because we have some new rules.

The Hon. Mark Latham: We can always hear Rose.

The PRESIDENT: The point of order has significant validity. I have asked members to dial back the volume a number of times today and yesterday. I understand that members are excited about the new format for question time, but I will have no other option than to call members to order if they keep interjecting.

The Hon. ROSE JACKSON: I thank my public school education at Newtown High School of the Performing Arts for the projection I am capable of bringing to this House. To be clear, this cap was put in place because the members opposite underinvested in infrastructure for over a decade, and we are playing catch-up. The Minister for Planning and Public Spaces is trying to get housing moving under the cap. Critically, infrastructure catch-up is happening, but major projects do take time.

The Hon. MARK LATHAM (11:48): The truth is that the development in Appin should not be happening at all. It is a shocking example of unnecessary urban sprawl that will kill koalas. The Government cannot build a whole new suburban space down the Appin Road corridor from Rosemeadow to Appin and not wipe out the remaining koala colony. I am a well-known environmentalist who stands up for koalas.

The Hon. Jeremy Buckingham: Who's this guy? It's Blinky Bill.

The Hon. MARK LATHAM: This is the reality. Listen, Ivan, I am just giving you good advice on how to sort things out.

The Hon. Jeremy Buckingham: That's harsh.

The Hon. MARK LATHAM: You know about killing. Appin should not be happening. It is urban sprawl. I implore the Minns Government to follow the path of Sydney going up, particularly in the inner city. I know it is the direction the Government wants to take. Anything that can be done to stop the urban sprawl from Rosemeadow to Appin should be happening—particularly by ignoring the lobbying advice of Morris Iemma. He now appears to be everywhere for the Inghams—out at Badgerys Creek for a new warehouse development where roads have been realigned, seemingly at public expense, and now at Appin Inghams are getting favourable attention. [*Time expired.*]

The Hon. ROSE JACKSON (Minister for Water, Minister for Housing, Minister for Homelessness, Minister for Mental Health, and Minister for Youth) (11:49): I take up the invitation, provided by the contribution of a member of the crossbench, to talk for another minute about why much of what he has said about the reorienting of the Government towards infill development in areas already supported by infrastructure is valid. I suggest that there is still some scope to support growth in areas of south-west and north-west Sydney where it is supported by infrastructure. But, fundamentally, he makes the point that we need to reorient away from just adding an extra street on the edge of Sydney every week. As a growth plan, that is wrong. He is correct to identify the need for infill development as the focus of our work. That is why I talked about the transport oriented developments—the low- and mid-rise reforms—because they are the foundation of that reorientation. We will continue to ensure that that is where the majority of the uplift and growth occurs. [*Time expired.*]

CRITICAL MINERALS MINING

The Hon. STEPHEN LAWRENCE (11:50): My question is addressed to the Minister for Natural Resources. Will the Minister update the House about new opportunities for critical minerals, including in Western Sydney?

The Hon. Mark Latham: In Western Sydney?

The Hon. COURTNEY HOUSSOS (Minister for Finance, Minister for Domestic Manufacturing and Government Procurement, and Minister for Natural Resources) (11:51): Yes, in Western Sydney. I thank the honourable member for the important question. I take this opportunity to welcome the school students who are on an excursion to Parliament today and encourage them to venture to our Londonderry core library at the WB Clarke Geoscience Centre, which I had the opportunity to visit last week with some years 10, 11 and 12 students from Kingswood High School, who enthusiastically informed me that they were much more interested in earth science as a result of their visit.

We know that critical minerals are crucial for our clean energy future, and our Government's approach is to partner with industry. I have spoken before about geological survey data release partnering with small grants, partnering with our royalties deferral scheme—an Australian first. This is another way we are partnering with industry but also encouraging our students by giving them an insight into it as well. The core library features deposits from all of our existing mines across New South Wales. We know that there are great opportunities in former mine sites and, particularly now, in finding critical minerals in those former mine sites. This is an opportunity. Regularly, I am told, companies are undertaking work analysing the core.

We have invested in the core library to provide a new HyLogger 4. It is an amazing machine—the first of its kind globally—that captures high-resolution images and mineral data at a millimetre scale without destroying the core, which is really important. It helps us pinpoint where critical minerals lie beneath the surface. This is where a number of previous discoveries were made: the Cadia mine deposits discovered by Newcrest; the Hera polymetallic deposit in the Central West; and a range of others— [*Time expired.*]

METROPOLITAN MEMORIAL PARKS CEMETERY SITES

The Hon. TANIA MIHAILUK (11:53): My question is directed to the Treasurer, representing the Minister for Lands and Property, the Hon. Stephen Kamper. A Standing Order 52 motion with respect to Carnarvon Golf Course and Metropolitan Memorial Parks was agreed to in this Chamber on 17 September, requiring the Minister to furnish all documents relating to all organisations that have been engaged with by the Minister with respect to Carnarvon Golf Course being a prospective new cemetery. I note that despite an extension being agreed to, a series of documents are missing, namely, the Lebanese Muslim Association's request via its freshly minted new executive director, Mr Khal Asfour, who wrote to the Minister on 13 August seeking a meeting with the Minister about Carnarvon. The Minister very swiftly obliged, within a matter of two hours, and offered a meeting on 18 August at his office. Can the Treasurer advise why such a disclosure was not included in the returns provided by the Minister on the return date of 8 October or by the extended date of 22 October?

The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY (Treasurer) (11:54): I thank the member for her question. The member asked whether I could provide reasons for the purported non-disclosure of documents related to that particular meeting. The short answer is I cannot, so I will take it on notice and see if I can get the member an answer.

The Hon. TANIA MIHAILUK (11:54): I was wondering where Mr Khal Asfour would end up. I now know that he has ended up at the Lebanese Muslim Association. I did request all documents from the Minister, and I did go and have a look at the empty box that I received from the Minister. I had to look deep inside that box, and at the bottom there was a paper or two—I think a media release and a little ad in Arabic, with Vietnamese on the back, advising people that there was a meeting at the golf course. I am disgusted that this particular documentation has come to me via a concerned resident who made a Government Information (Public Access) Act request and actually got the documents, as opposed to this House getting the documents. And it was in the time frame that the Minister should have provided those documents. What is there to hide? A legitimate meeting—*[Time expired.]*

WHITE SPOT DISEASE

The Hon. NICHOLE OVERALL (11:55): My question is directed to the Minister for Agriculture. Given that the white spot biosecurity order in effect for the Clarence River control zone in New South Wales is due to expire on 9 December 2025, what is the Government's plan for the prawn industry after that expiry, and why has the Minister not communicated that plan to the impacted fishermen and trawler owners?

The Hon. TARA MORIARTY (Minister for Agriculture, Minister for Regional New South Wales, and Minister for Western New South Wales) (11:56): I thank the member for the question. I have talked a very significant amount in this place about the plight of prawn fishers in the Clarence region in dealing with white spot. This issue in fact began under the previous Government, which did nothing to support them. We have a \$21 million package to support the prawn fishers who have been dealing with this issue and biosecurity zones that have been in place almost from the time I started as Minister.

We are calling on the Federal Government to also provide support because, as I have outlined in this House, the reason that the biosecurity order is in place is not so much because of the issues in this part of New South Wales but to protect other States' ability to trade with other countries across the world. It is the New South Wales Government's view, and my view, that prawn fishers in New South Wales should not be punished because of benefits to other States around Australia. I will continue to call on the Federal Government to work with us to provide more support.

In the meantime, we have a \$21 million package in place that has been supporting prawn fishers for a number of years. They are currently receiving income support through part of that package. It has provided a range of support for people to get through this period, including income support. It is true that the order will be lifted—I believe on 9 December. We will continue to work with the prawn fishers about plans for the future because we are consulting with them about what kind of support they would like to see for their future in this part of New South Wales. I have met with them personally. The department is engaging with them on a regular basis, including this week. We will continue to work with those fishers about how they want to get support from us for their future.

The Hon. NICHOLE OVERALL (11:58): If I did not know better, I would swear I was in an episode of *Yes Minister*. That is a masterclass in saying nothing at all but at great length. My goodness, where do we begin? I only have a minute to get through all of the inconsistencies that the Minister has just presented in her statement. We simply want to know what is going to happen come 10 December. Are they going to be able to fish again? That is the first question that the Minister needs to answer. The Minister talked about engaging with the industry and with groups involved in it. According to information I have from the hardworking member for Clarence, Richie Williamson, there has been zero contact in the past four months outside of a text that was sent yesterday at 4.00 p.m. advising them of the compensation payments that should have been received on 1 November 2025 and yet are still nowhere to be seen. *[Time expired.]*

The Hon. TARA MORIARTY (Minister for Agriculture, Minister for Regional New South Wales, and Minister for Western New South Wales) (11:59): I caution the Opposition about reading prepared speeches under these new standing orders. I know the Hon. Nichole Overall is still a new member of this House. I prefer her in this House, rather than in the other House, as I have said before.

[Opposition members interjected.]

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister has the call.

The Hon. TARA MORIARTY: As I have indicated, this has been a longstanding issue that began under the previous Government. Our Government has a \$21 million support package for these prawn fishers, which has been in place for a number of years since I became a Minister in this Government. I have talked about it many times in this House; members can google the *Hansard*. We have been very transparent about supporting these fishers in a very difficult situation and will continue to work with them in the future. *[Time expired.]*

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: The time for questions has expired. If members have further questions I suggest they place them on notice.

FORSTER PUBLIC SCHOOL MUSIC PROGRAM

The Hon. COURTNEY HOUSSOS (Minister for Finance, Minister for Domestic Manufacturing and Government Procurement, and Minister for Natural Resources) (12:00): During question time the Deputy Leader of the Opposition asked me about representations on behalf of teachers at Forster Public School who wanted to implement the Australian Children's Music Foundation [ACMF] program. As the member outlined in question time, the system is working. Parliamentary Secretary Greg Warren responded to correspondence from the Opposition, as I am advised the Parliamentary Secretary did when the Hon. Sarah Mitchell was the Minister. I can update the House that the department is currently developing a 10-year plan for music education in primary schools, in direct response to the recommendations of the joint select committee on creative arts education.

The ACMF has been invited to contribute to a roundtable discussion scheduled for this month, which will help shape future directions in music education across New South Wales. As the member may be aware, funding is allocated to schools through a needs-based model to ensure a fair and transparent system of resources within the public education system. As was the case under the former Minister, principals, in consultation with their staff and school community, are responsible for determining how those funds are best utilised to meet the unique needs of their students. That includes decisions on the structure of music programs, engagement of music professionals and acquisition of curriculum resources.

Supplementary Questions for Written Answers

MINISTERIAL DISCLOSURES

The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE (12:02): My supplementary question for written answer is directed to the Leader of the Government. Has the Premier declared his close personal relationship with his brother in writing? If he has, when was it done, and what steps has he taken to manage the conflict? If not, why, and on what grounds, did he decide it did not meet the threshold?

MINISTERIAL DISCLOSURES

Ms SUE HIGGINSON (12:03): My supplementary question for written answer is directed to the Leader of the Government, representing the Premier. Given the ICAC's guidance that it is not for a Minister to subjectively determine whether they have a conflict of interest, and that the term "private interest" is not limited to financial interests but covers non-pecuniary personal relationships between individuals, will the Leader of the Government provide details of what objective advice the Government has obtained suggesting reforms impacting Corrective Services staff, whom the Premier's family member advocates for, would not have the potential to incur private benefit to the Premier's family member and therefore require disclosure?

Questions Without Notice: Take Note

TAKE NOTE OF ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The Hon. SARAH MITCHELL: I move:

That the House take note of answers to questions.

FORSTER PUBLIC SCHOOL MUSIC PROGRAM

OLIVE OIL INDUSTRY

The Hon. SARAH MITCHELL (12:03): I take note of answers given today and also an answer I received overnight to a supplementary question for written answer. I start with my question to the Minister about Forster Public School and her response. It is not unusual for a Parliamentary Secretary to respond to correspondence.

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

The Hon. SARAH MITCHELL: It is not unusual for that to happen with either party in government. I raised the matter of that specific school because we have a Coalition member who reached out to the Minister about a really important school program in a community that the Minister knows well, and we got a quite dismissive answer back from a Parliamentary Secretary, saying, "The Minister won't have time to meet. She has asked me to respond on her behalf." Sometimes you have to look at what other MPs send you to see if there is something you can do. The reality is school budgets are not what they used to be. There is not enough money for many schools to do some of those extra things to support students. This is not even an extra thing. Music is part of the curriculum. This is a school.

There are representations from teachers at Forster Public School, saying, "This would make a big difference for our students in terms of outcomes." We know the benefits of music education. There was an upper House inquiry that said the same thing. The Minister said, "We are working on a 10-year plan." It is not that hard. When you are working in the education space you should open your door to members of this place who want to talk to you on behalf of their public schools. I did that when I was Minister. I met with many members of the Labor Opposition at the time, and crossbench members as well. Education should be above politics. After today, the Minister should have someone from her office go and knock on Tanya Thompson's door and say, "Come in for 10 minutes. Let's have a chat about the program and see what we can do." That is what we are calling on her to do today.

I also respond briefly to the answer I got from the Hon. Tara Moriarty to my supplementary question for written answer yesterday about the closure of the oils laboratory in Wagga Wagga, and the impact that will have for the olive oil industry and those growers in New South Wales. I asked where the nearest place is that they can go for accreditation when the Wagga lab closes, and what the costs are going to be. I got a one-sentence response. It says, "I am advised the New South Wales Government will continue engage"—not continue to engage—"with industry on the most suitable arrangements to support this accreditation." It is one sentence, and it is not even a properly constructed sentence.

It is not good enough to say to these individuals, "We'll work with you on that." I spoke a lot yesterday about the impacts. A number of people in the industry reached out to me overnight. They need some support. The Minister needs to acknowledge the importance of the corporate knowledge that will be lost when the lab is closed, with no consideration of what it means for the industry. They are not going away. We will keep supporting them. It is important that we get decent answers back. Frankly, a one-sentence response which is not even grammatically correct is pretty embarrassing and appalling. It is what we are used to from the members opposite.

WARATAH SUPER BATTERY

The Hon. JEREMY BUCKINGHAM (12:06): I take note of the answer given today by the Minister for Climate Change, and Minister for the Environment regarding the Waratah Super Battery. I put on the record my continued dismay at the contribution of the Hon. Wes Fang and the National Party in this debate. It is their battery. It is their plan. Now they are throwing rocks at the energy road map and our plans for net zero, to the extent that the National Party has now abandoned net zero. On the ABC last night Dugald Saunders said, "I don't know what net zero means." That is what he said. People are jumping on the bandwagon, saying, "There's 30 per cent of people who are opposed to net zero."

That is the 15 per cent of people who vote for One Nation and the 15 per cent of people who vote for the Coalition. You might notice that number is going down because people have voted with their feet. We have been having climate wars in this country for 20 years and you have lost. Prime Ministers, especially on the conservative side, have been torn down over their failure to properly deal with the industrialisation that we have to undertake. The coal-fired power generators are clapped out. From a kilometre away they look okay, but when you get up close to the Liddell Power Station, it is an absolute burnt-out kettle.

The Hon. Mark Latham: It's closed.

The Hon. JEREMY BUCKINGHAM: Of course it is closed. It closed because it was at the end of its life. What is the cheapest, cleanest technology on the table? Renewables!

The Hon. Susan Carter: Nuclear!

The Hon. JEREMY BUCKINGHAM: Nuclear power? What a joke! China is installing hundreds of gigawatts of electricity every month. This country is doing the same thing. Look at where the world is going. Renewable energy is now providing more energy globally than coal. Those opposite are stuck in the nineteenth century, with coal-fired power generators and a pipedream of nuclear power. Where are you going to put it? Dubbo? Out at Muswellbrook? When Peter Dutton announced the Coalition's nuclear power plan it included earthquake risks. Everyone asked, "What could go wrong?" The answer is the same thing that happened at Fukushima, Chernobyl and Three Mile Island. No-one wants it. Your plan is just a pipedream and a joke.

The Hon. Nichole Overall: Three Mile Island is not in your valley. You don't even know your geography. Give it a rest.

The Hon. JEREMY BUCKINGHAM: Put it in your electorate. Have the courage to say you want it built in your electorate. None of you—

The Hon. Wes Fang: I'd have it in my backyard.

The Hon. JEREMY BUCKINGHAM: We know what your problem is. It is absolute stupidity. It is an electoral and economic dead end.

TIMBER INDUSTRY AND GREAT KOALA NATIONAL PARK

The Hon. MARK BUTTIGIEG (12:10): I take note of the answer given by the Minister for Agriculture to my question regarding support for forestry workers. I congratulate her on the excellent work that she has done to achieve equivalence with the Victorian compensation package, which is what we were lobbying for over the past few months after the fallout from the announcement of the Great Koala National Park, where several workers lost their jobs. It is a very important package. Those opposite were rightly questioning the Government on the compensation package. That is the sort of question that is relevant in this House, as opposed to what we saw yesterday when the Leader of the Opposition tried to conflate Bob Carr's questioning of the Jewish lobby with the recent neo-Nazi protest—but I digress.

I have to say, those opposite were disparaging of the Minister during some of the questions. The fact is, she has delivered. For those who might have forgotten, the compensation package started at four weeks of base pay for every year of service, including employer-based redundancy capped at \$150,000. That is the equivalent of the Victorian compensation package. But members might remember that the unions concerned—the Timber, Furnishing and Textiles Union [TFTU] and the Australian Workers' Union [AWU]—argued for additional support for workers over 45 years of age, on the basis that it is much harder for people over 45 to find a new job. I give a shout-out to TFTU secretary Alison Rudman, who advocated on this strongly, and to Tony Callinan, New South Wales branch secretary of the AWU, who supported that campaign. I note that the Rail, Tram and Bus Union also lent its support to the campaign.

The likelihood of those workers in the timber mills and timber industry being able to find work in a tourism-based industry or to get retrained and find a job in a different industry diminishes from age 45. The ask was for additional support for those over-45 workers, and it has now been delivered—again, courtesy of the agriculture Minister's relentless push to make sure they are adequately compensated. It is not a joking matter. Opposition members come here and ask for those workers to be compensated, but when that compensation is delivered by this Government, they continue to disparage it. The impacted workers are getting three weeks' pay for every year of service if they are over the age of 45, capped at \$50,000. I again thank the unions for campaigning on this. I thank those opposite for asking the question of the Minister, but they should be grateful when she delivers. She has done her job well.

APPIN PRECINCT DEVELOPMENT

The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW (12:13): I take note of answers given today by the Minister for Housing with respect to the Appin housing development. The Minister is right in saying that the dwelling cap is in place for a variety of reasons—wastewater infrastructure being one of them. Nobody is quibbling about the cap, because it is rightfully in place. But we are quibbling with decisions about how the cap is divided up. A proposal went to the Housing Delivery Authority for 2,499 homes—the entire cap within that precinct. It does not exceed the cap; it is a proposal to meet the cap of homes, and it came from one proponent. That proposal was on zoned land, it was ready to go and, most importantly, the Housing Delivery Authority—the planning Minister's troika of independent advisers—said it should be approved. That happened on 29 August. But a funny thing happened on the way to the circus. While the Minister signed off on another 29 recommendations from the Housing Delivery Authority, when State significant developments were declared on 9 September, notably, the proposal for 2,499 homes was missing.

We are not talking about increasing or changing the cap; we are talking about delivering the homes that the Government had envisaged, within the cap. These are homes that can get underway. Evidence is that there are thousands that are ready to be delivered within the housing accord period. But why did the Housing Delivery Authority revisit the proposal on 10 October and only approve 824 homes? That is the question we are trying to get the answer to. The Minister has not told us today whether she had any consultation as part of it. She has quibbled about the cap. There was no discussion about increasing the cap. The question comes down to in whose interest was the decision made?

We know that the other property developer in the area, Ingham Property, is represented by Morris Iemma and that discussions have taken place between Ingham Property and the Premier's Office. We want to know what discussions led to this outcome. If we are going to put our trust in the Housing Delivery Authority, as the Government has asked us to do—and this House has done—and say, "These are independent operators within government, beyond reproach," we must be able to do that all the way. There is precedent, of course, because there was a cap in place in Rhodes. But, funnily enough, there it was fully exhausted.

The Hon. Mark Latham: Yes.

The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW: The Hon. Mark Latham knows much about this. Whereas, in the case of Appin, we have the curious position where the Government has decided on an equitable distribution of the cap rather than it going to one provider in full. There are many questions that need to be answered.

WORKERS COMPENSATION

GREYHOUND RACING NSW INQUIRY

The Hon. MARK LATHAM (12:16): I take note of the answer given today by the Treasurer and express my dismay that he has not apologised to Chris McCann. It would have been basic human decency for the Treasurer to say sorry for ignoring him in his moment of absolute need. I quote from the final paragraph of the email Chris McCann sent to the Treasurer on 30 May 2025:

I was good enough to speak to when you wanted dirt on the Liberal Party and you were prepared to use me to win support for yourself and your party and you have now just discarded me – won't even respond.

This is a clear case of the Treasurer abandoning human decency towards a seriously injured worker, who he will not even apologise to when he is clearly in the wrong. We have a special responsibility to protect whistleblowers. The Treasurer has been inhumane, disgraceful and barbaric in ignoring this man and refusing to apologise to him. I am sure an apology, the word "sorry", would give comfort to Chris McCann in his further moment of need. He says he cannot find employment because he was a whistleblower to the Hon. Daniel Mookhey and no employer will trust him. The Treasurer has a duty of care to Chris McCann and, at a minimum, a responsibility to issue him an apology.

The second matter I take note of concerns the Hon. Emma Hurst's question about greyhound racing. It is true that greyhound racing has undertaken structural reform. Greyhound Racing NSW has a further reform plan, closing some tracks on the advice of Deloitte Australia. I am not too sure I see anyone from Deloitte's all that often at Wentworth Park, but they produced an assessment of the financial viability of greyhound tracks. I say to Greyhound Racing NSW that the current plan to halve the number of tracks in New South Wales is too much too soon. We do not want to give the impression—particularly at Wagga—of going out the back door quickly. It is not an industry that is in distress, or which requires a halving of its track numbers around New South Wales.

It is an industry that has reformed itself, post its temporary closure by the Baird Government. The standards of animal welfare are much higher, and the responsibilities of trainers are much more supreme. The support for and success of the industry is there for people to see. I think rationalisation can be useful, but not on the scale that is being proposed at the moment. We talk about mental illness and the need to give working-class people hope. The night that Ken Burnett's dog Power And Glory took out the big Million Dollar Chase race at Wentworth Park was one full of joy. Everyone celebrated Ken's success. The ultimate battler from Bringelly had tried for 20 years just to get a group winner, and then this wonderful dog won the 2025 Ladbrokes Golden Easter Egg and Million Dollar Chase double. It is an example of how, for a working person, hope matters. The hope of having a good dog—a Zoom Top, a She's A Pearl, or a Power And Glory—gives working people hope. That is what greyhound racing does. It deserves our support. There is a lot of false information about it. We need to be backing working people and the racing of their animals.

NARRABRI WATER SUPPLY

MINISTERIAL DISCLOSURES

The Hon. STEPHEN LAWRENCE (12:19): I take note of answers given by the Minister for Water in response to the question of what the Government is doing to ensure quality drinking water in the north-west of the State, particularly in the Narrabri region. In October last year, PFAS was discovered in two of three bores in the Narrabri region. In recent months, Narrabri was placed on water restrictions as the demand for water increased and concerns about PFAS heightened. I know that the member for Barwon, Roy Butler, is doing a lot of work to address this problem and has been working with the Minister. It is fantastic to note the Government's announcement of allocating \$4 million for a portable water treatment plant for Narrabri. This is a government that is listening, assessing the problem and responding with substantial funding to assist the Narrabri community by providing \$4 million for the portable water treatment plant and scoping for new bores.

I know that the quality of water has been a really troubling issue for the Narrabri community and I have spoken to the mayor about it. The PFAS issue is really concerning people. There are indeed ill effects from PFAS. When the community hears that PFAS has reached an unacceptable level in their water supply, that causes great concern. People worry about those effects on them, but it should be said that the standards of assessing PFAS are very conservative. They are designed to enable communities to sometimes come in and out of compliance. The Narrabri community does not need to be alarmed about the level of PFAS. There is PFAS in two of the three bores, but the Government has responded by making \$4 million available to install a portable water treatment plant and to scope for new bores.

In relation to the supposed conflict of interest between the Premier and Jim Minns, I must say it never seemed clear to me from the beginning how it could possibly be a conflict of interest. Having heard the questions and speeches during question time, I am none the wiser. The media has suggested there is a comparison between Gladys and Daryl and two adult brothers, one of whom is working as a lawyer in the Public Service Association. There is no comparison in those circumstances. The suggestion is completely ridiculous. I sense that the issue has fallen completely flat, as issues often do when people try to bring in family.

MINISTERIAL DISCLOSURES

TIMBER INDUSTRY AND GREAT KOALA NATIONAL PARK

The Hon. WES FANG (12:22): In relation to the contribution to debate by the Hon. Stephen Lawrence, I make the point that it is not for the member to make his position known. ICAC has made its position quite clear, which is that it is not for a Minister to determine whether or not there is a conflict of interest; it is for the Minister to declare it regardless. The Parliamentary Secretary raised the issue of the packages for forestry workers. For the benefit of those watching the parliamentary webcast, at this juncture I will splice in a copy of what the Parliamentary Secretary said in this House today and what the Parliamentary Secretary said a couple of weeks ago. The Parliamentary Secretary previously criticised the Coalition for raising this issue and then praised the Coalition for asking questions.

Regardless of that, the package given to forestry workers is not good enough because the Minister for Agriculture, Minister for Regional New South Wales, and Minister for Western New South Wales said that the package was determined in the last 10 weeks. The Opposition knows the details of the package. The Minister thinks that, by saying it is above the minimum, the Minister and the Government deserve to be congratulated for what they have delivered. Forestry workers on the Mid North Coast have to ask themselves whether the package will compensate them for the loss of their job and what they will do about their future.

The Parliamentary Secretary and the Minister think that providing an extra three weeks per year for forestry workers over the age of 45, but capped at \$50,000, will somehow compensate workers for the loss of a job they have done for their entire working life and that that is in some way adequate. Members of the Coalition take a different view. We think the best thing this Government could have done is kept those workers in their jobs. This Government has not done that. The Government betrayed those workers, the industry and the jobs—and for what? It is so that the Government can get a headline. That is the ultimate betrayal by the Labor Party. [*Time expired.*]

METROPOLITAN MEMORIAL PARKS CEMETERY SITES

BANKSTOWN TAFE

The Hon. TANIA MIHAILUK (12:25): I take note of the answer I received in response to my question from the Treasurer, who was representing the Minister for Lands and Property. The Treasurer said he will take my specific question on notice, but I will very quickly express the reason for my disappointment. A standing order passed by this House imposes so much obligation and duty on a Minister to furnish requested documents. It is very disheartening and a real act of bad faith when a Minister obviously has decided to not provide all of the information and documents that an order obliges them to provide. Through an application made under the Government Information (Public Access) Act by a concerned resident, I have been given documents. The documents that were given to the resident should have been provided to this House. I await the formal response from the Treasurer, but I am disappointed in the manner in which the Minister for Lands and Property has undertaken the process and the lack of respect by not providing all the documents that I very clearly stated in the request.

I will make some comments relating to the questions I have continually placed on notice about Bankstown TAFE. I will not stop speaking about this issue. It distresses me greatly. I have given the Minister for Skills, TAFE and Tertiary Education a lot of information. I have asked questions relating to Bankstown TAFE being transferred to the site of the Western Sydney University and the commercial arrangements the Minister and his department have entered into. The Government is offering the university \$25 million in a "three by one by one" lease arrangement whereas the university—and this is not an exaggeration—pays only \$1 each year to the Canterbury-Bankstown Council for the use of the university's site in the centre of the Bankstown CBD. I am shocked that the Minister has not used powers under section 32C and section 32D of the Western Sydney University Act to request information on the university's commercial activity. To this date, the Minister still has not done that. Instead, the Minister has agreed to a lease whereby the university pays nothing, but the Government pays \$25 million to the university.

NARRABRI WATER SUPPLY WARATAH SUPER BATTERY

The Hon. CAMERON MURPHY (12:28): I first take note of the answer given by the Minister for Water. I am very encouraged by the Government's strong response to the PFAS contamination of bore water in Narrabri by providing \$4 million. I reflect on the good work of the Select Committee on PFAS Contamination in Waterways and Drinking Water Supplies Throughout New South Wales, which I sat on with the Hon. Scott Barrett. The committee heard evidence about PFAS contamination in various areas of the State such as the Blue Mountains and Newcastle. PFAS is pervasive; it is everywhere. The important thing is that the Government is willing to do what it takes to resolve water contamination. This Government has done that in Narrabri and will continue to do it in the other areas that are affected by PFAS contamination.

PFAS is terrible. I learnt some extraordinary things about it during the inquiry. It is in everything. It is in carpet and curtains. However, what horrified me the most was that it is also found in the film that coats the inside of microwave popcorn packets. It goes straight into the food that parents unknowingly give to their kids. There ought to be proper warnings and controls over the use of PFAS in consumer items like that. It is ridiculous and it ought to change, now that people are aware of it.

I also take note of the response from the Minister for Energy in relation to renewables and the Waratah battery. The fact that The Nationals have no policy whatsoever regarding renewables is ridiculous. I do not know what their proposition is. It seems to be "Maybe we'll use small modular reactors. Maybe we'll have nuclear power. Maybe it'll be ready by 2100, or 2150." We need to replace the retired coal-fired power plants, and we need to do it now. The only way to do that is with renewable energy, which this Government is rolling out. This Government has a plan to lower power prices by putting in renewable energy infrastructure. The Nationals' plan is to do absolutely nothing. [*Time expired.*]

WHITE SPOT DISEASE

The Hon. NICHOLE OVERALL (12:31): I come back to episode two of our very own version of *Yes Minister*—the Minister for Agriculture, and Minister for Western New South Wales has some favourite lines that are about as scripted but not as funny. If we have to hear one more time "We're taking it seriously" or "We're looking into it"—that is, yet another review—or "We've been talking to someone somewhere", although apparently who that is—

The Hon. Tara Moriarty: The Government's talking to the industry.

The Hon. NICHOLE OVERALL: Really? Not for four months have you been talking to the industry in this situation. Commercial fishermen, businesspeople and families that are being devastated do not know what will happen come 10 December. All the Minister can do is hark back to what the previous Government did or did not do—

The Hon. Tara Moriarty: Nothing.

The Hon. NICHOLE OVERALL: Exactly. Thank you for the interjection.

The Hon. Tara Moriarty: You—your Government.

The Hon. NICHOLE OVERALL: Nothing, which is precisely what the Government is offering. It is 2½ years later. Let us talk about that. There has been no communication and no engagement and there is still no money, despite that it was due on 1 November 2025. What is the date today? When will the Minister provide a plan? When will the Minister give those businesspeople and families some certainty so that they can deal with what is going on? Although I referenced a comedy, the current situation is not a comedy. It is real life, and real people are involved in incredibly difficult circumstances. They are being left with mental health problems. I have been advised that some of them have had to use antidepressant medication for the first time. It is not good enough. The Minister needs to step up and answer the question the member for Clarence has asked.

The Hon. Tara Moriarty: No, I don't.

The Hon. NICHOLE OVERALL: Yes, you do. He has reached out to the Minister to get information about her plan. What is the Minister doing—

The ASSISTANT PRESIDENT (The Hon. Peter Primrose): Order! Pursuant to standing orders debate is interrupted to allow the Minister to respond.

TAKE NOTE OF ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The Hon. TARA MORIARTY (Minister for Agriculture, Minister for Regional New South Wales, and Minister for Western New South Wales) (12:34): That was embarrassing. I would encourage Opposition members to check the facts and read *Hansard* to understand what is actually going on before being handed incorrect information. They merely follow a script but they think they are raising issues. They are completely wrong. It is embarrassing. I am loving the new sessional orders for question time. I hope that they continue forever because question time is incredibly important for getting information into the public domain. The Government takes question time very seriously. It really flushes out how little those opposite know about what is going on across regional New South Wales and how little the Coalition Government did when it was in power for 12 long years. In relation to white spot disease, I have talked about it many times in this place.

The Hon. Nichole Overall: You have talked about it, and that's about it.

The Hon. TARA MORIARTY: Again, I would encourage the member to check the facts before she comes into the House and makes a fool of herself. There is a \$21 million package to support people who are in a very difficult situation. I have met with them personally a number of times. The Government is working closely with the fishers to support them with this package.

The ASSISTANT PRESIDENT (The Hon. Peter Primrose): Order! Opposition members will cease interjecting.

The Hon. TARA MORIARTY: There is a continuing package of income support for this period, until the order is lifted in December. Rather than imposing an instruction upon fishers, this Government is discussing with them the future they want to see and what kind of assistance the Government can provide. It may be a novel approach for those opposite—that I, as the Minister, actually go out and talk to people. I do not rely on getting handwritten notes from departments, staffers or anybody else. I actually go out and engage with people across regional New South Wales to make sure that the Government is listening to what they need and what the Government can do to support them as they deal with significant biosecurity issues.

I also take note of the question relating to forestry and the timber industry. Again, those opposite make a lot of noise about it but for the 12 years that they were in government they did nothing to support or secure an industry that they now pretend to be passionate about. There were no plans, no support and no certainty for these workers. This Government is getting on with what it told the community it would deliver, which is the Great Koala National Park. It is supporting workers, some of whom, unfortunately, as a result of the creation of the park, are being made redundant. There is a significant support package in place for them, as I outlined earlier today. The Government will continue to support them alongside industry. Again, I am loving the new sessional orders. They are really flushing out how much work the Government is doing to engage with the community, how little the Opposition knows and how little it did when it was in power.

The ASSISTANT PRESIDENT (The Hon. Peter Primrose): The question is that the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

*Deferred Answers***PSYCHIATRY WORKFORCE**

In reply to **the Hon. SUSAN CARTER** (22 October 2025).

The Hon. ROSE JACKSON (Minister for Water, Minister for Housing, Minister for Homelessness, Minister for Mental Health, and Minister for Youth)—The Minister provided the following response:

I am advised:

The forecasted cost is around \$20 million in financial year 2025-26 and rising higher in financial year 2026-27.

After 12 years of unfair wage suppression, the Minns Labor Government are now delivering a meaningful wage increase to our Staff Specialist Psychiatrists in recognition of the crucial work they do.

The New South Wales Government has always committed to upholding the decision of the NSW Industrial Relations Commission and will now work to implement this wage rise immediately.

PSYCHIATRY WORKFORCE

In reply to **the Hon. SUSAN CARTER** (22 October 2025).

The Hon. ROSE JACKSON (Minister for Water, Minister for Housing, Minister for Homelessness, Minister for Mental Health, and Minister for Youth)—The Minister provided the following response:

I am advised:

The collation of vacancy numbers is a manual process, and therefore are only reflective of a single point in time.

As at September 2025, there were 257.4 FTE Staff Specialist Psychiatrists.

As at September 2025, there were approximately 317 FTE VMO psychiatrists.

Between September 2024 and September 2025, Staff Specialists Psychiatrists decreased by 68.2 FTE. There was a corresponding increase of VMO hours equivalent to 100 FTE over the same period - with a component of this additional VMO FTE comprising of staff specialists who resigned and are now working as VMOs.

POLICE PROSECUTIONS

In reply to **the Hon. ROD ROBERTS** (11 November 2025).

The Hon. TARA MORIARTY (Minister for Agriculture, Minister for Regional New South Wales, and Minister for Western New South Wales)—The Minister provided the following response:

I am advised:

The review was prepared by the NSW Police Force and is currently being considered by the Government. The review contains information and recommendations to Cabinet for legislative reform, which is Cabinet-in-Confidence.

Written Answers to Supplementary Questions

HOUSING AND PRODUCTIVITY CONTRIBUTION SCHEME

In reply to **the Hon. SCOTT FARLOW** (11 November 2025).

The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY (Treasurer)—The Minister provided the following response:

The Infrastructure Opportunities Plans will be released in due course.

OLIVE OIL INDUSTRY

In reply to **the Hon. SARAH MITCHELL** (11 November 2025).

The Hon. TARA MORIARTY (Minister for Agriculture, Minister for Regional New South Wales, and Minister for Western New South Wales)—The Minister provided the following response:

I am advised:

The New South Wales Government will continue engage with industry on the most suitable arrangements to support this accreditation.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE DEMONSTRATION

In reply to **Ms SUE HIGGINSON** (11 November 2025).

The Hon. TARA MORIARTY (Minister for Agriculture, Minister for Regional New South Wales, and Minister for Western New South Wales)—The Minister provided the following response:

I am advised:

The Police Area Command in which the planned protest activity is occurring is the command responsible for the operation. Central Metropolitan Command were the responsible command for planning and managing Saturday's event. The Counter Terrorism and Special Tactics Command, which includes the Engagement and Hate Crime Unit, became aware of the planned activity on 28 October 2025 when Central Metropolitan Command distributed a briefing note of the Form 1, as is standard procedure. The Counter Terrorism and Special Tactics Command supported the Central Metropolitan Command, who had operational responsibility for the event, through the provision of intelligence on the group "White Australia" and the availability of our Public Order and Riot Squad. Deputy Commissioner Hudson was not notified prior to the event.

Bills

FINES LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL 2025

First Reading

Bill received from the Legislative Assembly, read a first time and ordered to be published on motion by the Hon. Tara Moriarty, on behalf of the Hon. Daniel Mookhey.

The Hon. TARA MORIARTY: According to standing order, I table a statement of public interest.

Statement of public interest tabled.

The Hon. TARA MORIARTY: According to standing order, I declare the bill to be an urgent bill.

The ASSISTANT PRESIDENT (The Hon. Peter Primrose): The question is that the bill be considered an urgent bill.

Declaration of urgency agreed to.

The Hon. TARA MORIARTY: I move:

That the second reading of the bill stand as an order of the day for a later hour of the sitting.

Motion agreed to.

The ASSISTANT PRESIDENT (The Hon. Peter Primrose): I shall now leave the chair. The House will resume at 2.00 p.m.

*Private Members' Statements***NSW AMBULANCE COMMISSIONER**

The Hon. ROD ROBERTS (14:01): It is an expectation that witnesses who attend budget estimates hearings will provide answers that are truthful and accurate. That belief is not simply due to professional courtesy; it is bound by the Parliamentary Evidence Act 1901 and the Premier's Memorandum M2017-01. Imagine my shock then when, at the previous two Health portfolio budget estimates hearings, the NSW Ambulance Commissioner gave evidence that was incorrect at best and misleading at worst. My questions related to the modelling used to assign paramedics to Goulburn and Lithgow ambulance stations. Those questions should not have taken Dr Morgan by surprise. The paramedic resourcing at Goulburn has been raised over the past 12 months, with representations from the Health Services Union and members of both Houses, including the Hon. Bob Nanva and me, that paramedics have considerable concerns that Dr Morgan has strayed from the design and intent of the strategy to add 500 paramedics in regional and rural New South Wales.

The House had also, under Standing Order 52, received documents that described the modelling that has left Goulburn with a staffing shortfall, so I was alarmed that Dr Morgan provided answers no less than 11 times that fell short of the evidence. Allow me to provide two brief examples. On 27 February 2025 I asked Dr Morgan regarding the allotment of paramedics, "Was there consultation with regional communities?" He replied, "Yes, the consultation does occur at the local level you are referring to." However, the documentation provided under Standing Order 52 found zero evidence of community consultation. Secondly, regarding staffing and ambulance travel time, I asked on 21 August 2025:

... Lithgow got 17 new paramedics under the allocation and Goulburn got five. How does your modelling work there when, as I said—

Lithgow performs only 64 per cent of the workload that Goulburn does? Dr Morgan answered:

... Lithgow is 48 minutes away from its major hospital down at Penrith, compared to 23 minutes—

for Goulburn. He also stated, "It is basically 54 minutes from Lithgow to the next closest station. It's a very long way away." Sadly, once again the good doctor was incorrect. Goulburn's nearest major hospital is Canberra, which is 68 minutes away. That is double the time he quoted. The closest station to Lithgow is Katoomba, which is 36 minutes away and not the 54 minutes he quoted. His evidence was inaccurate and misleading.

I am not sure if Dr Morgan has deliberately misled Parliament, but the commissioner is no fool. He has a Master of Business Administration. One would expect that that qualification would include the topics of legal and regulatory compliance. Surely that includes providing accurate answers during budget estimates hearings. The men and women of NSW Ambulance provide a first-rate service to our community. They deserve adequate resourcing and staffing. As I close, it is worth noting that Danielle North has resigned as executive director of regional operations at Ambulance Victoria, a month after suggestions that she misled a parliamentary inquiry. Statements made under oath have consequences.

YASS WALK AGAINST DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE

The Hon. CAMERON MURPHY (14:04): I express my support and commendation for the forthcoming walk against domestic and family violence to be held in Yass on Friday 5 December 2025, organised by Rotary Club of Yass in partnership with Yass police. Participants will assemble at the Yass Police Station at 10.15 a.m. before proceeding along Comur Street and concluding with a community barbecue at Coronation Park. The first walk in Yass was held in 2024 and was a great success in uniting the local community against domestic and family violence. That is part of a broader call to action by Rotary clubs across Australia and New Zealand for more to be done to prevent domestic violence and provide support for victim-survivors.

Their advocacy on the issue began after Rotarian Mr Dave Harmon from the Rotary Club of Ballina-on-Richmond organised the first such walk in Ballina in 2019, following the 2018 death of a friend's sister who was murdered by her partner in front of her three children. Community members, leaders and police walking alongside one another sends a powerful message that domestic violence is not welcome in our community. Rotary is adding its voice to the chorus of many taking action to help prevent such tragedies occurring in future. Family

and domestic violence remains one of the most serious social problems in Australia, and the statistics are confronting.

According to the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare in September 2024, one in four women and one in 14 men had experienced violence from an intimate partner since the age of 15. Domestic violence is one of the key drivers of homelessness among women and children. It crosses all boundaries: race, age, financial status, education, gender and geography. I sincerely commend the Rotary Club of Yass on organising the walk, and the hard work of Mr Simon Quarrell and his colleagues in addressing this most important issue. I encourage all members of the House and the community who are able to attend to do so to show their support for this very worthy cause. Together we can say no to domestic and family violence and build a safer, more respectful society for all.

EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING AWARDS

The Hon. SARAH MITCHELL (14:07): I had the pleasure of attending the 2025 Excellence in Teaching and World Teachers' Day awards on Friday 31 October, hosted by the Teachers' Guild of NSW. It was a wonderful opportunity to recognise the commitment of our teachers and educators in all sectors across the State, their hard work and achievements, and the contribution that they make to young people's lives. Almost 500 guests, including teachers and their supporters, attended the event. For 133 years, the guild has celebrated their service, supporting educators with their aim "to promote, in all possible ways, the care of education". I thank and acknowledge the president of the Teachers' Guild of NSW, Dr Frederick Osman, for organising a wonderful evening. I also acknowledge some of the award recipients. I congratulate the guest of honour, Iris Nastasi, who is the principal of Rosebank College. She was awarded the main award of the evening, the 2025 Phyllis Evans Medal, for her many years of dedication to education in this State.

The Phyllis Evans Medal is a very prestigious award and Iris is the perfect recipient for such an honour. She is the long-serving headmistress of Rosebank College, and worked as the principal of Clancy Catholic College, where she led the college from its first HSC experience to become a high-performing learning community in 2017. Iris was awarded the Australian Council for Educational Leadership NSW Leadership Award in 2018 and the ACEL NSW Fellowship in 2022. Notably, in 2023 she was awarded the Honorary Fellowship of the Teachers' Guild Award of NSW. She has also contributed in many ways to educational governance, including being on the NSW Education Standards Authority Board and the Gonski Institute advisory board. She is currently the President of the Association of Catholic School Principals. Her speech was absolutely phenomenal. It is available on YouTube, and I encourage members to look at it. She spoke a lot about her journey as an educator, being born and growing up in Ireland, coming to Australia, and the influence of her family and particularly her grandmother. She was a very deserving recipient of the acknowledgement.

I also want to touch on the more than 100 teachers and educators who were acknowledged on that evening. I seek leave to have the Teachers' Guild of NSW 2025 World Teachers' Day Award Recipients incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Fellowships - Recognising outstanding educators who have made major contributions both within their mainstream sphere of work and more broadly across the profession

Dr Ken Edge, FTGN

Cindy Gardiner, FTGN

Dr Noel Hanna, FTGN

Joanne Kirby, FTGN

Dr Pauline Kohlholf, FTGN

Associate Professor Erin Mackenzie, FTGN

Emma Mansfield, FTGN

Dr Russell Olwell, FTGN

Dr Ari Pinar, FTGN

Dr Mahendra Samarawickrama, FTGN

Margaret Shepherd, FTGN

Dr Ken Silburn, FTGN

Louise Wallace-Richards, FTGN

Sarah Warby, FTGN

Matthew Woolaston, FTGN

Awards For Teachers in Their Early Years of Teaching - for outstanding Primary and Secondary teachers in NSW

Elizabeth Anderson-Gingold, Redlands

Elise Bond, Arndell Anglican College

Tara Harman, The Scots College

Yuna Kato, The Hills Grammar School

Alessandrio Lettieri, Freeman Catholic College

Cody McDonald, St Johns College Dubbo

Benjamin Moore, St Andrews Cathedral

Danielle Nichols, The Hills Grammar School

Kate Noack, Ravenswood School

Alisha Phoonie, Orara High School

Elessa Stivaktas, Thomas Hassall Anglican College

Alissa Warren, Loreto Kirribilli

The Research Award - Offered to a Postgraduate and/or Experienced teacher in NSW, who is currently completing or completed outstanding research of direct benefit to classroom teaching

Michelle Cheung, University of Sydney

Alexandra Harper, Western Sydney University

Bronwyn Lobsey, Pacific Hills Christian School *

Ros Moore, University of Technology Sydney

Nadene O'Neill, Trinity Grammar Preparatory School

Karen Yager, The Hills Grammar School

Amy Young, Barker College

World Teachers' Recognition Awards - Honouring teachers with the World Teachers' Recognition Certificate who have made a wonderful contribution to their school in advancing the education profession

Rohan Abbott, Taree High School

Rosanna Algeri, Rosebank College

Sean Alste, OneSchool Global Berwick Campus

Ben Andrews, Bishop Druitt College

Shona Apostolatos, Oxley College Junior School

Rachel Asher, Merrylands East Public School

Amelia Asquith, Merrylands East Public School

Charbel Assaf, Wenona School

Earnist Attaalla, Southern Cross Catholic College

Chloe Baumann, Sarah Redfern High School

Kristie Baxter, Picton High School

Catherine Berry, Penrith Selective High School

Carly Biddolph, Wenona School

Daniel Brattoni, St Paul's Catholic College, Greystanes

Joanne Brian, Marsden Park Anglican College

Suzanne Bridge, Rooty Hill Public School

Kayla Brogan, St Andrews College

Fiona Byrne, Thomas Hassall Anglican College

Tracey Cameron, Northern Beaches Christian School

George Camilleri, Prairiewood High School

Jessica Carr, St. Andrew's Cathedral School

Kylie Carroll, Rosebank College
Melissa Cash, St Paul's Catholic College, Greystanes
Carmelina Catanzariti, Freeman Catholic College
Adam Catchpole, Cranbrook School
Min Chen, St. Andrew's Cathedral School
Antonio Chiappetta, St Andrews College
Linda Chiba, Presbyterian Ladies' College Sydney
Garin Clarke, Our Lady of the Sacred Heart Catholic Primary School Randwick
Jessica Clarke, OneSchool Global Goulburn Campus
Emma Clemens, St Andrew's Cathedral School
Katherine Coady, North Sydney Boys High School
Julie Coleman, OneSchool Global Mt Victoria Campus
Rachael Cosentino, St. Andrew's Cathedral School
Jennifer Coupland, Model Farms High School
Iain Cowan, OneSchool Global Sydney Campus
Leisha Cox-Barlow, Sarah Redfern High School
Grace Denny, St. Andrew's Cathedral School
Dr John De Nobile, Macquarie University
Usha Deo, Homebush Boys High School
Leena Dib, St Paul's Catholic College, Greystanes
Annalisa Di Bella, Rosebank College
Annette DiFilippo, Freeman Catholic College
Natalie Dinjar, Thomas Hassall Anglican College
Belinda Dodd, Picton High School
Jennifer Dove, Marist Sisters' College Woolwich
Flynn Drego, Freeman Catholic College, Bonnyrigg Heights
Marcel El Hachem, Rosebank College
Melissa Else, Emmaus Catholic College, Kemps Creek
Emma Forbes, Brigidine College St Ives
Monika Frolich, St Mary and St Mina's Coptic Orthodox College
Jacob Fryatt, Taree High School
Francis Fu, Brigidine College St Ives
Alice Fullerton, Thirlmere Public School
Jen Gair, PLC Sydney
Matthias Galanyi, Presbyterian Ladies' College Sydney
Tosca Galluzzo, Sydney Catholic Schools Head Office
Jade Gillett, St John the Apostle Catholic School, Narrabeena
Carla Giuliani Bruno, Freeman Catholic College, Bonnyrigg Heights
Georgina Goddard, St. Andrew's Cathedral School
Jo Golotta-Maxwell, Presbyterian Ladies' College, Sydney
Good Samaritan Catholic College and St Joseph Trade Skills Centre, Hinchinbrook
Libby Goode, Brigidine College St Ives
Rhonda Goodenough, Rosebank College
Francine Guajardo, Sacred Heart Catholic Primary School Cabramatta
Rachel Guirguis, Mamre Anglican School
Fiona Harris, Bishop Druitt College

Dominique Haynes, St. Andrew's Cathedral School
Nicole Higgins, Taree High School
Jessica Holding, Rosebank College
Darren Hughes, Freeman Catholic College
Vanessa Ingram, Yanderra Public School
Rebekah Irwin, Mamre Anglican School
Stephen Jabaji, Georges River Grammar
Michelle Johns, Marist Sisters' College Woolwich
Vanessa Johnston, Marsden Park Anglican College
Josilin Kalifa, St Andrews College
Sarah Kemp, Jerrabomberra Primary School
Travis Kolek, St Andrews College
Lucy Krstic Baroni, Freeman Catholic College, Bonnyrigg Heights
Penny Laidlaw, Picton High School
Helen Laidler, The Hills Grammar School
Nina Laureti, Freeman Catholic College
Tara Lawson, Penrith Selective High School
Kelly Lees, Oxley College Junior School
Kayla Lewis, Bishop Druitt College
Anika Leydon, Mamre Anglican School
Janaya Long, Jerrabomberra Primary School
Maria Lonie, St Paul's Catholic College, Greystanes
Nyree Lovett, Brigidine College St Ives
Sara Maffei, Rosebank College
Sam Maker, Bishop Druitt College
Emily Mariglis, Rosebank College
Laura Marshall, Marist Sisters' College Woolwich
David Matheson, Southern Cross Catholic College
Michelle McCallum, Freeman Catholic College, Bonnyrigg Heights
Katharine McDonald, St Andrews College
Jennifer McKinley, Southern Cross Catholic College
Jason Miezis, NSW Department of Education, Eastern Creek Principals Network
Miller Technology High School, Miller
Maria Mollace, Rosebank College
Ros Moore, William Clarke College
Thomas Moore, St Paul's Catholic College, Greystanes
Molly Moyes, Wollongong High School of the Performing Arts
Restu Mufanti, MTC Future Ready
Jaya Nand, Sarah Redfern High School
Robert Naumoski, St. Mary and St. Mina's Coptic Orthodox College
Lucena Neal, Marsden Park Anglican College
Lili Negrine, Marist Sisters' College Woolwich
Danielle Nevin, Emmaus Catholic College, Kemps Creek
Nadine Newth, The Hills Grammar School
Erica Nguyen, Merrylands East Public School
Mary Nicola, St Mary and St Mina's Coptic Orthodox College

Keira Nightingale, Marist Catholic College North Shore
Caroline O'Hare, St Andrews College
Jacob Parker, North Sydney Boys High School
Rochelle Payton-Clark, Taree High School
Andrew Phillips, Mamre Anglican School
Elizabeth Picchio, Freeman Catholic College, Bonnyrigg Heights
Vita Pittavino, Sacred Heart Catholic Primary School Cabramatta
Darika Pose, The Hills Grammar School
Ian Preston, Murrumbidgee Regional High School – Griffith
Sonia Qin, Wenona School
Michelle Raft, Thomas Hassall Anglican College
Amy Ramisch, The Hills Grammar School
Morgan Reason, Picton High School
Anna Rees, Northern Beaches Christian School
Lauren Reeves, The Hills Grammar School
Karla Regan, Rooty Hill Public School
Rise and Shine Kindergarten Centres, Blacktown, Haberfield, Menai, Rydalmere, Kogarah, Carlton, Marrickville, Sylvania, Summer Hill and Appletree
Bill Robson, St Andrews College
Cameron Rodgers, Sarah Redfern High School
William Rogers, Mamre Anglican School
Stefania Ross, North Sydney Boys High School
Valanto Rossides, Presbyterian Ladies' College Sydney
Anastasia Roy-McGrath, St. Andrew's Cathedral School
Danniella Saad, St Paul's Catholic College, Greystanes
Kate Sampson, Northern Beaches Christian School
Matthew Scouller, Wenona School
Daniel Sellen, Mamre Anglican School
Anthony Sharman, St. Andrew's Cathedral School
Jaie Skinner, Emmaus Catholic College, Kemps Creek
Matt Smith, Northern Beaches Christian School
Julia Smithurst, Taree High School
Ingrid Smolka, Rosebank College
Melissa Sokol, Wenona School
Grace Spurr, Marist Sisters' College Woolwich
Raylene Starke, Taree High School
Adam Stewart, Sarah Redfern High School
Vanessa Stewart, Wenona School
Maria Stojoski, Rosebank College
Tom Stubbs, Sarah Redfern High School
Lyndal Tait, Inaburra School
EJ Tao, The Hills Grammar School
Andrew Tate, Wenona School
Kahlie Taouk, Southern Cross Catholic College
Artemis Theodoris, Kingsgrove High School
Kelly Thompson, St Andrews College

Domenica Todaro, Sacred Heart Catholic Primary School Cabramatta
Samantha Touma, Sacred Heart Catholic Primary School Cabramatta
Veronica Trainor, Rosebank College
Nick Tsoukatos, Cranbrook School
Uplift Education, Liverpool
Karel Vaclavik, Freeman Catholic College, Bonnyrigg Heights
Alex Vo, St Paul's Catholic College, Greystanes
Diana Vocisano, Freeman Catholic College
Mira Voon, St. Mary and St. Mina's Coptic Orthodox College
Linda Walburn, Loreto Kirribilli
Shayne Walsh, Picton High School
Cathy Wanganga, Arise Christian College
Cheryl White, Our Lady of the Sacred Heart Catholic Primary School Randwick
Tanya Whiticker, Rosebank College
Daniel Wong, William Clarke College
Vian Yousef, St Paul's Catholic College, Greystanes

The Hon. SARAH MITCHELL: There were four main areas in which people's achievements were highlighted, and I will very quickly mention the awards. The fellowships recognise outstanding educators who have made major contributions both within their mainstream sphere of work and more broadly across the profession. There were awards for teachers in the early years of teaching. The research award is for postgraduate or experienced teachers doing outstanding research to directly benefit classroom teaching, and the World Teachers' Recognition Awards are for those who are advancing the education profession. It was a wonderful night. I thank Miller Technology High School for its performance and all the colleagues in the room, celebrating our fantastic teachers.

SIMEON BOIKOV

The Hon. JOHN RUDDICK (14:10): I inform the House about the plight of Simeon Boikov, also known as the Aussie Cossack. Simeon was born in Sydney, the son of a Russian Orthodox priest. He attended Trinity Grammar School and later had a construction business. I had never heard of Simeon until he took the lead in organising anti-lockdown protests. Many tens of thousands of the best people took to the streets to end the insanity of COVID-mania. Others were involved, but Simeon deserves the most credit for having the courage and logistical know-how to make those protests a success.

During the protests, Simeon ridiculed our political leaders and the police for treating us like farm animals over a slightly worse than usual flu. At one protest, Simeon went off topic and mentioned a criminal court case coming up where the defendant was accused of paedophilia. Simeon named the defendant. That was a breach of a suppression order. Simeon was sentenced to 10 months in Silverwater and Long Bay, the heaviest sentence for a suppression order breach in Australian history. Since he was too smart to take the warp speed vax, he served four months, mostly in solitary confinement.

Why did Simeon take an especial interest in that paedophile case? Firstly, he had a family member who was a victim of the paedophile. Secondly, he had collated a ton of evidence showing that the accused paedophile had molested many more. Simeon had gone to the police repeatedly and urged an investigation. Eventually, they listened to this whistleblower and opened an investigation. That paedophile, 71-year-old Alexis Rosentool, was recently sentenced to 19 years. Thank you, Simeon.

Simeon was released after four months but, while inside, he was shackled in an orange jumpsuit because he was deemed a "national security inmate", on par with al-Qaeda, all over a suppression order. That was malice. Released on parole, he told authorities that his intention was to go to Russia as soon as permissible. He went to a winter clothing shop near Town Hall, and there he saw a small pro-Ukraine rally. He wandered over and, being reasonably high profile, a man physically hit him, absolutely unprovoked. Simeon pushed him away, but the man sadly fell over and hit his head, and an ambulance came. Fearing more unfairness from police, Simeon made the fateful decision to go to the Russian consulate in Woollahra.

Simeon and his wife have now been cooped up in that consulate for over 1,000 days. They are expecting their first child shortly. I visited Simeon there once. It was a welfare check on a mate. It is a drab, old, Soviet-style building, and he is effectively in solitary confinement. He is fearful of leaving the consulate, being arrested, being returned to jail and, again, being subject to unfair legal malice—revenge for him being right on COVID and the political class being wrong. Simeon is politically passionate, but he is a good-natured guy and good company. He is not violent. Surely, he deserves some leniency for his critical role in the paedophile matter and the fact he has well and truly served time, albeit in an unorthodox manner. I hereby plead with the Attorney General to find a way to end this sorry saga.

NEWCASTLE BUS WORKERS

The Hon. BOB NANVA (14:13): Bus workers in Newcastle are currently in dispute with the private operators of Newcastle buses, Keolis Downer, over a new enterprise agreement. Members of the Rail, Tram and Bus Union [RTBU] have been taking a range of industrial actions over recent weeks, which do not disrupt commuters but do include workers donning a range of French-themed items, including red berets featuring the RTBU logo. The berets have attracted a lot of local attention and some curious discussion. Were the berets a reference to the operator's French parent company Keolis? Or perhaps they were a tribute to the French heritage of NSW Tram and Bus Divisional Secretary, David Babineau? Either way, the actions highlighted the fact that a public service, which was delivered by a public entity for many years, was privatised by the former State Government and is now in the hands of an overseas-based operation.

The privatisation of Newcastle buses was opposed the Labor Party at the time and, in government, we have pledged to end the practice of selling off important public services—no more privatisations of hospitals or energy assets and no sale of Sydney Water. The former Government tried to justify the privatisation of public assets by calling it "asset recycling". The choice of words was important, because most people view recycling as a good thing—it is prudent and responsible. But rebranding privatisation as asset recycling is misleading, because the assets are not recycled. They are sold or contracted out to private entities whose only interest is to squeeze the return on their investment.

Privatisation turns the provision of public goods into the accumulation of private wealth. Sadly, we have seen the consequences of the privatisation fetish play out on our transport networks over many years. The Bus Industry Taskforce found that the franchising of the former Sydney bus regions saw contracts go to low-cost bids, which eroded the sustainability and damaged the reputation of the bus industry. One way the franchising experiment has backfired is through the failure of private operators to attract and retain bus drivers. If we do not pay our drivers enough, we will not attract enough drivers to deliver the timetable, and the reliability and punctuality of services will suffer. Unwinding the mess in transport left behind by the previous Government takes time, but significant progress has already been made. I commend the Minister for Transport and the Minister for Regional Transport for the work they are doing. Most importantly, the era of privatisation is over and, under this Government, it is not coming back.

The PRESIDENT: Before I call the Hon. Scott Farlow, I say this to the Chamber: There has been a longstanding tradition in this place that adjournment speeches are heard in silence. My very strong view is that private members' statements should follow exactly the same precedent, and I ask members to observe that from this point forward.

HUNTER REGION ECONOMY

The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW (14:17): As the shadow Minister for the Hunter, I am proud to speak up for a region that is Australia's largest regional economy, generating a GDP of over \$60 billion and driving roughly 28 per cent of New South Wales's regional economic output. I never speak to people in the Hunter without hearing requests for that region to have its fair share. The Hunter has a deep history, unmatched resilience and extraordinary potential. But potential, as we know, is worthless without the vision and the will to unlock it.

Last week Leader of the Opposition Mark Speakman and I had the opportunity to visit two of those potential enablers in the Hunter. They are the physical and economic gateways to the region—the Port of Newcastle and Newcastle international airport. These are not just pieces of infrastructure; they are two great, underutilised keys to a diversified, prosperous and secure future for the Hunter. The Hunter has the potential to become Australia's premier gateway, not just for today but also for the next 100 years. In visiting the Port of Newcastle, the Leader of the Opposition and I were able to witness a global gateway in action, which plays a hugely important role in our exports and has the opportunity to play an even bigger role in the future. Whether it is the millions of tonnes of coal that are exported from the port or the renewables infrastructure that is imported into the port, it is part of our energy transformation in this State.

Trade through the port is worth about \$48 billion to the national economy each year, yet its deepwater channel is operating at only half capacity. The private sector—the port operators—have cleared the decades-old financial hurdles to build the multipurpose deepwater container terminal, a privately funded, \$2.4 billion project. That terminal is ready to go. It will create over 19,000 new jobs and save New South Wales regional businesses hundreds of dollars per container by bypassing congested Sydney. It is a genuine game changer. But with this State Labor Government, it is stuck in the slow lane. The Government is failing to provide the political urgency to streamline planning approvals and enable the critical rail and road linkages needed to connect the private investment to our regional economy.

In our visit we also saw the recently upgraded Newcastle Airport, which showed an insight into what is possible for the Hunter region as it marks out its own identity. The runway upgrade is now complete, making it capable of handling long-haul international flights. There is already a flight going to Bali. We have the physical hardware to connect the Hunter directly to the world, with the potential to bring in thousands of tourists and billions of dollars in visitor spending. But the final, critical piece of the puzzle—the dedicated air cargo facility, which will unlock \$6.5 billion in freight activity for regional exporters and create over 4,000 ongoing jobs—is being ignored.

Worse still, the Labor Government cancelled the Williamstown Special Activation Precinct, walking away from the vision to make this area the nation's aerospace and defence epicentre. That vision was crafted by the Liberal-Nationals Government and, unfortunately, is now a lost opportunity with Labor in government, which has killed that project. The message we hear from the Hunter is clear: It is a region that has the assets, drive and potential for the future; it just needs a government that believes in it to unlock that potential.

TIMBER INDUSTRY AND GREAT KOALA NATIONAL PARK

The Hon. MARK BANASIAK (14:20): When I first heard the Government's announcement about the Great Koala National Park the afternoon before Father's Day—of all days—my stomach turned. I hoped it was bad info. I hoped the Government would not blindside workers on Father's Day, but I was wrong. I knew what that announcement would mean. It meant hardworking men and women—the people who built these regional towns and kept the lights on in sawmills and small businesses from Grafton to Kempsey—were about to have the rug pulled out from under them. These are not just workers; they are families and generations who have given their lives to the timber industry. In timber towns, you do not just work in it; you live it.

But then one morning the Government decides your life does not fit its agenda. No warning, no respect, just an announcement: We're closing it down. That is what the Minns Government did. While it was patting itself on the back for saving koalas—who do not actually need saving—families across New South Wales were sitting around dinner tables wondering how they would put food on the table the next week. When timber is all you have ever known, finding another job is not easy—not in towns where the mill is the main employer and not when there are no other industries to move to. The Government tried to brush it off with a token package, expecting people to just disappear, but it underestimated the strength of these communities.

It underestimated the pride and grit of people who refuse to be treated like second-class citizens. And those people did not go quietly—folks like Steve Coughran, who has 45 years in the industry; Alison Rudman from the Timber, Furnishing and Textiles Union, who never stopped fighting for fairness; or all the families who left their boots outside the office of the member for Lismore, each pair telling a story of a lifetime of work. That image will stay with me forever. The Shooters, Fishers and Farmers Party said it from the beginning: This compensation package should have been delivered from the get-go. We called for it. We beat down the Government's door, and we made it clear that the way this was staged was not up to standard. It did not pass the pub test for proper consultation or implementation.

The Government tried to take a shortcut at the expense of workers. We saw right through it and so did the people of regional New South Wales. It was that pressure—not compassion or leadership—that finally forced the Government to act. We now have a fairer support package, which includes proper redundancy pay, help for older workers, and mental health and financial support. It is a step forward, but it should never have taken protests, tears and sleepless nights to get here. If the Government cared about fairness, it would have spoken to workers before that Father's Day announcement. It would have looked them in the eye and said, "We will look after you, and this is how we're doing it." But it did not. It short-changed the very people whose timber built the State's infrastructure we have today.

So, yes, I am relieved that the package has arrived. But I am angry too because behind every dollar in that package is a broken promise and a family that deserved better. The timber families—who have become great friends of mine—deserved respect from the start. While this package brings some fairness, it came too late for too many. But this is not the end of the story. It is the start of a bigger fight for dignity and jobs other than baristas

and tour guides. As for the Government's so-called transition plan, I am looking forward to seeing the Hon. Jeremy Buckingham manage 5,600 affected forestry industry workers on his hemp farm.

FIRST NATIONS TREATY

The Hon. RACHEL MERTON (14:23): In the wake of the recent regrettable passage in the Victorian legislature of a statewide treaty bill, I speak briefly today to discuss why New South Wales must reject any attempt to implement a similar reckless course. As we know, the people of Australia, including the people of Victoria, thoroughly rejected the notion of a Voice to Parliament just two years ago. The failed socialist Victorian Labor Government has nevertheless ignored that verdict and delivered in its treaty legislation an outcome that will undermine democracy in that State. The detail is frightening. The bill establishes a First Peoples Assembly, a body exclusively for Indigenous Australians, which asserts their sovereignty has never been ceded.

This race-based body, like the rejected Voice to Parliament, will divide Victorians by race and grant legal and political privileges to one group over another. The bill establishes a so-called Gellung Warl advisory body and a treaty authority. This apparatus is being erected to uphold two systems of law. As the authority's own report crowns, "This body will act as a parallel and separate system of legal and political representation, with the power to require consultation on just about any piece of legislation." The sovereignty of the Victorian State Parliament—which represents all Victorians—is undermined and more bureaucracy created at the taxpayers' expense. What we now have in Victoria is two systems of law in one State. That is unworkable.

I note that, in the wake of the passage of the treaty, native title claims have now been made over almost all of metropolitan Melbourne. What does all this mean for New South Wales? The Minns Government has appointed taxpayer-funded commissioners and quietly begun consultations to see whether there is support for a treaty in New South Wales. My message to the Government is: Save the time and money. We have already had consultation with all the people of New South Wales via the Voice referendum just two years ago. Over 2.7 million of us voted no, a thumping 60 per cent rejection of racial division and separatism. A treaty will not fix a single hospital bed, road or classroom; it will only breed resentment, litigation and a permanent grievance industry.

As John Howard rightly said in 2000, "A nation does not make a treaty with itself." The notion of a treaty is very divisive. The people of New South Wales do not want a State where we no longer have equality of citizenship or an Orwellian situation where some citizens—through a treaty—are given more rights than others. As a legislator, I will continue to oppose any attempt to follow Victoria down this road to legislative ruin. I predict Victorians will spend many years trying to get out of this mess. The Victorian Statewide Treaty Bill stands as a stark warning to this State that we should heed.

HUNTER VALLEY COAL PROJECT

The Hon. EMILY SUVAAL (14:25): I speak briefly in support of the HVO South Open Cut Coal Continuation Project as the duty MLC for the Upper Hunter. I thank and acknowledge the Mining and Energy Union, the Minerals Council of Australia and the Australian Workers' Union, who today have informed members about the need for and importance of projects like this for our State and economy. A recent HVO coal continuation project submission has been revised. It has been the topic of some conversation in this House. I place on record my thanks and appreciation to HVO, and proponents like HVO, which has worked responsibly to revise its scope, admissions and project timeline, and has put forward a really commendable option for a coal continuation project in the Hunter.

This is an important project for our region, not just for the Singleton shire but for all of our coalmining communities. We know the importance of jobs in our regional areas and that there is still a high demand for our coal, both on the export market and locally. We can continue to responsibly produce coal in New South Wales. It will sustain jobs, our regional economies and also the New South Wales budget throughout the energy transition that we are embarking on. Coalmine projects are still being approved. There is still a pipeline of coalmine projects, whether they are extensions, expansions, revisions—all of the like. Even though the industry overall is in decline, the Government is commendably looking to expand projects like HVO South. There are new critical minerals projects that we are also looking at as a government, the subject of which will come up for debate today.

Those projects are also important. They have to be matched with community investment. Our regional communities, particularly in the Central West, can be extremely reliant on the mining sector. They are also reliant on the agriculture sector. We need safety standards, and workers and the local community must be supported through these investments. Regional workers and our communities are the backbone of the New South Wales economy. We just heard about the importance of the Hunter, and HVO South is another project that will contribute.

PARLIAMENTARY PRIVILEGE

The Hon. MARK LATHAM (14:28): I report to the House an extraordinary abuse of the resources of the Speaker's office in the other place. It certainly would not happen with our Presiding Officer, who is a very fine custodian indeed. Mr Piper has chosen to intervene in the Greenwich/Latham case at the New South Wales Civil and Administrative Tribunal [NCAT], falsely telling the tribunal he is an independent agent defending the principle of parliamentary privilege. It is a very fascinating matter. Piper, of course, is a Siamese twin to the member for Sydney. Where Alex goes, Greg trails along. Why this intervention at taxpayers' expense, employing a top-end-of-town legal firm? It is because my lawyer, Zali Burrows, called out Mr Greenwich in cross-examination.

Mr Greenwich tried to tell the tribunal that the blowback he had received from my single tweet 2½ years ago was the worst of his political career. Zali found a Greenwich quote in the Legislative Assembly at the time of the same-sex marriage debate saying he had received horrendous washback—it could not be any worse. Greenwich's barrister said it was a breach of parliamentary privilege to compare and contrast contradictory statements made by a member of Parliament—one in the Legislative Assembly and one at NCAT. That is a nonsense proposition. There is no breach. It is standard practice to compare the words of an MP in *Hansard* to see whether it is consistent or inconsistent with words said in some other forum.

It is a nonsense proposition. Nonetheless, Piper has intervened, using public resources, by hiring that legal firm to go down there, pretending that he is an independent Speaker—independent of Greenwich—with an independent assessment of the meaning of parliamentary privilege. It is a shocking abuse. I do not know how any member of the Legislative Assembly can put up with it. It would not happen in this place, as I said earlier. It is a nonsense proposition that parliamentary privilege prevents the comparison of words said in Parliament against words said in some other place by the same MP. That is standard practice. The media does it all the time. We do it all the time. We want our constituents to do it all the time. Consistency is a virtue. I urge the Speaker in the other place to pull his head in—pull his resources out of this—and not try to mislead the tribunal that he is somehow an independent agent in defence of parliamentary privilege, when he is no such thing.

Bills

EVIDENCE BASED AVO AMENDMENT BILL 2025

Second Reading Speech

Debate resumed from an earlier hour.

The Hon. MARK LATHAM (14:31): I resume my second reading speech on the Evidence Based AVO Amendment Bill 2025. I hope the House can understand how bad the Matthews-Petinos-Wilson lies have been. Three whole months—June and July 2023 and May 2024—have been fabricated in the Matthews witness statement lodged with the court. It is not just single events she has lied about; the history of entire months has been rewritten. For instance, Matthews dates my time in London in 2023 from April onwards. In fact, I was there between 15 June and 18 July. Matthews claims she was going to a conference in Paris, whereupon she changed her flights to meet me in London.

There was never any conference. In truth, a businessman called Paul Byrne—who she does not mention at all—paid for her flight to London, a hotel room with him in Notting Hill, nights out, clothes and a return trip with accommodation to Paris. She was with him in Paris, not at a conference at all. In messages to me from Paris, she said she had grown disillusioned with Paul Byrne, stating, "I don't really want to be here", "I will only last three days, kill me now", "It's honestly horrible", "I want to leave", "I woke up vomiting this morning", "Being in this guy's company has killed my sex drive", and "that fruitcake, Paul Byrne". She decided she needed a new master. During this time, she also sent me a message giving her view about the modern political agenda concerning positive consent and coercive control—part of her claim against me. She regarded these concepts as a standing joke. The message was a GIF reading "no means yes". That is right: The woman who now posts on her Instagram that she is a domestic violence survivor believes that no means yes. I have presented this to the court.

Matthews' inventions in May 2024 are even worse. She told the court she was in Dubai during this month, and I was being nasty to her. In truth, she was juggling her time between Sydney, Cairns and Phuket, and juggling her affections between her husband, Ross Matthews, her new pay-for-sex friend, Richard White, and me. In addition to the \$145,000 White paid to Ms Matthews, as she detailed in *The Australian* newspaper, he also gave her insider trading tips. While she was in Cairns with him, he tipped her into a penny stock that his associates had organised and was bound to appreciate quickly—as it did. Hopefully, these two inside traders will be prosecuted—and one has already had his office at WiseTech raided. Matthews told the court she was confused at this time. I am sure she was—from juggling three men simultaneously.

In mid-2023 Matthews was unable to tell the truth to the court of what happened between her, me and Paul Byrne. She had the same truth deficit in dealing with the situation created in May 2024 between her, her husband, me and Richard White. In both cases, in her witness statement, she concocted events to hide the truth of her promiscuity, undoubtedly not wanting her family to know about the life she leads. Mind you, she could have just said nothing. She could have just moved on with her life after 27 May, as I tried to do, but bitterness and revenge got the better of her. She went to the police to have me jailed, but the only one who spent time in the slammer is her.

The Hon. Jeremy Buckingham: You hate bitterness and revenge.

The Hon. MARK LATHAM: We won't be moving your motion today. There are other lies I could detail to the House—as I have to the court in my affidavit—but I think the case is made. In total she made 18 serious allegations against me, and invented them all. The messages and documents speak for themselves. She presented no messages and documents; I presented scores exposing her perjury. Importantly, she had no messages of complaint about me to her family, friends or anyone in the medical profession because, prior to our break-up, they did not exist. The only thing that made her complain about anything was rejection—and not for the first time.

On 25 July *The Daily Mail* published an account of a man who had been Nathalie's boss at a freight company in Botany, who she was living with at Rose Bay. She told me one night he threw a mirror at her and the police refused to help her. In fact, the reverse was true. She threw the mirror, and the man sought an AVO against her. When Ms Matthews burst into the media with her allegations against me, the guy's mother rang him and said, "This looks familiar, doesn't it?" After Matthews' former partner rejected her, he says, "She went a bit funny in the head." I can attest to that. It is all the more reason for this bill that I am putting before the House—to guard against people who, tormented by rejection, totally abuse the AVO and domestic violence systems.

I should also thank those who have contacted me offering support, especially Mark Vandersteen, who also had this kind of experience dating Nathalie Matthews. He wrote to me to say:

In my opinion and experience with Nathalie she is very mentally unstable with major mood and personality changes and highly vindictive, and aggressive, and extremely forthcoming with her sexual advances. I was lucky to have no further contact with her.

I found that she had brain explosions—a destructive recklessness every couple of months—but in between times she was great, and that was the basis of our association. She sometimes lamented about her persistent pattern of poor life choices. I know I treated her very well but was rewarded—to my lasting astonishment—with her trying to jail me. There is a flaw in our laws that made this possible, with all the biased, scarifying media coverage and some of the political commentary that came with it. My matter was high profile but many thousands of other people, mainly men, also suffer from deliberately false allegations.

A very experienced lawyer in this field has said that private AVO applications are a case of "court processes being used to defame people". He says, having been involved in scores of cases:

I cannot recall a private AVO that the police knocked back which had any merit. It's really about prospective risk, more revenge, anger and dysfunction.

He is saying it is a black mark on the New South Wales justice system, which it is. It is one that can be eliminated by the passage of this bill. What can be the problem with someone who has had their allegations examined and rejected by the police having to go to a magistrate to present a convincing case for the lodgement of a private AVO application? The police sponsor an AVO every 10 minutes. In New South Wales, there is no shortage of these issued—50,000 a year.

This bill is reasonable. This bill is needed. This bill is a practical, commonsense improvement to the New South Wales justice system. It also presents an opportunity to shine a light on another injustice raised persuasively in this Chamber by the Hon. Stephen Lawrence, who sits opposite. It is not uncommon for Aboriginal women in western New South Wales to be arrested and charged for recanting allegations of assault in sworn statements to the court. Why does this not happen to white women in Sydney doing the same thing? I urge honourable members to read the Hon. Stephen Lawrence's speech of 28 June 2023 on this issue, and his other contributions. I apologise for having just finished his career in the Labor Party. But they are very good speeches that are worthy of consideration. He is a learned member, and I learnt a great deal. I thank him.

Our justice system must be colourblind. It must treat an Aboriginal woman in Broken Hill no different to a white woman in Engadine. I urge the New South Wales police to enforce the law equally—in my case, to recognise the wilful perjury Nathalie Matthews has committed, and to go on to prosecute her. I also report to the House that this series of events highlights the malicious intent of the member for Miranda and the member for North Sydney in the other place, who helped write the private AVO application. These two gossips led Ms Matthews down a path which has resulted in her being charged with a serious criminal offence. I advise any other Liberal woman listening to Petinos and Wilson in a matter like this to consider their words very carefully

and then do the exact opposite of what they said. Those Liberal MPs pushed Nathalie into the public eye with devastating consequences for their erstwhile friend.

Not only is Ms Matthews facing revenge porn charges; she has also been reported to the Australian Securities and Investments Commission for insider trading with Richard White. If the New South Wales police take her false statements to the Local Court seriously, she will be prosecuted for them as well. If anyone wants friends, they should not look to Petinos and Wilson. Buy a dog. I understand that Petinos and Wilson have now abandoned Ms Matthews, which is typical from that pair of users whose trouble-making antics are a cancer not only inside the Liberal Party but also within our entire Parliament. In summary, the system is broken in many ways, and our Parliament needs to fix it, starting with this bill. I commend the bill to the House.

Debate adjourned.

Documents

PARLIAMENT HOUSE DEMONSTRATION

Production of Documents: Order

The Hon. SUSAN CARTER (14:40): I move:

That, under standing order 52, there be laid upon the table of the House within 7 days of the date of passing of this resolution the following documents created since 1 October 2025, in the possession, custody or control of the Premier, the Premier's Department, The Cabinet Office, the Minister for Police and Counter-terrorism and Minister for the Hunter, or the NSW Police Force relating to the protest action of the National Socialist Network 'White Australia' outside NSW Parliament on 8 November 2025:

- (a) all documents relating to the protest action of the National Socialist Network 'White Australia' outside NSW Parliament on 8 November 2025, including:
 - (i) applications to hold a protest gathering;
 - (ii) security advice;
 - (iii) intelligence advice;
 - (iv) approval process; and
 - (v) decision-making leading up to the event.
- (b) all documents relating to the deployment of police officers at the protest;
- (c) all documents relating to the protest sent between any officers or employees of the NSW Police Force stationed at the Sydney City Police Area Command and the Central Metropolitan Region office; and
- (d) any legal or other advice regarding the scope or validity of this order of the House created as a result of this order of the House.

This is a simple, straightforward motion that needs little explanation. I do not believe I need to trouble members with the details. Everybody is aware of the demonstration held outside this Parliament last Saturday, but we do not seem to be aware of the process by which it was approved. In fact, it takes me back to the days when The Wiggles soundtrack was playing continuously in my life, because it has been a *Hot Potato*: "I knew about it", "No, you knew about it", "No, really, somebody over there knew about it", and "Whoops, I knew about it all along." We need visibility and clarity in understanding when the form 1 was put in, who knew about it, how it was reviewed and how the protest occurred. If the statements of the Premier and the press reports are correct, we may soon be presented with further legislation in relation to protests and freedom of expression.

It is important that members of this House be fully informed and understand all of the matters that led up to last Saturday so that, if further regulations or laws are needed, we make our decisions on that basis. This motion calls for the papers to be provided within seven days. I acknowledge that it is a short time frame, but I also acknowledge that there is extraordinary public interest in this matter. People are anxious to know how a Nazi, white supremacist protest that called for the abolition of the so-called Jewish lobby, recycling all of the old tropes from decades ago, could be approved to be held in front of this Parliament House. There is extreme public interest in this, and there should not be a large number of documents. It should not be burdensome to provide those documents within that time frame. I urge all members to support the motion.

The Hon. TARA MORIARTY (Minister for Agriculture, Minister for Regional New South Wales, and Minister for Western New South Wales) (14:42): I speak on behalf of the Government and in my capacity representing the Minister for Police and Counter-terrorism on this matter. Firstly, the New South Wales Government condemns in the strongest possible terms the behaviour of the participants in the rally of last weekend. Freedom of speech does not extend to bringing about hatred in our community. That kind of activity undermines the values of decency, tolerance and mutual respect that hold our State together. Our message is simple: Hatred will not find a home in New South Wales.

The Government does not oppose this call for papers. The New South Wales police have apologised to the Minister for Police and Counter-terrorism, the Premier and the public for not advising the Government of the planned rally. As a result of that communication failure, the NSW Police Force is setting up a process so that it does not happen again. Of course, it would have been better to have known about the rally in advance, and the commissioner has apologised for that. The Government and the police have been transparent about that failure in communication.

I also note that the Minister has provided further information to the Legislative Council in an answer to a supplementary question to Parliament just this morning. The date at which the NSW Police Force Engagement and Hate Crime Unit was made aware of the rally is included in that document. We reiterate that damaging, public incitement of hatred has no place in New South Wales. It is unacceptable, it is unlawful, and it will be met with the full force of the law. Those groups know how to go right up to the line just short of committing an offence. The NSW Police Force will not hesitate to act when any person or group crosses that line. Again, the Government does not oppose the motion.

The Hon. JEREMY BUCKINGHAM (14:44): I support this motion and put on record that the pimply, prepubescent slugs from Pymble who were in front of this Parliament the other day are an absolute disgrace to this country. The worst thing that we in this Parliament can do is give those scumbags more oxygen, and I say that to *The Sydney Morning Herald*. The more oxygen we give them, the more they feel emboldened. It is exactly what they want. If we look back at history, that is how the Nazis got off the ground. Do not give them oxygen. Hitler literally took to the air, and that is how he came to power. He got on the airwaves. He used mass radio. He got in his Junkers and flew around like the old Donald Trump fly-around campaign. That is how he got around. He was the pioneer of mass rally campaigning. He hit the airwaves and amplified his voice at rallies. He used the Deutschland fluge and the Führer over Germany strategy to win the 1933 election, and it was mass media that got him there.

So starve those slugs of oxygen. I would like to see those boys who think they are the master race run into Fuifui Moimoi, Sonny Bill Williams, Gout Gout or Cathy Freeman and remind them that they cannot drape themselves in our national flag and our national story for their mad, sadistic, Nazi ideals and that the father of the great Allied victory of World War I was a Jew. Major-General John Monash was a Jew. We should remember that the people who fought to defeat the Nazis in World War II were of Indian, Greek, Scottish and Chinese descent. They defeated those Nazis, and they will defeat them again.

The Hon. MARK LATHAM (14:47): It was a long overdue, historic moment for Fuifui Moimoi to be worked into the *Hansard* of the upper House. My son, as a great Moimoi fan, will be delighted, and I will pass a copy on to him. But there is a serious point here. I raised it with Dave Hudson at the police budget estimates hearing, and I will repeat it here: Surely anyone who thinks the Third Reich was such a raging success that it needs to be repeated can be automatically defined as mentally ill. The people who rallied out the front of this building, graphically described by our friend the Hon. Jeremy Buckingham, were not all from Pymble. Some of them were from Victoria, and they came here specifically to cause trouble. As our great sleuth the Hon. Stephen Lawrence has highlighted, they were at a protest out the front in June, which everyone ignored. That was evidence at the antisemitism inquiry. Everyone ignored them, and that was probably the better outcome.

But now we have hysteria about this, particularly from the Premier. The truth is that the Premier needs them as much as they need him, in that he seems to be working under the complete delusion that Sydney is rife with antisemitism. Even in the Legislative Assembly yesterday he said that the Dural caravan incident was not a hoax; it was real. The man has gone gaga. He has lost the plot and is living in an alternate universe. Even Prime Minister Anthony Albanese said that the Dural caravan incident was a hoax. The police have said it. Everyone acknowledges it except Chris Minns and Sharri Markson.

The Premier has entered an alternate universe, desperate to prove his political point—it is solely political—that Sydney is overrun by antisemitism. The Dural caravan had 40-year-old explosives in it. They were last used around cracker night. It had a list of so-called Jewish targets left right in the middle of the table where the police entered, in case they could not find it. It was arranged by an organised crime figure in Turkey as part of some weird plea-bargaining deal with which the police in New South Wales are quite familiar. I suggest that the Labor members opposite take hold of their Premier and bring him back to reality. The Minister for Mental Health needs to make an intervention to get this guy back to the truth that the Dural caravan was a hoax.

I turn now to antisemitism in Sydney. At budget estimates, and onwards on the *Questions and Answers* paper, police have said that 13 of the 14 serious, homegrown antisemitic actions that led to criminal charges and prosecution were the product of organised crime. The other one was the two crazy nurses at Bankstown Hospital. Antisemitism is a political myth that the Premier has generated for base, opportunistic political purposes. He needs these idiots as much as they need him, which is why he has given them a platform. They should not be regarded

as mainstream threats in politics. Every resolution of this House should regard them as absolute fringe players and make them stay that way.

Ms SUE HIGGINSON (14:50): I briefly contribute to debate on behalf of The Greens. We support this call for papers. First and foremost, it is important to recognise that what occurred this weekend was the first authorised Nazi rally to ever take place in New South Wales. It has never happened before. In his brilliant article analysing the situation, Paul Gregoire wrote:

However, the unblemished record of not approving Nazi rallies in this state has been squandered ...

It is important to work out what happened and how it happened. I commend the police commissioner for taking an open approach. He has fronted up and disclosed what he thinks went wrong and how it happened. Peter Thurtell has apologised and explained, "Lanyon is a gentleman. Whilst he was frustrated, he hasn't berated me. He is taking this on." The overriding message from the police seems to be that it has lessons to learn—we all have. This is a journey we must all go on together to make sure that this does not happen, because it is absurd.

I agree with the other members who contributed to this debate that giving more air to this issue feeds into the awful reality of the few individuals who stood at the front of Parliament and exposed themselves as Nazis. It is really important that we get to the bottom of this. My contribution would not be complete without pointing out the glaringly obvious—how many times have the police gone out of their way to go straight to the police commissioner whenever a form 1 dropped that related to a pro-Palestine rally?

I do not necessarily think there was just a "naive communication error". I think the communication error has a major problem attached to it. This matter deserves more than just an internal look into what has happened. This call for papers is important. That being said, we have already seen the application. It was made available to members and published in *The Sydney Morning Herald*. A member in this House referred to it yesterday, and I agree with them that it was an incredibly sophisticated, well-drafted form 1. It was clearly intentionally drafted as an attempt to skirt around the current laws. The jury is still out on whether any laws were skirted. We support this important motion.

The Hon. STEPHEN LAWRENCE (14:53): I contribute to this debate to say that I support this motion. It seems very reasonable to me that the Opposition wants to understand why there was an apparent breakdown in communication. The Premier has spoken about the fact that they should have relayed this information. It is unfortunate indeed that people were not in a position to know that certain things were occurring. The motion is very commendable in that respect. However, I struggle with the suggestion that this will aid some sort of inquiry into "why this protest was authorised".

I recommend that members look at the police commissioner's interview on 7.30 on Monday. The police commissioner gave a masterclass in how to explain complicated things. He explained why certain things had occurred that should not have occurred. This was also an imperfect way of explaining what happens under the Summary Offences Act. It is his view that the application for authorisation simply had to be authorised, which is the same as saying that a court would have also allowed it to be authorised.

He talked about relevant things under the Summary Offences Act, including questions of immediate public safety and the obstruction of roads. This regime is fundamentally about the obstruction of roads. In a different speech in this House, I made the point that authorisation is not needed to conduct a protest on a footpath. That leads to the question about why the form 1 was lodged. I do not know if a form 1 was lodged for the protest on 24 June. I certainly have not heard that they did.

Ms Sue Higginson: They didn't.

The Hon. STEPHEN LAWRENCE: If they did not lodge an application for authorisation for the protest on 24 June, which passed without comment and did not lead to a blaze of publicity, it begs the question of why they lodged it in respect of this protest in circumstances where they did not need authorisation to conduct the protest on the footpath. It leads to the conclusion that they were seeking attention. I fully endorse the comments made by the Hon. Jeremy Buckingham, because history shows us that extremist movements thrive on publicity. It allows them to get their pernicious messages out. The psychology of cults and extreme movements that think they hold the key to salvation also thrives in environments of repression and oppression, because those tend to reinforce their beliefs. I think all of these things are relevant to the motion. I commend the motion because it has a worthy purpose.

The Hon. SUSAN CARTER (14:56): In reply: I thank all of the honourable members who contributed to this debate, including the Hon. Tara Moriarty, the Hon. Jeremy Buckingham, the Hon. Mark Latham, Ms Sue Higginson and the Hon. Stephen Lawrence. I thank the members of the House for supporting this motion.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (The Hon. Taylor Martin): The question is that the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.**CRITICAL MINERALS MINING****Production of Documents: Order**

Ms CATE FAEHRMANN (14:57): I seek leave to amend private members' business item No. 2677 for today of which I have given notice by:

- (1) Omitting "28 days" and inserting instead "62 days".
- (2) Inserting ", excluding any documents previously returned under an order of the House," after "the following documents".
- (3) Omitting "15 January 2024" and inserting instead "20 November 2023".
- (4) In paragraph (a) omitting "documents" and inserting instead "emails, submissions, correspondence, meeting or workshop minutes, or final briefs".
- (5) Omitting paragraph (b) and inserting instead:

"(b) all documents relating to assessments, approvals or investigations relating to the following applicants, licence holders or mines:

 - (i) MCi Carbon;
 - (ii) Trigg Minerals Ltd;
 - (iii) Tooloom Creek Pty Ltd;
 - (iv) Australian Consolidated Gold Holdings Pty Ltd;
 - (v) Peak Gold Mines Pty Ltd;
 - (vi) Manuka Resources Limited;
 - (vii) RZ Resources;
 - (viii) Silver Mines Bowdens Silver Project;
 - (ix) Perilya Ltd;
 - (x) Broken Hill Mines Pty Ltd;
 - (xi) Tronox Mining Australia Limited; and
 - (xii) Cadia Valley Operations.".
- (6) Omitting paragraph (c).
- (7) Omitting paragraph (d) and inserting instead:

"(d) all reports or briefs relating to lead exposure or contamination in humans, animals or the environment from mining activities;".
- (8) Inserting after paragraph (d):

"(e) all documents including notifications, notices, investigations or remediation relating to blood lead levels;".
- (9) Omitting paragraph (e) and inserting instead:

"(e) all emails, reports or briefs relating to remediation of metalliferous mines, including associated works or infrastructure relating to the following sites or mines:

 - (i) Leadville Mines;
 - (ii) Webbs Consol;
 - (iii) Lake George Mine;
 - (iv) Sunny Corner Silver Mine; and
 - (v) Broula King.".
- (10) Omitting paragraph (f) and inserting instead:

"(f) all correspondence, advice, briefs, agendas or minutes relating to meetings and the work of the Broken Hill Environmental Lead Response Group created since 1 November 2024;".
- (11) In paragraphs (g) and (i) omitting "31 December 2024" and inserting instead "1 December 2024".
- (12) Omitting paragraph (l) and inserting instead:

"(l) all documents and communication, including emails, notes, text messages or instant messaging services relating to the inquiry into 'Current and potential impacts of gold, silver, lead and zinc mining on human health, land, air and water quality in New South Wales' between any of the following persons or offices:

 - (i) the Minister for Finance, Minister for Domestic Manufacturing and Government Procurement and Minister for Natural Resources;

- (ii) the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment and Minister for Heritage;
- (iii) the Minister for Health, Minister for Regional Health and Minister for the Illawarra and the South Coast;
- (iv) the Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Work Health and Safety;
- (v) the Premier;
- (vi) any person employed by the NSW Resources division of the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development; and
- (vii) any person employed by the NSW Environment Protection Authority."

Leave granted.

Ms CATE FAEHRMANN: Accordingly, I move:

That, under standing order 52, there be laid upon the table of the House within 62 days of the date of passing of this resolution the following documents, excluding any documents previously returned under an order of the House, created since 20 November 2023 in the possession, custody or control of the Premier, the Treasurer, the Minister for Finance, Minister for Domestic Manufacturing and Government Procurement and Minister for Natural Resources, the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment and Minister for Heritage, the Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Work Health and Safety, the Minister for Health, Minister for Regional Health and Minister for the Illawarra and the South Coast, the Premier's Department, The Cabinet Office, the Treasury, the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water, the Environment Protection Authority, SafeWork NSW, the Ministry of Health or the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development (including NSW Resources) relating to the Resources Regulator and minerals mining:

- (a) all emails, submissions, correspondence, meeting or workshop minutes, or final briefs relating to the Critical Minerals and High-Tech Metals Strategy;
- (b) all documents relating to assessments, approvals or investigations relating to the following applicants, licence holders or mines:
 - (i) MCi Carbon;
 - (ii) Trigg Minerals Ltd;
 - (iii) Tooloom Creek Pty Ltd;
 - (iv) Australian Consolidated Gold Holdings Pty Ltd;
 - (v) Peak Gold Mines Pty Ltd;
 - (vi) Manuka Resources Limited;
 - (vii) RZ Resources;
 - (viii) Silver Mines Bowdens Silver Project;
 - (ix) Perilya Ltd;
 - (x) Broken Hill Mines Pty Ltd;
 - (xi) Tronox Mining Australia Limited; and
 - (xii) Cadia Valley Operations.
- (c) all reports or briefs relating to lead exposure or contamination in humans, animals or the environment from mining activities;
- (d) all documents including notifications, notices, investigations or remediation relating to blood lead levels;
- (e) all emails, reports or briefs relating to remediation of metalliferous mines, including associated works or infrastructure relating to the following sites or mines:
 - (i) Leadsville Mines;
 - (ii) Webbs Consol;
 - (iii) Lake George Mine;
 - (iv) Sunny Corner Silver Mine; and
 - (v) Broula King.
- (f) all correspondence, advice, briefs, agendas or minutes relating to meetings and the work of the Broken Hill Environmental Lead Response Group created since 1 November 2024;
- (g) all documents created since 1 December 2024 relating to the Broken Hill 'Future Lead Strategy';
- (h) all documents relating to funding requests to the Premier or the Treasurer for lead remediation or contamination work in Broken Hill;
- (i) all documents created since 1 December 2024 relating to funding, investigating or implementing dust or air monitoring programs for Broken Hill;
- (j) all documents relating to the Mine Safety Advisory Council's members, meetings, operations or decisions;

- (k) all documents relating to the review into lead being undertaken by the Office of the NSW Chief Scientist and Engineer;
- (l) all documents and communication, including emails, notes, text messages or instant messaging services relating to the inquiry into 'Current and potential impacts of gold, silver, lead and zinc mining on human health, land, air and water quality in New South Wales' between any of the following persons or offices:
 - (i) the Minister for Finance, Minister for Domestic Manufacturing and Government Procurement and Minister for Natural Resources;
 - (ii) the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment and Minister for Heritage;
 - (iii) the Minister for Health, Minister for Regional Health and Minister for the Illawarra and the South Coast;
 - (iv) the Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Work Health and Safety;
 - (v) the Premier;
 - (vi) any person employed by the NSW Resources division of the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development; and
 - (vii) any person employed by the NSW Environment Protection Authority.
- (m) any legal or other advice regarding the scope or validity of this order of the House created as a result of this order of the House.

This motion is an order for the production of papers relating to the operations of companies mining so-called "critical minerals" and "high-tech minerals" from the agencies responsible for regulating these critical minerals. I will say from the outset, as members can see from the amendments, that I have gone back and forth with the Minister's office to refine the scope of the original motion. I thank her office for those exchanges and for the way in which they worked through some of these changes. Members will know that I have tried to move a similar motion in this place before. I noted at the time that I was open, as we all should be, to working with the Minister and public servants about what the scope of our orders for papers means.

Having said that, this Standing Order 52 motion is very important. I have been contacted over the past year—or more, in fact—by more than a few regional communities that are in distress because of the discovery of current or potential mining exploration or mining activities in their area. Some found out overnight, for example, that they have a massive exploration licence title over their property and their neighbour's property that extends hundreds of kilometres all around them. Those communities spend hundreds of hours—and I am not kidding when I say "hundreds of hours"—researching what they need to do to understand what this means, to look at the planning approvals system and try to understand it.

At the moment there is a big push for exploration, and one of the things that stands out is that the Resources Regulator may approve an exploration licence, for example, but a lot of the documents that it uses and relies upon can be hidden from the public's view. As an example, a project—MCi Carbon—is contained in this call for papers. MCi Carbon will be clearing a lot of biodiversity. It is going to be drilling a lot of holes. I have seen documents indicating that exploration holes will be drilled, say, 80 to 100 metres below the surface, through a couple of different aquifers. It is said that there could be depressurisation as a result of that, but "Don't worry, it's all contained in the attachment"—but nobody can access the attachment. There is a lot of trust there. Different parts of the motion deal with that. For example, at paragraph (b) we call for documents relating to assessments, approvals and investigations—not for everything—which is what I worked on with the Minister's office.

I am also seeking documents relating to critical minerals and high-tech strategy. Again, I have refined that. Importantly, I have refined it from 28 days to 62 days. This time of the year—a couple of weeks before Christmas—is not good for the public servants and is certainly not good for me or my team. Members would be aware, I hope, with the recent media attention, of what is going on in Broken Hill in terms of high blood lead levels in children. There is a range of documents about what is happening to funding requests and what is happening to remediation. It is important work and I hope members will support it.

The Hon. EMILY SUVAAL (15:02): I indicate that the Government will support the motion, as amended by Ms Cate Faehrmann. I take the opportunity to put on record my thanks and those of the Minister's office to Ms Cate Faehrmann and the staff in her office for working collaboratively with the Minister's office this morning through the large order for papers. It remains a large order, but it has been revised. I thank the member particularly for changing the proposed 28 days to 62 days. That is a sensible amendment and speaks to three key factors, the first being the size of the order for papers. Now that it has been condensed, the scope of the order has been sharpened. But it is still expected to deliver many thousands of documents.

In terms of the core functions of some of the agencies impacted, I take this opportunity to put on record my thanks to the Resources Regulator at what is an understandably challenging time given recent events, which were covered yesterday in a ministerial statement by the Hon. Courtney Houssos in this place. It is a small but critical agency. The work that it does across the State is of the utmost importance, particularly in our regional

communities, to reduce the impact on frontline staff, including those currently undertaking investigations, proactive safety activities, reactive safety activities and other frontline duties. It is obviously a challenging time of year for us all as we head into the Christmas and summer holiday period. It is usually a time when people take scheduled leave. The expansion of days will sensibly accommodate some of that impact, and I again thank the member for doing that.

In terms of specifying the projects, we have reduced the initial scope from all applicants to 12 mineral licence holders and five legacy mine projects. It is worth noting that this morning we tried but were unable to reach agreement on a further amendment to make the scope more manageable. We support transparency in this House and we understand the seriousness with which the member takes matters such as this. Lead has been a topic of conversation. We have spoken about it previously in this House and it has been covered in budget estimates. It is an issue that we, as a government, take seriously. Many agencies have been working hard to keep our workers and our communities safe from unsafe lead levels. We are happy to support the motion under Standing Order 52.

The Hon. JEREMY BUCKINGHAM (15:05): I make a very brief contribution to debate on the motion brought to the House by Ms Cate Faehrmann, which I will be supporting. I say that for the benefit of the House and Ms Cate Faehrmann's social media feed. I got a lot of feedback last time when a much more expansive call under Standing Order 52 came through and there was not the consultation that I have had on this with Ms Cate Faehrmann and the Minister's office. We have managed to negotiate a scope that ensures that we get the documents that the community and Ms Cate Faehrmann and others demand.

A critical issue, and one that I have worked on previously, is lead exposure in mining-affected communities. Anyone who has been to Broken Hill would realise that it is a critical issue to the health and wellbeing of that community, and there are other mining-affected communities around the region that want to know about the issues that are reflected in this call for papers under Standing Order 52 as we develop critical minerals in this State and try to get the balance right with exploration, development and community health. I am happy to support the motion and am pleased to have worked with both the Minister and the member to ensure it passes today.

Ms CATE FAEHRMANN (15:07): In reply: I thank the member representing the Minister, the Hon. Emily Suvaal, and the Hon. Jeremy Buckingham. I was probably asking for it, but the last time I did put a call through to the Hon. Jeremy Buckingham, which was not responded to, I sent a text message and I believe I tried to see him in his office to talk to him. I just place that on the record because I think it is important that I did try, which I always do with these motions if they are important. But let us let bygones be bygones. We are all friends. We are all supporting this. It is a good moment and what we should be doing more in this place is working together to bring down the mining industry. I commend the motion to the House.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (The Hon. Taylor Martin): The question is that the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

MOORE PARK GOLF COURSE

Production of Documents: Further Order

The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW (15:08): I move:

(1) That this House notes that:

- (a) on Wednesday 19 February 2025 this House ordered the production of documents relating to the transformation of Moore Park Golf Course and Moore Park South;
- (b) on Wednesday 19 March 2025, the due date of the order was varied to provide for a second return of documents from the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure by Wednesday 26 March 2025;
- (c) in response to the order on Wednesday 19 March 2025 a return was received from The Cabinet Office which included:
 - (i) certifications from the Premier, the Minister for Small Business, Minister for Lands and Property, Minister for Multiculturalism and Minister for Sport, the Premier's Department, The Cabinet Office and the Office of Sport stating all documents held "that are covered by the terms of the resolution and lawfully required to be provided have been provided";
 - (ii) a certification from the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces stating that "no documents covered by the terms of the resolution and lawfully required to be provided are held"; and
 - (iii) a certification from the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure, including Greater Sydney Parklands Trust, advising "due to the large number of documents that still need to be reviewed for relevance and privilege, only some documents can be returned".

- (d) on Wednesday 26 March 2025 a return was received from The Cabinet Office, which included a certification from the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure stating that "all documents held by the Department that are covered by the terms of the order and required to be produced have now been provided";
 - (e) in response to a request on Thursday 5 June 2025 a return was received from The Cabinet Office of documents with personal information that should not be made public redacted;
 - (f) the documents returned to the order did not include the final business case or annexures regarding the transformation of Moore Park Golf Course and the future of Moore Park South;
 - (g) on Wednesday 22 October 2025 this House further ordered the production of documents from the Treasurer and the Treasury relating to the final business case and annexures for the transformation of Moore Park Golf Course and the future of Moore Park South; and
 - (h) in response to the further order of the House, on Wednesday 29 October 2025, a return was received from The Cabinet Office which included certifications from the Treasurer and the Treasury stating that "no documents that are covered by the terms of the resolution and lawfully required to be provided are held".
- (2) That this House:
- (a) rejects the definition of Cabinet documents used in the Government Information (Public Access) Act 2009 and the definitions of "Cabinet records" and "Cabinet documents" in the NSW Cabinet Practice Manual for determining which documents are subject to cabinet-in-confidence, which if followed may lead to a much broader class of documents being withheld from this House; and
 - (b) notes that the true principle from *Egan v Chadwick* concerning the power of the House to order the production of Cabinet documents is, at a minimum, that articulated by Spigelman CJ, who held that "a distinction has been made between documents which disclose the actual deliberations within cabinet and documents in the nature of reports or submissions prepared for the assistance of Cabinet".
- (3) That this House:
- (a) notes the failure of the Government to comply with the orders of the House regarding Moore Park Golf Course and Moore Park South and to produce documents necessary for this House to undertake its function of scrutinising the executive government;
 - (b) reasserts its power to order the production of all documents in the possession, custody or control of the executive government with the exception of those documents that reveal the actual deliberations of Cabinet, as articulated by Spigelman CJ in *Egan v Chadwick*; and
 - (c) reminds the Leader of the Government that, as the representative of the Government in this House, they are responsible for compliance with orders for papers passed by the Legislative Council.
- (4) That, under standing order 52, there be laid upon the table of the House by 9.30 am on the day following the passing of this resolution the final business case and annexures regarding the transformation of Moore Park Golf Course and the future of Moore Park South in the possession, custody or control of the Treasurer or the Treasury, and any legal or other advice regarding the scope or validity of this order of the House created as a result of this order of the House.
- (5) That, should the Leader of the Government fail to table the documents in compliance with this resolution, it will be a matter for this House to take all necessary actions and further steps to address the issue of continued non-compliance.

Members have heard motions like this before in this House.

The Hon. Jeremy Buckingham: When you were in government.

The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW: The motion goes to the rights of this House and of the people of New South Wales and the documents that calls for papers under Standing Order 52 apply to. It comes down to the case of *Egan v Chadwick*. I await the Government's response, but I suspect it will not say that the documents do not exist, that there is no final business case and annexures regarding Moore Park Golf Course and analysis that has been done. Government Information (Public Access) Act documents show that there is such a document. We are not having some sort of hallucination that this document exists when it does not. The certification from Treasury contains a qualification that states:

Treasury has read the Order in light of the specific focus of documents sought as detailed by the Member's comments in Hansard.

There was some discussion about what is and is not a Cabinet document. The motion notes:

... the true principle from *Egan v Chadwick* concerning the power of the House to order the production of Cabinet documents is, at a minimum, that articulated by Spigelman CJ, who held that "a distinction has been made between documents which disclose the actual deliberations within cabinet and documents in the nature of reports or submissions prepared for the assistance of Cabinet".

Someone else said:

I am sure, then, the Government will fall back on the argument that it is a Cabinet document. We have been on this roundabout many, many times. I can set out chapter and verse why a business case does not contain the actual deliberations of Cabinet. It cannot contain the deliberations of Cabinet; it is produced well before Cabinet deliberates. It is a very technical document that does not record any of the discussions that take place in Cabinet.

That is a quote from the Hon. Daniel Mookhey, the now Treasurer, in 2021 with respect to the Parramatta light rail. The learned Treasurer went on to say:

The business case is not a Cabinet document and does not contain any Cabinet deliberations, so it is for the Government to justify why the document has not been produced and what exactly is its lawful reason for non-production.

In 2014 the now Leader of the Government, who is mentioned in the motion, also opined on this fact when seeking a further order for production of documents with respect to the CBD and South East Light Rail Project. Having noted the statement from the Secretary of Transport for NSW that "all agencies are obliged to protect the confidentiality of Cabinet documents and not produce or refer to any such documents in complying with the resolution", the Hon. Penny Sharpe said:

I believe the Government has fallen foul of the intent in the powers of this House. The Government has actively sought to stop Opposition members from getting the information they need to fulfil their constitutional role.

Members should not just take my word for it; they should take the words of both the Treasurer sitting across from me and from the Leader of the Government, at a different time.

This is a dance that has gone on many times before. Earlier I heard the Hon. Jeremy Buckingham call out, "When you were in government." Yes, it was the case when we were in government. Every time this dance was embarked upon, the production of documents ended up occurring because nobody wanted to test the powers of this House. If this Government wants to proceed with testing the powers of this House, that might be something that is warranted. But when it comes to that clarification of documents, if the court were to revisit it, I hazard a guess that the determination and the opinion of Spigelman CJ in *Egan v Chadwick* would be where the court, at minimum, settled, but it may adopt a more expansionary definition, adopted by the minority in that case, of what fell within the power of the House. I leave my comments there and commend the motion to the House in order to preserve the powers of this House and to ask the Government nicely, once again, to provide the final business case for Moore Park.

The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY (Treasurer) (15:13): I find myself in an unusual position for me, in opposing a Standing Order 52 motion. Before I get into the substance of my remarks, I did appreciate the diligence of the shadow Minister's research on the Parramatta Light Rail Stage 2 [PLR2] call for papers, and his recount of that epic battle we had in 2021. The one part he omitted is that, despite me calling for the production of those documents, I never got them. I never got the actual business case. The Government at the time did not produce it on the basis that it was a Cabinet document. Even though I moved a furious motion, very similar to this one, the business case on the PLR2 was never produced. That is my polite way of saying that we have had these debates before, albeit from very different positions. Now, on behalf of the Government, I say that we oppose the motion.

The motion seeks the final business case and annexures regarding the transformation of Moore Park Golf Course and the future of Moore Park South. Previous orders for the production of papers relating to Moore Park Golf Course and Moore Park South were made by the House on 19 February 2025 and 22 October 2025. The order made on 22 October 2025 was in the same terms as the motion the House is now considering. The order made on 19 February 2025 sought a broader scope of documents. The Government complied with both orders. As for the concept of Cabinet documents, I am advised that the Legislative Council does not have power to require the production of Cabinet documents.

The *Egan* case provides the relevant tests for determining whether a document is a Cabinet document, and therefore not capable of production under Standing Order 52. The motion quotes from the judgement of Chief Justice Spigelman in the case of *Egan v Chadwick* in the New South Wales Court of Appeal, in which his Honour held that "a distinction has been made between documents which disclose the actual deliberations within Cabinet and documents in the nature of reports or submissions prepared for the assistance of Cabinet". In that case, his Honour also held the Legislative Council's power to call for documents "should, at least, be restricted to documents which do not, directly or indirectly, reveal the deliberations of Cabinet" and that "it may be that there are other Cabinet documents, access to which would contradict the collective responsibility of Ministers".

A document such as a business case may directly or indirectly reveal the deliberations of Cabinet. For example, a document containing a record of Cabinet's deliberations in a particular matter will directly reveal deliberations of Cabinet, and a further document relating to a new policy proposal may outline the position a Minister has taken or will take on a matter in Cabinet. For these reasons, the Government opposes the motion.

Ms CATE FAEHRMANN (15:16): The Greens support the motion for several reasons. We support it because the reasons outlined by the honourable member as to why most of the documents requested were not returned, including the final business case and annexures regarding the transformation of Moore Park Golf Course, and other documents, are very similar to what we have been hearing from this Government, and indeed occasionally from the previous Government. As many members who have contributed to debates in this place during this term of government have said, things are worse under this Government. An example is the order for production of documents last year, on my SO 52 motion, calling for all documents before the Independent Panel

on Gaming Reform. As most members would know, the Government still has not responded. The Greens expected that extensive documents would be returned.

I have communicated a couple of times now with the Cabinet Office, suggesting that hundreds, if not thousands, of pages have not been returned under that order. The report of the Independent Panel on Gaming Reform specifically says that the members engaged with multiple stakeholders and experts, and reviewed 218 papers and reports totalling over 2,450 pages of material. What came back in the return was just five boxes of public material, and a couple of boxes of privileged material, with hardly anything in them. I have been told that because the report of the Independent Panel on Gaming Reform is before Cabinet, apparently every single thing that the panel considered is Cabinet in confidence. That is the most ridiculous thing that anybody even outside of this place would have heard.

I want to assure anybody who is listening from the Cabinet Office or taking an interest in this particular return to order that my latest correspondence is delayed because of the time it takes to deal with it, but it will be provided before the end of the year. I have not given up on my return, and potentially I will bring my own motion to this place because hardly any documents have been produced. It is purely in self-interest that I am supporting the Hon. Scott Farlow's motion.

Ms SUE HIGGINSON (15:19): I speak in support of the motion, because the power of the Legislative Council to order the production of documents is one of the most important checks on the Executive Government in New South Wales. It is how this House ensures that decisions are not made in darkness, and it is how we verify what the Government tells the public. The production of documents under Standing Order 52 is not optional, as the Government well knows. Since *Egan v Chadwick* in 1999, it has been well-settled law that the Legislative Council may require the production of all documents in the possession of the Executive Government, except those that reveal the actual deliberations of Cabinet.

That principle has been exercised consistently by this Chamber under governments of every political persuasion. Yet, time and again, we see governments resist or delay the production of papers. In 2020 this House had to censure the Leader of the Government for failing to produce the Western Harbour Tunnel and Beaches Link business cases. It has had to order returns for the Powerhouse Museum relocation, for Murray-Darling water management, and for a range of environmental and planning decisions where the public interest demanded transparency. Each time, the message has been the same; the Executive is accountable to the Parliament.

The Moore Park matter fits squarely within this tradition. The question before us is not whether we support or oppose any potential future plan, but whether the Parliament will insist that documents lawfully requested are produced in full and without unnecessary claim of privilege. When Minister Sharpe moved her amendment in 2020 to progress an earlier order for papers, she said, "The people of New South Wales have a right to see those documents." She was right then, and she is right now. The department of planning and the Treasury hold materials that go directly to public assets, expenditure and land use. Those documents should already be on the table.

This is about a critical democratic process; it is not about politics. When the Executive ignores the orders of this House, it weakens the Parliament and erodes public confidence in our democracy. Transparency is not negotiable. The documents should be produced, or this House will, as we are compelled to, take further steps until they are. I strongly support the motion. The Government has about 16 minutes to reconsider its position, and it should do so.

The Hon. MARK LATHAM (15:22): In my time here, the most important power of the Legislative Council has been Standing Order 52 [SO 52]. It is a power that Labor legitimised while in opposition and utilised to some effect. So it is somewhat of a shock that, having gone into government, Labor has now decided to go in the opposite direction. The Premier promised "the Government of integrity", but we know that he is waging war on not only the truth but also this Chamber and its SO 52 powers. This is happening in four ways. First, the Government is conducting business on the Signal app. There is no doubt about that. Things are being hidden on messenger apps that some of us do not fully understand. It is secretive and it is wrong.

Second, it is having "pens down" meetings. A government that is prepared to have a pens down meeting about a matter of national security like the Dural Caravan incident will put its pens down about anything. The most important type of meeting requiring a record to be taken of what is said is one on a matter of national security and public safety. Just imagine how many pens have been dropped at meetings about less important matters, like filling potholes. Pens down meetings are used by this Government at all levels.

Third, this Government will refer just about everything it can to Cabinet. I think the Cabinet meetings now involve deliberations for, say, 90 minutes on four or five important matters and then Premier Minns says, "We've got 50 matters here that we've stuck on the tail end of the Cabinet agenda to hide from the upper House. Who moves that they be adopted?" The Hon. Stephen Kamper puts his hand up—as he always does—and it goes

through. Papers on matters such as statutory appointments have gone to Cabinet with no need. I experienced that when seeking to obtain papers under SO 52 about the racing industry. Ms Cate Faehrmann has outlined how papers on gambling have gone to Cabinet with no need. The referral of matters to Cabinet is the third way in which this Government is waging war on this House's power under Standing Order 52.

The final tactic used—and the worst of the lot, in some respects—is that the Government simply does not produce the papers. It has been like extracting teeth to try to get every single document relating to the Local Small Commitments Allocation [LSCA] program, to the point where it was some nine months after the original SO 52 order for papers that the true, genuine, dinky-di master list of Labor's pre-election LSCA commitments, rorted by Ms Cherie Burton, was produced.

When the Government has four ways of subverting the powers of this Chamber and Premier Chris Minns has declared war on us, we must declare war on him in return. We must say to this Premier, "We're not going to buckle. We are here for accountability, for transparency, for seeing these documents, for fulfilling the promise that the people of New South Wales have got the right to know." It is time to start chucking Labor's leadership out of this Chamber, expelling them just as they are trying to expel our SO 52 powers. I know members of His Majesty's Opposition tend to be timid, mild, friendly and convivial in all respects. Their leader in the other place could not blow out a candle or knock the top off a custard. I know these things are a political reality, but if we are to defend the Parliament and opportunities for accountability, we must defend our SO 52 powers and fight this war on all four fronts—and on the beaches!

The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE (15:25): I am a bit concerned about the description of the "convivial" Opposition. Certainly, in this place the Opposition is not convivial to a circumstance where the powers of the House are flouted in the manner which the Government is doing. I used to sit opposite, in the Leader of the Government's chair. I know exactly what arguments the former Government would use to respond to a call for papers under Standing Order 52. Of course, I would say things like, "These are Cabinet-in-confidence documents." Labor members would call BS on us. Their speeches were full of the normal rhetoric. That included the now learned Treasurer. He was one of the best protagonists of seeking to assert the powers of the House in relation to the documents which he used so effectively against us when we were in government.

I am sure the Hon. Scott Farlow has already referred to some of the Mookhey-isms which rolled so easily off the Treasurer's lips when he was in opposition. He would say things like, "I am sure, then, the Government will fall back on the argument that it is a Cabinet document." Guess what he has just done? He has said, "It's a Cabinet document." These too are his own words:

We have been on this roundabout many, many times.

Guess what he has done?

The Hon. Daniel Mookhey: He said all this.

The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: Has the Hon. Scott Farlow said all this?

The Hon. Daniel Mookhey: Yes. He said it all.

The Hon. Scott Farlow: But the Hon. Damien Tudehope says it better.

The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: In the circumstances, it makes a joke of the position that Labor members took when they were on this side of the House. I have seen the light. When I came over to this side, I saw the light. I know what a Cabinet-in-confidence document looks like. Those opposite know what it looks like. They know that a business case does not get within a bull's roar of being a Cabinet document. They are the documents on which, potentially, someone might form the view that they should take a matter to Cabinet. But the business case does not fall within a bull's roar of being a Cabinet document. The Hon. John Graham constantly persecuted me in this place. He even brought a censure motion against me for the failure to produce documents in relation to the Western Harbour Tunnel.

The Hon. Mark Latham: Do it to them!

The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: That may well have to come, because the Treasurer knows, and I know, what the consequences of this failure are. He knows what they are, and we will pursue them. I give him this assurance: We are not going to walk away from the consequences of noncompliance in relation to this order.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (The Hon. Taylor Martin): Before I call the Hon. Scott Farlow, I acknowledge and welcome to the President's gallery Kaelan Connor, who is in year 10 at Bulli High School and who is doing work experience with Ms Cate Faehrmann this week.

The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW (15:28): In reply: I thank all members who contributed to the debate: the Treasurer, Ms Cate Faehrmann, Ms Sue Higginson, the Hon. Mark Latham and of course the Hon. Damien

Tudehope, who was fired up and ready to go. When it comes to Cabinet documents and business cases, he has been on the roundabout, but he is now on the expressway and has seen the light. Unfortunately, the Treasurer has turned to darkness. The Mookhey wing upstairs is not looking very full at the moment. We have heard the stories from Ms Cate Faehrmann and the Hon. Mark Latham about the trolley being rolled into the Cabinet Office and rolled out with "Nothing to see here". That is the way this Government is behaving.

But when it comes to this document and the Treasurer's response, it seemed to be a case of "I never got my documents, so you shouldn't get yours." I would have thought the Treasurer would have taken the higher position in government. I would have thought he would have decided to implement some of his learnings from opposition instead of saying, "Up yours! I never got it, so you shouldn't either." We remember the Mookhey wing. I remember at that time pleading with him when I had Treasury representatives coming to me and saying, "Could you just have a word to this Daniel Mookhey? We're finding it very difficult to provide all these documents." The Treasurer was "SO 52 Man No. 1". He created a wing in this building named after him, and now he wants to shut it down for everybody else. He wants to make sure that nobody else gets a business case in this State.

What is important? It is not just a case of the powers of this House. It is about what the people of New South Wales deserve to know and, importantly, what their representatives in this place deserve to know. It is not a case of the Opposition going through the business case and saying yes or no, or saying that we know better than the Government. It is a matter of this House and the representatives of the people of New South Wales being able to understand the information that is presented to government and how government makes decisions. It is not to understand the decisions made by the Government and who says what and when; that is appropriate to be kept as Cabinet-in-confidence. What is appropriate, in relation to the decisions that the people of New South Wales expect their Government to make, is the information the Government is receiving. This House should have the power to receive that information. I commend the motion to the House and thank members who support the motion.

The PRESIDENT: The question is that the motion be agreed to.

The House divided.

Ayes 22
Noes 15
Majority.....7

AYES

Barrett	Higginson	Munro
Boyd	Hurst	Overall
Buckingham	Latham	Rath (teller)
Carter	MacDonald	Roberts
Cohn	Martin	Ruddick
Faehrmann	Merton	Tudehope
Fang (teller)	Mitchell	Ward
Farlow		

NOES

Borsak	Jackson	Murphy (teller)
Buttigieg	Kaine	Nanva (teller)
D'Adam	Lawrence	Primrose
Donnelly	Mookhey	Sharpe
Graham	Moriarty	Suvaal

PAIRS

Maclaren-Jones

Houssos

Motion agreed to.

Bills

VOLUNTARY ASSISTED DYING AMENDMENT (RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES) BILL 2025

Second Reading Debate

Debate resumed from 22 October 2025.

The Hon. CAMERON MURPHY (15:39): When business was interrupted during my contribution to debate on the Voluntary Assisted Dying Amendment (Residential Facilities) Bill 2025, I was setting out the reasons that prevent me from supporting this bill. In my view, nobody else should be supporting this bill either.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (The Hon. Rod Roberts): Order! There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber. I cannot hear the member's contribution.

The Hon. CAMERON MURPHY: It is unconscionable and manifestly unfair to put in place provisions that will affect people in their own homes. It is completely different to someone voluntarily accessing a service in a hospital; the aged-care facility is where they live. As I articulated at the beginning of my contribution, some of the consequences that flow from the bill are profound. No consideration has been given to people who are already living in residential aged-care facilities, who have entered into contracts and paid money. They are, effectively, stuck in the facility that they are in. No consideration has been given to the cost for those people to relocate to an alternative facility where they can access voluntary assisted dying [VAD], nor to the cost for obtaining legal advice on how to find a way out of their contract.

It is completely impractical to suggest that people living in a residential aged-care facility where VAD services are not offered should access those services in another facility such as a hospital. From the small amount that I have learnt about it, it takes numerous visits over a long period of time before the voluntary assisted dying process can be completed. It is not practical for somebody to remain in a residential facility where VAD services are banned and to be transported in and out. We are talking about people at a stage of life and in a state of health where it simply is not practical for them to move elsewhere. This would render voluntary assisted dying inaccessible to many people. Residential aged-care facilities are dotted across the State in places where there simply is no alternative facility nearby that people could relocate to in order to access voluntary assisted dying services.

The bill does not address many of the important practical consequences that would flow from its implementation, not least that it commences on assent. The people affected would be given very little notice that this very important change will occur. There is no transition period in which people can make a decision about whether to move to another facility. There is no time for people to make other arrangements. There may be people who have entered into a contract to live in a residential aged-care facility but are yet to move in. The bill does nothing to address the circumstances of those people. Rather, it will impose on them an enormous financial burden if they choose to break their contract and move somewhere else. Those issues ought to be considered in detail if the bill is to be passed.

I come back to my main point, which is that it is unconscionable to limit a person's access to a health care service in their own home. That is fundamentally what the bill does. I understand that the religious or ethical views of some members lead them to want to ban voluntary assisted dying in some residential aged-care facilities but, in my view, if a facility provides residential aged care then it ought to provide the full range of available health services, which includes voluntary assisted dying. The Parliament has already debated the merits of VAD and has determined that it should be available to residents of New South Wales. Residential aged-care facilities ought to comply with that law and provide that service. In the interests of time, I conclude my remarks. I urge all members to vote against the bill.

The Hon. ROBERT BORSAK (15:44): By leave: On behalf of the Shooters, Fishers and Farmers Party, I support the Voluntary Assisted Dying Amendment (Residential Facilities) Bill 2025. This legislation is about respect: respect for the ethos of faith-based aged-care facilities, respect for the rights of residents and respect for the freedom of conscience of those who dedicate their lives to caring for the elderly. I make it clear that the bill does not restrict access to voluntary assisted dying [VAD]. It simply ensures that faith-based aged-care facilities are treated no differently from faith-based hospitals. It extends to them the same right to decline to facilitate VAD on their premises, while maintaining the obligation to make reasonable alternative arrangements. It must be up to the particular facility and organisation to decide whether it wishes to allow VAD on its premises.

Residents and families also have responsibilities. When choosing an aged-care facility, they must take into account the values and policies of that facility. Strong notice provisions already exist, and this bill strengthens them further. No resident will be caught by surprise. This is about choice and responsibility. Members should be clear that people who wish to access VAD will still have that option, but they must be located in an appropriate facility that aligns with their wishes. For those who choose a faith-based facility, they do so because they value the comfort of shared beliefs, the reassurance of a community that honours life and the peace of knowing that their final days will be lived in accordance with those values.

We must also consider the impact on other residents. In New South Wales around 80 per cent of VAD is administered by a health professional. For a roommate in a faith-based facility, that can mean watching a doctor enter their shared room not to heal but to bring death. For those whose faith or life experience makes euthanasia

deeply troubling, that is not just uncomfortable; it is traumatic. This bill protects them while still preserving the rights of others to access VAD elsewhere. Finally, let us remember the contribution of faith-based organisations. In many regional towns the only aged-care facility exists because a faith-based community, decades ago, stepped forward to provide care where no-one else would. Should their freedom of conscience now be compromised simply because they have faithfully served their communities for generations? That would be a perverse outcome indeed. On that basis, the Shooters, Fishers and Farmers Party support this bill.

The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW (15:46): I support the Voluntary Assisted Dying Amendment (Residential Facilities) Bill 2025. From the outset I remind members that I opposed voluntary assisted dying legislation. I believe that that issue is now settled, and I do not believe that the bill introduced by the Hon. Susan Carter seeks to quibble with that. In fact, a close reading of the provisions in the bill will show it seeks to enable access to voluntary assisted dying for those who choose it by providing a pathway. It also seeks to preserve the conscience of those who work in aged-care facilities and the ethos of those aged-care facilities themselves.

In his contribution the Hon. Robert Borsak raised a very significant consideration related to the provision of aged care. Many aged-care providers are faith based, and they run those facilities as an extension of their faith. Many of the people who work at faith-based aged-care facilities do so as an extension of their faith as well. It is important to preserve their conscience so that they can continue to provide aged-care services across the State, without it being in conflict with their conscience if it was to lead to voluntary assisted dying. To the point made by the Hon. Cameron Murphy, the provisions in the bill may not be exhaustive but amending them is the role of this Parliament. If the provisions are insufficient then it is the right of members to move amendments to the bill to address those issues.

The issue is vexed and difficult because it deals with people's residences and homes. It also deals with a type of institution and practice. The people who work within those institutions should be given the same rights as those who work in the medical profession and in medical facilities. The bill seeks to do that by allowing practitioners within those services to be true to their conscience while also providing a path for people to still access voluntary assisted dying that is available under New South Wales law. It preserves the ethos, activities and profession of those who give so much to the community by working in aged care and residential facilities. I declare my support for the bill and commend it to the House.

The Hon. EMILY SUVAAL (15:50): I contribute to debate on the Voluntary Assisted Dying Amendment (Residential Facilities) Bill 2025. I have given extensive and careful consideration to the matter. It is not a decision I take lightly, and I have deep respect for the views of all members on this important topic. At the heart of the debate lies a fundamental tension between competing rights: the right to religious freedom for individuals and organisations, and the right of individuals to choose their end-of-life care in their own home. Both those rights matter and both deserve our consideration, but we must find the right balance. I believe the bill as currently drafted does not strike that balance appropriately.

Let me be clear about what members are debating. Residential aged-care facilities are not simply service providers; they are people's homes. Residents contribute significant amounts of money, alongside substantial Federal Government funding, for the right to live in those facilities. They are places where people have established their lives, formed relationships with staff and other residents, and created their final sense of home and community. What concerns me most about the bill is its impact on regional and rural communities. The parliamentary research I have reviewed makes clear that the consequences will not be felt evenly across the State.

According to data compiled by the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, there are 173 postcodes in New South Wales where only one residential aged-care provider operates. Of those, 45 are operated by faith-based organisations, and 32 of those are located in postcodes without a hospital. In the Oxley electorate, that applies to communities around Nambucca Heads and Bowraville, where the only local aged-care facility is faith based and there is no hospital in the postcode. In the Coffs Harbour electorate, communities around Sawtell and Toormina are in the same situation, again with a single faith-based aged-care provider and no hospital. In the Clarence electorate, that affects communities connected to South Grafton, Iluka and Woodburn, where, again, the only aged-care provider is faith based and there is no hospital in the postcode.

In those communities there is no meaningful alternative if the sole provider opts out of voluntary assisted dying [VAD]. There is no second facility down the road, no nearby hospital with capacity and no option to remain safely at home under care. For many residents, particularly those requiring high-care support, the only way to access VAD would be to leave the place they live and do so during the final phase of life. The pattern extends further across the regions, even to postcodes where a hospital exists. In Myall Lakes, including the community of Wingham, the only aged-care providers in several postcodes are faith based. In the Northern Tablelands, in communities such as Inverell, Tingha and Moree, the same reliance on a single provider applies. In Tamworth, that includes the communities around Barraba and Manilla. In the Upper Hunter, it includes the areas around

Scone, Muswellbrook, Gloucester and Aberdeen. In the Cootamundra electorate, the pattern appears in communities around Crookwell as well.

In all of those places, there is effectively no choice of provider. For anyone who has visited those areas, it is not a simple matter of driving down the road to the next postcode. There can be hundreds of kilometres before the next provider. Even in Tweed, Bathurst and Dubbo, where the single providers identified are not faith based, the same underlying issue remains. When there is only one aged-care provider, any policy that allows a provider to opt out of providing a lawful health service does not create "choice"; it removes it. Where there is only one provider, and no hospital nearby, allowing that provider to opt out does not balance conscience and access. It simply removes access, and I do not believe that is an outcome that the Parliament intends.

We have also heard the claim that the bill would simply bring New South Wales in line with Victoria, but the systems are not the same. Victoria has a substantial network of publicly run residential aged-care facilities. It has around 160 services, many of them in rural and regional areas. When Victoria introduced its voluntary assisted dying framework, residents in those towns still had genuine alternatives if a particular provider did not participate. New South Wales does not have that parallel public system. In New South Wales, aged care is delivered overwhelmingly and almost exclusively by non-government providers, and in many regional towns there is only one facility. In those communities, an institutional opt-out does not just express a position; it determines whether people have access to care at all. The structural difference matters. A policy that preserves choice in Victoria would remove it entirely in large parts of regional New South Wales.

I also directly address the suggestion that has been raised as a solution to this problem: that we can simply transfer residents to acute facilities to access voluntary assisted dying. That proposal demonstrates a fundamental misunderstanding of end-of-life care and the realities of our healthcare system. Having worked as a healthcare professional, and as someone who lives in a regional area, I know the demands placed on our acute care system. We are currently working hard to move aged-care residents out of hospital beds. They may have been awaiting discharge to a residential facility for weeks or months. They do not want to be in an acute facility, but the reality is that there is a shortage of aged-care beds. The bill would reverse that progress by potentially sending vulnerable, dying patients back into our emergency departments.

Let us be absolutely clear about what a transfer would actually involve. It would mean moving someone in the final stages of their life, someone who may have intractable pain, like bone cancer pain so severe that even routine pressure area care is almost unbearable. It means moving them from their bed, and their home, onto an ambulance stretcher, transporting them to an emergency department, and expecting them to undergo the voluntary assisted dying process there. There is no easy way to transport someone anywhere at the end of their life, not even down the corridor. There is no special bed waiting in our hospitals for those patients. They would arrive at an emergency department that is managing resuscitation in progress, crying children with injuries and all the chaos that characterises our emergency departments. To expect families to gather around behind a blue curtain to support their loved one through this final, intimate process is not dignified, not humane and, frankly, not realistic.

The reality is that many people in the end stages of life simply cannot be safely moved. To suggest otherwise is naive at best and cruel at worst. In actuality, the bill would deny people access to voluntary assisted dying, not through policy choice but through practical impossibility. I am also troubled by the timing of the legislation. Voluntary assisted dying became available in New South Wales on 28 November 2023. The only data we have available covers the period from that date through to 30 June 2024, which is not even a full year. During that period, 398 people died following the administration of a voluntary assisted dying substance. Of those, 9.5 per cent accessed VAD in residential aged care or residential disability care facilities, 50.5 per cent accessed it in hospitals and 39.5 per cent accessed it in private residences. That data tells us that the system is new, people are still learning how to navigate it, and patterns of access are still emerging.

To make significant, broadscale changes to the legislation at this early stage, before we even have a full year's worth of data, seems premature and potentially reckless. There is a better way forward, and it is already carefully built into our current legislation. A statutory review of the Voluntary Assisted Dying Act is scheduled to commence at the end of November. That review, led by NSW Health, will provide a structured, comprehensive opportunity to examine how the law is working in practice and identify any necessary improvements. That is the appropriate forum for considering the complex issues raised by the Hon. Susan Carter. It will allow for proper consultation with all stakeholders, which has been notably absent from the development of this bill.

That brings me to another significant concern, which is the inadequate consultation process behind this legislation. Key organisations that should have been central to any discussion about changes to VAD in residential facilities have not been consulted. The Health Services Union, the New South Wales Nurses and Midwives' Association, the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners and the workers and professionals who would be implementing these changes were not consulted. Even more concerning, not all faith-based providers were consulted. Uniting, the largest provider of aged care in our State, was not involved in developing the legislation.

Something important that often gets lost in this debate is that not all faith-based providers take the same approach to voluntary assisted dying. There are religious organisations that work alongside residents and families to support their choices through to the end of life.

My concerns exist beyond faith-based providers, though. On my reading of the bill, it would apply to all residential facilities, whether they are faith-based or not, for-profit or not-for-profit. That creates the troubling possibility that a manager of any facility in New South Wales could potentially become a conscientious objector and deny access to voluntary assisted dying within that facility. While I absolutely respect the right of individuals, including healthcare professionals, to be conscientious objectors, I question whether we should extend that same right to for-profit organisations as a blanket policy. An individual manager's personal beliefs could, under the proposed legislation, override the rights of residents who have paid significant amounts of money to live in that facility and who have every right to access legal end-of-life care options.

That brings me back to the fundamental question of what we mean by "home". Yes, residential facilities are also workplaces for staff, and they are operated by organisations with their own values and beliefs. But they are, first and foremost, residents' homes. They are places where people live, not just receive care. When someone enters residential aged care, they often sell their family home. They leave behind their community and invest their life savings into securing a place in a facility. They are not checking into a hotel or visiting a clinic or hospital; they are establishing their final home. With that come certain rights and expectations about the care they will receive. If we have situations where entire facilities—or worse, entire towns—cannot access voluntary assisted dying due to organisational policies, we need to ask ourselves if we have gone too far. Have we allowed organisational rights to override individual rights to such an extent that we are denying people access to legal healthcare options they are entitled to?

I am also deeply concerned about the bill's impact on people currently in the system. The bill would commence on assent, which raises serious questions. What happens to someone who has already begun the VAD process if their provider suddenly opts out? What happens to residents who are already living in facilities, having signed contracts and paid substantial fees, if those facilities suddenly declare they will no longer accommodate voluntary assisted dying? We have a shortage of aged-care beds across New South Wales and Australia. There is not a spare bed waiting in another facility for residents who might need or want to transfer to access VAD. For many residents, particularly in regional areas, there may not be another facility within reasonable distance. Do we tell those people that the rules have changed and that their investment in their home no longer guarantees them the rights they thought they had?

I want to be clear: I understand and deeply respect the concerns of some faith-based providers. I acknowledge that there are genuine tensions here between religious freedom and individual autonomy. Those are not easy issues, and they deserve careful, thoughtful consideration. That is exactly why we should not rush this legislation through. That is why we have a statutory review process built into the existing Act. That is why we need proper consultation with all stakeholders, workers, health professionals, providers of all types, advocates and, most importantly, residents and their families.

The original voluntary assisted dying legislation went through an extensive, careful process. I was not in this place for that debate, but I have read the contributions to the second reading debate. I was struck by the measured and considered care that members on all sides brought to those discussions, and I thank them all for it. That legislation was hard won, carefully crafted and designed with multiple safeguards and review mechanisms built in. We should let those mechanisms work. We should gather proper data over a full cycle. We should conduct the statutory review with all voices at the table and then, if changes are needed, we can make them based on evidence, proper consultation and a full understanding of the consequences.

Ultimately, this debate comes down to the dignity of being able to choose how and where you die, free from suffering and pain. For many people, that means dying at home, surrounded by familiar faces and the comfort of known surroundings. When we deny people access to voluntary assisted dying in their residential care facility, when we suggest that they can simply be transferred to a hospital, and when we allow organisational beliefs to override individual choices, we are compromising that dignity. We are saying that some deaths matter less, some people's homes are less valid and some communities—particularly regional communities—have fewer health rights than others. I cannot support legislation that would have those effects, however unintended they may be. I cannot support changes that would remove access to voluntary assisted dying from entire towns and regions. I cannot support a process that has failed to consult adequately with the workers and professionals who would implement the changes and the residents and families they would ultimately impact the most.

The balance between religious freedom and individual autonomy is a delicate one. It deserves our utmost care and consideration. It must be a real balance, not a wholesale prioritisation of one set of rights over another. I believe we can find a way forward that respects both religious freedom and individual choice. I believe we can create a system where faith-based organisations can maintain their values, while ensuring that residents can access

legal healthcare options. We cannot do that through rushed legislation, based on incomplete data and inadequate consultation. Let the statutory review process proceed. Let the voices of all stakeholders be heard. Let us gather comprehensive data and understand the full implications of any changes we make. Then let us make decisions based on evidence, compassion and a genuine commitment to protecting the rights and dignity of all people in New South Wales, regardless of where they live or call home. For those reasons, I will not support the bill.

The Hon. JEREMY BUCKINGHAM (16:07): On behalf of the Legalise Cannabis Party and, I believe, the majority of people in New South Wales, I oppose the Voluntary Assisted Dying Amendment (Residential Facilities) Bill 2025. I associate myself with the incredibly compelling and thoughtful comments of the Hon. Emily Suvaal, a health professional who has clearly put a lot of thought into this difficult issue. I will try to match her in what was a profound contribution.

The Hon. Trevor Khan, MLC, introduced the Voluntary Assisted Dying Bill 2017 into the Legislative Council on 21 September 2017. Unfortunately, and tragically for some, that bill was defeated in this place by one vote on 16 November 2017. I was here to witness that vote, and to see it defeated was incredibly disappointing for the activists and people in the community who wanted that freedom of choice about how they left this mortal coil. Subsequently, Ms Annie Gabrielides launched a Change.org petition for legislation for voluntary assisted dying [VAD]. That petition quickly received more than 75,000 signatures.

Ultimately, the Voluntary Assisted Dying Bill 2021 was introduced by Mr Alex Greenwich MP. Notably, the bill was co-sponsored by 28 members across both Houses of the Parliament from all sides of politics—Independents, conservatives, progressives and more. The Voluntary Assisted Dying Act 2022 came into effect on 28 November 2023—that recently—making New South Wales the final Australian State to legalise voluntary assisted dying. Those long considered laws should not be re-prosecuted. That is an important point to make in this debate: It is unfortunate that we are having this debate again so soon after the previous debates. When we deal with these vexed social policies—be it voluntary assisted dying, marriage equality or abortion—to re-prosecute them again and again does a lot of harm in the community. It creates a lot of uncertainty.

The Voluntary Assisted Dying Amendment (Residential Facilities) Bill 2025 is invalid. This is a key point: Even if it passes it will be contested in the High Court. The activists who have fought tooth and nail for these laws will take it all the way to the High Court, where it will be struck down because it is inconsistent with Federal aged-care laws, invoking section 109 of the Constitution. This has been confirmed by an opinion from respected senior counsel and other legal advisers with expertise in constitutional law. I particularly thank Professor Patrick Keyzer for his assistance and Dying with Dignity for its brief that led to that advice that I urge members to consider.

The primacy of the Federal aged-care laws and the obligation on aged-care providers to allow voluntary assisted dying in their facilities has already been confirmed by a fact sheet issued by the Aged Care Quality and Safety Commission in 2024 on the role of aged-care providers in relation to voluntary assisted dying. It expressly states:

Living in a residential aged care service does not impact a person's right and ability to choose to access VAD. Residents have the right to choose to access VAD even where the provider has made the decision not to participate in the VAD process. This also applies to states (such as Victoria) where there is no obligation for a provider to directly facilitate access to VAD services.

...

Importantly, a person receiving aged care shouldn't be disadvantaged if they live in an aged care facility and want information about and/or access to VAD. Enabling a person receiving aged care to access VAD under state laws is consistent with a provider's responsibilities under Commonwealth law to support a person's choice.

Surely no MP could knowingly support laws which are unconstitutional. The bill should be withdrawn. I note we have not heard from the faith-based aged-care providers. They have not been emailing or sending us letters. I believe they are weighing up the constitutionality of these laws. They recognise their obligations under Federal law that they have to adhere to. That is why we have not heard from them. The bill is a direct attack on the rights of aged-care residents.

It is surprising that the Liberal Party and the Libertarians—who so often espouse the rights of the individual and freedom of choice—have opted for organisational over individual choice. Individual rights and freedom of choice are the philosophical bedrock of the Liberal Party and the Libertarians, and yet here they are—putting the rights of the Catholic, Anglican or Baptist Church over those of individuals in their organisations. It is incredibly disappointing at a time when new aged-care laws have just come into effect to shore up residents' rights after the abuses exposed in the royal commission. I have heard from many aged-care activists. They say this is about choice and the rights of the aged to be treated fairly and with dignity.

The two-year legislative review of the voluntary assisted dying law is about to start. Surely that is the right forum for religious providers to raise their concerns. The Parliament and community have been blindsided by the

bill. There was no warning or consultation with those most affected or the bodies which represent seniors and the elderly, particularly in regional areas. I completely concur with the contribution of the Hon. Emily Suvaal. This incredibly disadvantages people in regional areas who do not have a choice and cannot just get in an Uber to go up the road and talk to a healthcare professional about voluntary assisted dying. They may need to travel hundreds of kilometres to access that healthcare professional or hospital. They may have to do it in an ambulance at incredible cost, and it may kill them because they are in such a fraught stage at their end of life.

I say this again: Interestingly, we have heard nothing from the two major faith-based aged-care providers in New South Wales, who we know are ideologically opposed to VAD—Catholic Health Australia and Anglicare. Where are they? They would be tuning into this debate. I have not seen a single email or anything in the paper. I have not seen them lobbying for this. If they are in such need of these laws to protect their staff and residents, why have they not been actively lobbying? There is no doubt that this bill would make voluntary assisted dying impossible to access for many, and more so in regional areas. Claims that residents have the ability to just choose a VAD-supportive facility are insulting because most residents end up where a bed is available. Once again, those in regional areas would be disproportionately affected. In so many of our regional communities, there is only one aged-care facility. That may well be faith based. That means that they will be affected, unlike people with more choice.

The media has been filled with reports of "bed block" in public hospitals across the country, with thousands of elderly patients stranded there—sometimes for months—waiting for an aged-care bed. This would compound that issue. The VAD process would require a minimum of seven transfers to undertake each of the steps, and this would be physically or logistically impossible for many residents and may lead to them losing their lives. The harms to residents and their families would be considerable and may mean leaving the homes they have lived in. They are the community. Why would we tell them they do not have the right to access VAD in their homes, as statistics show that so many already are? End of life is, of course, a difficult process, and so many people want to do it around their loved ones and in their communities and homes. Leaving their homes, forced transfers, delay and denial of voluntary assisted dying—in each case, those in regional areas would be most severely impacted, and the voluntary assisted dying data shows that almost two-thirds of the first assessments for voluntary assisted dying are in regional areas.

Analysis of New South Wales aged-care facilities shows that there are at least 20 regional towns with a single residential aged-care facility that is faith-based. For those compelling reasons of discrimination, removing choice for older people, an unfair postcode choice and that we are re-prosecuting a debate that we have had at great length and was settled in a vote of this House, I vehemently oppose the bill on behalf of the Legalise Cannabis Party. I acknowledge the work of Ms Penny Hackett, the President of Dying with Dignity NSW, who joins us in the gallery today; Go Gentle Australia; the Health Services Union; Mr Craig Ellis, the National Secretary of the Legalise Cannabis Party; and the NSW Nurses and Midwives' Association, amongst many others who led the campaign for these humane laws. I acknowledge their efforts to highlight their concerns with the Voluntary Assisted Dying Amendment (Residential Facilities) Bill 2025. I urge members to oppose the bill.

The Hon. RACHEL MERTON (16:19): I speak in support of the Voluntary Assisted Dying Amendment (Residential Facilities) Bill 2025, introduced by my esteemed colleague the Hon. Susan Carter, as one of its co-sponsors. As a proud member of the Liberal Party in the Legislative Council of the New South Wales Parliament, I stand for a health system that respects the deepest convictions of our communities—convictions rooted in faith, family and the inherent dignity of life. The bill embodies those principles, balancing freedom of conscience and association with the right of individuals to access voluntary assisted dying [VAD]. It is a measured, compassionate bill that I commend to the House.

The bill aligns the treatment of residential aged-care facilities with that of hospitals under the Voluntary Assisted Dying Act 2022. It extends to aged-care facilities the same opt-out provisions currently afforded to hospitals, allowing them to decline to facilitate VAD on their premises while mandating reasonable steps to arrange alternatives, such as transfers. That ensures that no resident's access to VAD is diminished, while safeguarding the ethos of faith-based providers—pillars of our communities—that deliver compassionate end-of-life care as a vocation aligned with sacred values.

I am surprised by the conclusions of the Legislation Review Committee in *Legislation Review Digest No. 37/58*, which suggested that the bill trespasses unduly on personal rights and liberties. That is a fundamental misunderstanding. The bill maintains all individual rights under the existing VAD legislation while providing further protections for freedom of association for residents of aged-care homes and freedom of conscience for those who work in and run them. It does not deny access to medical practitioners or information. In certain circumstances, access may occur offsite—for example, at a doctor's surgery rather than the resident's facility—but that is neither unusual nor burdensome. Attending an offsite medical appointment, as residents

routinely do for dental, psychological or specialist care, is not a breach of the right to health care. As the bill mandates, if VAD processes cannot occur onsite, the facility must facilitate access elsewhere.

The bill, as the Hon. Susan Carter eloquently outlined in her second reading speech, is born of conversations: formal dialogues with aged-care leaders and faith representatives, informal exchanges with frontline workers, and heartfelt discussions with residents and their families in faith-based facilities. Those are the lived realities of some of our most vulnerable New South Welsh men and women approaching the end of their journeys. The bill seeks to honour those residents, allowing them to end their days in peace and comfort, supported by communities that share their ethos and faith-based approach to life.

Let us consider how the bill interacts with the VAD process. Step one involves accessing information as set out in section 90. The amendments maintain the requirement for aged-care facilities to allow members of the navigator service to provide support, assistance and information about VAD. Residents retain access to their treating medical practitioners, who remain obligated to document requests and comply with the Voluntary Assisted Dying Act. There is no barrier to accessing information or appropriate health care. Step two involves making requests as set out in section 92. The bill ensures that facilities facilitate first and final VAD requests, either onsite or by arranging offsite access to the resident's chosen medical practitioner. The addition of new section 92 (b) allows facilities to opt for offsite facilitation, respecting their ethos. That mirrors existing practices where residents travel offsite for medical appointments, such as for cardiology or optometry, which may only occur onsite a few times a year.

Step three involves assessments as set out in sections 93 and 94. The amendments maintain the obligation for facilities to facilitate assessments by a medical practitioner, either onsite or by arranging transfers to another location. The principal Act already contemplates such transfers, and the bill simply adds the facility's ethos as a valid reason for offsite assessments, ensuring no roadblocks to VAD access. Step four involves the written declaration, as set out in section 95. Similarly, the bill allows for the written VAD request to be facilitated offsite if required, with the facility responsible for arranging access. That respects the conscience of those operating faith-based facilities while ensuring compliance with voluntary assisted dying processes.

Step five involves the administration of the VAD substance as set out in section 97. The final step—self-administration or practitioner administration of the VAD substance—may occur offsite if the facility opts out. The bill does not question whether voluntary assisted dying will occur, only where. That aligns with routine end-of-life pathways, such as hospital transfers, and respects the sensitivities of shared living spaces, particularly for multicultural communities or those with histories of trauma where euthanasia may evoke painful associations. The bill strengthens transparency by requiring facilities to publish their voluntary assisted dying policies in accessible ways for current and prospective residents, preventing any element of surprise. That fosters informed choice, ensuring residents can select facilities aligned with their values, whether rooted in faith, cultural heritage or reverence for life's sanctity.

My support for the bill is deeply personal, informed by concerns I raised in this Chamber on 28 June 2023 in a private member's statement on faith-based health services. I highlighted the risks to those vital institutions following the Australian Capital Territory Government's compulsory acquisition of Calvary Public Hospital in Bruce—a rushed process that bypassed due scrutiny and sent shockwaves through New South Wales. Faith-based providers—such as St Vincent's Hospital, founded by the Sisters of Charity in 1857 and operating public facilities in Darlinghurst and Auburn, and Calvary Health Care, managing public hospitals in Kogarah and Newcastle's Mater hospital—are not fringe operators; they are the backbone of our public and private health systems. They serve electorates across our State, including the Premier's own. I called on the Government to reassure faith-based hospitals, aged-care and disability services that New South Wales would not follow the path of the Australian Capital Territory. This bill answers that call by extending conscience protections to aged care.

Faith-based residential facilities are essential in New South Wales. According to the aged-care service list for New South Wales, as at 30 June 2023, providers like Calvary Health Care, BaptistCare and St Vincent's Care operate numerous facilities statewide, from Sydney's western suburbs to regional outposts. BaptistCare alone oversees multiple aged-care homes across New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory, emphasising Christian-based communities that prioritise dignity in end-of-life care. The bill addresses a fundamental life choice. Those organisations have stepped in where market forces faltered, particularly in rural areas with low commercial viability. As the Hon. Susan Carter noted:

Should the freedom of conscience of faith-based organisations be compromised simply because they have offered care for decades in circumstances where only an ethos of respect for others drives the provision of that care? If that were the case, that would be a perverse outcome indeed.

The NSW Voluntary Assisted Dying Board's interim report provides reassurance that these protections will not hinder access. It recorded 91 practitioner administrations and 40 self-administrations, while the rest were from other causes, underscoring the need for flexible arrangements in shared spaces. Notably, 63 to 65 per cent of

voluntary assisted dying applicants come from regional New South Wales, despite it comprising only one-third of our population. That disparity highlights inequities in palliative care access, as confirmed by reports from Palliative Care NSW and the Agency for Clinical Innovation.

Rural and remote residents face barriers like workforce shortages and geographic isolation, particularly in areas like Far West New South Wales where specialist services are hours away. This bill does not exacerbate those challenges; it complements efforts to address them by ensuring continuity of ethos-driven services in regional towns where a single faith-based facility may be the only option. For many in our diverse State, particularly refugees from regimes where euthanasia was weaponised, faith-based facilities provide solace. Forcing voluntary assisted dying facilitation could undermine the peace those havens offer. Families also choose these settings for their life-affirming cultures, seeking care that supports loved ones spiritually, emotionally and physically.

The bill eliminates an inequity that could compel faith-based providers to act against their fundamental beliefs. It upholds freedom of association, allowing residents to choose communities aligned with their values during the delicate transition into aged care. It is a balanced reform that protects conscience, promotes choice and enhances dignity. I commend the Hon. Susan Carter for this thoughtful legislation born of conversations with those who care most. It honours our faith-based legacy while upholding voluntary assisted dying's promise of dignity. I commend the Voluntary Assisted Dying Amendment (Residential Facilities) Bill 2025 to the House.

The Hon. Dr SARAH KAINE (16:31): I oppose the Voluntary Assisted Dying Amendment (Residential Facilities) Bill 2025. This is a deeply sensitive issue that touches on autonomy, dignity and compassion at the end of life. Precisely because of its gravity, any legislative change must be approached with care and respect for those most affected. However, when considering the bill, a number of issues arose for me, and that is why I do not support it. The existing Voluntary Assisted Dying Act in New South Wales is the product of extensive debate. It balances individual rights with safeguards for practitioners and institutions. It is patient centred, not provider centred, and this bill seeks to alter that balance. In doing so, it risks undermining the rights of some of our most vulnerable citizens.

As some of it has already been canvassed, I will not go into the current legislation in detail except to say that it allows for individual conscientious objection. There may have been a misunderstanding from some previous speakers who suggested that it does not. I support individual conscientious objection; however, this bill goes far beyond protecting individual conscience. It introduces institutional objection, allowing entire organisations to impose their beliefs on residents who may not share those beliefs. The patient's rights vanish not because of their own beliefs but because of the beliefs of the organisation that owns the building they live in.

That is particularly troubling when we take into consideration the fact that many people have a limited choice when it comes to which residential aged-care facility they enter. A number of previous speakers who also oppose the bill spoke eloquently about the dearth of available aged-care places and how difficult it is for people entering aged care or those assisting a relative into aged care to find a place, let alone have any choice about the principles and values of the organisation whose facilities they may end up living in. It is particularly troubling when choice is limited like that.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I apologise to the member for interrupting. As I ruled during debate on the conservation hunting bill, the Business Committee determined that proceedings be interrupted after 60 minutes but not so as to interrupt a member speaking. I propose to do what I did twice on previous occasions, which is to ask the Hon. Dr Sarah Kaine whether she would like to finish her contribution now or to move to adjourn the debate and start again when it is resumed.

The Hon. Dr SARAH KAINE: I will finish now, Mr President. The reality is that aged-care placement is driven by availability, not preference. Families take the first bed that becomes available, and they often do not have an option as to whether the facility is religious or secular. They do not always have the opportunity to choose based on the facility's voluntary assisted dying policies. They are focused, and rightly so, on getting their loved ones the care they need as quickly as they can. To suggest otherwise is to ignore the lived experience of thousands of families.

We also heard from members who spoke before me that the situation is even more dire in rural and regional areas. Many towns have only one aged-care facility and many not even that. In a lot of cases, that facility is faith based. If that facility refuses access to voluntary assisted dying, the resident has no alternative. They cannot simply choose another provider. They cannot uproot themselves and move hundreds of kilometres away in their final days. In fact, the facilities or paramedics may not be available to facilitate that move. The idea that choice exists in those circumstances is a fiction.

Let us remember that aged-care facilities are not hospitals. I know that other members have said this in earlier speeches, but it is one of the key reasons I do not support the bill: Aged-care facilities are people's homes. For many residents, they are the only home they have had for many years. To force a dying person out of their home and away from familiar surroundings, staff who know them and the comforts of their personal belongings is not only impractical but also verges on cruel. It is a violation of the dignity we claim to uphold.

I worry that the practical effect of the bill is that many residents, particularly those in faith-based facilities, would lose meaningful access to voluntary assisted dying. It means they may be forced out of their homes and away from familiar surroundings, staff who know them and the comforts of the things that make it feel like home. It means their final days may be marked by distress and dislocation rather than dignity and peace. In my view, this is not a minor administrative change; it is a profound shift in the rights of dying people.

The bill also seeks to pre-empt a process that is already in place—a process designed to ensure that any changes to the Voluntary Assisted Dying Act are informed, inclusive and evidence based. The current Act requires a statutory review after two years of operation. As I understand it, that review is scheduled to commence later this month, with a report to be tabled in November next year. It will be conducted by NSW Health on behalf of the Minister for Health and will involve wideranging consultation with all relevant stakeholders, including peak medical bodies, unions, private entities, religious and faith groups, community organisations, and advocacy groups. The review will provide a comprehensive, consultative and evidence-based approach to any changes that may be needed. To my mind, that is where this debate belongs, not now but when we have the benefit of the review to consider.

I am acutely aware that real people are behind the legal arguments and policy frameworks, like in the story I heard about Judy's sister Jenny. Judy wrote:

My sister Jenny voluntarily ended her life in July 2025, having suffered the effects of metastatic cancer over the past several years. She was in an aged care home at the time of her death and was able to end her life surrounded by her much loved books and photos and to say goodbye to her family and friends in the days and hours prior to her death. Jenny was able to die with dignity—she ended her life in the company of those she loved, in a room full of her favourite things and surrounded by aged care staff who had come to know and love her. If the provisions of this Bill were in force at the time of Jenny's death, she would have faced a pain-filled trip to a sterile hospital room filled with staff who would be competent but would not know her personal story.

That is what is at stake. I am concerned that this bill may result in distress and dislocation for those who need to be shown compassion and dignity. As such, I cannot support the bill.

The PRESIDENT: The time for debate has expired.

Documents

TABLING OF PAPERS

The Hon. ROSE JACKSON: I table the following paper:

- (1) Dams Safety Act 2015—Report of the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water entitled *Dams Safety Act 2015 Statutory Review: Review Report*, dated November 2025.

Motions

TANGARA TRAIN FLEET

The Hon. Dr SARAH KAINE (16:39): I move:

- (1) That this House notes that:
 - (a) the first eight-carriage Tangara has been upgraded at the Sydney Trains Flemington and Auburn maintenance yards as part of the \$447 million Tangara Life Extension Program;
 - (b) the \$447 million Tangara Life Extension Program is the biggest single fleet renewal in New South Wales history and will upgrade 55 eight-carriage trains over the next three years, extending their life by at least a decade, while creating hundreds of local jobs and rebuilding New South Wales's rail manufacturing capability;
 - (c) Sydney Trains is recruiting for more than 200 mechanical and electrical trades and engineering roles for the refit program, including apprenticeships; and
 - (d) the previous Liberal-Nationals Government failed to plan for the replacement of the Tangaras, which make up 20 per cent of the suburban fleet, despite them suffering the most maintenance faults on the Sydney network due to their age.
- (2) That this House recognises the Government's commitment to rebuilding our local manufacturing capability and celebrates the Government's actions to bring rail jobs and contracts onshore.

Today I note the success of the Tangara Life Extension Program. This milestone speaks volumes about our commitment to reliability and jobs and to rebuilding an industry that should never have been lost. The Tangara fleet has been the backbone of Sydney's suburban rail network for decades. It was built in Newcastle and entered

service between 1988 and 1995. These trains have carried millions of passengers and travel more than six million kilometres each year. One in four Sydney train trips is on a Tangara. But after 35 years, these workhorses were showing their age. Maintenance faults were increasing, and commuters faced more breakdowns and delays unless action was taken.

The previous Liberal-Nationals Government failed to plan for the replacement of the fleet. It sent rail jobs offshore, which we talk about quite a lot in this place. It dismantled local manufacturing and left us with a fleet that was ageing fast. This approach cost taxpayers billions of dollars and delayed the delivery of trains for years. The Auditor-General's report laid bare the consequences: a \$2.5 billion blowout on overseas-built trains, which still have not entered service. That is the legacy that we inherited. This Government is doing things differently. We are rebuilding what was lost and investing in local jobs, skills and manufacturing. The Tangara Life Extension Program is proof of that commitment. It is the biggest fleet renewal in New South Wales history. We are making a \$447 million investment to upgrade 55 eight-carriage Tangara trains over the next three years.

The first refurbished train has rolled out of the Sydney Trains Flemington and Auburn maintenance yards, and that is just the beginning. The upgrades will extend the life of the fleet by at least a decade and give passengers more reliable trains while we plan for the next generation of locally built trains. This program is about more than trains; it is about jobs, skills and rebuilding an industry. More than 300 people will be employed over the life of the project, including over 200 new mechanical and electrical trades and engineering roles. Apprenticeships have been created, giving young people a pathway into a proud and skilled profession. These workers will join the 260 rail employees we brought back into public employment last year, reversing years of outsourcing and neglect.

The program is happening in Western Sydney. It means local jobs for local people; it means investment flowing into communities that were left behind when manufacturing was sent offshore; and it means wielding a pipeline of skilled workers who will not only refurbish trains today but also have the skills to build the new suburban fleet. The upgrades are significant. We are installing more accessible emergency help points, emergency door releases and passenger visual displays, and upgrading the passenger address system. We are adding new wheelchair spaces and handrails and upgrading priority seating. Those changes will make the Tangaras safer, more accessible and more comfortable for everyone.

This is what good government looks like. We are fixing the problems we inherited. We are planning for the future in a way that delivers value for money, supports local industry and creates good jobs. I compare this with the record of the Opposition, which told us that New South Wales could not build trains. It told us that it was too hard, too expensive and too complicated. The Opposition spent billions of dollars and sent thousands of jobs overseas. It bought ferries that could not fit under bridges and trains that could not fit through tunnels. It gutted our manufacturing base and left us with nothing. I reject the Opposition's defeatist attitude. We believe that New South Wales can build trains. The Tangara Life Extension Program is proof of our belief in the skills and capacity of the workers who will lead program.

We have made a commitment to local procurement through the Future Fleet Program. This 50 per cent local content target will ensure that businesses and jobs based in Australia and New South Wales engage in designing, building and maintaining the fleet. This program is about more than transport; it is about reversing decades of decline in manufacturing and creating opportunities for the next generation. It is about putting New South Wales back on track, literally and figuratively. The Tangara Life Extension Program is a success story about jobs, skills and reliability. It is the story of a government that believes in local industry and backs that belief with action. Our commuters will experience this story when they step onto the refurbished Tangaras and see the difference for themselves. I commend this motion, the program and the workers making it happen. Together, we are building a better future for New South Wales, one carriage at a time.

The Hon. NATALIE WARD (16:44): I thank the Hon. Dr Sarah Kaine for putting another transport motion forward. It is odd to see a Centre Unity MLC spruiking Australian Manufacturing Workers' Union policy in this Chamber, but strange things do happen in this place at the end of the year. It is good to see the Government spending some money on public transport. I am excited! I will never knock the Government for investing in transport, but the devil is always in the detail with this Government. The reality is that the Government has extended the life of the Tangara fleet because it has delayed the rollout of its signature promise to have contracts signed to build the new Tangara fleet in New South Wales.

Let us turn to the evidence. First, the Government said, "We will build the new Tangara fleet in New South Wales." Then it said, "Local content means it can be built anywhere in Australia or New Zealand." Now it is saying, "We have a target of 50 per cent local content from Australia or New Zealand once we account for design, construction and maintenance." I do not think that members have picked up on the important point that maintenance clearly has to occur in New South Wales. Every dollar spent on maintenance over the life of the trains will count as local content. Where else would the trains be maintained? Will the Government send the trains

overseas to have maintenance done? As my teenagers would say, "Duh, of course it's got to be here." That is something we will watch.

The Government has already lied about local bus manufacturing. We get buses from China and Victoria and slap a sticker on them that says they are locally manufactured. The Government spoke about offshore manufacturing. It had ferries made in Tasmania, which is offshore. This Government says, "No problem." I also note that when Labor was in opposition in 2022, one of its media releases stated:

The Tangaras have already had their service extended by ten years beyond their design life and will reach their final end of service life by 2027.

The trains were too old when Labor was in opposition, but now that it is in government it thinks it is a great idea to extend their life. The Government is patting itself on the back, but its own train review said that the Tangara fleet is the highest contributor to maintenance incidents in the network.

I talk now about our record of investing in new trains. The former Government originally extended the Tangara fleet. We invested in the new intercity fleet, which the Hon. Bob Nanva and his Rail, Tram and Bus Union comrades made sure did not service commuters for years; we invested in the new Regional Rail fleet to support regional commuters; we invested billions of dollars through the More Trains, More Services package; and we invested hundreds of millions of dollars to improve digital systems on the train network. This Government is great at patting itself on the back for the small things while making excuses for why it does not get the big things done. It cannot even do simple things like getting the trains to run on time.

I seek an extension of time.

Leave granted.

The Hon. NATALIE WARD: I thank the House for its indulgence. I know that the Hon. Dr Sarah Kaine will have all the answers in her reply, because she is very well read and briefed. I ask her to respond to the following questions: Will the Tangara fleet be built from scratch in New South Wales? What will actually be built in New South Wales? Will the first order for the new fleet be made before the next election?

The Hon. MARK BUTTIGIEG (16:48): Mr President—

The Hon. Wes Fang: Union hack 101.

The Hon. MARK BUTTIGIEG: Thank you for the compliment. It is just like the Opposition to make the perfect the enemy of the good. The Opposition literally outsourced everything under the sun. Members will remember the new intercity fleet trains, which I think came from Korea. This goes to the argument for the free market philosophy of hunting down the cheapest possible price available from any overseas market at any cost, and the costs were manifold. Members will remember that there was a 30 per cent cost blowout on those trains because they could not fit on the tracks. They had to be retrofitted and fixed up. Do members remember the ferries that were riddled with asbestos? They were not able to go under bridges because people's heads would be cut off. There were also crap trams. That litany of disasters was superficially a good deal for New South Wales taxpayers. Once one accounts for the cost blowouts, not to mention the exporting of jobs overseas instead of creating local jobs, I really do think it is a bit rich to come here and quibble with manufacturing in Tasmania or New Zealand.

The fact is that this Government is back on a New South Wales Labor agenda, stimulating the local manufacturing sector by refurbishing the Tangara fleet and putting manufacturing back at the centre. It is another promise we are making good on, manifested in reality. Those opposite want to come into this place and say it is not real, that it is not happening. The fact is that it is, and it is based on a fundamentally different philosophy. The economic rationalist era we had through the 1980s and 1990s—which, to be honest, to a certain extent previous Labor governments fell for—has been turned around by the Minns Labor Government with an anti-privatisation agenda, which we have dealt with in legislation and in practice by putting the Northern Beaches Hospital back into public hands, stopping the privatisation of Sydney Water and stopping all future privatisations.

Public ownership and public managing of those sorts of things is not, in and of itself, a bad thing. We should not be hung up on ideology. Where the market does a good job, we should back the market and have the market provide those things. But where government does a better job, where government can create jobs and have a more reliable fleet, it should do so. That is exactly what the refurbishment of the Tangara fleet kicks off. I commend the Minister for Transport for doing it.

The Hon. RACHEL MERTON (16:51): I oppose the motion put forward by the Hon. Dr Sarah Kaine, which sets out to praise the New South Wales Labor Government on its first upgrade to Tangara trains. I cannot stand here without commenting on the Government's neglect of the transport needs of south-western Sydney. It has been spoken about here on many occasions. The neglect of transport and infrastructure in south-western Sydney is simply shameful. The Sydney Metro line to Western Sydney International Airport is a significant project

aimed at connecting the airport with Greater Western Sydney. The line will be 23 kilometres long and will link St Marys to the airport, providing efficient access. Western Sydney International Airport is set to open without the \$11 billion metro line connecting it with Sydney's train network. That means passengers will be forced to drive their car or catch a bus once the airport opens in late 2026. The New South Wales Government says issues around industrial relations and supply are crippling passengers on their daily commute.

In addition, the Sydenham to Bankstown metro conversion has been pushed back by two years. The delay is attributed to disruptions caused by industrial action, which has limited access to worksites and restricted the provision of crucial work permits. Worse still, Infrastructure NSW reports that critical extensions—St Marys to Tallawong, Bradfield to Liverpool and Bradfield to Oran Park—will not be built until 2040, leaving commuters stranded for decades. I highlight the work of the Hon. Natalie Ward in calling this out. The delays are becoming quite unbelievable to commuters.

The Government's betrayal runs deeper. Upon taking office in March 2023, it scrapped the business case for expanding the Sydney Metro from Bankstown to Glenfield and Westmead to the airport—commitments made by the former Coalition Government. That abandonment ignores the needs of south-western Sydney, where public transport is essential. The Federal Labor Government should be called on to step up with funding— [*Time expired.*]

The Hon. BOB NANVA (16:54): I thank the Hon. Dr Sarah Kaine for bringing forward an excellent motion. The Tangara upgrade project is a really good example of the Government delivering on its promise to bring public transport manufacturing back to New South Wales and to ramp up transport maintenance in New South Wales to create secure, well-paying jobs. It is a measure that supports more reliable public transport services for commuters, which is in stark contrast to the approach of many of those opposite during their decade in government. They took an obsessive approach to pursuing a procurement strategy that took a sledgehammer to local rolling stock manufacturing and whittled away important maintenance of rolling stock infrastructure.

I will not forget the words of the former Minister for Transport Andrew Constance when he uttered the phrase—it was notorious in the Rail, Tram and Bus Union—that in 10 to 15 years' time the Government will not be in the provision of transport services. The gall of it! Those opposite had no interest whatsoever in rolling stock manufacturing or maintenance. They did not want to be in the provision of public transport services, full stop. It was a remarkable thing for a Minister for Transport to concede. The comment was made to *The Australian Financial Review* at a summit and I will not forget it. It shocked us all.

It was a great shame for a transport Minister to have that attitude because, as the Hon. Dr Sarah Kaine would well know, public transport manufacturing is an industry with a long and storied history in New South Wales. Steam locomotive engines were built at the magnificent Eveleigh Railway Workshops, which opened in 1887. As Sydney's rail network was electrified, the new electric rail cars were built at the Chullora Railway Workshops, which also produced diesel locomotives, passenger carriages and freight wagons, and since then train manufacturing has played an important role. It is an important industry in places like Lithgow, Kundle and, of course, Newcastle. For a transport Minister—and for a government at the time—to have absolutely no interest in the provision of transport services, let alone the procurement of local rolling stock, is a remarkable thing. And it is in stark contrast to the approach that is being taken by this Minister, who is proud of bringing manufacturing back to New South Wales and is proud of the fact that we are ramping up maintenance of rolling stock infrastructure in New South Wales—something that those opposite should be commending, not objecting to.

The PRESIDENT: I call the Hon. Wes Fang.

The Hon. Taylor Martin: You don't have to, you know.

The Hon. WES FANG (16:57): I acknowledge the interjection of my good friend and colleague the Hon. Taylor Martin, saying I do not have to. He is quite right; I do not have to make a comment, but I was somewhat compelled to after listening to some of the drivel coming from those opposite. I remind the Hon. Dr Sarah Kaine that there is an old saying: Self-praise is no praise. The Government brings motions to the House, and I do not know if they are meant to filibuster, kill a bit of time or whatever. But let us be honest: This Government does not have a very good track record with transport.

Let us talk about the metros. We set up the metros. We designed them, we planned them, we funded them and we pretty much built them. All the Government had to do was follow the plan that was there. It just had to work its way down the steps. But with the western metro, the one heading out towards Parramatta, the Government was yes, no, maybe, sort of, kind of, and in that time, how much did the price increase? Was it \$1 billion or \$2 billion? I note that, in her contribution, the Hon. Dr Sarah Kaine talked about the budget issues with some projects. The price increased by \$2 billion because the Government was dillydallying about something that had to be built, was ready to be built, and was literally planned and ready to be rolled out. All it had to do was press

the button. But it could not even do that. The Government does not have a very good record when it comes to transport.

Turning to manufacturing, let us talk about the Government's little facility in Nowra—except it is not a facility; it is a paddock at the moment. When it is a facility—because I think you have somehow managed to fast-track the delivery of the shed—what you will have is a facility to put some stickers on. This is a government that is delivering a trade in sticker placement or bolting on Opal card readers—or whatever it is that you are going to change those to. We have got a Minister for decals here who is effectively claiming that somehow he is delivering manufacturing back to New South Wales.

Let us be honest, the most manufacturing we have had in relation to transport in this State was when the previous Minister agreed to however many millions of dollars to put cameras on trains that did not need them because their union demanded them—the same union that put drivers on driverless trains. Let us talk about the reality of this Government and its delivery of transport services. It has put drivers on driverless trains. It could not build the metros we delivered. It is putting stickers on buses and claiming that it is building them here. It is not doing a very good job. [*Time expired.*]

The Hon. MARK LATHAM (17:00): Labor is vastly improved on Tangara performance. As the amateur Labor historian in the Chamber, I remember the 1988 election campaign when the Tangaras were not quite ready, so they put the false nose on them and the hapless the Hon. Barrie Unsworth had to appear down at Central Station with these trains that had a cardboard nose. You think journalists are pretty dumb—by and large they are—but even they were smart enough to work out this was a bodgie train. This was not going out to Campbelltown, Penrith or Chatswood any time soon with its concrete nose. The Minister here is a vast improvement. Without boasting, I have probably been on more Tangaras than any other member in this Chamber. I have been trekking in on those trains. Under this Minister, the trains have never been as clean, on time and reliable, and they are vastly better than the road chaos that you find on the M5.

Some people say this Minister is a burglar. With his responsibilities, he works at night on the night-time economy, but by day he is actually doing the job for the trains. I am sorry for my friends in the Opposition, who have a magnificent shadow Minister. It is the best tag team quality that we have had, with no disrespect to our economic managers the Hon. Daniel Mookhey and the Hon. Damien Tudehope, who are taking an eternity to work out the simple workers compensation plan. At least these people can run a Tangara. I am predicting that soon, under the burglar Minister—when he does not work at night—we will have Tangara vibrancy. You will feel the buzz! We are lucky as a House that we have our own Ben Chifley here in the Chamber, the Hon. Bob Nanva, who talks about trains like he had a train set as a kid. I reckon he has driven a few; I reckon he has even been on a few.

The Hon. Bob Nanva: I have.

The Hon. MARK LATHAM: He has. Like me, he lives in the outer suburbs. Coming in from Penrith, he knows the service is pretty good. Although the shadow Minister assures me I am lucky because I am on the T8 line—the privatised one through the airport—which has got the highest on-time running. I am lucky there—and, of course, the trains are a lot safer for me than taxis! All of that adds up to a pretty good deal. I am probably on the side of the Government here. The Hon. Dr Sarah Kaine said that we are upgrading the Tangaras. They have not got a plastic or cardboard nose; they have got real noses now and they are running okay. We are upgrading the eight-carriage Tangara, and I look forward to riding on many more in the future under this very fine Minister and his very fine opponent.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM (Special Minister of State, Minister for Transport, Minister for the Arts, and Minister for Music and the Night-time Economy) (17:03): I will not comment on the 1988 campaign for re-election by that Labor Government, but I am pleased to hear the feedback from a member who I know is on the train often.

The Hon. Mark Latham: And the announcements are better.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: That is good. I take those comments very seriously. It does align with what we are seeing in the reliability statistics. But I have got to be honest, the Government knows there is a long way to go. People rely on these trains. We need them to be more reliable every day, but I am pleased to hear the feedback. The Opposition is very critical of the Government, which is genuinely trying to shift the dial in this area. It is not easy to go from practically zero when it comes to these workforce and manufacturing issues, but we are giving it a really good go. I just ask the Opposition to get on board a little bit more.

The good news is that this has really started. I have been out with the Premier and the member for Auburn to these workshops where, along with the 260 people who have been insourced and are now on the Government payroll, there are 200 more people on the payroll doing this rail maintenance work. They are practically rebuilding

the Tangaras around the bones of that magnificent train manufactured up in Broadmeadow in Newcastle. Now that those trains are fully fitted out, it is fantastic to see.

The Opposition says, "Hang on, we delivered the intercity fleet. We delivered the Regional Rail fleet." There is only one big problem: Those trains never hit the tracks! They never actually ran on a track or picked up a passenger. This is a traditional argument where the Government has got one view and the Opposition has another. If members are in any doubt about which side to back, go and read the report from the Auditor-General. It is a mind-boggling, scathing review of these trains, which were up to six years late and cost an extra \$2½ billion. The Hon. Dr Sarah Kaine observed that they did not fit the tunnels, but I tell her that she is being too kind. They did not fit the tunnels, they did not fit the tracks, and they did not fit the platforms—all three. That is quite a remarkable triple.

The Hon. Mark Latham: What about the cardboard nose?

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: I will not comment on the '88 campaign. I will not be drawn into that. The Government's plan is this. We have got a deal for industrial peace. We are driving out new technology to lift reliability, such as replacing those binoculars, for example. We have got the trains that the shadow Minister opposite referred to on the tracks. Those trains, which were left languishing by the former Government, are making a difference heading up to the Hunter and as you head up and down to and from the Blue Mountains. They will make a difference on the South Coast. But we are also working on these Tangaras. That is crucial. They carry one in four trips on the Sydney network and we need them to be more reliable—and they will be.

The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE (17:06): I felt compelled to speak when I heard the Hon. John Graham get up and extol the virtues of refurbishing the Tangaras. There is only one yardstick about delivery of infrastructure by which he should measure himself: Catch a metro, mate! Once he has done that, the experience of travelling on a Tangara will not be the same anymore. Go and catch the metro and then we will be done. Most of us have travelled on a Tangara, and that is the problem. They were delivered in 1988. I note the Treasurer looks like he is dying to speak on the other side of the table. Does he have an announcement to make? Is he going to deliver new infrastructure?

The Hon. Daniel Mookhey: I was going to say that you could have thought about what to buy.

The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: The big announcement those opposite have is they are going to refurbish the 1988 Tangara trains. The Minister and the Treasurer come into this Chamber and make a virtue out of seeking to refurbish an old train. Let me give you both the tip, mate: Deliver more metros! That should be the Government's vision for this State. That would be a government that would be able to say something about the legacy it would deliver for the people of New South Wales. But the Premier comes out and says, "Nothing before 2040." I tell members, I do not think I will be here by then. The infrastructure vision of those opposite is to deliver stuff after most of us are dead. I will not speak for the Hon. Courtney Houssos. I am sure she will be the Premier by then—well, after we have been in government for a while! This motion is underpinned by the fact that this Government has no vision. The only thing that those opposite can come in here and try to spruik their credentials for is the refurbishment of an old train.

The Hon. Dr SARAH KAINE (17:09): In reply: I thank all of my colleagues across the Chamber for providing such rich content to respond to. I was pleased to be bringing this motion today because I knew that the Hon. Natalie Ward would speak to it. What I really appreciate about her contribution is that I share her approach that attack is always the best form of defence, so double down on that. I say, though, to the Hon. Natalie Ward that, being known as a very obedient member of caucus, I will not be offering answers on behalf of the Minister. I will leave that to him. The Hon. Mark Buttigieg made the good point that we are making progress in the area of local manufacturing by making considered choices about where we spend our procurement dollars to make sure that we are reskilling, upskilling and creating jobs. Sure, it would be great if we were able to fix everything in one go and to build everything in one place in New South Wales to start with, but that is not realistic. In his words, "Don't let the perfect be the enemy of the good."

In particular, I appreciated the Hon. Wes Fang doing what he does best, which is to lead with his chin. He wanted to talk about track records and the past. As the Minister said, in relation to transport, that cannot be done without considering the Auditor-General's most recent report. The Minister talked about the report a little bit, but just to recap the highlights, the Auditor-General found that under the previous Government the new intercity fleet and Regional Rail fleet were not effectively procured; there was no effective scoping or estimation of the full costs of either of those fleets. I appreciate the Hon. Wes Fang offering the Government his advice, but perhaps he should peruse that report in a bit more detail. That would be appreciated. I also really enjoyed contributions about the history of our trains. I thank the Hon. Mark Latham for bringing up the 1988 Tangara situation, which some of us—

The Hon. Jacqui Munro: Were not born for.

The Hon. Dr SARAH KAINE: I was born before it, I am afraid. But I did not remember it, so I do appreciate that we have entered into some historical consideration and analysis. Overall, I am really proud that this Government is trying its damndest to provide opportunities to reskill workers, to create new jobs, to bring back manufacturing, and to have much tighter control over procurement undertaken in New South Wales. I commend the motion to the House.

The PRESIDENT: The question is that the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Documents

WORKPLACE PSYCHOLOGICAL INJURIES

Production of Documents: Order

The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN (17:12): I seek leave to amend private members' business item No. 2656 for today of which I have given notice by:

- (1) Inserting ", the Premier's Department, The Cabinet Office, the Minister for Customer Service and Digital Government, Minister for Emergency Services and Minister for Youth Justice, the State Insurance Regulatory Authority, the Department of Customer Service," after "the Treasury".
- (2) Inserting after paragraph (a):
 - (b) all documents relating to the review undertaken by the State Insurance Regulatory Authority of the use of the Psychiatric Impairment Rating Scale within the workers compensation scheme, as referred to by the Government in its 4 March 2024 response to the 2023 Review of the Workers Compensation System; and.

Leave granted.

The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN: Accordingly, I move:

That, under standing order 52, there be laid upon the table of the House within 14 days of the date of passing of this resolution the following documents, excluding any documents previously returned under an order of the House, created since 28 March 2023 in the possession, custody or control of the Treasurer, the Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Work Health and Safety, the Minister for Water, Minister for Housing, Minister for Homelessness, Minister for Mental Health and Minister for Youth, the Treasury, the Premier's Department, The Cabinet Office, the Minister for Customer Service and Digital Government, Minister for Emergency Services and Minister for Youth Justice, the State Insurance Regulatory Authority, the Department of Customer Service, or the Ministry of Health relating to workplace psychological injuries:

- (a) all documents relating to the new tool being developed by the Chief Psychiatrist to measure permanent impairment for psychological injuries;
- (b) all documents relating to the review undertaken by the State Insurance Regulatory Authority of the use of the Psychiatric Impairment Rating Scale within the workers compensation scheme, as referred to by the Government in its 4 March 2024 response to the 2023 Review of the Workers Compensation System; and
- (c) any legal or other advice regarding the scope or validity of this order of the House created as a result of this order of the House.

As much as this motion is intertwined with the workers compensation scheme changes proposed by the Labor Government, it is worth taking some time today to go over one of the unresolved issues which, in my opinion, we will likely need to resolve next year, namely, the question of replacing the current psychiatric impairment rating scale [PIRS] and whole person impairment [WPI] methodology of assessing those with a psychological injury. Currently in New South Wales, the PIRS is mandated for assessing permanent impairment for the purposes of a workers compensation claim.

The State Insurance Regulatory Authority [SIRA] issued the fourth edition of its guidelines for the application of the PIRS in 2015. Since then, psychological injury claims have exploded in New South Wales and run the very real risk of driving the system into a seriously unsustainable position within the space of several years. In fact, it is so outdated and underexamined that on the SIRA website—a State Government website, complete with the waratah logo—where the guidelines are to be set out, there are broken links or links to websites that do not exist anymore. It refers to the *American Medical Association's Guides to the Evaluation of Permanent Impairment, 5th Edition* [AMA5], when so many other jurisdictions, including the Australian Federal Government and many States in the United States of America, now rely on the updated sixth edition, particularly chapter 14, which addresses psychiatric impairment.

In those jurisdictions that have been utilising the updated sixth edition, which includes additional methods of assessing impairment, it has been reported to produce a far more reliable rating for the patient or claimant than the AMA5 rules that New South Wales currently uses. I am advised that the updated rules are around 50 per cent

more reliable, which helps significantly when appeals are lodged or challenges end up in court. Furthermore, I am advised that the time taken to get the rating under the sixth edition, AMA6, can add 50 per cent to 100 per cent more time with a psychiatrist, due to the added criteria to be assessed.

If the current scheme has too much fraud and too many legal challenges, and the resources taken up by all of this work around the issue are not actually addressing genuine cases, then moving to a newer, more comprehensive system of assessment would go a long way to fixing the system, would it not? It is abundantly clear that our system, as it currently stands, is not fit for purpose, and no tweaking of the current WPI figures under the existing system will do justice to those who go to work and come home permanently impaired, catatonic or, in some instances, suicidal.

This is the system that we are relying upon to adjust how payments will be made going forward. This system is the foundation of the workers compensation reforms which we have been debating most of this year. Unfortunately, that debate has now descended into a stalemate over which percentage WPI should be applied under the current system. New South Wales has the option to update to the newer, more detailed, guidelines. Yes, it will likely mean more time taken by a psychiatrist to assess the injured worker, but it can result in a much more accurate rating and weed out fraudulent cases, which are obviously costing this State and its employers so much. It is not an easy implementation to make, but something has to change. Obviously, I am no expert, hence why this motion requests documentation in the possession of the Government to inform us all on what any future updates may look like, so that we can urgently begin that work.

The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY (Treasurer) (17:17): The Government will support the motion. There are many reasons why it should be supported, as set out by the mover of the motion. I commend the Hon. Taylor Martin for bringing the motion forward. Many of the issues that the member raised will be canvassed in this place shortly. Whilst I will save the substance of my remarks for that debate, which I anticipate will be lengthy, it is fair to say that, to the extent to which the production of documents can assist the House in its deliberations, the Government has always been predisposed to support their release, particularly when it comes to workers compensation reform.

The final point I make in this short contribution on the Standing Order 52 motion is that the member is quite right to say that regardless of what position members adopt in the debate, we can all agree that the need for continuous vigilant reform in this space is ongoing. As I said at the very outset when I gave a ministerial statement back in February or March, we have to break our "set and forget" culture when it comes to workers compensation. We have to remain engaged in this debate and revisit it more than once a decade.

Ms ABIGAIL BOYD (17:18): On behalf of The Greens, I indicate that we support the motion and thank the Hon. Taylor Martin for moving it. One of the big sources of frustration for many of us who have been following workers compensation for some time is the number of recommendations that have been left on the table after very thorough reviews by previous committees of this place and independent reviewers. They have pointed out the significant flaws in the scheme and what needs to happen for the scheme to be a fairer and more sustainable system. The whole person impairment [WPI] scale is one of those issues. I remind members of what McDougall said in 2021 in relation to this scale:

The use of the concept of WPI as the test for entitlement to weekly and medical benefits does not reflect the policy objective of ensuring that the most injured workers should receive appropriate support. That policy would be better served by a test that assessed the severity of an injury by reference to the treatment and support necessary to manage its consequences, as well as its impact on the worker's capacity for work.

WPI assessments may well be suitable for their original purpose – assessing lump sum compensation for the non-economic loss caused by the injury ... But those assessments measure neither the capacity to work nor the necessity of medical treatment. The use of a WPI assessment for those purposes creates a significant risk that workers may be left uncompensated for a real and severe loss of capacity to work, or substantial medical expense, arising from a workplace injury.

That is the nub of the issue that we have been discussing. WPI, at whatever threshold, is not an accurate reflection of capacity to work. When the amendments raised the WPI to 20 per cent under previous changes that the Labor Opposition at the time fiercely opposed, we saw people basically being up lined up in a row to assess what level of WPI they were. Then an arbitrary number was inserted in the row and if a person fell on one side of it, regardless of their actual capacity to work, that person found themselves having their entitlements cut off.

Unfortunately, the people we spoke to in this process who were at 22 or 23 per cent told us very clearly that if they are cut off and they have no capacity to work, they do not want to be a burden on their families. Many of them told us they will take their lives. That is the reality of what we are dealing with. That is what happened when the assessment changed last time. We had at least 59 instances of injured workers dying by suicide. It really matters that we get this right. We need to completely reform that by paying attention to these recommendations and implementing them before we make any changes to WPI thresholds.

The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE (17:22): I also support the motion. In the media this morning, Mark Morey said he thought the process of amending the workers compensation legislation had been done "arse about". Effectively, he suggested the work relating to the review of the scale should have been done first before the amending legislation was presented to Parliament. A situation has been created in which Parliament is being asked to exclude people from benefits when there is no demonstrable capacity for work. The Parliament will be asked to do that when the workers compensation legislation is presented.

Earlier today we had debates about production of documents in response to orders for papers, either voluntarily or through an order of this House. I would have thought that, in the interests of progressing this legislation, the documentation should have been available to the committee and to all members before this Standing Order 52 motion was brought to the House. If the State Insurance Regulatory Authority is already working on this and is modelling alternative opportunities for the whole person impairment rating scale to be amended, that should be introduced. The Government is asking this House to set in place a percentage based on a flawed scale, but telling us that we will move to a different scale once the review is complete. The problem is that the review should have been done before Parliament was asked to pass legislation to determine percentages in relation to access to entitlements.

This process has been appalling. The committee that reviewed this legislation dealt with an enormous amount of evidence from injured workers and psychiatrists about flaws in the scale and the capacity of people to work under the scale's current settings. When we measure that evidence against what Parliament is being asked to do, we are virtually left with no alternative other than not supporting the legislation. We support the legislation and the work being done, but the legislation should have followed the work instead of the work following the legislation.

The Hon. MARK LATHAM (17:25): I support the motion and what the Hon. Taylor Martin is trying to achieve. I also support the comments of colleagues who are members of the Boyd committee—Ms Abigail Boyd and the Hon. Damien Tudehope—because the Treasurer's handling of this issue has been abysmal. His original intent was to ram through the workers compensation bill. He thought he could stampede the Liberal Party with a bit of business community pressure and panic, and ignore the opportunity for this Chamber to gather evidence. Thank goodness for the committee.

I was by no means an expert or knowledgeable about workers compensation when I filled in for my friend the Hon. Rod Roberts on the Donnelly committee, but I learned. In the early stages of the inquiry, I thought that the 31 per cent whole person impairment [WPI] had some merit. Looking back now, it was a superficial appeal. The process of being educated and learning on committees by gathering evidence and taking it seriously, which is the best work and core function of this House, was critically important. Can someone in the Labor Party stand up and say that it is completely barbaric and unacceptable for a party founded on the interests of workers to now be in a situation of knowing, based on evidence—not hearsay, but evidence and science—that there will be injured workers at 31 per cent WPI who kill themselves. A workers party certainly cannot tolerate that.

I know it is hard to break caucus solidarity, to put a black mark on your career and feel wretched when your colleagues look at you aghast, but a workers party cannot be in a situation where injured workers hurt themselves, harm themselves and even kill themselves because of the proposition the Labor Party is advancing. I implore Labor members to rethink and abandon the 31 per cent. I am saying, based on my own past errors, that we can learn through committee processes to reach a sensible agreement with elements of the crossbench and the Opposition about reforms. Make the savings—but do not do it at the expense of workers committing suicide.

The Hon. TAYLOR MARTIN (17:27): In reply: I thank every member who contributed to the debate. I particularly thank the Treasurer for his engagement on the issue this year. I take this opportunity to thank Ms Abigail Boyd publicly for her work, not just on the committee that reported last week but through her work on several committees in recent years that examined workers compensation. I thank the Leader of the Opposition, who is a fearless leader. I am pleased he included the quote from the Unions NSW secretary, Mark Morey, who said that this whole proposal is "arse about". Unfortunately, I have to agree. This whole assessment system is not fit for purpose in assessing psychological injuries. I agree with everything the Leader of the Opposition said during the debate. I thank the Hon. Mark Latham who, as a former Federal Leader of the Labor Party, is lecturing the party of the workers about protecting workers. I am sure we will hear much more about all of this, if not tomorrow then next week.

The PRESIDENT: The question is that the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

*Bills***JUSTICES OF THE PEACE AMENDMENT BILL 2025****First Reading**

Bill received from the Legislative Assembly, read a first time and ordered to be published on motion by the Hon. Penny Sharpe, on behalf of the Hon. Daniel Mookhey.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: According to standing order, I table a statement of public interest.

Statement of public interest tabled.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: I move:

That standing orders be suspended to allow the passing of the bill through all its remaining stages during the present or any one sitting of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: I move:

That the second reading of the bill stand as an order of the day for the first sitting day in the next sitting period.

Motion agreed to.

KOSCIUSZKO WILD HORSE HERITAGE REPEAL BILL 2025**Second Reading Debate**

Debate resumed from 22 October 2025.

The Hon. ROBERT BORSAK (17:30): On behalf of the Shooters, Fishers and Farmers Party, I speak on the Kosciuszko Wild Horse Heritage Repeal Bill 2025. The Shooters, Fishers and Farmers Party will not oppose the bill on one clear condition: that the heritage value of the brumbies is recognised and respected and that a sustainable herd reflecting that value is managed and maintained within Kosciuszko National Park into the future. I foreshadow that we will move a couple of amendments. We have always said that the management of wild horses must be humane, scientifically sound and carried out using suitable firearms in the hands of skilled shooters. That is non-negotiable.

It is commendable that the Government now acknowledges what some of us have said for years: Introduced animals can and do have heritage value. To many Australians, especially those who live and work in the high country, the brumby is not a pest or a statistic but a totem animal and a living symbol of freedom, endurance and the pioneering spirit of Australians. I have spoken to many people over the years—stockmen, horsemen, rangers and local families—who see the brumby as part of their own story. For them, the horses are part of the landscape of their hearts. To some, the sight of a mob of brumbies running across the high plains is as powerful as seeing the Southern Cross in the night sky.

That is not just a view held by non-Indigenous Australians. In my travels and hunting trips through the remote Northern Territory, I have met Indigenous people who hold deep respect for wild horses, and even donkeys, some believing that the horse carries the spirit of their ancestors when it runs across country. Others see the donkey, with its distinctive cross on its back, as a sacred Christian totem that should not be killed. That tells us something profound. Heritage and cultural meaning are not confined to native species and are not frozen at a certain point in time or history. Animals can and do become part of our shared story and our identity, even when they arrived here with us.

But let us also be honest—heritage is not honoured by neglect. Doing nothing is not respect; it is irresponsibility. Allowing animals to suffer through starvation, drought or unmanaged overpopulation is the opposite of humane care. That is why we have always said that proper management is essential. Numbers must be kept at a level that the environment can sustain, but their management must be humane, competent and respectful. Our concern has always been that, too often, so-called control operations have been run with poor oversight and questionable marksmanship and without sufficient regard for animal welfare or community sentiment. If brumby management is to continue, it must be done properly, with clear standards, accountability and transparency.

There is another critical element that cannot be ignored in this debate. Effective brumby management cannot occur in isolation. The Shooters, Fishers and Farmers Party believes that management of brumbies must be undertaken within a broader, coordinated brumby management framework across all land tenures—national parks, reserves, State forests and private land alike. That is not just common sense; it is exactly what the various New South Wales government departments, including the Department of Primary Industries and Regional

Development and the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water, already espouse on their websites: that pest management must be cross-tenure, collaborative and consistent across land boundaries. If horses are removed from one area but not controlled on adjoining lands, Kosciuszko National Park simply becomes a sink for unmanaged horses from elsewhere, attracted by the better feed conditions in the areas from where horses have been removed. That is not management; that is displacement. It just moves the problem around and invites more conflict.

We need collaboration between landholders, national parks staff, Local Land Services and community groups to ensure that brumby populations are responsibly managed across the wider landscape, not just inside park boundaries. We support the principle that the park's ecological integrity must be protected, but we also insist that the heritage value of brumbies be preserved within that framework so that future generations can see and understand this living link to our rural heritage and frontier history.

In short, the Shooters, Fishers and Farmers Party supports the repeal bill provided the heritage value of the brumby is formally recognised and preserved through a maintained, sustainable herd. We insist that all control measures be humane and professionally undertaken with suitable firearms operated by professional shooters. We call for coordinated, cross-tenure pest management programs across New South Wales to prevent Kosciuszko National Park from becoming a refuge for unmanaged horse populations from surrounding lands. The brumby is more than a management problem; it is a symbol. It represents the bond between people and the land and between past and present. Let us ensure that, in caring for our national park, we do not erase that bond but manage it wisely, respectfully and humanely. The Shooters, Fishers and Farmers Party supports the bill on that basis.

Ms SUE HIGGINSON (17:36): On behalf of The Greens, I indicate our strong support for the Kosciuszko Wild Horse Heritage Repeal Bill 2025. I put on record that The Greens opposed the Kosciuszko Wild Horse Heritage Bill 2018 and have been active in supporting the repeal of that bill ever since. The legislated protection for an invasive species in a national park is a fever dream that could only be dreamt up by John Barilaro and his mate Peter Cochran in what was a "jobs for the boys" decision. Following passage of that bill in 2018, Kosciuszko became the only national park in Australia in which a feral species was protected. It was an especially despicable decision by the former Government, given that while debate on the bill was occurring, the Threatened Species Scientific Committee was considering feral horses as a key threatening process.

Of the unique and irreplaceable native wildlife of the Australian Alps, 28 threatened species and two ecological communities were directly threatened with extinction by feral horses. Along with the importance of the Kosciuszko National Park as a source of water to the Murray-Darling Basin—some 9,600 gigalitres every year—the environmental dangers of leaving horses in that precious national park is why the Kosciuszko Science Accord was co-signed by 100 scientists in 2018. I note the comments of my colleague Senator Mehreen Faruqi, who said in debate on the bill at the time:

We oppose it because we recognise the detrimental environmental impact that wild horses are having on the Australian alps bioregion ... this bill entrenches this impact rather than addresses it.

She also said:

We oppose the bill because it is another example of the influence of powerful vested interests and political donations that dictate policy in this Government.

The result of that 2018 bill was extreme and deleterious. Between 2020 and 2022, after aerial shooting programs had been halted under the management plan, feral horse numbers increased from 14,000 to almost 19,000, a 30 per cent rise in population numbers. The lack of humane and scientifically justified aerial shooting programs meant that just 886 horses were removed through trapping and ground shooting in 2019 to 2020 and 859 horses in 2022.

Without aerial shooting, those other measures fell well short of the 2,825 horses required to be removed each year to stabilise the number of feral horses in Kosciuszko, and nowhere near the 6,000 horses required to be removed to reach the legislated target of 3,000 animals. The simple truth at the heart of the issue is that, for every breeding mare left in the park, there will need to be continued mass slaughter of those animals to maintain the population target. As unpalatable as aerial shooting of horses is, it is far less harmful and far more humane to work towards zero horses in the park through effective, humane and professional aerial shooting programs.

The repeal bill would have been impossible without the dedication of the traditional custodians who have been resisting colonisation and invasion of their country by horses. The incredible Narjong water healing ceremony held at the headwaters of the Murrumbidgee in 2019 was a reminder that the lands and waters of this country have been cared for across tens of thousands of years by First Nations people, and that we must ask them to continue sharing their knowledge and their care for country. I thank some of the leaders who were part of the Narjong ceremony: Richard Swain, Wayne Thorpe, Sue Bulger, Max Harrison, Major Moogy Sumner, Bruce Pascoe, Rhonda Casey and Kevin Dean Whyman. I also acknowledge the brilliant work of Reclaim Kosci, the

Invasive Species Council, the National Parks Association, the Colong Foundation for Wilderness and the Nature Conservation Council. They have worked tirelessly with tens of thousands of regular community members to keep this critical issue at the forefront of public and political discourse. Without them and their incredible campaign, members could not have this debate.

The Hon. AILEEN MacDONALD (17:41): On behalf of the Liberal Party, I contribute to debate on the Kosciuszko Wild Horse Heritage Repeal Bill 2025. I support the bill not because I want to see horses shot but because I respect the landscape, the evidence and the responsibility that we all share as stewards of our environment. Kosciuszko National Park is one of Australia's most extraordinary landscapes. It is home to unique alpine ecosystems found nowhere else on Earth. As legislators, we have a duty to protect it for future generations. The bill restores that principle: that national parks exist to conserve native flora and fauna, not to enshrine the protection of invasive species, however romantic their image may be. I know the issue touches the hearts of many people across regional New South Wales. The brumby holds a powerful place in our cultural imagination in poetry, film and family stories. But affection alone cannot guide environmental management—science must.

I participated in an inquiry into the aerial culling of wild horses in Kosciuszko. It was not a pleasant experience. The evidence, including photographs and testimony about the degradation of fragile wetlands and the destruction of native habitats, was confronting. To touch on something important, many of the photographs shown were not about the state of the park at all; they were images of the horses that had been shot. They were not pretty, and I never want to see images like that again—no-one does. But, if we fail to manage the park properly, that is exactly what will happen. The heartbreak will continue.

We have a duty to ensure that Kosciuszko National Park never again faces a situation where horse numbers spiral out of control, where people are left in despair and where inaction leads to the very outcome everyone fears. It is not about cruelty; it is about responsibility. It is about making sure we never again allow conditions to reach a point where distressing measures become inevitable. We can still honour our history—the Banjo Paterson legends, the Snowy River spirit, the communities who feel connected to those animals—while also recognising that heritage does not mean perpetuating harm. Stewardship is a deeply Liberal value: caring for what we inherit so that it endures for those who come after us. The bill does not end that story; it allows us to write the next chapter, one that balances cultural recognition with ecological truth.

The bill transitions management of feral horses back under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974. Decisions will be led by science, based on evidence and made by professionals. We have seen what happens when horse numbers spiral beyond control: waterways polluted, soils compacted and alpine vegetation trampled. But we have also seen recovery when numbers are responsibly managed: stream banks stabilising, native plants returning and the park beginning to heal. That is proof that humane, science-driven management works. The debate is not about denying history or disrespecting communities; it is about respecting country. It is about upholding our shared responsibility to protect fragile ecosystems that cannot speak for themselves. While I understand and respect the deep emotions the debate stirs, my support for the bill comes from principle: stewardship, evidence and care for the land that defines who we are. I commend the bill to the House.

The Hon. RACHEL MERTON (17:45): I speak in opposition to the Kosciuszko Wild Horse Heritage Repeal Bill 2025. I am strongly opposed to this misguided piece of legislation that quite frankly threatens to erase a vital and iconic thread of our Australian heritage. The bill seeks to repeal the Kosciuszko Wild Horse Heritage Act 2018, an Act that wisely recognised the sustainable cultural significance of the brumbies in 32 per cent of Kosciuszko National Park. The existing Act mandated a heritage population of 3,000 brumbies and has ensured this wonderful living symbol of our nation continues to play an important role in the culture and ethos of our Snowy Mountains.

The fact is that the Parliament passed the Kosciuszko Wild Horse Heritage Act just seven years ago for very good reasons. The Act recognised that Australia's alpine heritage is not only environmental but also social and tied to our history. The Act was about protecting the cultural value of those animals. The Act created a fair and level playing field that protected the cultural value of our brumbies whilst recognising the needs of the natural environment. The Act has been working. It is an achievement that the former Liberal-Nationals Government should be proud of. The reality is that the brumby is our living link to those generations of Australians who worked and lived in the Snowy Mountains area: families, cattlemen and horsemen who became part of our national ethos and psyche.

I have previously discussed in this place and elsewhere the role that those horses played in our history in wartime, through the Snowy Mountains scheme and in our literature and poetry. Those horses are an integral part of our national identity. The horses may be located in the Snowy Mountains, but over generations they have become a distinct part of our unique Australian culture and identity. I have followed the increasingly shrill debate on the issue over the past few years and am disappointed that we have reached a point where an Act established

by this Parliament not all that long ago for entirely appropriate and legitimate reasons is now on the cusp of being repealed.

The misinformation that has surrounded the Snowy Mountains brumby, and the attempt to reduce those horses to nothing more than an invasive pest, has been hugely disappointing. Why have Ministers in this Government reportedly rejected meeting with the Australian Brumby Alliance and Snowy Mountains rehoming groups to discuss this matter? Do local stakeholders not matter? Or is it only groups that agree with the Government on this bill, like the Invasive Species Council, that get an audience? Is this community engagement and local democracy, NSW Labor style, in 2025?

I listened intently to debate when the bill was before the House last fortnight. I particularly commend the excellent speeches of the Hon. Nichole Overall and the Hon. Emma Hurst, who each made important and valuable contributions as to why the bill is unnecessary. The Hon. Nichole Overall rightly pointed out that the defence of the brumby is not simply about nostalgia or romanticism; rather, it is also the science, culture and heritage that make those horses so vital, not just to the Snowy Mountains but to our nation. The bill, quite frankly, is the result of rampant ideology and a campaign of sustained disinformation against the Snowy Mountains brumbies. In years to come, people will look back on those speeches, look at the destruction unleashed on the Snowy Mountains brumbies and recognise that the members who said no to the bill were on the right side of history in this debate.

I will oppose the bill today and, furthermore, I will support the sensible amendments my very good friends in the National Party will move in the Committee of the Whole, should the bill pass the second reading stage. Everyone wants to protect the Snowy Mountains national park and supports lessening the impact of the brumbies on the environment. That can be done—and has been done—through the existing responsible and sensible 2018 Act. It can be achieved by the considered management of brumby populations, through expanded trapping. Over 3,200 have been rehomed since 2002. It can also be achieved through fertility trials and true, reliable audits that place weight on the environment but also recognise the profound cultural, heritage and scientific significance of the brumbies to our nation.

Brumbies have a heritage and cultural value, but they also bring significant value to the Snowy Mountains region in many other ways. They are vital to the local tourism industry, attracting visitors from across the nation and the globe, who are drawn to the cultural narrative and living history those horses embody.

The Hon. Wes Fang: Point of order: Ms Sue Higginson was heard in silence when she made her contribution in relation to the bill. It is important that all members are treated with respect. Each member's contribution is as important as another's. If Ms Sue Higginson continues to interrupt the member, perhaps she should be asked to leave the Chamber.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (The Hon. Emma Hurst): There is no point of order, but I remind members to keep their conversations to a minimum. The Hon. Rachel Merton has the call.

The Hon. RACHEL MERTON: Brumbies support a diverse regional economy and local jobs. From an environmental perspective, they maintain the character of our famous high country and keep the dense bush and grasslands under control. Brumbies are also an intrinsic part of the identity of those living in the Snowy Mountains region. They are not viewed as invaders and pests; rather, they are viewed with pride, as a living and ongoing link to the opening up of those areas by settlers nearly 200 years ago. I again recognise the Hon. Nichole Overall—a very good former local member in the other place for the Snowy Mountains area—for her informative contribution, in which she pointed out that the Snowy Mountains brumbies are the only animal population in the entire world that is formally identified as having a significant heritage value, recognised under the Burra Charter and National Heritage List criteria.

Furthermore, brumbies are the subject of valuable and ongoing DNA and genetic research, with bloodlines linked, as I understand it, to rare Iberian breeds. As a horse breeder, that interests me. As a legislator, I look at the facts and evidence before me, and there is simply no justifiable reason to repeal the 2018 Act and implement this bad and unnecessary piece of legislation. It is worth considering why, after almost 200 years of brumbies being an integral part of the Snowy Mountains, it is only in very recent decades that we have seen a campaign of vilification against them, in which they have been reduced in importance from living treasures and national icons of our free spirit and liberty to little more than invasive pests. How have we gone from globally celebrating the Snowy Mountains brumbies at the opening of the 2000 Sydney Olympics to signing off on the mass eradication of those animals, just a quarter of a century later? Sadly, the vilification of brumbies in recent times has, in some cases, been driven not by conservation but by cultural vandalism and a reluctance to celebrate Australia's pioneering colonial past from which the brumby derives.

Brumbies are more than feral pests; they embody the indomitable spirit of our forebears. Brumbies today are descended from the horses introduced in the 1800s that opened up the high country. Those horses inspired

Banjo Paterson's *The Man from Snowy River* and the *Silver Brumby* series, and had a role in the Australian Light Horse in the Great War. They represent the liberty and freedom that are a key part of our national identity. A 2015 national cultural heritage assessment confirmed their profound significance, noting their role in folklore, art and the settler identity that shaped New South Wales. The 2018 Act struck a fair balance, protecting that legacy without sacrificing the environment, through trapping, rehoming and fertility controls. Yet the bill before us, cloaked in environmental rhetoric, dismisses that heritage as myth and misplaced romanticism, echoing an ideology that deems our colonial symbols disposable. The bill is ultimately a malign attack on not only brumbies, which are reduced to the role of unwelcome invaders, but also our broader Australian colonial history.

Worse still, the push for repeal of the 2018 Act further enables the brutality we have witnessed with the recent resumption of aerial shooting. Aerial shooting of brumbies was rightly banned in 2000 after the disgraceful Guy Fawkes massacre, surely one of the darkest days in the history of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. After a 23-year hiatus, aerial shooting resumed in November 2023. In my opinion, the process has proven appallingly inhumane. Figures released by the New South Wales Government demonstrate that well over 5,500 brumbies were shot via aerial culls between November 2023 and May last year. In opposition, Minister Sharpe used to say that she was opposed to the aerial shooting of horses. Some 5,500 culled horses in little more than six months is quite a leap in anyone's language.

I totally understand the importance of culling for the protection of land, whether it be our national parks or private agricultural land. I am a licensed shooter and a primary producer. I have seen the corrosive impact of introduced species on our environment, and I support the use of effective methods to control populations as appropriate. Yet what we have seen with the brumbies is anything but appropriate. Evidence from the Legislative Council inquiry reveals grotesque failures—horses chased for up to 20 minutes until exhausted, horses shot multiple times outside welfare protocols and carcasses left riddled with bullets in their rumps and necks.

Dr Jillian Brown, the convenor of the Heritage Horse and Environment Protection Alliance, criticised the volume of shots being fired into a brumby, stating, "That up to 15 shots are being used, with a median of 7.5, is absolutely staggering." Are we proud of this? In October 2023 alone 280 bodies—including foals—reportedly rotted in the park, some with wounds violating RSPCA standards for minimising suffering. Witnesses reported aborted foals beside mares and a 2024 inquiry heard of staff threats, including decapitated horse heads dumped at offices, underscoring the moral rot this unchecked method fosters. Compounding those horrors are the serious flaws in brumby counts justifying the cull. Just how reliable are the numbers we hear?

The October 2023 survey claimed 17,000 horses using distance sampling from helicopters, an imprecise method in rugged 690,000-hectare terrain. Critics, including biostatisticians, highlight biases, such as the overestimation of brumby numbers from double counting fleeing mobs. The quantum of the culls that followed the November 2023 resumption of aerial shooting has been based upon unreliable estimates carried out by the National Parks and Wildlife Service. Its estimates of brumby numbers have fluctuated hugely year on year. The aerial survey estimate process has been dismissed as not only statistically incorrect but also biologically implausible. Independent audits have also questioned the methodology's validity, noting past surveys sighted only 3,000 to 4,000 brumbies annually over 20 years. Dodgy data and shonky statistics are no way to manage and determine the future of our iconic Snowy Mountains brumbies.

As a legislator, I have found one matter particularly mystifying during the debate. Those in the environmental movement who are the most outraged by the presence of brumbies in the Snowy Mountains area and the damage they claim these horses are causing the natural environment are generally the same people who are more than happy to support the clearing of mass tracts of native forest in areas like the Snowy Mountains for energy transmission lines as part of the net zero transition to renewables—what hypocrisy! The bulldozers for new powerlines for renewable energy in the Snowy Mountains are ripping through native forest, leading to habitat loss for native species, erosion, weed infestation and destruction of the area's natural ambience. If one wants to blame someone for environmental vandalism in the Kosciuszko National Park, point the finger at the renewable energy zealots who have rammed bulldozers through many hundreds of hectares of pristine bushland and national park, not a pack of brumbies.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak in opposition to the bill, and I urge the House to reject the repeal of the 2018 Act. Let us honour our brumbies and respect our heritage with humane tools, such as expanded trapping—with over 3,200 rehomed since 2002—fertility trials, and true, reliable audits. Let us guarantee a future for the brumbies by maintaining a large enough population of at least 3,000 horses in the foothills of the Snowy Mountains to both act as an impediment to inbreeding and, importantly, ensure they do not face extinction the next time major bushfires inevitably sweep through this area. Let us manage our brumbies and recognise their immense historic, cultural and social contribution to our Snowy Mountains, our State and our nation. Brumbies sustain our story. Do not let ideology silence it.

The Hon. WES FANG (18:04): From the outset I say that my National Party colleagues and I oppose the Kosciuszko Wild Horse Heritage Repeal Bill 2025. I appreciate the contributions that have been made, and I note that of the Hon. Rachel Merton. She talked about comments that were made by the then Leader of the Opposition or shadow Minister, who is now the Leader of the Government in this place. She indicated that the Hon. Penny Sharpe said that the Labor Party would not introduce aerial culling. There was some debate about that. I note that the Minister threw some comments at the Hon. Rachel Merton. I looked up exactly what was said in *Hansard* back in 2018 when we were debating this very issue. It was during a contribution by the Hon. Reverend Fred Nile, who suggested that the Labor Party had a plan to bring back aerial culling if it was in government. Minister Sharpe interjected and is recorded in *Hansard* saying:

No, we would not; we ruled out aerial culling.

The Minister for the Environment, who is now in charge of national parks, at the time reaffirmed the Labor Party position that it would not reintroduce aerial culling. Fast-forward to 2023 when we know, from ministerial disclosures, the Minister took a trip to the Kosciuszko National Park. Not long after that she had a ministerial meeting with the Invasive Species Council. One can surmise what occurred in that meeting. However, not long after, the Minister made an announcement that she would seek to review the management document for the wild horse population in Kosciuszko and would seek submissions.

Madam Deputy President Hurst, you were the chair of the inquiry into the proposed aerial culling of brumbies. It is a fantastic report, although somewhat changed from the draft report that you proposed. If members go to the report, they can see the minutes from the deliberative meeting and the changes committee members made to the excellent draft report—making it a shadow of its former self. Going back to the history of how we ended up here, the Minister sought submissions in relation to a proposed change to the management plan for the Kosciuszko wild horse population—or the brumbies, as we call them. The Minister received around 11,000 submissions. The vast majority of those submissions were form submissions from the Invasive Species Council. I note that the CEO of the Invasive Species Council, Mr Jack Gough, is in the gallery. I disagree with him on some matters and agree with him on others. That is the nature of these debates.

The Hon. Penny Sharpe: Consistency is not your forte.

The Hon. WES FANG: I remind the Minister that she is the one who ruled out reintroducing aerial culling. If the Minister wants to talk about consistency, you are the one who told the House you would not introduce aerial culling. You lied to the House, Minister!

Ms Sue Higginson: Point of order—

The Hon. WES FANG: You lied to the House!

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (The Hon. Emma Hurst): Order!

Ms Sue Higginson: The Hon. Wes Fang is out of control and acting disorderly. It is not parliamentary, and he must direct his comments through you, Deputy President.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (The Hon. Emma Hurst): Yes, absolutely.

The Hon. Mark Latham: To the point of order: There is definitely a broken promise. The Labor Party said there would be no aerial shooting; there has been. This is a debating Chamber—it is not tiddlywinks here. Those points are valid and should be made because they are true.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (The Hon. Emma Hurst): The point of order was not about the content of what the Hon. Wes Fang said; it was about how his comments were directed. I uphold the point of order. The Hon. Wes Fang will direct his comments through me, not direct them to members opposite. The Hon. Wes Fang has the call.

The Hon. WES FANG: Thank you, Madam Deputy President. I accept your ruling.

The Hon. Penny Sharpe: You have to. Those are the rules.

The Hon. WES FANG: Madam Deputy President, I ask you to stop the clock while I take a point of order.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (The Hon. Emma Hurst): The Clerk will stop the clock. I will hear the point of order.

The Hon. WES FANG: Madam Deputy President—

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (The Hon. Emma Hurst): Order! Members will take any discussions outside the Chamber.

The Hon. WES FANG: I think the honourable member is a bit upset about item No. 22 on the draft Business List.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (The Hon. Emma Hurst): What is the member's point of order?

The Hon. WES FANG: The Minister keeps interjecting. Whilst I appreciate your earlier ruling, it is perhaps a little hypocritical for her to take objection to my contributions about her when she keeps interjecting on my contribution.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (The Hon. Emma Hurst): Interjections are disorderly. I will not call the Minister to order at this time, but I remind her of that fact. The Hon. Wes Fang has the call.

The Hon. WES FANG: I was talking about the 8,000 form submissions from the Invasive Species Council. On first blush, it appeared that multiple form submissions were from similar names and similar addresses. Many of them were from outside New South Wales. If we strip away those form submissions and look at just the independent, discrete—I will say genuine—submissions, we see that they were made by people who had put considered time and effort into making them to the Minister. There is no doubt that the vast majority of those true submissions were against the reintroduction of aerial culling. However, one can surmise that there may have been a bit of a stitch-up between the Minister and the Invasive Species Council to try to get enough numbers so that the Minister could introduce what she wanted to do.

That was done some time in late 2023. Not long into the job, already the Minister had effectively broken the promise that she made to this Chamber and to the Parliament about not introducing aerial culling. We had a trial. That was about the time that we agreed to have an inquiry into the proposal. Normally it is good practice to have a pause on matters when there is an inquiry before the Parliament. However, the Minister was so desperate to start culling the brumbies once she had her hands on the ministerial levers that—despite the fact that we had a very important inquiry into the reintroduction of aerial culling—she ignored the fact that we were seeking to investigate, have hearings and a report generated on that matter, and she sought to roll out the culling straightaway.

One can draw a conclusion as to why that was the case. We have since determined clear evidence on the numbers and the alleged need to reintroduce aerial culling. I submit that the Minister knew the numbers published were much higher than the actual numbers in the park, and she used those inflated figures in order to reintroduce culling. I see the Minister getting upset because obviously the lies that she has told the House—

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (The Hon. Emma Hurst): Order! There are too many interjections.

The Hon. WES FANG: —are now coming to light. I think the Minister is very sensitive in relation to lying to the House. That is okay.

The Hon. Penny Sharpe: Point of order—

The Hon. WES FANG: Look at that. This is the point I make.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (The Hon. Emma Hurst): A point of order has been taken.

The Hon. Penny Sharpe: I simply make the point that it is not in order for the member to verbal members of the House or to suggest what they may be doing or saying within the House while asserting imputations about their motives or otherwise. That is out of order. It is not within the standing orders.

The Hon. WES FANG: To the point of order: I said that, using the evidence, one might surmise that those things were the case. Certainly, from the way the Minister is reacting to those things, one could suggest that I was correct. The other thing is that the Minister continues to interject on my contribution. She knows that is disorderly. I am trying not to engage with her, but she continues to do that. I ask you to call the Minister to order so that I can finish my contribution without the interruptions.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (The Hon. Emma Hurst): I understand that this is a heated debate and a lot of emotions are involved. I will not call members to order at this time. I remind the Hon. Wes Fang to be mindful of any accusations or imputations he makes in his contribution.

The Hon. WES FANG: Understood. We know that the numbers were inflated. We know that now because if we subtract the number of horses that were shot through aerial culling or were removed from the park through other means, and then we look at the numbers that are believed to be there now in the most recent count, we see that the numbers do not correlate. There is a very high likelihood that there are less than 3,000 horses in the park at the moment. That would indicate that the Minister has perhaps shot—

[Interruption]

The Hon. Mark Latham: Point of order—

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (The Hon. Emma Hurst): A point of order has been taken.

The Hon. Mark Latham: The Hon. Jeremy Buckingham has said things across the Chamber to the Hon. Rod Roberts that are clearly unparliamentary, clearly wrong and should be withdrawn—not this sort of gutter talk.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (The Hon. Emma Hurst): I did not hear those comments, but I heard members calling across the Chamber.

The Hon. Mark Latham: He called the Hon. Rod Roberts a coward. He is one of the most honest persons with courage and integrity in this Chamber. I am not going to wear the fact that someone who served our Police Force with such distinction—and serves this Chamber with distinction as our Deputy President—is being described by that man as a coward.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (The Hon. Emma Hurst): I did not hear the comments, but I heard yelling across the Chamber. It is disorderly for members to yell anything across the Chamber. The Hon. Wes Fang is making a contribution, and he should be heard in silence. If members wish to make comments and have conversations, I remind them for the last time that they can take those conversations outside the Chamber. The Hon. Wes Fang has the call.

The Hon. WES FANG: I have only seven minutes left, and the interruptions I have faced have been very unfortunate. I foreshadow that I will seek an extension of time. In relation to the numbers, we know that aerial culling was introduced on an inflated figure. I surmise that the Minister was aware of that. Certainly, when one subtracts the number of horses that were aerially culled from the number purported to be in the park in 2023, the result is well above the figure we have now. I believe that the Minister has breached the legislation as it currently stands. There is a high probability that the number is below 3,000. That is from the very figures that have been provided to us through the National Parks and Wildlife Service.

That creates an issue and is perhaps partly the reason why the Government is now prepared to support the repeal of the Act. If it is the case that the Minister has culled too many horses, repealing the Act would mean that the Minister is no longer in breach of the legislation, as I believe she currently is. I note the constant interjections occurring behind me. I am trying not to engage with them. I think the Hon. Jeremy Buckingham, who introduced the bill in this House, is upset because of item No. 22 on the draft Business List. If he is so upset about that—

The Hon. Penny Sharpe: Point of order: If the member has a point of order, he should take it. He should not be referring to other matters that are on the draft Business List for debate. That is deeply unhelpful, and he should be sticking to the matter that is before the House.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (The Hon. Emma Hurst): Does the Hon. Wes Fang wish to take a point of order?

The Hon. WES FANG: I believe that if the Hon. Jeremy Buckingham is upset about item No. 22 on the draft Business List, he should raise that separately to my contribution on the bill.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (The Hon. Emma Hurst): That is not a point of order. The Hon. Wes Fang may continue his contribution.

The Hon. WES FANG: If the Minister was serious about this, we would know that from the petition debate that occurred earlier this year in the other place regarding the repeal of the bill when the Invasive Species Council, I believe, was yet again involved in stacking the petition. In the final paragraph of his contribution to the debate, the Labor member with carriage of that in the other place, the Hon. Jihad Dib, said:

The New South Wales Government does not, therefore, consider pursuing repeal of the Kosciuszko Wild Horse Heritage Act 2018 to be a priority at this time.

The Labor Party is yet again talking out of both sides of its mouth on this issue. We have a Minister who in 2018 lied to the House, saying that she would not reintroduce aerial culling. In almost the very first act of becoming a Minister, she sought to bring in the very thing that she guaranteed to this House she would not do. That speaks to the integrity of the Minister and the Labor Government. We then saw the Minister in the other place, when leading the debate on the petition, say that this would not be a priority. Yet here we are. Of course, that is what this Government does.

The Hon. Penny Sharpe: Don't you support Independents bringing forward bills? Clearly not.

The Hon. WES FANG: I note the Minister is now interjecting. She often does that when she knows she is wrong on an issue. Here we go. The Labor Party is yet again seeking to defend the indefensible. It says it will not do something and then does it as soon as it is in power. The Minister in the other place said it is not a priority,

so what did the Government do? It used a proxy. It used somebody else to bring in the repeal so Labor can have clean hands on the matter. We see it time and again from that party.

We held a good inquiry on this matter and produced a great report. That inquiry uncovered a lot of issues. During the contribution from the Hon. Rachel Merton, the Hon. Jeremy Buckingham referred to the brumbies and said, "Why don't you have them in your backyard? Put them on private land." Part of what the inquiry uncovered was that many supporters of the brumbies would be prepared to take them from Kosciuszko National Park and rehome them, but the National Parks and Wildlife Service would not give them access.

If that was the Government's true intention, I can promise that people would be lining up to save the brumbies in Kosciuszko National Park rather than see them shot from the air. But the Government will not let them do that. Whilst I appreciate the interjections from Hon. Jeremy Buckingham during the Hon. Rachel Merton's contribution, the reality is that the Government will not let people do it. Many people would accept rehoming brumbies on their own private lands, but the Government will not let them do that.

The Hon. Jeremy Buckingham: There are 10,000 of them.

The Hon. WES FANG: There are not 10,000 there; that is the problem. The Minister shot too many. The Shooters, Fishers and Farmers Party indicated it will only support the bill in circumstances where the Government preserves some part of the heritage value and a herd that will ensure that that is the case. If the Shooters are prepared to believe the Government after all the lies it has told on brumbies, then more fool them.

The Hon. MARK LATHAM (18:24): I oppose the Kosciuszko Wild Horse Heritage Repeal Bill 2025 on not only its contents but also the means by which it has come to our House. The sponsor in the other place, who brought it here via the Hon. Jeremy Buckingham, is Dr McGirr. He is not a doctor of philosophy but a doctor of medicine. I do not know how a doctor of medicine could authorise the slaughter of animals as beautiful as the brumbies. I do not know how a doctor of medicine could sign up to a workers compensation whole person impairment [WPI] of 28 per cent knowing that injured workers will kill themselves at that level. Dr McGirr is doctor death, and he needs to think long and hard about the oath he has taken—

Ms Sue Higginson: Point of order—

The Hon. MARK LATHAM: —and the things that he has committed to doing.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (The Hon. Emma Hurst): Order! I will hear the point of order from Ms Sue Higginson.

Ms Sue Higginson: You have to sit down. I am taking a point of order.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (The Hon. Emma Hurst): Order! The Hon. Mark Latham will resume his seat.

Ms Sue Higginson: The member was casting aspersions on a member of the other place, and he must do that by way of substantive motion.

The Hon. MARK LATHAM: To the point of order: If someone is in the business of slaughtering those beautiful animals—anyone who has an affinity with horses knows how beautiful and glorious they are—and they sign up to a 28 per cent WPI, knowing on the evidence of our committee chaired by Ms Abigail Boyd that injured workers will kill themselves, then they are doctor death and they should be ashamed of themselves. They should be ashamed because they are advocating for the death of horses and injured workers. It is disgraceful.

Ms Sue Higginson: Further to the point of order—

The Hon. MARK LATHAM: Dr McGirr is doctor death.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (The Hon. Emma Hurst): Order! The Hon. Mark Latham will resume his seat.

Ms Sue Higginson: The member is flouting the rules of this House. He is bringing everything into disrepute.

The Hon. Jeremy Buckingham: To the point of order: The member is making imputations against the good doctor and should be made to withdraw the comment. That is an outrageous allegation. It is an absolutely awful thing to say against a man who has dedicated his life to being a health practitioner. To call him that as a cheap slur is outrageous. The member should be made to withdraw his comment.

The Hon. MARK LATHAM: Further to the point of order: He is a bad doctor in my assessment. I do not think it is out of order to tell the truth. Those members cannot handle the truth about the sponsor of the bill. If members have facts to back the assertion—

Ms Sue Higginson: Further to the point of order—

The Hon. MARK LATHAM: Hold on. I haven't finished here. You have a big say all the time.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (The Hon. Emma Hurst): The Hon. Mark Latham will not direct other members.

The Hon. MARK LATHAM: The evidence shows that man is for the killing of those beautiful, glorious animals and, at 28 per cent WPI, we know there will be the suicide of workers. "Doctor death" is appropriate.

Ms Sue Higginson: The member is bringing the House into disrepute by flouting the rules in front of all members. He must now be called to order for the first time. He has flagrantly breached the rules and has continued to make rude, wrong and nasty imputations about a member from the other place. We know the rules. If he wants to do that, he can, but he must do it in accordance with the rules of this House, which is by way of substantive motion only.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (The Hon. Emma Hurst): I will seek advice from the Clerk. I uphold the first point of order taken by Ms Sue Higginson. The Hon. Mark Latham made inappropriate comments about a member of the other place, which can only be done by way of substantive motion. I call the Hon. Mark Latham to order for the first time and warn him about making further comments. I also remind members that they are not to give directions to other members, such as a direction to sit down. That is the role of the Chair.

The Hon. MARK LATHAM: Madam Deputy President, do you require me to withdraw my comments in light of that ruling?

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (The Hon. Emma Hurst): The member is not required to withdraw.

The Hon. MARK LATHAM: I have concerns about the content of the bill and the means by which it has come before the House. Unfortunately, there is a pattern with crossbench members in the other place, which we should be concerned about as diligent members of a crossbench in this House which holds the Government to account. Each of the nine crossbench members in the Legislative Assembly gets concessions, boondoggles and pork barrels from this Government. The member for Wagga Wagga got this bill. In Pittwater it is road funding. In Wakehurst it is the Northern Beaches Hospital. In Sydney it is the alphabet agenda. And the member for Lake Macquarie was made Speaker.

The Hon. Penny Sharpe: Point of order—

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (The Hon. Emma Hurst): A point of order has been taken. The Hon. Mark Latham will resume his seat.

The Hon. Penny Sharpe: The member is entitled to make contributions to this debate that relate to the long title of the bill. He is not entitled to make imputations about members of the other place or to speak about other matters outside the long title of the bill.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (The Hon. Emma Hurst): I remind the Hon. Mark Latham to ensure that his contribution to debate relates to the bill before the House.

The Hon. MARK LATHAM: I was just pointing out that the member for Wagga Wagga getting this bill is part of a pattern. All of his colleagues in the other place, who are mostly teals, have got concessions as well. In Orange it is virtual fencing; in Barwon it is an avalanche of grant funding; and in Wollondilly it is manipulation of the Local Small Commitments Allocation.

The Hon. Jeremy Buckingham: Point of order—

The Hon. Penny Sharpe: Point of order—

Ms Sue Higginson: Point of order—

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (The Hon. Emma Hurst): I will hear from the Minister on a point of order.

The Hon. MARK LATHAM: Nine out of nine have been bought off.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (The Hon. Emma Hurst): Order! The Hon. Mark Latham will resume his seat.

The Hon. Penny Sharpe: Madam Deputy President, I ask you to consider calling the Hon. Mark Latham to order. He flouts the rulings of the House and disrespects the rules of debate anytime he sees fit. He has also flouted your ruling.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (The Hon. Emma Hurst): I remind the Hon. Mark Latham to ensure that, going forward, his comments relate specifically to the bill.

Debate adjourned.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (The Hon. Emma Hurst): I shall now leave the chair. The House will resume at 8.00 p.m.

Documents

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION AND CARE SECTOR

Further Return to Order

The CLERK: According to the resolution of the House of Tuesday 18 March 2025, as varied on Tuesday 6 May 2025 and amended on Thursday 5 June 2025, and Thursday 27 March 2025, I table:

- (a) a return received on Wednesday 12 November 2025 from The Cabinet Office, together with an indexed list of documents with certain privileged and personal information redacted as ordered; and
- (b) a return received on Wednesday 12 November 2025 from The Cabinet Office of documents subject to a claim of personal information.

LOWER MID NORTH COAST HEALTH SERVICE PROJECT

Return to Order

The CLERK: According to the resolution of the House of Wednesday 22 October 2025, I table:

- (a) a return received on Wednesday 12 November 2025 from The Cabinet Office, together with an indexed list of documents; and
- (b) a return received on Wednesday 12 November 2025 from The Cabinet Office of documents subject to a claim of personal information.

POLITICAL LOBBYING

Return to Order

The CLERK: According to the resolution of the House of Wednesday 22 October 2025, I table:

- (a) a return received on Wednesday 12 November 2025 from The Cabinet Office, together with an indexed list of documents;
- (b) a return received on Wednesday 12 November 2025 from The Cabinet Office of documents subject to a claim of privilege; and
- (c) a return received on Wednesday 12 November 2025 from The Cabinet Office of documents subject to a claim of personal information.

TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICES

Return to Order

The CLERK: According to the resolution of the House of Wednesday 17 September 2025, I table:

- (a) a return received on Wednesday 12 November 2025 from The Cabinet Office, together with an indexed list of documents;
- (b) a return received on Wednesday 12 November 2025 from The Cabinet Office of documents subject to a claim of privilege; and
- (c) a return received on Wednesday 12 November 2025 from The Cabinet Office of documents subject to a claim of personal information.

VIRTUAL STOCK FENCING

Return to Order

The CLERK: According to the resolution of the House of Wednesday 22 October 2025, I table:

- (a) a return received on Wednesday 12 November 2025 from The Cabinet Office, together with an indexed list of documents;
- (b) a return received on Wednesday 12 November 2025 from The Cabinet Office of documents subject to a claim of privilege; and
- (c) a return received on Wednesday 12 November 2025 from The Cabinet Office of documents subject to a claim of personal information.

*Committees***SELECT COMMITTEE ON YOUTH JUSTICE****Establishment, Membership, Chair and Deputy Chair**

The Hon. AILEEN MacDONALD (20:02): I move:

- (1) That a select committee be established to inquire into and report on evidence-based approaches to reducing the number of children in contact with the criminal justice system in New South Wales, and in particular:
 - (a) the underlying drivers of children's contact with the criminal justice system, including but not limited to:
 - (i) school disengagement and educational exclusion;
 - (ii) out-of-home care, homelessness and housing instability;
 - (iii) disability, mental health, and alcohol and other drug issues; and
 - (iv) family dysfunction, poverty and intergenerational trauma.
 - (b) the availability, effectiveness and evaluation of evidence-based and community-led responses that prevent offending and reoffending, including:
 - (i) diversionary programs and early intervention strategies;
 - (ii) alternatives to remand and custodial sentencing;
 - (iii) support services targeted at at-risk children and families, particularly in regional and remote areas; and
 - (iv) vocational, training, employment and mentoring initiatives.
 - (c) the specific and disproportionate impact of the youth justice system on Aboriginal children, and the adequacy of current strategies to Close the Gap on Aboriginal youth incarceration;
 - (d) alternative youth justice models and frameworks, including:
 - (i) examples from other Australian jurisdictions, such as Tasmania; and
 - (ii) international best-practice models, including those in Scotland, England and Wales, and Scandinavian countries.
 - (e) the collection, use and transparency of data, including:
 - (i) youth justice recidivism rates in New South Wales compared with other jurisdictions;
 - (ii) the cost of incarceration and the broader fiscal impact of the youth justice system;
 - (iii) the remand population, including data on sentenced versus unsentenced children; and
 - (iv) historical trends in funding for community-based diversion and rehabilitation.
 - (f) the experience of children with disability in youth detention, including:
 - (i) assessment practices and identification of disability;
 - (ii) access to the National Disability Insurance Scheme; and
 - (iii) availability of coordinated, wraparound supports.
 - (g) the role of the Children's Court of New South Wales, including the effectiveness and consistency of pilot programs aimed at diversion and community engagement;
 - (h) governance and oversight mechanisms, including:
 - (i) the role and effectiveness of the Department of Communities and Justice in coordinating a whole-of-government response;
 - (ii) the adequacy of youth justice community offices, staffing, service models and public accountability; and
 - (iii) reports by oversight bodies, including the Inspector of Custodial Services and relevant royal commissions.
 - (i) the long-term social and intergenerational impacts of youth justice involvement, including:
 - (i) pathways between youth detention and adult incarceration; and
 - (ii) impacts on families and communities.
 - (j) labour market and workforce considerations, including transitional and redeployment opportunities for affected staff in the event of service model reforms; and
 - (k) any other related matters.
- (2) That, in undertaking its inquiry, the committee will:
 - (a) engage with Aboriginal communities, children and young people with lived experience, service providers, law enforcement, the judiciary and other stakeholders; and

- (b) identify legislative, policy and practice reforms required to reduce the number of children in contact with the youth justice system and to build safer, more resilient communities.
- (3) That, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the standing orders, the committee consist of seven members comprising:
 - (a) three Government members;
 - (b) two Opposition members, one being the Hon. Aileen MacDonald; and
 - (c) two crossbench members, one being Ms Sue Higginson.
- (4) That the chair of the committee be Hon. Aileen MacDonald and the deputy chair be Ms Sue Higginson.
- (5) That, unless the committee decides otherwise:
 - (a) all inquiries are to be advertised via social media, stakeholder emails and a media release distributed to all media outlets in New South Wales;
 - (b) submissions to inquiries are to be published, subject to the committee clerk checking for confidentiality and adverse mention and, where those issues arise, bringing them to the attention of the committee for consideration;
 - (c) attachments to submissions are to remain confidential;
 - (d) the chair's proposed witness list is to be circulated to provide members with an opportunity to amend the list, with the witness list agreed to by email, unless a member requests the chair to convene a meeting to resolve any disagreement;
 - (e) the sequence of questions to be asked at hearings alternate between opposition, crossbench and government members, in that order, with equal time allocated to each;
 - (f) transcripts of evidence taken at public hearings are to be published;
 - (g) supplementary questions are to be lodged with the committee clerk within two business days following the receipt of the hearing transcript, with witnesses requested to return answers to questions on notice and supplementary questions within 21 calendar days of the date on which questions are forwarded to the witness;
 - (h) answers to questions on notice and supplementary questions are to be published, subject to the committee clerk checking for confidentiality and adverse mention and, where those issues arise, bringing them to the attention of the committee for consideration; and
 - (i) media statements on behalf of the committee are to be made only by the chair.

I move this motion because right now too many people in New South Wales feel less safe, not more. They see stories of break and enter offences, car thefts and serious assaults involving teenagers. They see children as young as 10, 11 or 12 moving through our courts and they ask a very reasonable question: "Why isn't anything changing?" The uncomfortable truth is that our current youth justice system is neither tough enough nor smart enough to keep our communities safe or to change the lives of these children. As of June 2025 there were 234 young people in custody in New South Wales, which is a 34 per cent increase in just two years from June 2023. More than half of these young people are on remand, not yet sentenced. Almost one in four is detained for a break and enter offence and nearly 60 per cent of them are Aboriginal. Behind every one of those numbers is a victim, a family, a community, and a child whose life is heading down a very dark path.

The Inspector of Custodial Services has told us plainly that Youth Justice NSW is effectively operating six remand centres. Centre managers describe their role as providing crisis accommodation, not rehabilitation. Young people are coming into reception, spending an average of around nine days, and then going straight back out again. Nine days in a Youth Justice centre will not heal trauma. It will not fix school disengagement. It will not stabilise housing. It will not diagnose and treat disability or mental health challenges. It will not build a pathway into training or work. In many cases, it simply interrupts a chaotic life, exposes a child to other damaged young people and then returns them to exactly the same environment—and all of this comes at an enormous cost.

It costs around \$2,814 per child per day to keep a young person in custody. Nationally, spending on youth detention has risen to over \$1 billion dollars a year while violent youth offending has increased. We are spending more and still failing to keep the community safe. The numbers just do not add up. This is not a policy problem; it is a human problem. When I visit regional communities and speak with police, victims, parents and grandparents, I hear the same pain from different angles. Victims want to feel safe in their homes, their cars and their businesses. They want to know that the law means something. Families of young offenders, often doing their very best under difficult circumstances, are desperate for help before things spiral out of control. Aboriginal leaders tell us again and again that they are watching another generation of their children being taken into detention and they cannot accept that as the norm.

This select committee will be about listening to all of those voices and bringing the evidence together. The motion asks us to look at the underlying drivers of children's contact with the justice system: school disengagement and exclusion, out-of-home care, homelessness and housing instability, disability, mental health and alcohol and other drugs, family dysfunction, poverty and intergenerational trauma. The motion asks us to examine

evidence-based, community-led responses that reduce offending and reoffending: diversionary programs and early intervention, alternatives to remand and custody, and practical supports for at-risk children and their families, particularly in regional and remote areas.

In Spain, the Diagrama Foundation runs therapeutic youth justice centres that combine secure care with education, vocational training, psychological support and strong family engagement. They have achieved significantly lower reoffending rates at a fraction of the cost of traditional detention, while maintaining clear expectations and community safety. This is not about being soft on crime. It is about being effective on crime. Every offence prevented is one fewer victim. Every young person we turn away from a lifetime of offending is one fewer adult in our prisons and one more citizen contributing to their community. For the sake of community safety, for the sake of fiscal responsibility and, above all, for the sake of the children whose lives are at a crossroads, I ask members to support the motion.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM (Special Minister of State, Minister for Transport, Minister for the Arts, and Minister for Music and the Night-time Economy) (20:07): I thank the Hon. Aileen MacDonald for her remarks, for moving the motion and for the spirit in which she has brought this proposal to the House. I indicate the Government will support the motion with amendments, which the Government will shortly move. I thank the Hon. Aileen MacDonald for agreeing to those amendments. I can think of no better use of this House's committee system than to inquire into some of these important issues.

I state for the record some of the Government's initiatives in youth justice. The Government is investing \$105.3 million through this year's Youth Justice budget to produce a range of early intervention and diversion programs. The Government knows that investment in those diversion programs reduces youth crime. This funding previously was not provided into the future, which left many of the essential diversion programs on a fiscal cliff and faced with uncertainty. In the longer term, the Government absolutely wants to see fewer young people interacting with the criminal justice system.

Last week the Government announced that a site has been secured for the Moree Bail Accommodation Program. Youth Justice is due to take possession next month. The \$8.75 million investment includes a new accommodation facility and wraparound support services. The Minister for Youth Justice also announced last week the \$5 million Community Safety Investment Fund, which is open to community and non-government organisations across New South Wales. The new grant program will back innovative and potentially scalable local initiatives that prevent or respond to youth offending, strengthen families and build safer, more cohesive communities. The fund recognises many communities need support, particularly in regional areas. Applications are now open for organisations. The Department of Communities and Justice will prioritise applications targeting areas with the highest demonstrated needs and service gaps.

The fund complements a range of existing programs Youth Justice NSW runs across the State. For example, the Government has expanded the Safe Aboriginal Youth program to four new locations—Coffs Harbour, Orange, Tamworth and Moree—and has also expanded the program in Dubbo. It works alongside other programs: Youth on Track, rural residential adolescent alcohol and other drug rehabilitation services and Keep on Track. There is certainly more that the Government can do, and it appreciates the guidance of the House in tackling that task.

Ms SUE HIGGINSON (20:10): The Greens support the establishment of the Select Committee into Youth Justice. We commend the Hon. Aileen MacDonald for her passionate and reasoned advocacy on the issue. Frankly, youth justice is in freefall. The current Government has abandoned Closing the Gap. It is locking up kids who are in year 4 and year 5. It has extended horrific youth bail laws. This select committee presents a chance for the Parliament to probe the impacts of this Government's war on children and what the solutions are to the problems young people face.

Data released in August by the NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research [BOCSAR] reveal the Minns Labor Government's bail laws are driving a crisis in youth detention, with the number of young people in custody surging by 34 per cent in just two years. As at June this year 234 young people were in detention, up from 175 in June 2023. More than 70 per cent of them were being held on remand. The figures also expose the ongoing over-incarceration of Aboriginal young people. As at June this year 140 Aboriginal children were in detention, making up almost 60 per cent of the youth prison population.

What Labor Premier Chris Minns is doing is not working, and I am certain that this committee will prove that. The Premier cannot feign ignorance, because over 60 peak bodies and well over 500 legal experts told him that his youth bail laws would radically depart from youth justice and would make youth crime worse. I have repeatedly asked the Premier and the Attorney General for one review, one peer-reviewed study, one preliminary study that shows or one legal expert who believes the Government's youth bail laws have the effect of reducing youth crime, but there is not one. Five hundred experts told the Premier his lock-up-kids laws would make youth

crime worse but not one expert has told him otherwise. I imagine this select committee will reveal that New South Wales does not have a government that is serious about youth justice or preventing youth crime, but rather a government that is serious about pleasing shock jocks.

The committee needs to probe the 12 per cent reduction in youth crime the Government has been crowing about because the BOCSAR statistics are clear that all the children who repeatedly offend have simply been thrown in prison. Of course crime will fall temporarily. However, that same temporary fall—as well as an enduring fall in youth crime—can also be accomplished by sending that child to a specialist diversionary program. The establishment of the committee is yet another opportunity to make a choice to listen to the experts and ensure youth justice. Or we could continue on the path of deliberately causing harm to children, who are, frankly, incapable of the evil that they are falling into. When kids are simply locked up, they get out and they commit another crime. When a child is sent to a diversionary program, they get support and they get better.

The Hon. CAMERON MURPHY (20:13): I speak in support of the motion to establish the Select Committee on Youth Justice. I thank the Hon. Aileen MacDonald for bringing it to the House. I know that she, like me, has a very deep and long-held commitment to youth justice and better outcomes in that area. I would like to move an amendment to the motion. I move:

That the question be amended by:

- (1) Omitting paragraph (1) (g).
- (2) In paragraph (1) (h) (i) omitting "the Department of Communities and Justice" and inserting instead "New South Wales government agencies".
- (3) In paragraph (4) omitting "the Deputy Chair be Ms Sue Higginson" and inserting instead "the Deputy Chair be the Hon. Dr Sarah Kaine".
- (4) Inserting after paragraph (5):
 - (6) That the committee report by 31 December 2026.

The State has to achieve better outcomes in juvenile justice. If we are ever going to close the gap, reduce recidivism and divert people away from becoming career criminals then we have to look at implementing alternative strategies. Other jurisdictions have strategies that work. There are lessons that we can learn from the important work that has occurred in other parts of Australia and overseas, which we can adopt and implement here in New South Wales and improve upon.

Recently the Sessional Committee Government Administration B of the Tasmanian Parliament's Legislative Council ran an inquiry into Tasmania's adult imprisonment and youth detention matters. Its final report, tabled on 2 April this year, looked in detail at some of the failings and issues relating to justice in that State, with a particular focus on juvenile justice, and suggested alternatives that would break the cycle. The New South Wales committee is also about finding the best practice solutions that will ultimately break the cycle of criminal behaviour and the involvement of juveniles in the criminal justice system.

That is a goal that all members in this House should support. It is about significantly reducing recidivism, it is about successfully diverting children and adults away from the risk of being incarcerated and it is about strengthening the families and communities around them to make sure that they do not end up in that cycle of violence. Prison is criminogenic, which means that if someone goes to prison, the likelihood that they will go to back to prison and have a career path in crime is increased. The only way to change that is to use strategies that work. That is what this committee will examine and report back to this House on.

The Hon. AILEEN MacDONALD (20:17): In reply: I thank all members who made a contribution to debate: the Hon. John Graham, Ms Sue Higginson and the Hon. Cameron Murphy. I also acknowledge the Government for ultimately supporting the establishment of this committee and for engaging with the motion through amendments. While I would have preferred the original form of the motion, I will accept the amendments in the spirit of cooperation, because the most important thing is that this House now agrees to shine a proper light on youth justice in New South Wales.

The Minister often says at budget estimates hearings, in meetings and in public that he and I are on the same page when it comes to the children in our youth justice system. I say clearly that I am glad we are on the same page because if we genuinely share that commitment, then this select committee can be the vehicle for real change, not just more talk. What troubles me most is the churn through our youth justice centres. Young people are coming in and spending an average of nine days in what is effectively short-term remand, then going straight back out again.

I note that the Government's amendment removes one paragraph of the motion and extends the reporting date. I would have preferred a tighter time frame, but I will not let the perfect be the enemy of the good. We now

have terms of reference and a clear mandate from this House. My message is simple: Let's get on with it. Let us use this committee to move beyond slogans, test what actually works and deliver reforms that reduce reoffending and make our communities safer. As I said, the Minister says he and I are on the same page when it comes to the children. With the establishment of this committee, we now have the chance to prove that, not just in words, but in outcomes. I commend the motion to the House.

The ASSISTANT PRESIDENT (The Hon. Peter Primrose): The Hon. Aileen MacDonald has moved a motion, to which the Hon. Cameron Murphy has moved an amendment. The question is that the amendment be agreed to.

Amendment agreed to.

The ASSISTANT PRESIDENT (The Hon. Peter Primrose): The question now is that the motion as amended be agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Motions

NEO-NAZISM AND WHITE SUPREMACY

Dr AMANDA COHN (20:19): I move:

- (1) That this House acknowledges the significant threat posed by neo-Nazism and white supremacy to a broad range of communities across New South Wales including Jewish communities, people of colour, First Nations people, people with disabilities, women and LGBTQIA+ communities.
- (2) That this House notes that racism and widening inequality have allowed far-right extremist organisations to grow by targeting marginalised groups of people in a housing and cost-of-living crisis.
- (3) That this House calls on the Government to meaningfully and urgently address racism and inequality, including implementing the Australian Human Rights Commission National Anti-Racism Framework.

Like so many people in the communities that we represent, I was absolutely horrified by the neo-Nazi demonstration outside Parliament House on Saturday. There have already been very good, hard questions asked about why and how it was supported by New South Wales police and unbeknownst to the Premier. Personally, as a queer woman who has read my Opa's memoir of his experiences of the Holocaust, the most frightening aspect of Saturday's demonstration was not that it was at my workplace in Parliament. The most frightening aspect of Saturday's demonstration was that it took place in broad daylight on a Saturday morning and that neo-Nazis had the confidence to bare their faces in public when, up until this point in Australia, they had demonstrated in the cover of dark with their faces covered.

The first time that I reported threats from neo-Nazis in my community to Albury police was in 2018. Notoriously, they have organised outside Corowa because their activities had been effectively banned in Victoria. Last year 30 masked and armed neo-Nazis attended the Albury pride film night, and they have since demonstrated, like they did at Parliament on Saturday, at the war memorial in Corowa and the war memorial in Albury. These people mock veterans of the world wars in which Australian soldiers fought against fascism. The antisemitic slogan that they displayed on Saturday was horrific, but the Nazis did not just come for the Jews. The Nazis came for people with a disability, for people with opposing political views and for LGBTQIA+ people. The organisers of Saturday's demonstration are now talking about forming a political party that includes in its policy platform deporting Jewish people from Australia.

Jewish community leaders in Australia, including the Federal Government's antisemitism envoy, have had such a focus on suppressing criticism of Israel that we have missed the swastika-wearing elephant in the room. The Premier has already talked about changes to protest laws, which I understand members will debate this week. But white supremacy is not a problem that we can police or arrest our way out of. Racism and hate has not just arisen in a vacuum; it has been increasing in Australia for years. That is because far-right extremist movements thrive when people are disenfranchised and disconnected. The most recent statistics out of the NSW Council of Social Service are distressing: More than a million people in New South Wales live in poverty and more than one in seven children live below the poverty line.

People with a white supremacist agenda have a much easier time scapegoating migrants and people of colour when owning a home is just a pipe dream for young Australians. They offer seemingly simple explanations and solutions that offer a feeling of empowerment, which come at the cost of the diversity of our communities and the safety of marginalised communities. In 2022 the Victorian Government held an inquiry into extremism. It found that social isolation, economic insecurity and inequality are risk factors that play a part in increasing susceptibility to extremist narratives. It found that, in formulating intervention and prevention measures, it is imperative that alienating, criminalising or discriminating against young people is avoided as much as possible.

The inquiry also found that when public and elected figures accept racist rhetoric and action, it blurs the lines between what is acceptable in the community and what is not, and leads to risks that multicultural communities will be targeted. That is exactly what has happened in New South Wales and across Australia over some years. The neo-Nazis did not just appear out of nowhere on Saturday. We need to take a unified approach to address rising inequality and racism in our communities. We cannot arrest or police our way out of the problem. Many of the solutions are already on the table. The Australian Human Rights Commission has drafted an excellent National Anti-Racism Framework, with a number of recommendations for State governments to implement in the education, health and justice systems. We should do that work.

I commend my colleague Jenny Leong in the Legislative Assembly, who has introduced a human rights bill supported by the Human Rights for NSW alliance. It sets out the economic, social, cultural, civil and political rights we need instead of a piecemeal or reactive approach to discrimination. Those are the types of solutions that members need to debate at this absolutely pivotal moment in our history. We only need to look to the United States to see what happens when this racist, white supremacist, neo-Nazi, fascist agenda is left to fester. Transgender people have been listed as criminals and terrorists, and people have been deported without due process. That is the risk. *[Time expired.]*

The Hon. ANTHONY D'ADAM (20:25): I support this timely motion. We have all been horrified by the recent demonstration by neo-Nazis. It is shocking to see Nazis so brazenly appearing on our streets, conveying such vile messages to the public. We are all concerned about the growth of neo-Nazism in our society, and we are all in agreement that we need to arrest this development. The real question is what kind of action is effective. The challenge is that there are people who want to look like they are doing something about it, and then there are people who actually want to solve the problem. People in the latter category should take a nuanced approach to the tactics deployed to combat the right-wing extremism, white supremacy and neo-Nazism that we see on our streets.

The starting point should be this: We should not do what the fascists want us to do. I am persuaded by the contribution of the Hon. Stephen Lawrence, suggesting that there was clearly planning involved in the protest activity. They had consulted lawyers and were looking for a legal fight to amplify their cause. We need to be very careful that our responses do not fall into the trap of amplifying their message, giving them a platform or giving them more attention than they deserve because they are aiming their message at a very specific group. It is clear that there is a particular problem with a whole lot of young men who are susceptible and attracted to this ideology. We need specific strategies to address what appeals to that demographic. We need specific strategies to make sure that the circumstances that give rise to that attraction are addressed. *[Time expired.]*

The Hon. NATALIE WARD (20:28): I also speak in support of Dr Amanda Cohn's motion. I note that the Opposition supports the motion. I thank the member for her personal contribution. I know that she brings personal experience of both the issue and of diversity to the matter, which is incredibly important in this place, as is her perspective. There are many things that members disagree on in this place, but I am pleased to see members genuinely come together on this particular matter. It is of grave importance in our lifetime, which is astounding in itself. Let us call out people in the neo-Nazi movement for what they are: They are weak, they are small and they thrive on division. They want to make noise for recruitment, not for change. They crave the bright lights of the media to amplify the darkness of their views. They seek to spread like a virus into the community, looking for people to blame.

The antidote to their deplorable views is in society speaking, in parents educating their children and in common people standing up for common good. Our society once seemed to move at glacial speeds. With the internet, smart phones and social media, it has now turned into a river of information, with parts true and false, uplifting and horrifying. In my view, everyone faces the perception of injustice in their lives—some big, some small. That comment is not to equate one's injustice or trauma with another, but it is to say that the perception of injustice is a shared experience across society. The challenge is how to process and respond to it.

Following the demonstration on the weekend at the front of Parliament, I found myself thinking that at times it is difficult to judge whether the number of neo-Nazis or white supremacists has grown or whether their voices are just louder, more focused and more active. There have always been bigots and racists in society, but in this instance I keep coming back to the level of the noise, the confidence in their actions and the deliberately menacing presence in the lived experience of different marginalised communities. There is not a person alive who does not want to change the world to their view, and clearly the 42 members in this Chamber got into politics to say something. Regardless of creed, policy perspectives and significant battles over what the laws that govern our community should mean, there is an unspoken debt that all members of the community have: While the boundaries of Australian society work, by and large, they can always be improved. We treat people we do not know or disagree with reasonably well, and it is un-Australian to punch down on marginalised communities.

I seek an extension of 30 seconds.

Leave granted.

The Hon. NATALIE WARD: In Australia, tolerance and silence have typically been the choice of division and anger. The neo-Nazi movement wants to change that. It wants to constantly turn up the temperature, not for change but for the sake of doing it. When neo-Nazis attack groups of society, they attack those very embers of the community. We will not tolerate it in this place. We will stand united with Dr Amanda Cohn's motion and as the Parliament that represents the people who say no to that.

The Hon. MARK BUTTIGIEG (20:31): I speak in support of the motion. I thank Dr Amanda Cohn and acknowledge her previous advocacy and work in this space. The Government commends the motion to the House and acknowledges the scourge of, and threat posed by, neo-Nazism and white supremacist groups. Saturday's events were abhorrent, hate filled and divisive. As the Premier said on Tuesday, that group and those scenes were bigoted, racist and antisemitic, designed to wrench our community apart. We acknowledge the hurt and impact those scenes would have had on our Jewish community, and we stand in solidarity with them, as we do with any community targeted by hatred. Nazism and white supremacy, and the fascist and racist ideologies they espouse, have no place in our State. The entire House stands united against them.

As the motion makes clear, those groups and ideologies target not only our Jewish community but also Australians of colour, Australians with disabilities, First Nations people and LGBTQIA communities. Fascist ideologies target and hate almost anyone. We acknowledge their threat to our communities, and we stand alongside all those targeted by hatred. Similarly, we note that far-right extremists have wormed their way into the spaces that have emerged within society, as fair-minded people raise legitimate concerns about the cost of living and affordability. Such groups and ideologies look for any chink in our societal armour and any grievance or concern of reasonable people—unlike them—to weaponise and use for their own hate-fuelled purposes. They thrive on and perpetuate division. The whole of society—government, political and community leaders—must work together to show them the door.

The motion calls on the Government to address racism and inequality, and we are happy to reaffirm that call, given that we have been addressing those two issues for almost three years. I believe it is fair to say that not many other New South Wales governments have taken on the scourge of racism as rapidly and seriously as ours. One simply needs to look at the policies, reforms and legislation we have introduced—the new offence of inciting racial hatred being just one—that showcase our commitment to tackling racism. We are happy to renew that call and view it as a reaffirmation of our relentless work tackling racism and remedying inequality across our State.

It is a salutary lesson, even for a very diverse, multicultural, open society like New South Wales and indeed Australia, that if these groups are allowed to take hold, it can quickly grow into a bigger thing. I counsel the Chamber on the point made by Dr Amanda Cohn regarding inequality. Fortunately, we have a philosophy that we value equality and fairness in this country. We do not want to go down the American path where things take a greater hold because of that inequality and unfairness.

The Hon. JOHN RUDDICK (20:35): This motion inadvertently achieves precisely what the National Socialist Network [NSN] wants: more attention. It is not only the motion. The second story on the ABC News tonight was all about how the NSN is trying to register as a political party. The ABC, helpfully for the NSN, points out that they need 750 members to register. Premier Minns has done the same thing twice in the past two days. Yesterday, *The Sydney Morning Herald* ran a front-page story with a big photo of the NSN. The Herald was also keen to point out what steps are required for the NSN to register as a political party—all free, invaluable advertising. It is inadvertent, and I am sure that the mover of the motion, The Greens, the ABC, *The Sydney Morning Herald* and Premier Minns are sincere in their opposition to the NSN, but they are acting as the public relations agents of that group.

The NSN is no doubt revelling in all that attention, which is likely to be gaining them new members. Often on a Saturday morning there are about 50 pro-life activists out the front of Parliament. Those good people say prayers and hand out flyers but, unless someone happens to be on Macquarie Street that day, no-one knows they are there because it does not get reported everywhere in the media. I fear that there are elements in the left who, probably subconsciously, want to exaggerate the NSN threat so as to whip up fear. What is the substance of the NSN threat? The political party most closely resembling the NSN in this country is former Senator Fraser Anning's Conservative National Party. That party contested one Senate election in New South Wales. In the 2019 Federal election, that party received 0.38 per cent of the vote in New South Wales. What a threat!

I put on record that if, after all the free publicity and advertising, the NSN does meet the requirements for party registration, it should be allowed to contest the coming State election. That may seem repugnant—it is repugnant—but the alternative is worse. It will only encourage more people to join the NSN, since they will be able to claim that they are such a threat to the establishment that the establishment is throwing out liberal

democratic principles to crush them. I doubt the NSN was going to get the required number of members but, if it does, we can partly blame all the media attention and motions like this one.

In the mid-1950s it was clear to all that communism had enslaved one-third of the world. At that time the communists were halfway through murdering 100 million people. Former Prime Minister Robert Menzies, whom I revere and who was absolutely dedicated to liberal democratic principles, broke with those principles and passed a law to ban the Communist Party of Australia. The High Court rightly found that law unconstitutional, so Menzies put a referendum to the people to amend the Constitution to ban the Communist Party. The Australian people wisely rejected that proposal. In his twilight years Menzies wrote that he regretted trying to ban the Communist Party. This is the same situation. We should take the same approach and remain fully committed to our sound liberal democratic principles.

Ms SUE HIGGINSON (20:38): I associate myself with Dr Amanda Cohn, the mover of the motion, and thank her for bringing it before the Parliament. We would rather there not be the need to move the motion, but there is a need to do so right now. I have some sympathy for the Hon. John Ruddick. Of course nobody wants to platform Nazis, but I point out that that member is the only member who actually named the organisation he is saying should not be platformed. It is important that we make contributions in a considered way in relation to exactly that point. Today we are all speaking in a unified way to a threat that is very real and existent.

I say two things. One, make no mistake, what we saw was not a protest. It was a despicable display and performance of hatred and racism. It was absolutely inciting racism and hatred. It was not a protest. Protest, as civil society and our democracy knows it, is something very different. It has a completely different character. I am genuinely concerned that New South Wales police have not made that distinction and actually facilitated and enabled this event. We need to think long and hard about how we administer form 1s in this State.

Two, now is not the time to go down the path of introducing more draconian and authoritarian laws because the reality is that is exactly the fascist handbook. That is the playbook. We cannot fight hatred, fascism and far-right extremism with authoritarianism because they are the same thing. It is time to take a breath and take a proper approach. It is time to start facing racism and white supremacy front-on. It is time to name it, shine a bright light on it and start combating it in earnest. We need to fund all the civil society organisations and communities that are willing to face this, to engage in deradicalisation and to move away from hate and division. Together we can do it.

The Hon. CAMERON MURPHY (20:41): In light of the events that occurred in recent days, I thank Dr Amanda Cohn for moving this important motion. I place on record my view that people who engage in such an horrific antisemitic act at the Parliament are despicable individuals. Other members are correct: It was not a protest. It was a PR stunt designed to further their aims, which are not about changing people's views or making the nation a better place. They are about seeding division and using it as a recruiting tool to get others to join their group. I echo the comments made by the Hon. Natalie Ward and agree wholeheartedly with what she said: These people are weak. I cannot help but think that turning up in front of the Parliament in the middle of the day where hardly anybody can see them, dressed in black, in some type of pathetic uniform, in an attempt to show strength is actually a weak attempt to compensate for other inadequacies. That is the only reason—other than perhaps mental illness—that anyone would join and participate in organisations like these.

I also quickly return to the point that my colleague the Hon. Anthony D'Adam made. It is important that we are very careful and considered about how we respond to this because this organisation is not about changing the public's mind. It is about using this event as a PR exercise and a recruitment tool, and we have to be very careful not to fall into the trap that has been set that allows them to do that. At the same time, we need to demonstrate the uniform view of this House and the Parliament that there is no place for people like them in a modern, multicultural Australia. Australia is stronger and better for the diversity that we have, and that is something that we should celebrate. We should call out these weak, pathetic individuals for what they are. They go to the gym and try to show they are strong or dress up in some type of uniform. All they are doing is trying to compensate for their inadequacies.

The Hon. WES FANG (20:44): I make a brief contribution to debate on the motion. Not many people would know this, but on my mother's side, it turns out that we have Jewish heritage. I am obviously also of Asian heritage. I am probably exactly who these people hate. I know this because I have lived with it my whole life. It has certainly been an interesting experience—not all bad, but there are times when ethnicity has been raised as an issue. When I was a teenager I remember people saying that Australia was being swamped by people of my race. It is obviously confronting when these things happen. But let us not kid ourselves: This is not a law and order issue. We cannot arrest our way out of this. New laws are not going to fix the white supremacy issues that we are experiencing because, ultimately, this problem will not go away by bringing in protest laws or laws around religion. This is not ideology; this is a mindset that they are superior to people like me.

By highlighting this issue and giving it oxygen, we are doing exactly what they want. We have already discussed the fact that their first protest had no coverage whatsoever. So they have done it again. Now we have headlines, talk of new laws and people discussing the issue out loud. We are giving them exactly what they want. That is why I almost did not contribute to debate. But it is important because we need to be united as a Parliament to make sure that we are at one with how we combat this. The only way we will fix it is through education and making sure that we are united against what they stand for. I make one last point: Do not make them martyrs out of this; that is they want. Do not give it to them.

The Hon. STEPHEN LAWRENCE (20:47): I make a brief contribution and thank Dr Amanda Cohn for bringing this important motion before the House. The Hon. Anthony D'Adam sent an email to Labor MPs earlier in the week that included advice from the White Rose Society. The document gives people advice on how to talk about Nazis. I might disseminate it further because it contains really clear guidance about appropriate ways to talk about Nazis in a way that does not assist them. The earlier protest received no publicity and was not accompanied by a form 1 being lodged. Now a form 1 was lodged when they did not actually need to lodge it and did not need permission to stand on the footpath.

The inevitable conclusion is that the Nazis have played a pretty clever game and have gotten themselves an absolute blaze of publicity at a critical time—when they seek to register a political party and need to reach a threshold to do so. This could well be a transformative moment for this very evil movement, and of course history is replete with examples of state action leading to a transformative moment for a social or political movement. Sometimes it is an incident of state repression, or sometimes it is the application of certain laws to a movement, but history is replete with examples of movements taking off in a certain direction as a consequence of state action. At this time we need to be extremely careful because a very small and marginal group of individuals—they have to be marginal to get involved—have managed to platform themselves right at the heart of the media and get a blaze of publicity that money cannot buy.

The ASSISTANT PRESIDENT (The Hon. Peter Primrose): Order! Pursuant to standing orders debate is interrupted to allow the mover of the motion to speak in reply.

Dr AMANDA COHN (20:50): In reply: I thank the Hon. Anthony D'Adam, the Hon. Mark Buttigieg, the Hon. Natalie Ward, Ms Sue Higginson, the Hon. Cameron Murphy, the Hon. Wes Fang and the Hon. Stephen Lawrence for their contributions to debate on the motion. It was very nearly an important and unanimous moment for this Parliament. I place on record that only one member sought to use the debate to score a political point, and history will not remember him kindly. A lot of words were used during the debate to describe what happened on Saturday outside Parliament. Some people have called it a protest or a stunt, arguing over whether it was a public relations exercise or whether it was a display of hate. For me, as a person who is directly targeted by those people, what happened on Saturday was only one thing: It was a threat.

We talk about protest as something that happens on a regular basis outside Parliament as part of a healthy democracy. When people protest, they want to have a particular law changed. Sometimes, if they are really nasty, they want some of us to be out of Parliament and lose our seats as elected representatives. But neo-Nazis do not just want me and people like me out of Parliament; they want me dead. That is a very different kind of threat. It is the threat my grandparents fled across the world to escape so that I could be here—so that I could be safe and not face what they faced.

What starts as racist dog whistling in this place often—not always—ends in real violence against marginalised people. I thank the members who contributed tonight in the way that I hoped we would, one that actually dignified a really significant moment in Australian history. I hope that we can exercise that level of caution and nuance in some of the policy debates that I am sure are to come. I finish by reading a poem that I think everybody knows, but that I include on the record tonight. It is a poem written in 1946 by Martin Niemöller. It reads:

First they came for the Communists
And I did not speak out
Because I was not a Communist
Then they came for the Socialists
And I did not speak out
Because I was not a Socialist
Then they came for the trade unionists
And I did not speak out
Because I was not a trade unionist
Then they came for the Jews
And I did not speak out
Because I was not a Jew
Then they came for me
And there was no one left
To speak out for me

That is the future we are looking at if we do not make the right decisions in the coming weeks and months. I thank the members who have taken that as seriously as they should.

The ASSISTANT PRESIDENT (The Hon. Peter Primrose): The question is that the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

PREGNANCY AND INFANT LOSS AWARENESS MONTH

The Hon. SARAH MITCHELL (20:52): I move:

- (1) That this House notes that:
 - (a) October 2025 is Pregnancy and Infant Loss Awareness Month;
 - (b) a report released in October 2025 by the Pink Elephants Support Network details a review of national and global miscarriage data and recommendations for best practice care; and
 - (c) the report includes a call to action for awareness, stories from real people with experiences of miscarriage and early pregnancy loss, and supported insights from leading experts in the field.
- (2) That this House acknowledges that the report highlights that:
 - (a) one in four pregnancies end in miscarriage, with recent studies suggesting this figure may be as high as 37 per cent, yet this widespread experience remains universally neglected by the Australian healthcare systems;
 - (b) 75 per cent of women report feeling unsupported through their miscarriage experience, 68 per cent receive no support when told their pregnancy has ended, and no formal support pathways exist; and
 - (c) Australian families have struggled to access necessary resources to support them when they need it most.
- (3) That this House recognises all of the personal stories shared by women in the report, including from those who received no support for their emotional wellbeing after their miscarriage and early pregnancy loss.
- (4) That this House congratulates the chief executive officer of Pink Elephants, Sam Payne, and her team for continuously supporting women and their families through the tragedy of miscarriage and early pregnancy loss, because it is "Not just a loss".

I have spoken about this issue in the Chamber many times before, and several times I have moved a motion to recognise that October is Pregnancy and Infant Loss Awareness Month. It is important to continue to do that. There has been good discussion and contributions from those of us with lived experience of pregnancy loss, and acknowledgement of the good work of advocates in that space. I have spoken many times about the Pink Elephants Support Network and the incredible work it does to support families, particularly when they are experiencing miscarriage and early pregnancy loss. The motion recognises the importance of Pregnancy and Infant Loss Awareness Month, which we acknowledge in October, and the work of Pink Elephants.

This motion also addresses a report that Pink Elephants released last month, which raised concerns about best practice care, particularly as it relates to early pregnancy loss in regional, rural and remote communities. The report is entitled *Not just a loss*. That is a phrase that Pink Elephants uses a lot. The founder, Sam Payne, has experienced loss herself. It is a phrase that she uses because she had two losses. In the report she states:

A miscarriage is not "just a loss." It is a profound grief that is too often met with silence, dismissal, and a healthcare system that simply isn't equipped to handle it.

The report was made in conjunction with a range of different experts, including Dr Fran Boyle, who is an associate professor and social scientist and health services researcher at the University of Queensland. Other experts consulted include Dr Zoe Bradfield, the president of the Australian College of Midwives; Dr Nisha Khot, the president of the Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists; Katrina Ward, the chief operations manager of Walgett and Brewarrina Aboriginal Medical Services, to make sure that First Nations perspectives were included; and Claire Brett, an amazing woman who lives just outside of Armidale, who is a mother and advocate for miscarriage support. I was also lucky enough to be a consultant. They put me in as an expert—I do not know if that is quite right, but I was very happy to share my lived experience and perspective on suffering with miscarriages in a regional community and the impact of that. It might be slightly different for families who live in the city.

I could address many aspects of the report, but I will only touch on a couple of things. The report makes five key recommendations, which are all very sensible. Pink Elephants wants to establish comprehensive national data collection systems, establish early pregnancy loss care standards and establish midwifery continuity of care. I note that also came up in the birth trauma inquiry, which a number of members participated in. Pink Elephants wants to ensure that early pregnancy loss care standards are culturally safe, and also to implement the Pink Elephants Care Standards, which provide a practical framework for systematic emotional assessment, proactive

referral pathways, bereavement leave and structured follow-up protocols so that no family feels that they are left without support.

This motion is not a political attack on the Government. It does not in any way dismiss the work of NSW Health, which I know the Minister for Health and his office are aware of. However, all parliamentarians—and there is a Federal role as well—should look at what has happened for people who have lived through that and see what we can do to improve the system. I will touch on a couple of the case studies in the report because the words of those women are more powerful than anything I can say. The first story was shared by Rebecca. She said:

I've experienced 16 pregnancies and have one child—15 losses that healthcare systems treated as routine medical events rather than profound grief. It wasn't until my ninth miscarriage, one that nearly ended my life, that anyone in a clinical setting acknowledged my pain or gave me permission to grieve.

I do not know how brave a woman like Rebecca must be to be able to share her story. I cannot imagine what it is like to endure 15 losses, but I think it is quite telling that it took nine for her to feel that she could grieve for the loss of her babies. I also share Miranda's story. She lives in Berridale and talked about living rurally and facing barriers when she lost her baby. She was pregnant in February and lost her baby in April. She said:

We went to the ultrasound at 3:30pm and found no heartbeat. We needed to go to the hospital next door for a follow-up scan to confirm whether we had lost our baby, but it was already closing.

She said that she had limited provider choices and that appointments were 30 minutes away in Cooma or four hours return to Canberra. She was going through all of that without being able to access the support that she needed. I have run out of time, but I will have more to say at the end of the debate. It is a really good report. There is good work in there, and it is something that parliamentarians should give a lot of consideration to.

The Hon. EMILY SUVAAL (20:58): I thank the Hon. Sarah Mitchell for once again moving a motion to recognise Pregnancy and Infant Loss Awareness Month, which it is important to recognise every year. The motion brings us together and gives us an opportunity to reflect on new evidence and new reports that have been shared. I place on record my thanks for the work of Pink Elephants, which does such an important job in providing support for women and their families. I extend that thanks to its founders, Samantha Payne and Gabbi Armstrong. *Not just a loss*—those are really powerful words, and it is a powerful name for the report. I thank the Hon. Sarah Mitchell for contributing to the report. It is important that we continue to share our experiences, and the report speaks to the power of including that lived experience. The Government supports the motion and notes the importance of this issue for women, particularly those living in regional areas.

October marks International Pregnancy and Infant Loss Awareness Month. Pregnancy and Infant Loss Remembrance Day is observed worldwide on 15 October for pregnancy loss and infant death, which includes miscarriage, stillbirth and infant death. The New South Wales Government recognises that pregnancy loss at any stage of gestation is devastating. The loss can have profound and long-lasting impacts on women and their families, and the Government is committed to supporting women and their families during that time. It is important to note that we can always do better in terms of the care we provide. I note the report's recommendations that the member has put on record.

The motion is a salient reminder of the importance of midwifery continuity of care, and we heard that loud and clear through the birth trauma inquiry. While there is more work to do, I think this is a good moment to celebrate the initiatives that we have put in place as a government. Recently, the Royal Hospital for Women celebrated its 250th home birth, and we have expanded our midwifery group practice services in a number of key regional areas. Yes, there is always more work to do. Having an evidence-based care pathway for stillbirth and infant loss is an important initiative, and I commend the report. We also recognise the role of all the non-government organisations involved in the advocacy space. I place on record our thanks to them. I also note that the Gidget Foundation will be in this place next Thursday celebrating Perinatal Mental Health Week. I encourage members to join us then too.

The Hon. Dr SARAH KAINE (21:01): I make a brief contribution to this debate by firstly acknowledging that the member who brought this motion today has, in the past—probably October last year—brought motions to ensure that we remember Pregnancy and Infant Loss Awareness Month. I thank her for that and for her way of framing this discussion as being about the important issue of women's health and the experiences of women when they miscarry. Indeed, it is really not a political issue.

I had not looked at the report and I did not know, so I appreciate that the other role that this motion plays is ensuring that all of us are made more aware of the reality of the statistics. The statistics that hit me were that 75 per cent of women report feeling unsupported through their miscarriage experience, 68 per cent receive no support when told their pregnancy has ended, and no formal pathways exist. Honestly, I find it absolutely outrageous that 68 per cent of women receive no support when their pregnancy has ended. As someone who has

been pregnant and had two children, I cannot imagine what it is like to go through that devastation and then not receive the kind of support that one would only think compassionate.

The issues in this motion—and I do not pretend to be an expert in the care of women in that tragic situation—are part of a continuum that we have seen in the medical system. It is not political; it is just the reality of systems that fail women across the board. This is a continuation of that. I know there are members of this Parliament, including the Hon. Emma Hurst, who have done a lot to expose the inappropriate and unacceptable experiences and treatment of women in our health system. If we thought that just exposing it was enough, it is not. It is still the experience of women in their most vulnerable time. I commend the motion and all of those who support it, and I urge members to do everything that we can to ensure that this and other expressions of medical misogyny are stamped out in the shortest possible time.

Dr AMANDA COHN (21:04): The Greens express their strong support for this motion, and I thank the mover for bringing it to the House and for the opportunity to discuss this important issue. I also acknowledge and commend the excellent work of Pink Elephants Support Network. Pregnancy loss and infant death are obviously devastating events for anyone. I had the privilege of going on that journey with some of my patients when I used to practice as a GP, and it is abhorrent that a majority of people who go through the experience of losing a pregnancy do not get the support they need. I acknowledge that the Federal Government did something very good this week when it passed Priya's law, which protects paid parental leave when a child is stillborn or dies. That is an important protection to allow people the time to grieve, recover and not be rushed back to work.

This motion is important not only because it commends people who are doing good work but also because it draws attention to work that needs to be done. Part of that work is raising awareness about what people go through so that they can get the support they need. When someone breaks a leg or is diagnosed with cancer, their friends, family, colleagues and wider community know how to respond to that. People pitch in and sign the cast. But when someone experiences a pregnancy loss, there may not be the same level of automatic and confident support, and that is a problem.

But there is also a problem in our public health system that means people are not getting the support that they need. We know that both the public mental health system and the public maternity system are catastrophically understaffed and under-resourced. It is deeply difficult for nurses, midwives, doctors and others working in the public health system to know that they are providing people with inadequate care. We heard that loud and clear through the excellent inquiry into birth trauma. I am sure we will hear similar stories throughout the upcoming inquiry into fertility support that the mover of this motion is chairing.

Finally, it is important to recognise the reality of women's experiences of pain and trauma, particularly when they are exacerbated by the medical system. When we are seeing more people turn to dangerous practices like freebirthing, that have even resulted in death, the Government and the health system need to provide environments where people feel safe and supported and where their real experiences and trauma are responded to appropriately so that people have trust in medical professionals. This is a serious and ongoing issue, and I again thank the mover for the opportunity to debate it tonight.

The Hon. EMMA HURST (21:07): I speak briefly on this motion and thank the Hon. Sarah Mitchell for bringing it to the House today. I remember when we were chairing the inquiry into birth trauma in New South Wales, and one of the women came forward and vulnerably shared her story. She talked about the trauma of having a stillbirth in a New South Wales hospital, being kept there overnight and hearing other healthy babies being born, even though she requested to go to a different ward. In the morning when the doctor came in, he did not have time to check the notes, and he asked her where her baby was. That is just one of the horrific stories we heard during the birth trauma inquiry. I am sure we will hear more during the fertility inquiry, also chaired by the Hon. Sarah Mitchell.

Again, it is an important motion that the Hon. Sarah Mitchell brought here today. One thing that is changing in this space is the removal of the stigma associated with pregnancy and infant loss. We are seeing a real change in people being far more open. Social media has a lot of negatives, but I am noticing that more women who have experienced miscarriage are openly discussing it. Previously those issues caused a lot of people to feel extremely isolated, leading to things like depression. It is not just the birthing parent; both parents go through this. This was previously one of those topics that people were encouraged to keep private. We had to make sure that we were not having these conversations publicly. It was almost like there was some sort of shame attached to miscarriage, early infant loss and stillbirth. These conversations are now happening, which promotes more healing among families.

Members should recognise that this is far more common than people realise, particularly miscarriage. So many women will experience at least one miscarriage in their lives. When this process is normalised, people will be able to have these conversations in public forums. This will provide families with the opportunity to grieve

about the family they had imagined was going to be their future and about how their lives changed when this horrible incident occurred. I am glad that members are talking about this today. Having these conversations breaks through some of the stigma and isolation, which means members need to talk about it. I thank the Hon. Sarah Mitchell for moving the motion.

The Hon. NICHOLE OVERALL (21:10): I support the motion of the Hon. Sarah Mitchell, who is my National Party colleague and also my friend. This is an incredibly important and emotional motion for so many. Behind every statistic is the heartbreak of a mother, a partner or a family. To be told that this loss is common rather than being comforted with compassion is difficult to fathom. We need to continue to have these conversations to raise awareness and acknowledge what can be an incredibly traumatic moment in the lives of women and mothers. Miscarriage cannot be dismissed as simply a medical inconvenience to be borne or something that people have to get through. It is a bereavement, and it deserves to be recognised as such.

When it comes to women in regional, rural and remote communities, particularly here in New South Wales, the pain and loss can be compounded even further by distance and cost or, even worse, by neglect. The neglect is not necessarily intentional. It is the idea that this is something that can be borne easily. Not having the opportunity to take a child through to the next stage of life is something that so many people find incredibly difficult to even contemplate. Many people are forced to go to emergency departments. They are surrounded by trauma because early pregnancy units do not operate 24/7. In some parts of regional, rural and remote New South Wales, women can travel hundreds of kilometres for simple procedures.

One of the great concerns I had while reading the Pink Elephants Support Network report tabled by the Hon. Sarah Mitchell is about the Australian Bureau of Statistics not including early pregnancy loss in the census. This means that grief is statistically unrecognised and therefore invisible to a degree. When there is no data, there is no funding. Without funding, there is no reform. The recommendations in the report provided a road map. We should all take them into account, follow them to whatever degree we can and ensure that they are brought forward. I commend the motion to the House and thank my friend for bringing it forward.

The Hon. SCOTT BARRETT (21:14): I thank the Hon. Sarah Mitchell for bringing this motion on. I guess that it is a different experience for blokes, and my heart bleeds for everyone that has had to go through this. I remember when this was spoken about before the election when I was previously in Parliament. I was shocked at how many people had actually been through the loss of a child at that early stage. The fact that people do not yet feel as comfortable as they should to share that experience is a tragedy. I can only imagine that the more we destigmatise this so people feel more comfortable talking about it, the better it will be for everyone involved. I spent a little bit of time thinking about what this would be like from my experience. I do not want to take away from the motion, but I also want to give a shout-out to the dads involved in this. I can see how tough it would be for them to go through this.

I feel as though I am dismissing the experience of mothers, but dads must feel so helpless throughout this experience. To want to do something for a wife or partner and to be helpless to do anything must be really trying. My heart goes out to every person who has been through that. I am blessed with two kids myself. I know people who have been through this, and I give all power to them. I hope that more people can come together and talk about this so that shared experience can lessen the blow. More people uniting around this and sharing their experiences will help everyone move forward with what I am sure is a horrific experience. I send my thoughts and prayers to anyone who might have experienced this.

The Hon. SARAH MITCHELL (21:16): In reply: I thank members for the contributions they made to debate on this motion. It is important to have discussions when motions like this are on the *Notice Paper*. It gives comfort, because there are women and families who listen to us. Funnily enough, people sometimes tune into Parliament, read *Hansard* or watch videos. It gives comfort to those who are suffering and those who have been through loss to know that their parliamentarians hear them, are sorry for their loss and recognise that we need to do more to help them. I credit Miranda for her story, which I mentioned in my opening remarks. I will read her story properly this time. When speaking about her miscarriage, she said:

This was completely new territory for us. We fell pregnant in February and lost our baby in April. I'd never dealt with this kind of grief before and couldn't have imagined how this feels.

...

We went to the ultrasound at 3:30pm and found no heartbeat. We needed to go to the hospital next door for a follow-up scan to confirm whether we had lost our baby, but it was already closing. We were told by the receptionist, "Absolutely not. You're not getting in today." We had to come back the next day at 2pm, and then again the day after to get my anti-D shot because pathology had closed. It was three days of back and forth.

That really resonated with me. I have spoken about this before. It has been more than eight years, so I am quite able to speak about it now. I know that some women cannot speak about it because it is too raw. Maybe some women never can.

My experience with my second pregnancy loss was not dissimilar to Miranda's. I had a routine doctor's appointment and found out that there was no heartbeat. I had to go across the road for an ultrasound and then had to travel to Tamworth to have a dilatation and curettage procedure, which is now called something else. This was all within one day, which is the lived reality for people in the regions. I actually feel lucky that as horrific as that day was, we did not have three days of it. That would probably have added even more trauma to what my husband and I were going through. I acknowledge what the Hon. Scott Barrett said, because this is very difficult for partners.

The other part of the report that resonates a lot with me is where it talks about changing some of the terminology that is used and being a little bit more conscious of what women are going through. The report talks about the language that is used if someone needs to go to a hospital for a procedure. In my experience, it was called "evacuation of the products of conception". I remember driving home from the hospital and looking at the paperwork I had been given for my health insurance, and that is what it said. It felt so cold and clinical. That was not what had happened. We had lost our baby that we wanted, and we were sad and grieving about that.

It might seem small and trivial, but there are ways to fix the language that is used when women and families go through this. They should not have to tell their story about what they are there for so many times. I cannot tell members how many times I had to tell people that day, "I'm here because I lost my baby," while I was grieving losing my baby. We can do better. They are not big changes but they are significant changes. I know we can do better for women and families going through those sorts of issues. The Pink Elephants Support Network is amazing. It wants to work with the Parliament and we should definitely do that. I thank members for the debate; it has been good, as it always is.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (The Hon. Dr Sarah Kaine): The question is that the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Bills

GAME AND FERAL ANIMAL LEGISLATION AMENDMENT (CONSERVATION HUNTING) BILL 2025

Second Reading Debate

Debate resumed from 22 October 2025.

The Hon. SARAH MITCHELL (21:20): When we were last debating the Game and Feral Animal Legislation Amendment (Conservation Hunting) Bill 2025, I think I was talking about the work that the committee did on the report. My colleague the Hon. Scott Barrett was a member of the committee, and I am sure he will speak in more detail about some of the evidence that was heard. I have read through the report and have looked at some of the evidence that came before the committee, and I will speak to a little of that shortly, but it is a good example of some of the issues about which the community had strong views. There is quite a bit in the bill. Putting it through the upper House committee process so that people had an opportunity to let the Parliament know what they thought about the bill, with several hundred submissions—there might have been a couple of thousand, actually—was a positive thing.

Some of the specifics raised in the committee inquiry were different from the perspective we had when the bill was initially introduced and debated. I want to talk about some of the concerns with broader community safety risks. Like others, I have met with different stakeholders and representatives who had concerns about what the bill would mean in terms of the right to hunt and the promotion of hunting more generally. There were concerns about the potential weakening of gun laws and what that may mean for community safety. There was some evidence about rural women's experience of domestic violence and the impact that guns and hunting can have on that, and there were also some concerns about the types of firearms that are able to be used. Again, it is important that witnesses had the opportunity to give their evidence.

Some evidence was given of the stakeholder perspectives on the proposed Conservation Hunting Authority. Concerns and questions were raised about how it would operate and who was consulted on the proposal, particularly given that that hunting authority received funding allocations in the budget, yet the legislation to supposedly set up the authority has not actually passed through Parliament. Some people criticised the proposed authority, its composition, its functions and its policy intent. They are all valid things for them to put on record and for us to keep in mind as we work through the contents of the bill and the amendments that may be coming when we reach the Committee stage.

The committee received evidence about a right to hunt, which was very divisive, and the witnesses who appeared before the committee certainly polarised people. Hunting advocates spoke of the value of the right to hunt. Others spoke about the cultural importance of hunting for Aboriginal people, which was an interesting perspective that I had not considered—and probably would not have—in relation to the bill before the committee. People also had very legitimate questions about how the proposed right in the bill could be expected to operate and, again, there were a lot of divergent views on what that would look like in practice. All of that work has been very good. The committee's work was important and we will take some of it into our consideration as Nationals, particularly when we reach the Committee stage. We will consider the various amendments on their merits.

The Nationals' position—and I think I did say this on the last occasion—is that we will support the second reading of the bill. We will consider the amendments on their merits in the Committee stage. We will move some amendments of our own throughout that process. But, by and large, we understand the impact that we see in many communities and among the farmers who live every day with the destruction that wild animals cause to some of our best country, whether they are wild pigs, foxes, cats, dogs or deer. Farmers and landholders are dealing with the problem.

Parts of the bill go to allowing more hunting on certain Crown lands. We have always been supportive of that and we continue to be so. It is important that there is support for the opportunities to reduce feral animal populations, which are very destructive and can cause a lot of damage to our important agricultural communities. I will stop there because others have much more expertise on the subject than I do, including the Hon. Scott Barrett, who I know will speak. As I said, The Nationals will support the bill on its second reading and consider the amendments on their merits in the Committee stage. I will have more to say then.

The Hon. SCOTT BARRETT (21:25): There is quite a lot to the Game and Feral Animal Legislation Amendment (Conservation Hunting) Bill 2025, despite it being relatively short compared to many others that come before this place. Already I see that there are a shedload of amendments. As foreshadowed, I will support the bill through to the Committee stage to be debated further, because a lot more improvement needs to be made to the bill before it can pass. I like the idea of providing more access to people to enjoy outdoor activities. I am also in favour of effective control measures for our invasive species. I support the principles or intent of the bill. However, when we first saw the bill, it was pretty clear that it had several spiders on it. We kicked it off to committee for further inquiry. Unfortunately, I am yet to be convinced that all of those spiders have been removed. That being said, I hope that we can work through the bill and come up with something that delivers on its stated intent.

I find the Government's approach to the bill particularly interesting. It was clearly willing to support the bill without the inquiry and voted against further investigation. The reasons for that bizarre approach are still unclear. However, it does seem that the Government has strongly walked back from much of what it initially promised in support of the bill. Things develop and new information comes to light all the time, and that is okay. We need to be able to change our position. But it does suggest that if the bill was rushed through, as Labor tried to facilitate early on, some things might have been passed that even the Labor Party now believes are just bad ideas.

That highlights why the bill needed further investigation and also raises questions about why the Government was so willing and eager to support the bill, without fully understanding its implications. I do not at all criticise the movers of the bill. They have been very clever. They have brought forward a bill that promotes the interests of the specific constituents and interest groups that they openly represent. I will steal what someone else said on the bill in this place: They are doing exactly what it says on the tin. They have even been able to do so under the guise of conservation and biosecurity. Well played for getting it here.

The inquiry was initially referred on 24 June, with a reporting date of 10 October. I have gone back through the minutes to see how we ended up feeling so rushed throughout the whole process. I found the proposed timeline. Submissions closed just four days before the first hearing on 8 August, with a second hearing date set for 11 August. In the end we had only one hearing date, with a deliberative set for 8 September and the report tabled on 12 September—well before the scheduled reporting date. What ended up happening was something that I had not seen before. It seemed incredibly unusual and unnecessary. A draft report was actually given to us before the answers to the supplementary questions were returned. It seemed odd and unfair to those who took the time to provide information, and to the secretariat, who had to deal with the additional pressure it must have placed on them.

We tried to acknowledge the truncated process in the report but were, not surprisingly, blocked by Labor. I am still unclear as to why the Labor Party was in such a hurry to bring this bill back to the House for debate. In response to queries about this bill, the Government has said, "It's not our bill." Then why the urgency to bring it back? Schedule 1 [10] to the bill refers to removing part 2 of the Game and Feral Animal Control Act, which legislates the Game and Pest Management Advisory Board. The bill abolishes the board, with the support of the

Government. This was discussed in the inquiry. We asked Government representatives about this board and were told we have an existing board that is operating pretty well. We have a legislated advisory body the Government is supporting the abolishment of, without any real explanation as to why.

I understand why the Shooters want this, but I am unclear why the Government is getting rid of a board that is operating pretty well. It would have been a good group to go to for advice in the inquiry. It would have been good to get evidence at a second hearing—a second hearing day that we were not able to hold due to the rushed timeline placed on the committee. But we cannot hear from this body because it does not exist anymore. The legislated Game and Pest Management Advisory Board, demanded under part 2 of the Game and Feral Animal Control Act, does not exist.

I have heard that it might have had a meeting in May, but despite asking the Minister a question on notice—question No. 4445, for those who want to look it up—I still do not know for sure when it last met. I asked that question, following up on information we learnt in the inquiry. I asked a number of things about the Game and Pest Management Advisory Board: Who is the Chair? Who are the members? When were they appointed? I asked about vacancies, when the last meeting was and when the next meeting is. I asked, if there is not a currently active Game and Pest Management Advisory Board, what are the reasons? The response I received from the Minister states, "The New South Wales Government is recruiting the board."

I asked 14 specific questions, seeking numbers and dates, and I got a seven-word response that did not answer any of those 14 questions. The disrespect and arrogance in the response from this Minister reflects the disrespect and arrogance in the Government's approach to this bill. Why has the Minister not re-formed this group? It has been at least five or six months since it met—that is how long we think it has been; but the Minister refused to tell me when it last met. It has a legislated role; it is meant to report to the Government every year. Yet under this Minister the board has lapsed and no longer exists. Is this incompetence from the Minister to fill a legislated role? Or is it arrogance and disrespect for the Parliament in assuming the bill would pass and acting as if it already has before the debate has even begun?

The same question needs to be asked about the budgetary allocations for the Conservation Hunting Authority. Let me remind the House that in this year's budget there was an unknown amount of funding "to establish the Conservation Hunting Authority and support the regulation of additional hunting activity". Of course, we do not have a conservation hunting authority; we are debating it as part of this bill. In trying to learn more about this from the Minister with a question on notice, I learnt that funding was actually for "an increase in hunting across additional identified areas of public land". This was followed up again in the inquiry, when we were told by government that the amount was \$7.9 million and it was for:

... the creation and operation of the Conservation Hunting Authority and then also some funding for the department because the bill does propose hunting on additional public land ...

This was explored further in budget estimates hearings a few weeks after that inquiry when the Hon. Tara Moriarty said that this money was "the Government being prepared and anticipating, or potentially anticipating, a bill that is before the Parliament". This seemed astounding to me. How much other money is in the budget that is anticipating bills that may or may not pass the Parliament? The initial response from the Minister stated the money was for "an increase in hunting across additional identified areas of public land." I specifically reminded the Minister of her written response:

The Hon. SCOTT BARRETT: As I said, we asked specifically what this money was for and you didn't mention the bill or the hunting authority; you said it was for an anticipated increase in hunting across additional identified areas of public land.

The Hon. TARA MORIARTY: Correct.

...

The Hon. SCOTT BARRETT: So you have identified areas for additional hunting?

The Hon. TARA MORIARTY: No.

This whole thing—the money allocated before the bill was passed, the differing explanations for what the money is for, and then the Minister contradicting herself literally within a couple of lines in budget estimates hearings—simply reeks of arrogance, incompetence or total disrespect for this House. Or perhaps it is a bit from column A, a bit from column B and a bit from column C. Either way, it has done damage to this bill and cast shadows over the process that has led to this point, but it is also not inconsistent with the dealings of this Minister. The idea of a "right to hunt" still leaves me uncomfortable, and numerous amendments are foreshadowed to remove that aspect of the bill. The Premier has also walked back the Government's support for it.

My position is not because I have a problem with hunting—not at all; I am quite supportive. But in New South Wales we have very few legislated rights, and enshrining this right in legislation could supersede other pastimes that do not have such rights. From what I can work out, in New South Wales we have the right to

education, the right to self-defence, the right to public information held by public sector agencies, water rights, and victims of crime rights. Adding a right to hunt to that limited list would elevate this pastime—this hobby—well beyond other pastimes. That may cause further issues when conflicts of land use might arise. Plenty of people love to hike and ride horses through the various lands where hunting is allowed.

Providing a right to hunt seems to make hunting more important than other pastimes—such as horse riding, bushwalking, fishing, camping, four-wheel driving, beekeeping—giving hunters greater priority to access and other resources. All that being said, I do understand where the motivation or desire for this right has come from. I can 100 per cent understand why licensed firearms owners feel demonised. Guns are dangerous—all gun owners get that. I think I would be supported in saying that, as a general rule, that is why they take so much care to look after their guns, to ensure they are as safe as possible. Every time there is gun-related violence or a firearms incident, more pressure is applied to legal gun owners, when such a small proportion of those incidents—and I am sure others would know the numbers—are attributed to licensed firearms owners.

It is generally not licensed gun owners who cause the bulk of the problems. I note, however, that we do seem to drop this demonisation every four years at the Olympics when we cheer on our shooters as athletes—the likes of Chloe Esposito, whose pistol shooting in Rio saw her jump to the lead and ultimately win the gold medal in the modern pentathlon, a sport I have had little exposure to but have the utmost admiration for. While I have sympathy for the motivation of licensed gun owners and appreciate the impacts of their demonisation, I cannot support a legislated right to hunt.

I do note the bill proposes changes to the Weapons Prohibition Act. The second reading speech specifically mentions suppressors. I believe some people should have access to suppressors as a pest control tool. As a casual shooter, I probably do not need to have one—despite having a gun licence. But from a pest control and safety perspective, others could benefit from access to suppressors. Despite the intent of that amendment, I do not see this bill delivering the desired result. It is too broad, and there needs to be a significant amount of work done before it can progress—perhaps exploring the serialisation of suppressors, for instance, which this bill does not do. As it stands, I cannot support that amendment because we do not want any prohibited weapons ending up in the wrong hands, and I do not see enough safeguards in the bill to ensure that will not happen. I would be happy to explore it at a later date, though, through more considered legislation.

I am not against the idea of opening up more public lands for hunting. I do not think it is at all the silver bullet to the feral animal problems we have, but I am not against the idea of hunters and other users having greater access to our public lands. There are other issues around how we best share that access. I will come to those a bit later on. But in the first instance, I just want to talk about opportunities for increased hunting on Crown land, which is clearly one of the key intentions of the bill.

The bill has sections dedicated to increasing the amount of Crown land designated for hunting, including a list of areas in schedule 5 that would be designated with the passing of the bill. In the inquiry we asked witnesses about this proposed process and learnt from the director of forestry and hunting regulation at the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development that there is already a process for the declaration of public lands. The evidence in the inquiry was that:

In the proposed bill, it looks at a different pathway ... it is slightly different but still ultimately the same process.

The process already exists under section 20 of the Game and Feral Animal Control Act, so there are no legislative changes needed to see more land declared for hunting; the Minister can declare that land at any time. There are obviously some steps that need to be taken. In the inquiry we learnt that:

... the Minister must give public notice of the proposed declaration. In making a declaration, the Minister must consider safety, the rights of other land users, plans of management or other documents relating to the use or management of the land, and any recommendations from the land manager and the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development.

But I think there are additional things we could do. Allowing hunters on Crown land will not alone fix the feral animal problem. There were arguments made in the inquiry that it could make it worse. But if this really is about biosecurity, let us have the Independent Biosecurity Commissioner investigate and report on opportunities to safely incorporate recreational hunting into the control of feral animals. This could include input from pest management experts and hunting stakeholders, using their knowledge and experience, to identify areas of Crown land where the impact of pest animals could be decreased through the use of recreational hunters, as part of coordinated and strategic pest management programs.

Critically, though, we need to ensure public safety is the number one priority. Obviously, I am not talking about a free-for-all where anyone can shoot anywhere at any time, and I do not think the bill enables that. But let us look at if and how we can make the bill work. We heard some compelling arguments against the bill from the likes of Outdoors NSW, which suggested that providing hunting access to Crown land could be a deterrent to other users. We need to avoid that. I acknowledge there would be some costs associated with implementing the

bill, but there is \$7.9 million attached to it already that could be directed to delivering some really good outcomes for all involved. Let me reiterate that this needs to be done safely. I know there is doubt around the bill, but amongst the pessimism we still heard the likes of Outdoors NSW talk about the possibility of the proposed arrangements working. It told the inquiry:

... if the framework is there and we come up with a wonderful foolproof method of knowing where they are, when they are, so that we can avoid those particular areas—absolutely.

There is \$7.9 million available; why not use some of that to develop that foolproof method, increase the enjoyment of more people in more areas of Crown land and clean up a few wild pigs while we are at it? I support opening up more of the State's Crown land for hunting. We will look closely at the amendments in the Committee stage for the best pathway to do that. Let us see how it unfolds and how we can make that work.

When it comes to the management of invasive species, Australia's history is littered with terrible mistakes and poorly thought-out Government decisions. Those errors could have been easily avoided if decision-makers, such as legislators, had given greater consideration and applied additional rigor to those important decisions and their direct and indirect consequences. The litany of blunders includes the introduction and subsequent mismanagement of pests such as rabbits, foxes, prickly pear and deer, to name just a few. While I very much support the purported intent of the bill to help reduce feral animal populations, I am not convinced it will achieve that goal.

Given our country's storied history of the failures in feral animal control I have just listed, we need to make sure all of our decisions are thoroughly thought out. The bill we have before us is not perfect. It amends the Game and Feral Animal Control Act, the Crown Land Management Act, the Weapons Prohibition Act, and also the Forestry Act. While the intent of the bill might be palatable to me, there still needs to be work done to get it to a point that will have a positive outcome. I will support the bill through to the Committee stage, for that further work. How it progresses will depend on what happens with the amendments, when we get there.

The Hon. JACQUI MUNRO (21:44): I do not support the Game and Feral Animal Legislation Amendment (Conservation Hunting) Bill 2025. I grew up on a family farm where, obviously, there were feral animals—rabbits, in particular, were shocking, and cats as well. We grew up with sheep and horses, in superfine merino wool country, with people who used firearms reasonably regularly, and lawfully, to my knowledge. My family members had firearm licences and owned firearms that were appropriately stored on the property. We understood, from a very young age, that firearm safety is a serious business, that guns are dangerous—they are deadly—but that they have a place, particularly in regional and rural areas where the lifestyle is obviously very different to that of people who live in the city.

People in rural and regional areas are dealing with invasive species all the time, and with animals such as foxes that are potentially threatening to their livestock. I did not deal with feral pigs so much, but I am certainly familiar with how dangerous and nasty they can be, with their thick hides and aggressive nature. I have never come across one, and I never want to.

The Hon. Stephen Lawrence: There might be a few around here.

The Hon. JACQUI MUNRO: I acknowledge that interjection; there might be some feral animals around here. But we are welcoming enough of feral animals in this place. My personal values really align with the idea that we should be protecting native species and encouraging land management that is fundamentally all about protecting our natural flora and fauna. For example, I never let my cat go outside because I definitely do not want her killing birds, rodents or anything at all. I feed her well.

The event that first caused me to consider the impact of guns on a broader scale was the Port Arthur massacre. I understood not only the terrible impact on the individual families involved, but also that Australians needed to protect themselves—not from each other, with guns, but against a society that normalised gun ownership. I joined the Liberal Party, where John Howard led the change to ensure that gun ownership was much more restricted. I have not recently looked up the number of firearms that were returned under his amnesty program, but it was in the millions. That was done with the assistance and support of the Federal National Party. It was an incredible display of unity for the betterment of our country. Globally, Australia is known for its strict gun laws and often referenced in relation to the United States of America and what it experiences.

I give that context because I think most people, particularly those of my age, understand gun ownership in the light that guns are dangerous, that they should not be easily accessed, and that restrictions on use and ownership should remain stringent. In relation to this bill, the Hon. John Howard, AC, very staunchly came out to say that the bill should not be supported in any form. Those were his words. He also said that any changes would water down the effects of the National Firearms Agreement. We have a man whose legacy is so important to our real safety and our sense of safety that he is commenting on this legislation. He has a good life. He does not have to

worry about provincial New South Wales politics, but he knows that this bill is so important that his intervention in the debate is valuable. I thank him for that.

I also thank the Hon. Scott Barrett for raising pertinent questions that include the very concerning process questions around how this bill came to be before the House with the concurrence of the Government. The Nationals have a deep interest in this legislation for the constituents they represent in regional and rural areas. I respect that many National Party members in this Chamber and in the other place have gun licences. They even have children who have youth gun licences and who understand fundamentally the importance of placing safety first in relation to gun ownership. I will read something that I found very interesting:

I do not support this bill because, given the risks, it is simply too costly to allow recreational hunters ... when it is cheaper to have professional feral animal eradication. For all of the Game Council's boasts, it cost New South Wales taxpayers \$249 per feral animal killed last year in our State forests. I do not support this bill because effective feral management requires culling of large numbers of animals in a small area over a long period. Programs need to be targeted and coordinated, and they need to use multiple approaches. Recreational shooting is not coordinated; it is random. Experts tell us that on-ground shooting is not effective. Depending on the animal, aerial shooting, mustering, baiting and trapping are more effective. On-ground shooting can make feral animal problems worse by dispersing the animals further. I do not support this bill because it is dangerous.

Earlier this week, the Hon. Penny Sharpe did me the honour of quoting something I had written in relation to a topic she was quite interested in. I offer the same honour today. I read the Hon. Penny Sharpe's comments on the Game and Feral Animal Control Amendment Bill 2012 that was debated in this House on 20 June 2012. Considering Minister Sharpe's former comments, it is quite extraordinary that she is now supporting this bill. It is a quite an extraordinary backflip not only as a member of this House but also as a Minister for the Environment, given all the evidence we have about the lack of effectiveness that on-ground shooting has on keeping feral pests and feral animals under control. I want to ensure that the voices of some of my colleagues in the other place are heard in this debate and that there is a record of those members who commented on this bill. The first is the Leader of the Opposition, Mark Speakman, who said:

The Premier and Labor appear to have been caught out doing US-style political horse-trading on gun rights with the Shooters Party in exchange for their support on other Government legislation.

This highlights the concern that has been raised consistently that this bill is a dirty deal between Labor and the Shooters so that the Labor Party can get their workers comp legislation through. It is a really problematic use of the way our parliamentary system works. I believe it is very problematic from a democratic point of view to be horsetrading these types of very important legislation, one for the other for support. Mark Speakman said:

Chris Minns must rule out trading gun laws for upper house votes to pass his cuts to workers' compensation.

My colleague the member for Ryde, Jordan Lane, described this policy as a "dog of a policy". He said:

It is not only a disgraceful law, it's a disgraceful way of making law.

Further, Monica Tudehope, who is the new member for Epping, said:

... former prime minister John Howard had warned the bill would undermine gun laws introduced after the Port Arthur massacre.

She said that John Howard is so worried that he wrote to the Premier asking him to reject the bill, but we know that will not happen because Labor has allowed the bill to be introduced in the upper House to get votes for its workers compensation legislation. She also said that that is the state of politics in New South Wales at the moment—undermining community safety, and trading that for votes on a completely different bill.

We heard the words spoken by the Hon. Penny Sharpe, stating her previous position of more than 10 years ago on a very similar bill in this House. But she now comes into the Chamber as a Labor Party member and as a Minister for the Environment and says, "Oh, no. Actually, the information I had in the past was wrong. That position is not one that I believe in anymore." It would be very welcome for her to explain her changed position, which is a total backflip, and why Labor, under her stewardship as a Minister, has decided to support this bill when she very clearly would have voted against it previously if it had not been for—

The Hon. Wes Fang: Dodgy deals.

The Hon. JACQUI MUNRO: Dodgy deals and vested interests. I acknowledge the interjection. I will read some comments from the New South Wales Young Lawyers committee of the Law Society. I thank the committee for doing an incredible job at short notice of exploring this very difficult issue.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (The Hon. Dr Sarah Kaine): Order!

The Hon. JACQUI MUNRO: The New South Wales Young Lawyers have had a pretty similar upbringing to mine in terms of their sense of how politics works and what is important in our society. In their concluding comments of their submission—and they are the opposite of a vested interest—they said that their subcommittee submits that the amendments proposed by the conservation hunting bill go against the interests of

the public, present a serious risk to public safety, are harmful to genuine and targeted conservation efforts, and fail to consider animal welfare issues created by the proposed amendments.

They go on to say that the subcommittee submits that the conservation language used in the bill is far from genuine and that the true purpose of the proposed amendment is simply to advance the interests of a small group of hunters. The subcommittee submitted that the proposed amendments come at an enormous cost to the public interest and public safety, so the bill should be rejected in its entirety. They are the incredibly strong words from that group. They have provided an extensive submission of 22 pages to outline in great detail their concerns, but to sum up the situation with such clarity speaks volumes. They also made recommendations.

I will comment on something said by the Hon. Scott Barrett in relation to silencers. The idea that this Parliament will relax legislation to allow the use of silencers on weapons and enable people to sneak up on unsuspecting prey is incredibly troubling for the wider community. Multiple submissions addressed this topic, but I will now refer to the Alannah and Madeline Foundation, which has been very vocal in speaking against this bill. The foundation was set up following the Port Arthur massacre where the two children died at the hands of gun violence. The foundation's key interest is children's safety and it has been tireless in its advocacy. It noted in its submission, which specifically referenced silencers, that it wanted to register its concern that:

... The Hon Robert Borsak went to great lengths to outline how the Bill would open a new pathway for the availability of silencers to recreation shooters.

The submission quoted the Hon. Robert Borsak, who said:

The Bill also amends the provision relating to genuine reasons for granting a permit for a suppressor for a firearm to allow a conservation hunting licence to be recognised as a genuine reason for obtaining a permit to use a sound suppressor on a hunting rifle.

The submission then stated:

The use of silencers is available to a very limited number of professional shooters in most jurisdictions. Enabling recreational shooters to routinely use silencers in newly designated areas hunting areas on public lands that are used by other outdoor recreation enthusiasts is ignoring the fundamental premise that the use and possession of firearms is a privilege, conditional on public safety.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (The Hon. Dr Sarah Kaine): According to standing order, it being 10.00 p.m. proceedings are interrupted.

Adjournment Debate

ADJOURNMENT

According to standing order, members made the following statements.

MEMBER FOR SYDNEY

The Hon. MARK LATHAM (22:00): Like many MPs, I was surprised to read *The Sydney Morning Herald* of 27 October and realise our Parliament has its very own Derek Zoolander, with that pouting Blue Steel look. Either that, or it was the new buff fireman's 2026 calendar with a stripped-down member for Sydney. No-one believes him, of course, but Alex Greenwich has told various courts and tribunals that he has not had sex with his husband since a single tweet 2½ years ago. I must say that has not been my experience. Nonetheless, it seems that this little display in the Herald was an attempt to overcome not only Zoolander's mental illness but also his alleged sex drought. Up and down Oxford Street they are all saying, "There's a lot more to life than being really, really, ridiculously good-looking." My tweet, of course, was simply saying that not all the things we do in the bedroom are up to hospital-hygiene standards.

Let us go back to the origins of the Greenwich Blue Steel matter. In political desperation, in the last days of the election campaign in 2023, Zoolander tried to blame me for the violence in front of the Belfield church, but I had nothing to do with it. I arrived well after the protagonist had been dispersed. Greenwich was not there that night. He spoke to no-one who knew what had occurred—not the police, not me, not the church representatives. Yet, on the basis of ignorance, he called me "a disgusting human being", "crazy", "a very cruel and lazy politician" and "an extremely dangerous and hateful individual". He called on the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition to denounce me for something I had not done.

In a telling moment during the recent NSW Civil and Administrative Tribunal [NCAT] hearing, Mr Greenwich admitted he was unaware of the true culprit or that Christian Sukkar had been convicted in the Bankstown Local Court in June 2023 for organising the violence in the days leading up to the event. Bizarrely, at NCAT, Greenwich kept blaming me because I told two police officers well after the violence had ended that I wanted to give my speech to the voters gathered in the church hall at the back of the church area, among them mothers and grandmothers worried about the transgender push in schools.

The police had not been in the hall where the parish priest was sitting on the stage. It was a peaceful, orderly gathering and the meeting was held successfully. Even though the facts are clear, Alex Greenwich told the hearing, "Mr Latham didn't follow police instructions, which led to an act of violence." That is completely untrue, but he said it under oath. The violence at Belfield occurred 40 minutes before the police talked to me. Greenwich also spoke of "actions Mr Latham took that directly led to political violence". He was under oath at NCAT. There were no such actions. He also pointed to "political violence provoked by Mr Latham", but that is another falsehood. Greenwich has not been able to identify the real culprit, Christian Sukkar, because he has not wanted the facts to get in the way of his personal and political pursuit of me.

Forget his abortion bill, his euthanasia bill, his equality bill and his making a man Sydney's woman of the year; according to Greenwich, the one great controversy swirling around him and making his life a misery is a single tweet from 2½ years ago. It is the reason he says he is mentally ill, has become a hermit and cannot face his constituents. It is the reason his marriage is barren and he thinks about leaving politics. None of that is true, but I suppose if I had known it was so easy, I would have tweeted it years ago. Greenwich and his office monitor every single thing I say here and on social media. Welcome to my world. If I did not exist, he would not have anything to do of a day or to whinge about.

Alex Greenwich is mentally ill, but not in the way he describes. He is a self-obsessed, entitled European prince, accustomed to always getting his own way and, like all narcissists, when something stands in his way, he plays the victim card nonstop. In my matter, he says the attention has destroyed his life, yet every day he seeks more attention. Greenwich has given my single tweet a thousand times more publicity than I ever could. He has got himself into a psycho-circle of attention seeking: complaining about the attention, seeking more attention and then running to a court, tribunal or psychologist—or all three—to claim that the self-generated attention has sent him crazy. It is a new mental condition called GWS, or Greenwich syndrome, where a fragile public exhibitionist creates his own fake world of grievance and victimology, thinking the only remedy for his illness is the attention-seeking psycho-circle he created in the first place.

As the gay activist Gary Burns—no friend of mine—has said, if all the attention is destroying Alex Greenwich, why does he keep seeking more attention? If the stress of all this lawfare is so extreme, why does he keep taking legal action? For his own sake and for those around him, the member for Sydney should retire from public life because, clearly, he sent himself crazy. Yes, he embroiled me in legal matter after legal matter, but I am quite enjoying it. Some people thrive on stress while others fall apart. There is no real damage Greenwich can do to me, and it has been amazing watching him fall apart piece by piece and destroy himself. That is what obsessiveness and fanaticism do to people. That is why it is so dangerous. The real lesson in public life is that self-obsession can destroy you. Take your knocks, get on with your job, stop thinking about yourself and find a cause bigger than yourself and your own sense of entitlement; otherwise, you end up as broken and mentally ill as Alex Greenwich.

TRIBUTE TO DICK CHENEY

CONSTRUCTION, FORESTRY AND MARITIME EMPLOYEES UNION

The Hon. CHRIS RATH (22:05): Tonight I pay tribute to one of my political heroes, Dick Cheney, who passed away last Monday at the age of 84. Cheney was the most powerful vice-president in America's history and remains a complex and divisive figure. He was a moderate as the chief of staff to President Gerald Ford and was America's youngest ever chief at just age 34. He was a Reaganite in congress and served as Whip. He was an establishment conservative when he served as Secretary of Defense under President George H.W. Bush. He was a prominent neo-con hawk as vice-president for eight years. Then finally, in retirement, he was one of Trump's harshest critics, even endorsing Kamala Harris at the last election. Cheney had a remarkable career. He served America with distinction. His advice for people like us in politics was:

The ones who spend all of their time trying to be loved by everyone probably aren't doing much. If you not prepared to have critics and be subject to criticism, then you are in the wrong line of work. If you want to be loved, then go and be a movie star.

That is definitely advice that Chris Minns should consider. Dick Cheney certainly lived up to his own advice. He did not seek popularity. He was absolutely resolute in his determination to take out terrorist threats and to keep America and her allies safe, regardless of the vociferous criticism he copped. Whatever views members hold of Dick Cheney, there is no doubt that he changed the course of history. It is appropriate that we recognise his life of service, express our condolences to his family and acknowledge his enduring legacy of defending liberal democracy. Vale, Vice-President Dick Cheney.

To change the topic entirely, when walking onto a construction site in New South Wales today there are things a person would expect to see: hardworking tradies, apprentices and supervisors. What they would not expect to see is crime gangs calling the shots behind the scenes, yet that is exactly what we have learnt is happening. For decades the CFMEU has been one of the largest and most influential unions in Australia, closely tied to the Labor

Party and known for wielding and utilising significant influence within that party. But in recent times shocking allegations have come to light: bikie gang infiltration, including into \$100 billion taxpayer-funded projects; criminal figures placed in key roles; secret kickback schemes; and senior officials linked to organised crime.

In August last year the union was placed under administration and the Australian Federal Police was asked to investigate, but nothing has really changed. In fact, subsequent reporting has found continued criminal influence and that attempts to remove criminal elements had been simply inadequate. Meanwhile, both State and Federal Labor have failed to clean things up. October of this year saw senior CFMEU officials sacked for taking bribes from the companies they were supposed to be overseeing and for committing violent crimes in the presence of former gang bosses. All the while, Labor continues to accept CFMEU money—as a matter of fact, \$11.5 million of that at the last Federal election. That is not just a union problem; it is a Labor government accountability problem.

If the Government is serious about integrity, the time has come for it to act once and for all by doing four main things. First, it must give up the tainted CFMEU donations to victims of its criminal activity and support a full, independent royal commission. Second, it must establish a State-based construction watchdog to protect workers and closely monitor the CFMEU for instances of corruption. Third, it must audit all CFMEU involvement in New South Wales Government projects and remove all CFMEU influence from public projects. Thuggish CFMEU officials should not have influence over multibillion-dollar taxpayer-funded projects for their own gain. Finally, it must ban union officials with CFMEU ties from holding Labor Party power. After all, no-one can serve two masters. The people of New South Wales deserve confidence that public money is clean, public projects are honest and decision-makers are not compromised. The time has come for the Premier and the New South Wales Labor Party to show leadership by standing up to criminal influence rather than pretending it is not there. Anything less is not just a failure of government but a betrayal of the people of New South Wales.

HISTORICAL SOCIETIES

The Hon. BOB NANVA (22:10): It is often said that you cannot stop progress. It is inevitable that our natural, built and cultural environments will change over time. That is why it is so important for us to make and preserve records, buildings and artefacts to remind future generations of what came before them and how our local communities came to be. The history of this Chamber itself is a fascinating story that tells us much about postcolonial New South Wales and the development of our democracy. As members are all aware, the New South Wales Legislative Council started meeting in a room in the colony's so-called Rum Hospital in 1828. For a period, the building existed as both a hospital and a Parliament, a classic example of interoperability in the colonial era.

While this Chamber was an extension to the original Rum Hospital building that was added in 1856, the extension itself was a prefabricated iron hall made in Scotland and originally intended for use on the Victorian goldfields. Careful restoration has seen this remarkable building survive and thrive. It has stood as a silent witness to the arguments, debates and decisions made by members of the Legislative Council for 170 years. Every day that members turn up for work in this place, they are reminded of that history and the legacy of their predecessors. While we cannot stop progress, we cannot afford to lose contact with the past. To that end, I give a shout-out to the many dedicated local historical societies around New South Wales.

Local historical societies are run by dedicated, passionate volunteers who give up their time to ensure that the stories and events of their communities are not lost with the passage of time. According to the Federation of Australian Historical Societies, there are more than a thousand historical societies, family history groups, keeping places and community heritage groups across Australia. One of those is the Yass Valley History Centre. I had the honour of opening the centre's new site last October. Last week the Yass Valley History Centre launched a major exhibition entitled *National Treasures, Local Stories*. It showcases photographs, records and artefacts that tell the story of Yass Valley's people and industries, collected by the history centre over the past six decades.

Specifically, the exhibition includes 11 key archival collections on display; stories of innovation, endurance and community identity; and the centre's first online exhibition, offering extended content, images and audio for audiences beyond the region. I have had a chance to look through the online exhibition. What struck me was the way the collection brings the story of the Yass Valley and its people to life. It also shows the role that the Yass Valley played in our larger national story. The exhibits about Yass Valley women who served in the Second World War and the collection of beautifully preserved uniforms of Private May Burgess are remarkable windows into that time. The exhibition is open from 10.00 a.m. to 4.00 p.m. at the Yass Valley History Centre on Comur Street, just near the Yass Valley Information Centre. For anyone who cannot get to Yass, they can see the exhibition online at yasshistory.org.au. As another great Australian used to say, do yourself a favour. Check out the *National Treasures, Local Stories* exhibition and support your local historical society.

GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE

The Hon. SCOTT BARRETT (22:14): Recently the Alliance of Western Councils, which represents 13 councils in western New South Wales, reaffirmed its call for the operational storage capacity at Burrendong Dam to be raised. Burrendong Dam can hold around 150 per cent to 160 per cent of its official capacity in the flood-mitigation zone, or above the paint, as they say. Downstream communities are asking for the official holding capacity to be increased by using some of that flood-mitigation zone. It is a clever and relatively inexpensive way to significantly increase the water security in the Macquarie Valley. By increasing the level, we could see a full extra year of water for critical human needs during the next drought. I call on the Government to see that happen now and get onto it quickly.

Federal Labor is apparently considering lowering default speed limits on roads outside of built-up areas to, in some places, as low as 70 kilometres an hour. That road management shortcut will take a significant toll on regional communities. Regional people travel vast distances to access the services they need, such as child care, health care or even the shops. It would also significantly increase freight costs, with additional time to get product across the State. It is clear why the policy is being considered: It is because the New South Wales Government has completely neglected the regional road network. The consistent lack of funding from State Labor has meant that its Federal counterparts are being forced to look into the option because the neglect has left our regional road network unsafe. It is shameful to consider that the hardworking people of regional New South Wales could be forced to add hours to their commutes to make up for the shortfall.

There has been a lot of flexing over housing policies by all sides as of late, with big ideas being floated, many of which will never see the light of day. While all that posturing is going on, there is some lower hanging fruit that could make a real, immediate difference to people. One step we could take would be a stamp duty exemption for older empty-nesters—couples and/or singles living in houses bigger than their needs. Based on the last census, more than one million people over the age of 55 in New South Wales occupy a three- or four-bedroom home on their own or as a couple, without children. Rather than continuing to live in those houses fearing the loss of capital to stamp duty, they could sell their homes, move into somewhere more appropriate and manageable, and free up houses for young families in particular—maybe their first home or their first home as a couple. Either way, that approach would free up more homes and make it easier for young people, in particular, to enter the housing market and buy the homes in which they can raise their families.

Yesterday my boy, Darcy, gave a speech at his school. He wrote the speech himself, despite the fact that I wanted to be heavily involved. In opening his speech, Darcy invited his peers to think about the challenges they face—the things that make school or home life difficult. He asked them to raise their hands if they had such challenges. He then joined them in the display of vulnerability, detailing one of his own challenges in front of the entire school. It was a brave speech that made me incredibly proud. I am not raising it to trumpet my pride, nor am I about to share my vulnerabilities in this place. I do not believe such an admission would be met with the same level of maturity that we might see in a primary school.

I raise it to say this: We need to be better people—all of us, me included. I do not mean just members in this place; I mean everyone. We need to be kinder people, to each other and to everyone, because we all have our challenges. We all have some issue that we are dealing with. Rather than looking for others on whom to vent the frustrations that those challenges bring, how about we take care to remember that others are facing struggles of their own? The country would be a much better place if we did. Of course, I include myself in that lesson. I thank Darcy for reminding me of it. The other lesson he brought up is that it is okay to be vulnerable. It is okay not to be perfect. I am sure that Darcy showing an example of that to other kids meant a lot to them, and it should mean a lot to us here. I thank Darcy so much for those reminders. I could not be prouder of him.

POLITICAL EXTREMISM

The Hon. STEPHEN LAWRENCE (22:24): In recent weeks, various members have discussed the vexed issue of extremism during in the adjournment debate, and I add to the discussion. Compared with many other countries, Australia has been largely free of extreme social and political movements. Indeed, one could make an argument that that is why we have such a lack of laws seeking to prohibit ideology by placing restrictions on speech, association and the like. Of course, there is another way to look at it. Might it be the case that we are comparatively free of extreme social and political movements because we have, by and large, not had recourse to strict and repressive laws? That is perhaps somewhat counterintuitive, with it often being attractive to think that bad things can be stopped by strict laws, but it is a perspective worth considering.

I say that we have "largely" been free of extreme social and political movements. Of course, we are not completely free of them. Far-right and far-left movements in Australia have existed for a long time. In New South Wales we had the New Guard, with 60,000 members at its height. It started a political party, the Centre Party, which polled well in a small number of seats but then declined. Later there were a large number of much smaller

organised groups. We had the Australia First Movement; the Australian National Socialist Party, formed in 1962; and the National Socialist Party of Australia, which contested elections a bit later. Then there was the National Action group later again, and many others, some of which are still active.

We have also had many more incoherent skinhead groups and other types of groups. I commend to the House the work of Mark Aarons in exposing how far-right war criminals infiltrated Australia and our political parties. We have also seen far-right violence at different times—in fact, perhaps more in the past than now. The 1980s saw Chinese restaurants in Perth being burned by the Australian Nationalist Movement. Synagogues have been burned in Australia throughout the twentieth century, including the very serious 1991 Sydney synagogue attacks, a series of arson incidents occurring between 26 January and 28 March of that year.

That history is important because it informs an assessment of current circumstances. It helps us to judge what responses are necessary and to understand if we are truly in dangerous uncharted waters or if we are dealing with a chronic problem, whose real threat can be assessed over time. Sometimes the hardest thing in government is to act with restraint, to accept the limits of State power and the counterproductive and unintended effects its exercise can have, and to focus on other solutions. We definitely cannot approach the problem of far-right extremism like another day-to-day issue, to be managed like a bad law-and-order issue in the political moment, with a focus on transacting a public relations solution.

A reason for real caution is that the history of social and political movements is replete with transformative moments brought about by state repression, which saw the expansion of a movement. It is seen in historical events as a consequence of violent state repression but also as a consequence of applying onerous legal measures to extremist groups, such as jail terms, the imposition of censorship and the commencement of court cases. On one view, such laws do violence to a core tenet of a liberal democracy. Once we ban one idea and its expression, we pave the way for others to be banned. Once we do not tolerate the intolerable, we pose the question squarely: Who is intolerable? Who else should be banned? Other consequences can be more immediate. Such laws can also elevate those they are applied to as significant threats to the community when, in fact, they are not. That plays into victim mentalities that often propel such groups and can help to shape and fortify the internal psychology of such groups.

Such responses can also help to boost the profile of the extremist group, something that has happened to a great extent in the past few days. The oxygen of extremist groups is attention and publicity. Such laws are also hard to apply sometimes. For example, symbols can be changed and language can be recast slightly. They can also cast a burden on police resources, which might not be justified. We are, however, lucky to have a robust system of government to decide over a proper period of time and in a considered way what laws we should have.

AMAZON WORKPLACE CONDITIONS

The Hon. MARK BUTTIGIEG (22:25): Yesterday members from the Transport Workers' Union [TWU], the Shop, Distributive and Allied Employees Association [SDA] and the Media, Entertainment and Arts Alliance [MEAA] joined together in New South Wales and across the country to protest Amazon's exploitative practices and unfair working conditions in anticipation of the Black Friday sales. Leading the New South Wales protest were TWU president Richard Olsen, TWU national secretary Michael Kaine and SDA NSW secretary Bernie Smith, with national support from SDA national secretary Gerard Dwyer and MEAA chief executive Erin Madeley.

Black Friday generates outrageous profits for Amazon. In the 2024 financial year alone, Amazon Commercial Services earned \$3.12 billion in Australia yet paid just \$24.9 million in tax. That is less than 1 per cent of its earnings. While Amazon reports record profits every year, Amazon workers around the world continue to face poverty wages and dangerous conditions. Behind those profits are real people suffering unimaginable consequences. In 2019 Amazon workers in Australia told ABC News what it is really like inside those warehouses. The ABC reported that workers work within a culture of fear, where every second of their performance is monitored. They are expected to maintain "Amazon pace" constantly, somewhere between walking and jogging. High-pressure targets leave them feeling like they cannot even take a bathroom break. Safety corners get cut. They can be sent home early without pay when orders are done. Everyone is casual, living shift to shift, never knowing if they will get called back.

As a result, the unions' 10-point claim on Amazon is to pay fair wages, pay its fair share of tax, pay for the creative and media content used to train AI, stop excessive worker surveillance, use technology to create sustainable jobs that augment worker capacity rather than intensify work, create secure and sustainable jobs, respect worker rights to a voice at work through their unions, improve practices before being rewarded with lucrative government contracts, empower workers to speak up on safety rather than create a culture of fear, and pay fair superannuation.

Alongside that, it is important to note that those protests are part of a global movement against Amazon's global exploitation. For instance, it was reported in the United States in December of 2024 that a US Senate committee accused Amazon of "shockingly dangerous" warehouse practices, citing high injury rates and unsafe speed-driven culture. Amazon warehouses recorded over 30 per cent more injuries than the industry average in 2023, with workers nearly twice as likely to be injured compared to non-Amazon warehouses. The report also alleges that Amazon discouraged medical care, under-reported injuries, terminated workers on medical leave and retaliated against those seeking accommodations or filing complaints. It is because of unions like the TWU, SDA and MEAA that Amazon employees in Australia have capacity to organise effectively against exploitation and stand in solidarity with workers worldwide, inspiring a global movement to organise against exploitation.

The threats that these companies pose, along with the spectre of growing artificial intelligence, automation and the monopolisation of data and information, is the new capitalism. We have to be very careful of these new technologies and make sure that workers are empowered to control them rather than the new technologies controlling the workers. I give a special shout-out to TWU State secretary Richard Olsen, TWU national secretary Michael Kaine and SDA NSW branch secretary Bernie Smith. For national support, I also thank the SDA National secretary-treasurer Gerard Dwyer, MEAA chief executive Erin Madeley and all union members involved in fighting the important fight against the international behemoth that is Amazon.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (The Hon. Rod Roberts): The House now stands adjourned.

The House adjourned at 22:30 until Thursday 13 November 2025 at 10:00.