

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**Thursday, 2 March 2017****The SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)** took the chair at 10:31 and read prayers.

The SPEAKER: Honourable members, I respectfully acknowledge the traditional owners of this land upon which this parliament is assembled and the custodians of the sacred lands of our state.

*Bills***VOLUNTARY EUTHANASIA BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 20 October 2016.)

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (10:32): I move:

That this order of the day be discharged.

Motion carried; bill withdrawn.

CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES (YOUTH TREATMENT ORDERS) AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 November 2016.)

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (10:33): I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 22

Noes 18

Majority 4

AYES

Bedford, F.E.

Brock, G.G.

Digance, A.F.C.

Hildyard, K.

Key, S.W.

Odenwalder, L.K.

Rankine, J.M.

Wortley, D.

Bettison, Z.L.

Caica, P.

Gee, J.P.

Hughes, E.J.

Koutsantonis, A.

Piccolo, A.

Rau, J.R.

Bignell, L.W.K.

Cook, N.F.

Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.

Kenyon, T.R. (teller)

Mullighan, S.C.

Picton, C.J.

Snelling, J.J.

NOES

Bell, T.S.

Gardner, J.A.W.

Knoll, S.K.

Pisoni, D.G.

Tarzia, V.A.

Whetstone, T.J.

Chapman, V.A.

Goldsworthy, R.M.

Pederick, A.S.

Sanderson, R.

Treloar, P.A. (teller)

Williams, M.R.

Duluk, S.

Griffiths, S.P.

Pengilly, M.R.

Speirs, D.

van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

Wingard, C.

PAIRS

Close, S.E.
McFetridge, D.

Redmond, I.M.
Weatherill, J.W.

Vlahos, L.A.
Marshall, S.S.

Motion thus carried; debate adjourned.

LIMITATION OF ACTIONS (INSTITUTIONAL CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE) AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 29 September 2016.)

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (10:41): I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 22
Noes 18
Majority 4

AYES

Bedford, F.E.
Brock, G.G.
Digance, A.F.C.
Hildyard, K.
Key, S.W.
Odenwalder, L.K.
Rankine, J.M.
Wortley, D.

Bettison, Z.L.
Caica, P. (teller)
Gee, J.P.
Hughes, E.J.
Koutsantonis, A.
Piccolo, A.
Rau, J.R.

Bignell, L.W.K.
Cook, N.F.
Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.
Kenyon, T.R.
Mullighan, S.C.
Picton, C.J.
Snelling, J.J.

NOES

Bell, T.S.
Gardner, J.A.W.
Knoll, S.K.
Pisoni, D.G.
Tarzia, V.A.
Whetstone, T.J.

Chapman, V.A.
Goldsworthy, R.M.
Pederick, A.S.
Sanderson, R.
Treloar, P.A. (teller)
Williams, M.R.

Duluk, S.
Griffiths, S.P.
Pengilly, M.R.
Speirs, D.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.
Wingard, C.

PAIRS

Close, S.E.
McFetridge, D.

Redmond, I.M.
Weatherill, J.W.

Vlahos, L.A.
Marshall, S.S.

Motion thus carried; debate adjourned.

STAMP DUTIES (TRANSFERS EXEMPTION) AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 February 2017.)

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (10:48): I brought this matter to the house almost 12 months ago. It is the first time it has come up on the *Notice Paper*—

The SPEAKER: If the member speaks, he closes the debate.

Mr WILLIAMS: I am going to withdraw the matter, sir. I believe that the Treasurer has, during the last budget, resolved the issue that I was trying to resolve with this bill.

The SPEAKER: Splendid.

Mr WILLIAMS: In moving that the bill be withdrawn, I thank the Treasurer for acceding to my argument. Unfortunately, my constituent is still out of pocket by a significant amount of money. I thought it would have been better if the Treasurer, in fact, made an ex gratia payment to my constituent, but, in any case, I move:

This this order of the day be discharged.

Motion carried; bill withdrawn.

Motions

ELECTRICITY MARKET

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (10:51): I move:

That this house expresses its concern at the state of the South Australian electricity market and, in particular, notes—

- (a) the state government's energy policy over the last 15 years has delivered South Australian consumers the worst outcomes in the nation;
- (b) the first ever statewide electricity blackout in Australia occurred in South Australia on 28 September 2016;
- (c) electricity supply reliability in South Australia is the lowest in the nation;
- (d) electricity prices in South Australia are the highest in the nation;
- (e) the impact that high household electricity prices add to cost of living pressures;
- (f) the impact that high business electricity prices add to unemployment pressures;
- (g) unemployment in South Australia is the highest in the nation;
- (h) both the Victorian and South Australian electricity markets were privatised at similar times, yet Victorians pay the lowest electricity prices in the nation; and
- (i) the closure of the coal-fired electricity generator at Port Augusta has led to the increased importation of coal-fired electricity from Victoria.

South Australia is in a complete and utter mess at the moment. Fifteen years of self-serving, hopeless Labor administration in this state have delivered for us the highest unemployment rate in the nation and also the highest youth unemployment rate in the nation.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Members are entitled to be heard in silence. I ask all members on both sides to observe the standing orders so that the leader can be heard in silence.

Mr MARSHALL: It is interesting that the Premier has come into the chamber and wants to argue that he does not have the highest unemployment rate in the nation. The last time I looked, which was only about a week ago, the ABS statistics on the trend unemployment rate in the nation showed South Australia as having the—

The Hon. J.W. Weatherill interjecting:

Mr MARSHALL: Now the Premier comes into the chamber and says, 'I want to look at the seasonal adjustment.' He moves around all over the place. The trend is acknowledged by every single economist.

Members interjecting:

Mr MARSHALL: There we go again, from the Premier of this state wanting to take one small statistic and twist it 19 different ways to support his hopeless narrative. The simple fact of the matter is that this guy is hopeless. He is a wrecking ball—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am on my feet.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am on my feet. The leader's time will expire without any debate if you do not be quiet and observe the standing orders. It is very simple: he is the one on his feet, so he is the one who speaks. People who interject will be named and warned, and question time will be very quiet if we do not all start observing the standing orders.

Mr MARSHALL: Thank you very much, Deputy Speaker. The simple fact of the matter is that this government has been a wrecking ball for employment in this state. We have had the highest unemployment rate in trend terms for 23 out of the last 24 months. What a disgraceful situation. The youth unemployment rate has recently been published, and we have a dangerously high 17 per cent youth unemployment rate in this state.

Take a look at some of the other catastrophes which are now hitting the people of South Australia: the hopeless mismanagement of our Corrections in South Australia; Transforming Health is a complete and utter mess; we have an exodus of young people out of this state and, most importantly, we have a crisis of confidence in the future of this state. Young people are giving up hope. Last financial year, we had in excess of 6,000 people leaving our state, in net terms. So, that is the difference between the people who are leaving and the people who are coming back in—more than 6,000 people have given up hope in this state because of the hopeless mismanagement of this government.

They have been hopeless in child protection—take a look at the mess. They have been hopeless in managing the build of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital—\$600 million over budget. Transforming Health is a complete catastrophe and they cannot keep a bridge up after building it six years ago, but the area in which they have a special sort of incompetence is their electricity strategy in South Australia—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Treasurer is reminded of the standing orders.

Mr MARSHALL: Their incompetence in terms of electricity policy knows no bounds and has made South Australia the laughing stock of the entire nation. Just take a look at the facts. We now have the highest priced electricity in the nation and the least reliable grid. That takes a certain type of incompetence, the highest price and the least reliable grid in the entire nation. Take a look at what the effects of this will be on investment going forward in our state.

We have had statements in the press, in the media, for months where people are saying, 'I'm not going to be making any further investment in South Australia until they can guarantee to keep the lights on.' Unfortunately, what the Premier is now doing is referring to these people as the employer class as though these are somehow some sort of nasty people who have got some dog in the game, backing coal and not backing the people of South Australia. Let me tell you, Premier, these are the people who are employing South Australians. These are the people who strive to grow our economy by investing, and they cannot invest in this state when you cannot keep the lights on, you cannot keep our electricity prices affordable and you cannot ensure that this state has a future.

This government, of course, decided on their electricity strategy for this state based upon pure ideology. They made it very clear a long period of time ago that they wanted to have this state as some sort of renewable nirvana. They said that they wanted to have a 50 per cent renewable energy target for South Australia. So, this is not something that has happened to the people of South Australia, this is something which has been inflicted upon the people of South Australia by none other than those people that are sitting opposite. Their ideological pursuit, their obsession of intermittent renewable energy in South Australia has left us vulnerable and has put us at a massive competitive disadvantage from every other state in Australia.

Let's just take a look at the facts. Recently, the Liberal Party held a conference down in Mount Gambier. What a disgraceful situation when business after business, producer after producer says, 'I can see a situation over the border where the electricity prices are half what they are on this

side of the border.' The same situation is happening in the Riverland. We have this divide between our states, a completely different arrangement in terms of energy security and energy pricing, and the deliberate strategies of the Labor government have left us at a competitive disadvantage from our near neighbours.

Labor, of course, continues to defend their strategy. They want to blame everybody other than themselves. Basically, we have a long list of people that the minister would like to blame. He would like to blame the Liberals, he would like to blame the Victorians, he would like to blame the weather, he would like to blame AEMO, he would like to blame the Prime Minister. The one person who does not take any responsibility in this entire debate is the energy minister in South Australia. I think he has been the minister now for almost four years. He should have got a briefing by now and he should understand that the deliberate policies of this government have led to the situation that we are currently in.

He should also have listened to some of the warnings that have come from this side of the chamber because for many years now the Liberal Party have been saying that this relentless, obsessive pursuit of intermittent renewable energy in South Australia needs to be checked. Where was the market impact assessment? Where was the understanding of what the generational arrangement should be in South Australia so that we had an appropriate mix in this state? None, none whatsoever, even though we know that they have an energy policy unit sitting within the Department of State Development, which costs the taxpayers around \$30 million a year.

Where was the advice to the government? Where was the modelling about what the impact of their strategies would be on household energy affordability and the affordability and reliability for the business community in South Australia? Perhaps they received it. Perhaps they ignored it. Perhaps they do not care. Perhaps they just have this obsession and the obsession must be satisfied. The simple fact of the matter is, whatever the reason is, they have not done a good job for the people of South Australia.

Again, on this side of the parliament we have been asking questions about what was going to happen up at Port Augusta with the Alinta facility, the Northern power station, where the owners of that facility, Alinta, have been making very substantial investments in that site over the last few years to try to bring it up to world's best practice standard. They have made very substantial investments, but the government refused to listen to any of the warnings about the profitability and viability of that affordable, reliable base load provider.

They could not wait to run them out of the state. Basically, the Premier was standing there with pompoms, shaking them as Alinta was driven out of this state by the ideology of those opposite. Take a look at the consequences. When they made the announcement to the people of South Australia and to the Australian market more broadly in June 2015, immediately the ASX futures price for energy went through the roof. That should have been the first warning sign. Let me tell you, at that point the Liberal Party again said, 'What are you doing to keep Alinta in South Australia?' Hundreds of jobs lost at Leigh Creek; hundreds of jobs lost at Port Augusta. Did the Premier care? No—absolutely not.

He was absolutely wedded to his obsession for intermittent renewable energy in South Australia. They hate coal. They hate people having affordable, reliable fuel, energy, in South Australia. Their obsession has put us in a perilous situation in this state. So, what could they have done? Let me tell you: there was an offer. It was put on the table by Alinta, and for a small state subsidy we could have kept that base load in South Australia and managed the transition to renewable energy in an orderly fashion where we would not be damaging our economy, possibly irreparably, with the current policy settings of this government. Something was put on the table, but the government rejected it, the cabinet rejected it. In fact, they still will not tell us what was in that deal.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MARSHALL: They will not have the guts to stand up in this parliament and tell the people of South Australia what was in that deal. That is disgraceful. They should be putting the interests of

the people of South Australia first, and now they should be coming to this debate and putting on the table what we could have done to keep that Alinta site in South Australia open. Of course, we now have the situation where the government says the National Electricity Market in Australia is broken.

They are the latest people we need to blame for the failings of this government, yet it turns out that the Treasurer has stood up in this chamber pretty recently, thumping his chest, telling us all that, actually, he decided. It was the South Australian government that designed the National Electricity Market, and it was going to deliver better outcomes for all South Australians. Only 18 months ago, the Treasurer stood up and said that energy prices in South Australia were going to go down by 10 per cent.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MARSHALL: That certainly has not happened. They cling to the renewable energy target. Let me tell you, even the Labor leader in Western Australia is moving away from the 50 per cent renewable energy target because he knows we need to manage the transition through to renewables, not just have this ideological drive that is ruining the South Australian economy. I must say, true to form, the federal Labor leader, Bill Shorten, and Mark Butler, the environment shadow minister for the ALP, have been back-peddalling very quickly lately.

No longer is it going to be some sort of legislated renewable energy target: it is now going to be aspirational. Let me tell you, it is not aspirational in South Australia: it is something that must happen in South Australia, and that is what these people opposite want.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MARSHALL: A couple of weeks ago, when we realised we have the dual crises of the highest price and least reliable energy in the country—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Treasurer is called to order.

Mr MARSHALL: —and there is nobody left to blame, the Premier stood up and said, 'I am going to have a dramatic intervention in the market; we are going to go it alone,' only to be shot down the next morning by the Treasurer on the radio, who said, 'We can't really go it alone.' Then the Premier had to go out again and say, 'Well, we are going to go it alone.' Then the Treasurer came into the parliament, and do you know what he said? He said, 'I am going to COAG tomorrow, and I am going to outline to absolutely everybody what this dramatic intervention is actually going to be.' Did he do that? Did he go to COAG, as he told the parliament—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MARSHALL: —to outline this dramatic intervention? No, he did not, because they do not even know what they are going to do. They have absolutely no idea whatsoever—no idea. Let me tell you what they should be doing. First of all, they should scrap the state-based renewable energy target. That is a fact. That is not serving the people of South Australia well whatsoever.

They need to look at demand management, lowering the total energy consumption here in South Australia because it is the peakiness of our demand which pushes up the total price. They need to be investing in storage technologies. The simple fact of the matter is that we have all this intermittent renewable energy but it is not available when we actually need to use it. We need to be investing in storage technologies. Have they done that? No. It is the Liberal Party that has been calling for the state to support those people who are investing in this new technology. The government have done nothing; they have been sitting on their hands.

There needs to be a market impact assessment for all new renewable energy opportunities in this state. We do not need to stop all renewable energy opportunities for South Australia. Those

that offer base load, like pump hydro and solar thermal—and I commend the member for Stuart who has been advocating—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MARSHALL: —for solar thermal at Port Augusta for an extended period of time. These are the things—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I am on my feet, sit down. There is to be no—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, I can't help him when he is on his feet if you speak, can I? We are all aware of the standing orders. I would hate to have to give the leader another minute. Leader.

Mr MARSHALL: Thank you very much, Deputy Speaker. The government's energy policy is in crisis: highest prices and the least reliable energy in the country. They have made South Australia the laughing stock where people interstate are basically saying, 'You cannot even keep your lights on,' and it is going to kill any future investment in our state. They have made South Australia the laughing stock. They have humiliated the state on the national stage. That is what the Premier of South Australia and his energy minister have done.

By contrast, the Liberal Party has said, 'Let's scrap the state-based renewable energy target. Let's have a market impact assessment on all new renewable energy opportunities for this state. Let's invest in storage technology. Let's consider every single possible option, whether that be pumped hydro, solar thermal or whether it be restarting the facility at Port Augusta. Keep everything on the table and put the consumers first. Put the consumers first, not the consumers last.'

I will tell you what, we had a real hiccup at the Oscars this week when they accidentally announced *La La Land*. I can tell you exactly where *La La Land* is: it is those opposite.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I encourage you all to do a little bit more of that because once—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Morialta has taken advantage of my good humour. I have warned everybody for the last time. Standing orders will be observed here this morning, and just as you have mostly been heard in silence—mostly, I say—I expect the same courtesy to be extended to the Premier while he is on his feet. The Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (11:08): South Australia is proud of its leadership role in relation to renewable energy and we believe that this represents not only South Australia's energy future but the future for our nation: cleaner energy, more reliable energy and energy which provides an affordable way of ensuring that we meet our energy needs into the future.

Do not just take my word for it but take the word of the present Prime Minister of Australia who in 2010 said that Australia needs to move to a situation where all or almost all of our energy comes from zero or very near zero emission sources. He went on to say that we should be guided by science. As recently as last year at the Liberal Party campaign launch here in South Australia Mr Turnbull congratulated South Australia on its renewable energy policies. He said:

South Australia is a leader in clean energy generation and also benefits from our programs [his programs] which support renewables including of course the RET.

He has also been a strong supporter of an idea which we have been advocating, an emissions intensity scheme, describing it as a greener, cheaper, smarter plan. In August 2009, he told the federal parliament:

Part of the genius and wisdom behind the Frontier Economics proposal—

that is, the proposal designed for them by the EIS—

is the fact that, because it results in dramatically lower electricity prices in the near and medium term, you do not require that enormous churn of money—that enormous tax grab by the government which the government then recycles. It is a vastly superior approach.

Of course, he is not the only person who once backed greener, cheaper, smarter renewables.

In February 2012, soon after I became Premier, the opposition's then sustainability and climate change spokesman, the present Leader of the Opposition, accused me of being a Premier who does not have the same focus on renewables as the former premier. Let us underscore that: the opposition leader lamented my commitment to renewables not being strong enough. He accused me of 'passing the buck to the feds', and he went on to say these words:

There's no certainty for the industry, these things are announced, then they're dropped...there has got to be certainty.

So, what has changed? In September last year—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order on my left.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: So, what happened? In September last year, with a Prime Minister, who by then had a one-seat majority, hanging on by a thread with the right-wing ideologues, principally out of Queensland, who are dictating the direction of his government, he seized on the statewide blackout, which his own advice told him was caused by a storm, and took the opportunity to make some cheap political points. The Prime Minister went on from congratulating us on renewable energy to use these words:

Drunk on Left ideology on energy...putting Australian's livelihoods, businesses and households at risk.

The Prime Minister went on from advocating a zero emissions future to advocating coal. Just recently he said:

Coal's going to be an important part of our energy mix—there's no question about that—for many, many decades to come.

And, now, we have an opposition leader, who once lamented I was not doing enough on renewable energy, who now wants to scrap our renewable energy target altogether and hand over our energy policy to the same people who are handing around lumps of coal in the federal parliament. So it was not doing enough on renewable energy to actually now, essentially, doing too much on renewable energy. He now says the target is dangerous.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order on my left!

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is called to order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: He wants to outsource our energy policy to Canberra. What does the upshot of all this mean? It is the political equivalent of a protection racket.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is warned for the first time.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It is the political equivalent of a protection racket: somebody who goes around all night bashing your windows in—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is warned for the second time.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —goes around all night bashing your windows in, and then turns up—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Premier, just a moment. Member for Chaffey, you are on two warnings, and you will leave the chamber if I hear you again. Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It is the political equivalent of a protection racket: they go around all night bashing your windows in and then turn up the next morning wanting to sell you home insurance.

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Hartley is warned.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: They want to send us the bill for the policy sabotage in this country of our energy system. We have been—

Mr Marshall: Oh, give it up!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The leader is called to order.

Mr Marshall: Stop trying to blame other people. You are such a wet, weak Premier.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The leader is warned for the first time.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Once again, don't take my words for it, take the words of the Prime Minister of the country for it, who says:

So as I am a humble backbencher—

those were the days shortly after he was deposed—

I am sure he won't complain if I tell a few home truths about the farce that the Coalition's policy, or lack of policy, on climate change has descended into. First, let's get this straight. You cannot cut emissions without a cost.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The leader is warned for a second time.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: He continues:

To replace dirty coal-fired power stations with cleaner gas-fired ones, or renewables like wind, let alone nuclear power or even coal-fired power with carbon capture and storage, is all going to cost money. To get farmers to change their way, to manage their land, or plant trees and vegetation all costs money. Somebody has to pay.

So, any suggestion you can dramatically cut emissions without any cost is, to use a favourite term of Mr Abbott, 'bullshit'. Moreover he knows it. The whole argument for an emissions trading scheme, as opposed to cutting emissions via a carbon tax or simply by regulation, is that it is cheaper. In other words, electricity prices will rise by less to achieve the same level of emissions. The term you will see used for this is 'least cost abatement'. What we have had—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The current Prime Minister of Australia describes the Coalition's policies in relation to climate change and the integration with energy policy as 'bullshit' and he criticises it for being the policy sabotage that it is. The Labor Party has consistently said that you need to be running a scheme which allows us to put a price on carbon because you need a price on carbon to incentivise the investment that will be necessary to drive an effective and sustainable energy system.

So, the very things that the Leader of the Opposition complains about, the underinvestment, which are causing the pressures on the system—and I noticed today that one of the defence spokespeople for the federal government is saying that the national security of our nation is at risk

because our energy security system in this country is broken, a national electricity market which is broken. It is a national electricity market which is broken because of the absence of leadership at a national level to provide a price on carbon to send the investment signals to ensure the investments that need to be made in this system happen. So, the policy sabotage which has emerged at the national level, cooperated and collaborated in by those opposite, leads us to this very day, and they have the audacity to come in here and lecture us about—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The deputy leader is called to order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —our failings in relation to—

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Hammond is called to order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —electricity policy, and they are made so much worse—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The situation in South Australia is made so much worse by that ill-fated privatisation of the Electricity Trust of South Australia. Not content to privatise—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The leader is named and will leave us for five minutes.

The honourable member for Dunstan having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Not content to privatise the Electricity Trust, the cold dead hand of the spokesperson for the energy policy in the upper house, Mr Lucas, reaches out from his political grave to one last time punish the people of South Australia through the scotching of the interconnector with New South Wales, something which if it had have been in place would have provided an entirely different energy pattern of investment here and put us in a much better position to deal with the current circumstances we find ourselves in. What we have—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Unley is called to order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: At least the Prime Minister of this country had an excuse to run away from his former convictions—it was survival.

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Hammond is warned for the first time.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: How does that explain the Leader of the Opposition's position where he has sacrificed South Australia's interests for no more than a craven attempt to fall into line with his federal colleagues? What is the explanation for every Liberal opposition leader in this country to simultaneously on the same day abandon their commitment to renewable energy? Unless that was an extraordinary coincidence, it is more likely explained by the fact that the federal Coalition whistled up all of their kowtowing state colleagues and asked them to sacrifice their state's interest in respect of one venal interest, that is the interest of the Liberal Party of Australia. We believe in a clean energy future, a renewable energy future—affordable, cheaper, cleaner, reliable power for the future of our citizens.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I draw members' attention to the fact that the member for MacKillop is on his feet waiting for the call.

An honourable member interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I remind members of standing orders 129 and 131. Move for your books immediately which should keep you quiet for three minutes, and we now give the member for MacKillop the call.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (11:18): Just now we have heard exactly what the problem is with this government. We have had the Premier come in here with an opportunity to talk about his energy policy and not once did he tell us what he is planning. Not once did he say anything about what he is planning to do, what his minister is planning to do. All he did was have a go at everybody else. South Australia is in a—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WILLIAMS: South Australia in a perilous position. We are desperate for investment in this state.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Wright's voice is carrying down here.

Mr WILLIAMS: Who on earth is going to invest in South Australia when they know that the lights are going to go out at any minute? South Australian businesses are losing tens of thousands of dollars because of the stupid policies of this government, and this government does not have the guts to talk about its plan—does not have the guts. The Premier just said that one of the problems we have is that we have a broken system and that there is no investment; there is no investment in electricity generation.

During the last two weeks, the Minister for Energy has told this house that \$7 billion—\$7 billion—has been invested in renewables in South Australia in the last period. It is on the *Hansard*—\$7 billion in wind farms and rooftop solar panels. How much money do we need to invest in electricity in South Australia to keep the lights on? We have seen \$7 billion invested over and above our capacity to produce electricity from the electricity generating set that was here before any of that investment. As we were told again in question time this week by the minister, South Australia has enough installed capacity to look after itself. That is without any of the renewables.

So we had enough capacity to look after our electricity needs and then, through the policies of this government, we have invested another \$7 billion and we still cannot keep the lights on. The Premier says it is Malcolm Turnbull's fault. Give me a break—give me a break. We have heard the Minister for Energy say over recent weeks, 'All these wind farms, it's not our fault, it's the RET, it's the federal government's policy that has been driving investment in wind farms in South Australia.'

There is an approval for a wind farm in my electorate that was only gained because this government changed the Development Act so it would get through. Yet, they stand up now and blame the federal Liberal government for encouraging wind farm development in South Australia. I am gobsmacked by the hypocrisy that I hear on a daily basis in this place. The previous premier Rann, I cannot say many how many times I heard him—

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, the member for Newland.

Mr WILLIAMS: —say the line, 'There was not one wind farm in South Australia before we came to power and look how many we've got now.' He took the credit for it, but now that the lights keep going out we have the minister running away from that as hard as he can. Yet, the Premier is embracing renewables; they are playing both sides of the fence. They are playing both sides of the fence and South Australia is losing out. That is the problem; well, that is one of the problems.

The Premier used the term a moment ago, 'the ill-fated privatisation'. I was sitting on the crossbenches when that bill went through the parliament to privatise our assets. In fact, I think the Labor Party supported a 100-year lease, which is what we have.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: No!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Treasurer is called to order.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order on my right!

Mr WILLIAMS: Notwithstanding that, I was sitting on the crossbenches when that bill went through the parliament. One of the things that convinced me that that sale was for the benefit of South Australia was that at that time we had significant manufacturing happening in South Australia. We did not have the benefit of some of the electricity saving technologies that have come along in the meantime, principally and particularly LED lighting, which has the potential to save, worldwide, up to 50 per cent of the carbon footprint of electricity production.

We did not have any of that 20 years ago, but what we did have was a lot of manufacturing in South Australia and we were reaching capacity of our generators. We needed another power station. The state could not borrow the money to build another power station, and we all know why: because that lot over there sent the state broke. The last borrowings that the previous Labor government inflicted upon the people of South Australia were from a group of Belgian dentists at the interest rate of 15 per cent.

Should we have borrowed money at 15 per cent to build another power station, that would have been madness. One of the things that convinced me about the sale of ETSA was that, by selling ETSA, we could recover the position of the government's finances, but we also sent a strong message to the private sector, and that is why the Pelican Point power station was built. It was built by the private sector following the sale of ETSA.

We have the Premier and the minister coming here regularly saying the system is broken, saying how dare those private owners of the Pelican Point power station, ENGIE, not have their machines running, and blaming privatisation. If it was not for the privatisation of ETSA, that power station would not even be there—that is fact. It would not be there.

This government encourages all this renewable energy to be put into the system. Whenever the wind blows, the electricity that is sold to the market comes from windmills, yet they expect ENGIE to be running the Pelican Point power station non-stop just to allow for when the wind stops blowing. The Pelican Point power station is a very modern power station and it can be started up fairly quickly, but it is not a matter of turning the key and it running. It is a combined-cycle gas generator. You can get a fair bit of output out of it fairly quickly, but you cannot get the total output out of it until the whole thing is warmed up, and that takes many hours.

Port Augusta can take up to 24 hours to start from scratch and, when you have it running, you cannot slow down the amount of coal you put into it because, if you slow it down, you lose its capacity. When the wind stops, if you do not have the capacity there, you cannot use it, and it takes many, many hours to build the capacity up. That is why Port Augusta shut down, and that is why Hazelwood will be shutting down, because they were forced to run flat out for when the wind stopped blowing, which happens for at least one period, every day.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: What wind are we talking about?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Treasurer is called to order.

Mr WILLIAMS: The reality is that we are sold this giant lie that we are saving the planet by reducing our carbon footprint by building windmills. Port Augusta kept burning coal even when the wind was blowing because it had to. It kept burning coal. Hazelwood burns coal 24/7, irrespective of whether the wind is blowing or not, because it is obliged to be there for when the wind does not blow, and the wind drops out every day. If we produce 40 per cent of our power from windmills, we certainly are not reducing our carbon footprint by 40 per cent: we would be lucky to be reducing it by 10 per cent. That is the giant lie about wind generation. You do not reduce your footprint because you are reliant on a coal-fired generator.

If this government thinks that South Australia is going to go it alone, they should go down and pull the interconnector with Victoria. 'We do not want to be connected to that dirty, filthy coal-fired power station,' they say. Go and pull the interconnector so we are not connected to it and see what happens. We all know what will happen: the lights will be out even more regularly. Every time it heats up, the lights will go out.

One of the solutions this government has proffered over recent times is to build another interconnector. The Premier just bemoaned the fact and accused Rob Lucas of scuttling an interconnector to New South Wales—another interconnector. Mike Rann promised at the 2002 election that he would build an interconnector to New South Wales to bring cheaper energy to South Australia. What happened to that promise? Fifteen years later, we still do not have it. Their record is abysmal.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member's time has expired.

Mr WILLIAMS: That is a great pity, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member's time has expired.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (11:29): Written and authorised by Reggie Martin and Mitch Williams.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Williams: I am talking about your policy, you fool.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That could be a Labor Party ad.

Mr Williams: I am talking about your policy.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That could be a Labor Party ad.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer hasn't been given the call yet.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sorry, ma'am; my apologies.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would just like to give everyone a few seconds to vent, so we can all get back to the standing orders. Okay, we seem to be ready. Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you, sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Ma'am.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Ma'am—my apologies.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That's alright. It has been rumoured I have—anyway, go on.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, ma'am. Over the debate on our electricity in this state, the opposition have attacked every form of South Australian generation available. They have attacked wind, they have attacked solar and they have attacked gas. What is the generation that they defend? Victorian coal. If we want our sovereignty—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: If we want our sovereignty—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for MacKillop is called to order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: If we want our sovereignty to be able to decide our own future, to decide our own generation needs, to decide our own prosperity, then we need our own generation. The idea that we would have a South Australian party, like some *Manchurian Candidate* in here arguing for interstate sources of fuel and energy, is a disgrace. I will go one step further: arguing for banning coal—

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Hammond is warned for the second time.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —for banning gas in the South-East goes to show you their preference for the eastern seaboard over us. We are awash with national resources—we are awash with gas, we are awash with sun, we are awash with wind—and attacking Santos and attacking Beach and attacking our South Australian-based oil and gas supplies behoves the opposition and it shows who they are really are: they are not here to serve the state's interests, they are here to serve the Liberal Party's interests.

I have to say that, in regard to this lamentation over the closure over a failing coal-fired power station at Port Augusta, the Leader of the Opposition was right about one thing: there were massive investments made by Alinta to make that power station profitable—over \$200 million to try to make the mine economic, to try to make the logistics work and to try to make the power station operate, yet, unfortunately, that Eastern States coal and commonwealth subsidies killed it.

The reality is this: South Australians were not buying power from Alinta. The government did; the government had a contract with Alinta. We did everything that we could to support that power station. Why? We wanted competition, so we used our procurement in a sensible way to try to make sure that we did everything we could to support a competitive market.

The opposition have called for direct intervention to prop up one generator, one retailer—a capacity payment, that is what it is. Dressed up anyway you want, it is a capacity payment. The Western Australian government pays over \$100,000 per megawatt hour in capacity payments. Imagine if we paid to keep the Port Augusta coal-fired power station that was losing money on, what is the next phone call we would get on a hot day? We would get a phone call from AGL, saying, 'If you want Torrens Island on, pay us as well.' Then we would get a phone call from Origin, saying, 'If you want Osborne on, you pay us as well.' Then when it is really hot, and we want ENGIE to turn Pelican Point on, they will say, 'Hang on, you're paying Port Augusta, you're paying AGL, you're paying Origin, pay us too.' How about we actually think this through and come up with a concerted policy, rather than howling at the moon.

Mr Wingard: Keep the lights on.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: There you go—slogans, slogans rather than policies, slogans.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: There you go—no better example of the malaise in the Liberal Party.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am on my feet. I just want to remind both the member for Mitchell and the Treasurer that interjections and responding to interjections is not acceptable under standing orders.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I have heard the opposition say that they are going to take nothing off the table—nothing—to focus on killing any potential investment in South Australia. So will go to the most recent policy document, '2036'. This manifesto that the state Liberal Party outlines is their plan for the next 19 years. Do you know how many times the word 'electricity' is mentioned in that plan? Anyone have a guess? Once, twice, 50 times? Not once. Not once is the word 'electricity' present in Steven Marshall's '2036' plan. In fact, the only time he mentions energy is when he talks about resources, minerals and energy. That is the vision for 2036. They do not even mention the word 'electricity'.

So, do not come in here and lecture us. In fact, their commitment to energy is so robust they demoted their shadow spokesperson. They demoted him, took responsibility off him and gave him what they call 'junior portfolios'.

Mr Wingard: You're full of rubbish; same as yours.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Mitchell is called to order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: While gas and energy are a solitary mention—

Mr Wingard: He is provoking.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, you are called to order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —in '2036', the word 'believes'—

Mr Whetstone: Keep your eyes on both sides of the house.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are on two warnings.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —is mentioned 160 times. So, 'electricity', not once; 'believes', 160. It is a church.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: It's a cult.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is a cult. It is not about policy. It is not about a party, about an idea, it is a belief. That is what it is about opposite. Then they wonder why they have lost four elections in a row. But they did have a policy at the last state election and that was to abolish the Residential Energy Efficiency Scheme that helps people improve the energy efficiency in their homes—

The Hon. J.W. Weatherill: Demand.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: A form of demand management—which the Leader of the Opposition is advocating. But what he is really talking about is forcing people to turn their air conditioners off when it is hot using smart meters. That is demand management. Let's have a look at some of the other policies the Leader of the Opposition has announced. He is going to say that they will take nothing off the table; that is, we want all our energy options available, yet the one policy they have announced is to ban for the exploration of unconventional gas in the South-East, which is alongside infrastructure and pipelines in a gas-rich province.

Policy No. 1, destroy South Australian gas. So, we can have gas-fired generators, which are our thermal base. They want to stop more mining for gas. Do not believe me, believe Josh Frydenberg. He came up with a very simple slogan: 'More gas equals more jobs', yet members opposite want less gas. According to the federal government, what does that mean? They want fewer jobs. They say also, if it is commercial, that they want to re-open the Port Augusta power station. Who sold the Port Augusta power station to the private sector? Who sold it?

Mr Whetstone: Whose policy settings closed it?

Mr Picton: Uncle Rob.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Uncle Rob.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey, I would like you to leave the room for three minutes.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Uncle Rob, the gift that keeps on giving.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey can leave the room for three minutes.

Mr Whetstone: Three minutes, with pleasure.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We know—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You can come back. Just leave for three minutes.

The honourable member for Chaffey having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —that there are more moratoriums on the table for energy.

Mr Pengilly: Go to the naughty corner, mate.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Finniss is called to order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We heard the shadow minister say that there is no social licence for any other activity at Leigh Creek.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That is interesting because the South Australian Chamber of Mines and Energy told me that the shadow minister said to them—

Mr Tarzia: Who said that? Name them.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Hartley is warned for the first time.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The South Australian Chamber of Mines and Energy said the shadow minister said there was no social licence for underground gasification at Leigh Creek.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: He denies it. Okay, good. We have got that on the *Hansard*. Of course, we also have the renewable energy target. We have the actual opposition claiming that our RET is compulsory, that we will compel the state to meet that target, yet the only mechanism in place to meet the renewable energy target set by the commonwealth is their mechanism. We have no mechanism in place. When challenged, the opposition cannot mention what it is, other than the Development Act. That is what they think our mechanism is, by approving people who are taking advantage of the commonwealth scheme to put their wind farms and solar panels—guess where?—where the sun is shining and the wind is blowing.

As to these social licences they are talking about and nuclear power, think of the hypocrisy. They say that nuclear power is on the table. Every nuclear power station needs somewhere to store spent fuel, yet they oppose any discussion at all on how to store spent fuel. Yet, apparently, nuclear fuel is an option for South Australia.

Mr Wingard: So, you support a dump?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Mitchell is warned for the first time.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: They support reopening a coal-fired power station that is uneconomic and that private operators could not run and coal is running out, and then we are hearing claims that there is no social licence for mining in the Adelaide Hills, no social licence for mining on Yorke Peninsula and no social licence for mining in the South-East for oil and gas. They are the guilty party.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (11:39): I will try to put a bit of fact and order into this debate. We have just heard a rant, a complete rant from the minister.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order on my right!

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: We have just heard a complete rant from the minister. We have heard 10 minutes of the minister with not one solution about what he is going to do to address the problems we have in South Australia.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Newland!

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: There is no denying that, unfortunately, in South Australia we have the highest electricity prices in the nation and we have the least reliable electricity in the nation. In fact, we have had six blackouts in the last several months—six blackouts in South Australia since May. That is not including the 4,000 who lost power on Tuesday. We are talking about major blackouts.

The other thing that is very serious at the moment is that we in South Australia also have the highest unemployment in the nation. It is not an accident that we have the highest electricity prices in the nation and the highest unemployment in the nation. They go together. That comes on top of the government not very long ago promising 100,000 extra jobs in this state. They have come nowhere near that target. I think the last calculation was 12,000 extra over the last eight years or so, which is way behind the performance of any other state. In fact, the mineral resources and energy minister promised two Novembers ago that there would be an extra 5,000 jobs in the mining sector. We have gone backwards by approximately that many in the mining sector. These are the very real problems that exist in our state.

The history of how we got here starts not with privatisation of ETSA but with the State Bank, as the member for MacKillop quite rightly said. The Labor government drove this state to near bankruptcy through its complete financial mismanagement, primarily through the State Bank. When the Liberal Party came to government, it had absolutely no choice but to rectify that situation immediately. One of the things it did was sell ETSA. That was a necessary step.

The other thing I would say about that is that everybody in this place and the state knows that both South Australia and Victoria are privatised electricity markets. Both of them privatised at

about the same time, yet in South Australia we have the highest electricity and the most unreliable electricity in the nation, but in Victoria it is the exact opposite. We are paying nearly double in South Australia what Victorians pay for their electricity. It has absolutely nothing whatsoever to do with privatisation, but it has to do with the renewable energy target.

Let me say that we on this side want a clean planet and we want as little pollution as possible going into our atmosphere. We understand that we need to make a sensible, well-planned and well-managed transition away from fossil fuels towards renewable energy, but it cannot be the instant, overnight, ideological, zealous step the government wants to take. The state government went from no target to 20 per cent, to 33 per cent to 50 per cent. The state government was warned in 2005 by ESCOSA that if it went beyond 20 per cent renewable energy the grid would suffer. The state government was warned again in 2010 by ESCOSA about the same sort of thing.

The state government was warned by independent consultants the state government went to seeking advice in 2009 that if it went beyond 20 per cent the grid would suffer, that South Australian's would suffer. The state government decided to do it anyway. The state government decided to take that step regardless, knowing South Australians would suffer—from the smallest household to the largest employer, they would suffer. However, the government did it anyway for their own personal benefit, for their political purposes. They ignored all these warnings.

The next critical step is the closure of the Port Augusta power station, which the Treasurer alluded to. He made a lot of very spurious claims, but one thing he forgot to say, conveniently for him, was that Alinta went to the government in January 2015 and said, 'We need help. We need your support. Can you give us some support to stay open?' The Treasurer says that they could not possibly do that: 'We couldn't possibly interfere with the market. We could never support a business to stay open.'

At the same time, when they talk about the closure of Holden, they say that the federal government should have bent over backwards to do everything possible to keep Holden here, when in actual fact, Holden said very clearly, 'We don't care how much the federal government supports us financially, we are leaving anyway.' The state government says that the federal government should have helped them anyway, yet what is good for the goose is not good for the gander, from the state government's perspective. The state government says, 'No, of course, we should never have helped Alinta.'

Alinta had to close at some stage; there was no doubt about that. Whether it was going to be in two years, four years or six years, it needed to close as part of that sensible, well-planned, well-managed transition away from fossil fuels towards renewable energy, but to allow it to close in May 2016, as the state government did, was a very poor mistake. This state Labor government's energy policies forced the Port Augusta power station out of business. Why is that so important? Not because we want to burn coal forever, not because we are picking one company over another—it has nothing to do with that whatsoever—but because all South Australians have been suffering since that happened.

On average, forward contract prices increased 98 per cent when the Alinta closure was announced in June 2015. From the actual closure in May 2015, spot prices have gone up 91 per cent in the generation market. That price is way in excess of any level of support that Alinta sought from the state government to stay open for a little while longer. The hundreds of millions of dollars of cost to our economy since the Port Augusta power station closed could have been avoided if this government—

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: Had only paid hundreds of millions of dollars.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Newland is called to order.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —had actually wanted to put a relatively small amount of money to support that company to stay open. I am not saying that they should have given the company what it asked for, and I am not saying that the power station should have stayed open for as long as it wanted to.

The government should have used that as an opportunity to actually develop its own plan and say, 'Look, we're not going to do exactly what you want, Alinta, but we will give you this much,

this type of support'—it may not have even been a cash component—'and we're going to give it to you so that we get to choose when you close, not so that you can stay open for as long as you want to.' The government should have said, 'We'll choose that you will close in two or four or six years,' or whatever the appropriate time frame was, so that we could have had a very sensible transition.

The government has had many opportunities to avoid this crisis, starting with premier Rann, continuing with Premier Weatherill, with Treasurer Koutsantonis supporting it all the way to the disadvantage of South Australians. But throughout all of that, the Liberal opposition has been putting forward very positive suggestions. We have actually been putting forward positive suggestions that the government has chosen to ignore. The government chooses to ignore our positive suggestions and then when they do not accept them, tries to pretend they never existed.

We have said for years that we should have exactly the same wind farm development application planning rules in South Australia as in other states, so that there would be consistent planning regs across all states, so that wind farms would go where the wind resource, the terrain and the connection to the grid is the best, not where the planning rules are the softest, as is the case in South Australia. We have said that we should have an electricity market impact assessment statement associated with every new wind farm development application so that if a new one that comes along will help us, fantastic, we will let it through, but if it is actually going to damage our electricity market, we would not support that.

We have called for one national renewable energy target—not the scrapping of the target, not no target, not a low target—one target that all states and the federal government agree to. One nation, one environment, one target—not the current state Labor government trying to extend and just look good and pick the biggest number it possibly can and make all South Australians suffer.

We have said that we support renewable energy, but with storage. There is nothing wrong with renewable energy. It is when it has no storage, is intermittent, cannot be relied upon and creates a volatile market that it is hurting us. We support renewable energy with storage. We want a sensible transition. We want South Australians to survive. We want South Australia to be a great state again and, until the electricity system is fixed, that will not happen.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (11:49): I rise to speak against this motion because it is an easy motion to speak against. This is a motion put forward by the Leader of the Opposition not motivated by seeking facts, not motivated by seeking truth and not motivated by seeking improvements to our energy market or the arrangements that we have in South Australia. It is not about improving reliability or affordability: it is about the Leader of the Opposition seeking another tedious opportunity to play politics with this important issue in South Australia.

This is, once again, an effort by the leader to further politicise what has been an issue of grave concern to all South Australians. It is a further effort to sheet home blame to a government that no longer owns assets within the National Electricity Market, nor controls its operations. Rather than calling for better market performance or better market controls or even, despite what the member for Stuart would have you believe, not coming up with a coherent, cogent policy that will address the problems that we are confronting, this motion just seeks to play politics and echo the federal Liberal Party's lines on this issue, and is that not always the way with this leader.

I have to say that last September, when we suffered that statewide blackout, I thought just for one moment that there might be a glimmer of hope for the Leader of the Opposition. His first tweet that night said that this was not good enough and that there were questions that needed to be asked and answered. I do not think anyone could argue with that. It is not good enough that South Australia is being let down by poor reliability of our grid, let alone the operations of the National Electricity Market. There are serious questions that need to be asked, let alone answered, but within hours, of course, he had retreated from that position—that reasonable position which you would expect any political leader to take—and had fallen in once again behind his federal Liberal mates, parroting whatever they had told him he needed to say.

What was he parroting? It was deliberately the wrong information and deliberately the wrong line about what had caused this issue. He was deliberately misleading South Australians, particularly South Australians who had been affected by this, as to what the cause was, let alone whatever an

appropriate remedy might be, and that is par for the course with this leader. It is par for the course that he abdicates his leadership position of a major political party in this state just so he can fall in behind his federal Liberal mates and do whatever they tell him to do.

When South Australia is being done over, he is the first one either to sit back or fall in behind those people—those federal Libs or those east coast interests—who are looking to do over South Australia time and time again.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I need to remind members on my left of standing orders 129 and 131—get out your books if you are not familiar with them—and remind them that the courtesy of the house has to be extended to each member when they speak. Minister.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Every time those east coast interests and those federal Libs are doing over South Australia, he just sits there and backs them in 100 per cent. Let's look at the examples.

Mr Bell interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Mount Gambier is called to order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: There was an \$80 billion cut from the state's health and education budgets—\$80 billion.

Mr Bell interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Mount Gambier, I am reminding you of the standing orders.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: And what did the Leader of the Opposition do? He got in and backed his federal mates. What did he do when they dared Holden to leave and then gloated over their imminent exit? He backed in his federal mates; he would not stand up for South Australia. What did he do when we caught them trying to offshore the submarine build, contrary to the promise they made to the people of South Australia that they would be built here? He stayed silent, once again backing in his federal mates, parroting whatever they were telling him to say.

When the federal Liberals said that the ASC could not be trusted to build a canoe, where was he? He was completely vacant. He completely exited the field of play, refusing to stand up for South Australian workers. When the federal Liberal Party cut age pensions from South Australians, where was he? He was missing once again, doing whatever the federal Liberal Party told him to do, and that is exactly what he did in 2014 when they cut pensioner concession funding to the states, including South Australia. In fact, he even told South Australians that it was not true, that it was not even happening. He was lying to South Australians. Time and time again, the leader does over South Australians.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Stuart has a point of order.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I ask the minister to withdraw his statement and apologise for saying the Leader of the Opposition was lying to South Australians.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Stuart has asked you to apologise for calling the leader a liar.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Perhaps I can rephrase.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I withdraw and apologise.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Okay, on we go. He has apologised.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The Leader of the Opposition backed in his federal mates and tried to tell South Australians that it was not happening, when the opposite was true. He knew what he was doing. The Leader of the Opposition must go home each night and wonder why he is even here. Is he just in the job to help other people do over South Australian interests? Because that is

what he has done, time and time again. When it came to this energy issue, once again his true colours came out.

When it came to what the federal Liberal Party said should be the solution for this issue for South Australia, what did he say? He got in straight behind them and said that east coast coal interests are the answer for South Australia, not local gas interests, not the vast reserves of gas we have in South Australia. It was bin the South Australian industrial opportunities, bin South Australian jobs and get in behind those east coast interests. He is not interested in jobs in South Australia.

They are so wedded to coal, they are so wedded to the private interests that form their policy for them at a federal level, that I think the only surprising thing is not that they want to burn coal for electricity but that they are not burning tobacco, because that is their approach to industry policy. Whoever has got in their ear last forms their position, and the Leader of the Opposition gets in behind it 100 per cent. Of course, we have heard from the Leader of the Opposition today—

Mr Bell interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Mount Gambier is warned for the first time.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —that, contrary to what the member for Stuart says, there is no room for renewables in their solution. The member for Stuart says there is some room: the leader says there is not. The leader says there is no room for that. In fact, the leader says we need demand management. What is that code for on a hot day like today? Turn off your air conditioners. Are you using a lot of power as a business? Are you using a lot of power as an industrial consumer? Turn off your business; shut down. That is the way we should be managing. That is the solution: the problem is too hard, so just shut it down.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Davenport has just come to my attention.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: It is no wonder South Australians think he is weak and not up to leading South Australia. He cannot stand up for our state. He is a patsy for his federal mates in Canberra. He is a patsy for east coast interests against the interests of South Australia. That is why Alexander nearly swooped in late last year to rescue the show.

Mr Bell interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Mount Gambier!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: You see the member for Davenport go quiet. You see the conservatives on that side of the party go quiet and start navel-gazing because they know how close they came to rescuing the show—maybe, but probably not. Just last weekend, when I was out doorknocking amongst all those Labor voters whose support I am very fortunate to have, I came across an elderly woman. She said to me, 'Stephen, I am sorry, but I am a Liberal Party supporter.'

Mr Bell interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Mount Gambier is warned for the second time.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: 'I am a Liberal Party supporter and I always have been, but I will tell you what, I can't stand that Steven Marshall.' That is what she said to me. That is the common refrain from the vast majority of Liberal voters, let alone swinging voters.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Stuart has a point of order.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I ask you to direct the minister to come back to the substance of the motion, which has absolutely nothing to do with a lady's opinion about Steven Marshall.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am going to listen very carefully to the minister in his last 3½ minutes.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: These people are so sick of a state Liberal leader who continues turning his back on his state's interests. He will not stand up for them, and that is why, more than a year out from the next state election, the most extraordinary move has been undertaken

by the Leader of the Opposition. This awful advertising campaign tries to reposition him as somebody who actually cares about our state. What an unfortunate experience it is having to watch this or see it coming out of your television. We have the awful rictus of him looking enthusiastic around the table of European bottled water and a group of Liberal Party plants.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker: I implore you—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I can't hear the member for Stuart's point of order.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I implore you to direct the minister back to the substance of the motion which has nothing to do with European bottled water or anything else that he is talking about.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, I'm struggling.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: He has not mentioned electricity.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Newland, wouldn't it be a shame? I have to say to the minister I see nothing about European water here.

Mr Duluk interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, member for Davenport!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Not even bottled water from Mount Franklin from Coca-Cola's bottling facilities, Deputy Speaker?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: What a hypocrite! He was happy to goad and gloat over them leaving our state, wasn't he?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: If we could just get back to the debate for the last 2½ minutes, that would be good.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: They looked about as comfortable as Malcolm McDowell in *A Clockwork Orange* getting his Ludovico treatment. That is how comfortable those people looked around that table in that backyard when they were filming that ad. That is all the leader is, he is an uncomfortable charade of a political leader, a hologram of a political leader here in South Australia, and that is why people are fleeing away from him when it comes to whom they will support. That is why they are looking for alternatives, like the member for Stuart or maybe even someone from outside.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: When it comes to outsourcing, who does he bring in? Good old Uncle Rob from upstairs.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order. Deputy Speaker, please.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, I think that might almost be the finish.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: If he is so scared to talk about the electricity prices—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Okay.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Let's go on from Uncle Rob and electricity, shall we? The ETSA sale apparently was eminently necessary as soon as they assumed government in late 1993, despite four years later promising South Australia that they would not sell it; that is how urgent it was. Not only did they spend four years promising not to do it, they did not do anything in that four years using those funds to retire debt.

In fact, what did they do in the second four years of their term? What did good old Uncle Rob do? He ran four massive budget deficits. So, while he was out there arguing that he had to sell assets to pay off the credit card, he was racking up the debt. He was racking it up. That is the sort of false budget management that the Liberal Party not only sold ETSA for, but this is the sort of misleading mistruth that they put around about why they sold our energy interests down the river. What did it turn out for, compared to how the other states have sold these assets? A handful of magic beans, compared to the tens and tens of billions of dollars in the Eastern States.

This is how they have sold our state down the river. When you look at this motion, and you see hollow political accusations of blame and fault, we all know where it started. It started straight after that 1997 election when they sold our assets and they still do not have a policy to fix the mess they created.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:03): I rise to support the motion by our leader, the member for Dunstan:

That this house expresses its concern at the state of the South Australian electricity market and in particular, notes—

- (a) the state government's energy policy over the last 15 years has delivered South Australian consumers the worst outcomes in the nation;
- (b) the first ever statewide electricity blackout in Australia occurred in South Australia on 28 September 2016;
- (c) electricity supply reliability in South Australia is the lowest in the nation;
- (d) electricity prices in South Australia are the highest in the nation;
- (e) the impact that high household electricity prices add to cost of living pressures;
- (f) the impact that high business electricity prices add to unemployment pressures;
- (g) unemployment in South Australia is the highest in the nation;
- (h) both the Victorian and South Australian electricity markets were privatised at similar times, yet Victorians pay the lowest electricity prices in the nation; and
- (i) the closure of the coal-fired electricity generator at Port Augusta has led to the increased importation of coal-fired electricity from Victoria.

I would like to begin by reflecting on the previous speeches from the Premier, the Minister for Energy and the Minister for Transport. Not once in that complete diatribe from the other side did we hear one answer to the energy crisis in this state. We are being told there is this great solution to the statewide blackouts, yet the state has been left in the dark by the princes and princesses of darkness on the other side of this house. It is completely outrageous that this has happened in this state. We are the laughing stock of not just the nation but internationally. Internationally, we are a laughing stock.

We have just had the Minister for Transport put up another leadership-contending speech. I do not know whether he has Jack the Knife onside, or if Jack the Knife is going to stick by Mali—the Hon. Peter Malinauskas from the other place—who is coming down here. He has managed to knife the Speaker (the member for Croydon). Mali is coming downstairs, but who is lining up alongside either the Hon. Peter Malinauskas or the member for Lee (the transport minister)? All I know is that the Premier will be looking over his shoulder.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I just remind the member for Wright of the standing orders. The Attorney has something to say.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: This is really good, high-value stuff. It would be great if we were down at the Spiegeltent—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —but it is actually not pertinent or relevant to what is in front of us today.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We are going to listen to the member for Hammond in silence, and then we will see how relevant it all is.

Mr PEDERICK: Let's not forget former premier Mike Rann's pledge for an interconnector back in 2002. Where did that go? We had the transport minister talking about the reason that Holden's left. The reason Holden's left was that Detroit made the decision. That is where GM make their decisions. They said it did not matter what—

Mr Picton interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Kaurna is called to order.

Mr PEDERICK: —subsidies were forthcoming. Some people need to just look at reality. We had half an hour of speeches from the princes of darkness and we have had not one answer shown to this state. I want to go through the items in this motion:

- (a) the state government's energy policy over the last 15 years has delivered South Australian consumers the worst outcomes in the nation;

It absolutely has. What has happened in this state is an utter disgrace. The lights go out and power goes out. We have some towers fall over 250 kilometres north of Adelaide, yet the lights are not even on in the member for Mount Gambier's electorate. That is outrageous. Who would ever set up a business, let alone run a state, with that sort of power capacity? It is completely outrageous—

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Newland is warned for the first time.

Mr PEDERICK: —how that could happen. I reflect on paragraph (b):

the first ever statewide electricity blackout in Australia occurred in South Australia on 28 September 2016;

People still rub their eyes in disbelief at what happened that day. It is crazy. We are supposedly a First World economy, and look at us. We are the laughing stock. I gave a speech in front of people from right around the nation in Perth in January, and the lights flickered in the room. I said that for a moment I thought I was back in South Australia, but the lights came back on, and I said, 'Sorry, I am in Perth. I am not at home, because the lights would have gone out.' I look at paragraph (c):

electricity supply reliability in South Australia is the lowest in the nation;

Absolutely, it is the lowest in the nation. We look at the hot days we have had over summer and the hot days we are having now in autumn. People ring up my office and ask, 'What is going to happen? It is going to be 37°. Are we going to have power or not?' These question should not be asked.

Even at Coomandook, I have had the power on since 1966. Thank God I still have the 32-volt engine room because I might have to hook up the generator. I might have to put a diesel generator in like the poor souls of this state are having to do, especially after what happened in September. People are spending tens of thousands, and some are spending over \$20,000, putting in diesel generators and petrol generators with automatic switching devices so they can at least have some power to run their generation.

If we look at electricity prices in South Australia, they are the highest in the nation. Look at your pocket NEM apps—I know you all have them. It has been in the red today. Electricity prices are definitely the highest in the nation and twice as much as they are in Victoria at times. Look at the impact that high household electricity prices add to cost of living pressures. It just goes on and on, what this government imposes on people, whether it is NRM levies or whether it is emergency services levies. People are suffering because of the high electricity prices in this state: it impacts unemployment and it impacts households, and the impact on business in this state is just disgusting.

The government seems to be completely unaware of what impact the closure of Hazelwood, which is a 1,600-megawatt coal-fired power station in Victoria, will have on this state. If they have not been listening to their constituents, they need to have a good look on the other side. I have business constituents in my electorate who have already been told that their power will go up by 150 per cent in their forward contracts? Only because Hazelwood is closing. Do you know why it has gone up? Because of the uncertainty and the unreliability of what is coming after Hazelwood.

It is because the princes and princesses of darkness have forced Port Augusta out. They have shut down a perfectly good coalmine at Leigh Creek. Alinta did have a solution that was put before the cabinet but, no, the green ideology is: let's have the windmills going. Well, we have seen how good wind turbines have been in saving this state. We saw how good Mike Rann's wind turbines were—the little mini ones that he had floating around—they were next to useless, if not useless.

Unemployment in South Australia is the highest in the nation. As I indicated, both the Victorian and South Australian electricity markets were privatised at similar times, yet Victorians pay the lowest prices in the market and we pay the highest. We have the Premier and others on that side bleating about what happened with the sale of ETSA, but what they forget to say is why that had to happen. It would have been a very tough decision in the day, but the issue was that Labor parties generally run you broke. That is essentially what they did with the State Bank disaster. They ran this state right into the ground, and things had to change to bring this state into the future. That is why hard decisions had to be made. They need to take responsibility for what happened, and that is exactly what happened.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Can I just ask the members for Newland and Chaffey to observe the standing orders. The member for Hammond is just building up for his last minute and we do want to be able to hear it.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I advise the chamber that I will be protecting the member for Hammond to the very end.

Mr PEDERICK: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. We have seen the disaster that has happened in this state. Do you know the time line? The time line is simple: since Port Augusta closed. It is as simple as that. We have had this disaster in South Australia since that over 500-megawatt coal-fired plant at Port Augusta shut down, putting hundreds of people out of work at Leigh Creek and Port Augusta. My father-in-law, Richard Abernethy, was a good, loyal employee of that coal-fired plant back in the day. He would be turning in his grave if he could see what is happening in South Australia today.

If people think energy unreliability is bad now, I can assure them, as I said in a speech late last year, that we 'haven't seen nothing yet'. We have not seen anything yet because the people on the other side of this house have no idea what is going to happen when Hazelwood shuts down at the end of this month. We have had the Premier, the energy minister, and the transport minister talk about a whole range of things, but not once today have they given a solution to this unending crisis. They need to get on and tell us what they are going to do for the sake of this state.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (12:14): I just thought I would rise to say a few words, and it is difficult following the member for Hammond. His contribution has provoked me into saying—

Mr Pengilly: You're already on the list.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Finniss!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I was going to come off until I heard the member for Hammond and now I am back on again. There are a couple of things I want to say about this motion. I am not going to canvass everything that has been so well canvassed by my colleagues on this side, but I do want to shine a little bit of light on a couple of elements of this that I think have not received sufficient attention.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Shine a light.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Shine a light in the darkness, yes. The first one is just a few words about the National Electricity Market. The National Electricity Market is a national construction. It is not something that is South Australia-based. I think it is important for us to look at the way it actually works. Some of those people on the other side will be very familiar with the way markets work

because they have primary products that they know they sell into markets at different times, and the market goes up and the market goes down.

Well, the market for electricity goes up and the market for electricity goes down. The players in the market, who are the generators of electricity, are in the market essentially—and this is going to shock people—to make money. If, for example, on the hot day a week or two ago when we had an AEMO-inspired shutdown of power to 90,000 residents of the City of Adelaide, AEMO had actually said to one of these generators to start up—to those who say there was not time, I do not know if this is the most authoritative thing, but I saw Jane Reilly the night before and she said, 'It's going to be really hot tomorrow, really hot.'

If people in AEMO do not have Channel 7 Adelaide, I know for those elsewhere that the ABC covered it as well. The ABC did cover the fact that it was going to be very hot the following day and the ABC is a national network.

Mr Picton: Jess Harmsen.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Jess Harmsen could have said it. She probably did, actually. I will re-check my video. But the point is that everybody except AEMO seemed to be aware that it was going to be very hot in Adelaide the next day. Everybody except AEMO. So, what did they do? They said, 'Well, actually, we're not going to do anything because we haven't got the phone call from the ABC, Channel 7 or somebody else. We're not going to bother ringing.' Do not ask, do not know. Do not ask, do not find out.

They blithely go on and get to the point where the whole show is about to crash and they ring up the people and say, 'Look, would you mind starting your thing up?', and they say, 'Sorry, you have only given us an hour's notice.' That is a terrific little story, but the back story is that, if those people had started that generator up, how many dollars per kilowatt hour would that company be getting for all the other power they were generating? Would it have continued to be \$14,000 or whatever it was per kilowatt hour, or would it have been something like \$200 or \$300?

Where was the commercial interest on that day for that company to do what all of us in this place would call their community service obligation? Answer: it did not happen. Although, because it was such a terrible catastrophe here, blamed incorrectly on everybody except AEMO, they were very careful to watch Channel 2 Sydney that night to check what was going on in Sydney the next day and they got on the phone to the big aluminium smelter and said, 'Shut down, shut down.' So, Sydney just waltzes through it, not because they have coal but because AEMO (a) watched the weather report and (b) picked up the telephone.

How on earth that has anything to do with something that is going on here in South Australia I do not know, but let us be very clear: the rules of the National Electricity Market appear to have no weighting for community service obligations—zero. They are all about making a quid, and I think that is an area for reform of the National Electricity Market. There should be an overriding obligation on those people to provide power in peak times, which do occur from time to time on a few days a year across the country.

The other thing is the debate that has been going on at a national level. I guess the debate reached its zenith of articulation when the Treasurer brought a lump of carbon into the federal parliament and displayed that because he thought people might have been confused about what it looked like. Let us make no mistake: this sort of obsession with coal has everything to do with east coast Liberal Party, National Party, One Nation politics and zero to do with good, reliable energy, low-carbon emissions or anything else. It is pure politics, and it is all eastern seaboard politics, and it is getting people to say bizarre things about what is and is not a viable alternative in this space.

I am going to ask a question. I do not know if people will get the answer to this, but I am going to work it through. I am going to list a series of different propositions and I am going to ask what these have in common, not which is the odd person out but what they have in common. Start writing; here they come. The first one is the transmat beam (apparently invented by Scotty); second, unicorns; third, the capacity of an old chap with a beard by pouring chemicals onto lead to convert it into gold; fourth, cold fusion; fifth—are you writing these down, member for Hammond? I do not want

you to miss any of this—the warp engine; sixth, threats by the Minister for Planning to make incursions into the Parklands; seventh, clean coal. What have they all got in common?

Mr Picton: They don't exist.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: They don't exist—exactly! We had a week of unicorns going on in Canberra—a week of it. 'Clean coal, it's going to be terrific, clean coal.' My son is able to use the computer. I asked him, 'Can you look on your machine for clean coal and tell me what it says?' He did look on his machine and he showed it to me (and if you use your finger you can make it move up and down so you can read it). At the bottom it said, 'Does not exist.' That is the whole week of that conversation gone.

The other two interesting things are that, even though the opposition are opposed to any conversation about nuclear energy, they do think small nuclear reactors, similar to the ones found in submarines, should be festooned all around the state of South Australia in order to solve this problem. That is going to go over a treat, isn't it? What happens when they need to have their rubbish taken out? Who is going to help them with that? That is a terrific idea.

The other one is gas, the great alternative, which does offer a cleaner solution than coal. What is their answer to our being able to have more gas to be able to do that? 'Lock up your paddock. Don't let those gas chaps in, they might find something.' So, here we are, trying to have an informed conversation with the public about what is really going on in this space to try to get some realistic understanding of what the problems are and what can be achieved. Meanwhile, we have all this confetti being thrown up by people who are more interested in cuddling up to big coal and more interested in keeping community service obligations with the big generator players under the AEMO regime.

My hope is that eventually the opposition, like pretty much everyone else out there, will accept the fact that a week or so ago we had a power outage not because of windmills, as they were described, but because AEMO did not watch the weather report. The big outage last year in September had nothing to do with windmills and it had everything to do with a cyclone ripping all these powerlines down. In answer to the question asked by the member for Hammond—why is it that if the cyclone is here the power goes out over there?—I will explain it this way. If you stick a defective shaver into your power point in your bathroom and switch it on and it blows up, your oven goes off as well—I know that is a revelation—and the whole house goes down.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (12:24): That is all pretty interesting from the Deputy Premier. We have had nursery rhymes and riddles for the last 10 minutes from him, without any solutions. This is the problem South Australia has: you are in government and you have been there 15 years. You had former Premier Rann stand up in 2002 with his pledge card and say, 'I will put in another interconnector.' You have not fixed the problem. You have not even looked like being able to fix the problem in that time. You are an outrageously unsuccessful government on this issue alone, without everything else.

You do not even look like being able to fix it. On top of that, Deputy Premier, in regard to your discussion points around coal, on a regular basis South Australia is bringing in 700 megawatts' worth of coal-fired power from Victoria at any given time. You seem to forget that. You are hooked on coal. I am not going to get into a debate about nuclear, coal, hydro, gas or whatever. I am telling you that the good people of South Australia want reliable electricity. They want to be able to flick the switch and have their lights on.

We have Premier Candles and Treasurer Storm Lantern who are not able to do anything about this. People want their lights on. They want to be able to afford their power. Business is screaming about the lack of power. You only have to see what is going on. Glenn Cooper from Coopers has been very vocal in the last 24 hours on where you are going. You are actually failing to live up to what you are meant to be doing.

On top of that, we have the member for Frome sitting over there, who has got into political bed with these people and who is unable to provide any answers either. The member for Waite is the same. You have not addressed nor fixed the problem. You have had 15 years to do it and you are abysmal failures. It is outrageous! The people of South Australia will not forget and, when the power goes out, the first thing they think about is the Labor government in South Australia.

I do not care particularly whether you are able to fix it up in the next 12 months. I will say 'Good,' if you do, but you have not fixed it up. You have not turned your attention to it properly in 15 years. The wheels have fallen off. We have had extended blackouts in the state last year and, lo and behold, as fate would have it, the only places in the state that had power were the APY lands, with a population of 2,500, and Kangaroo Island, with a population of 4,500, because SA Power Networks turned the generators on.

It is your fault. You can run around and blame the federal government. You can blame us and you can blame whomever you like. It is about time you had the guts to stand up and deliver and do what you were put in government to do for the people of South Australia—provide reliable power and do something about power prices. Those people out in the suburbs and the towns of South Australia, those families that are unable to pay their power bills, which are coming in at increasing rates, want answers. You are not providing the answers. You can come in here like a mob of pompous windbags and puff and blow through question time—

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: You would never do that.

Mr PENGILLY: —and come up with all the excuses in the world. After 15 years, it is about time, you accepted the blame.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: You would never do it.

Mr PENGILLY: The member for Newland is interjecting quietly over there. He and I are of the same mind on nuclear power. I do not know whether we will get nuclear power in my lifetime. I really do not know. I have no problem—

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: Welcome back to the conversation. I've been waiting for you guys to come back.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Newland, although you were provoked, you must be quiet.

Mr PENGILLY: Thank you, ma'am. I say again: what you have done in this state has been a categorical disaster. I have no objection whatsoever to renewable energy. I like solar power and I like wind power, but the fact of the matter is that it is not working. When the wind drops out, as it will do from March, April, May and June, wind power drops right down. Those are the quiet months. One other issue is, if you have read the article by Professor Judith Sloan in *The Weekend Australian* a week or two ago—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PENGILLY: Judith Sloan was saying that it will be 20 years before we have enough technology for some sort of battery power to provide for storage of electricity—

Mr Hughes: She doesn't know what she's talking about.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PENGILLY: It's alright, let 'em go. You can interject as much as you like; it doesn't worry me. The fact of the matter is that over 15 years the state Labor government have dismally failed to do anything about electricity. You only have to go out in the street and talk to anybody and the number one issue is power. Electricity is the number one issue—the lack of reliability and the expense of power—and then you get onto the other subjects you have stuffed up, which are the cost of water and the emergency services levy. You can sit over there and squirm, member for Frome, if you want to, but you are part of it. You have not fixed it up. You have dismally failed.

We are still hooked on coal power from Victoria—700 megawatts at any given time. If you look at the graphs that go around on spot prices, it is frightening, absolutely frightening. What are you going to do about it? Every day this week in question time, the Treasurer has puffed and blown—he has enough wind power to provide power for Victoria—but you do not come up with answers. You sit there and carry on like you do in question time and pooh-pooh and blame the opposition, but it is about time you had the intestinal fortitude to stand up and admit that you have blown it and get out

there and tell the people in your electorates what you are going to do about it, how you are going to provide reliable power and how they are going to be able to afford to pay for it, etc. because you have not done it in 15 years.

At the risk of being repetitive, I take you back to Mike Rann's pledge in 2002. He said, 'I will provide another interconnector.' It has not happened. 'I will sort out the electricity problems.' It has not happened. Fifteen years later, you are an embarrassing disgrace to South Australia and you should be chucked out of office sooner rather than later.

Mr PICTON (Kaurana) (12:31): I think that was a quite interesting contribution from the member for Finniss because he really let the cat out of the bag when he said the words today, 'I don't care whether you fix it or not.' That really reveals the fact that those people on the other side actually do not care about fixing any issues in this state. They actually do not care about putting any policy propositions forward. They actually do not care about solving the issues. All they care about is complaining—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey, I want to remind you that you have already left the house briefly this morning. Before I call you to order again, I want to give you the opportunity to understand that standing orders prevent interjections and insist that members be heard in silence.

Mr PICTON: All they care about is complaining. All they care about is trying to make the most political mileage out of whatever issue comes before us. They do not want to work in a bipartisan way. They do not want to work to stand up for South Australia's interests on the national stage, and that is why consistently the people of South Australia have rejected them. This is a very important issue for South Australia, but it has been put forward in such a ridiculous way in the Leader of the Opposition's motion.

I think it is important to note that, while we are debating this, we are being looked down upon by Sir Thomas Playford, the former premier of South Australia. In 1946, he nationalised the electricity supply of South Australia. He created the Electricity Trust of South Australia. It was a state government proposition to maintain supply, to roll out the supply across regional areas of our state and to say that electricity was a public good that needed to be maintained for our state. That existed for a good 54 years until in 1999-2000, the Olsen government privatised our electricity.

They broke their promise to the people of South Australia at the 1997 election, when they said they would not do it, and they sold off our generators. They sold off our distributors. They sold off our transmission lines and they sold off retailing. All those elements are now owned by the private sector and the state government does not control the delivery of electricity in this state.

At the time, they were warned about the risks of increasing the cost of electricity for South Australians. They were warned about the risk of our being at the mercy of private companies seeking profit out of monopoly services. They were also warned about the need to build a new interconnector to New South Wales for electricity and energy security in the national market. They ignored all this advice. In fact, they did not put the interconnector in place because they wanted to get as high prices as possible for when they flogged off the assets so that there was less competition for those generators.

We have now had a privatised system in this state for some 17 years, a system where all the players are operating not for the public good but for what is in their best interests to make money. We now have a system where pretty much two companies have huge market power in this state over the South Australian electricity system and we have little interconnection to other states. What we have seen is that a small number of companies have been able to use their market position to control supply and to set the price. That is what happened recently in February when we saw huge prices when there was supply available that was not put into the market.

All those members opposite hate to hear about this, about privatisation, but it is true. In fact, when it was put to the Leader of the Opposition recently, he said he could not comment on the sale of ETSA because he was at school at the time. That was quite an interesting comment because a quick check of his birthdate on the internet showed that he was 31 years old at the time of the sale

of ETSA. Either that was a complete untruth to try to get out of a radio interview, or he was held back quite a number of years for his school education.

We have in South Australia a privatised system, but we also have a National Electricity Market that is broken. That is true in terms of the rules of the National Electricity Market, it is true in terms of the operations of AEMO and, most importantly, it is true in terms of the incentives in the system for new investment in supply for our system across the country. This is not just an issue for South Australia: it is an issue across the whole country. We have seen other states having significant issues over the past few months. Prices have been spiking, both in the spot price and in futures prices, in New South Wales and Queensland, and they will be soon in Victoria as well.

We have seen New South Wales having very significant issues with the supply of electricity. That state has one of the largest concentrations of coal-fired power in the world, and they still have massive issues in terms of keeping the lights on to the point where they had to do load shedding of one of their biggest employers in the state, 300 megawatts, three times what was required in South Australia. They also had load shedding in the ACT. As well as other places in the ACT, the Australian Signals Directorate, which I would have thought was a pretty important place to keep running, had to go back onto its diesel generators. In fact, they almost lost power in Bendigo and Ballarat to keep the lights on in Sydney, such a farce our national market has become.

It is a problem around the whole nation. We have seen 10 coal-fired power stations across the whole country leaving our system, and there is no plan from Canberra for a proper system that should be in place to provide the incentives needed for new supply to come into the market. That is why, not just now but for years, we have been calling upon the federal government—as have experts, independent panels and independent economists—to introduce a national emissions intensity scheme. Supporting such a scheme is what the private sector wants and what independent people want. It would allow the private sector to make long-term investments.

These investments need to go for 30, 40 or 50 years. At the moment, there is such a dearth of policy at the federal level that they cannot make these investments. Of course, this is the same scheme the current Prime Minister himself proposed back in 2009, when he was not desperately appealing to the right wing of his party in New South Wales and Queensland to hang on to power and when he was not desperately trying to hold on to people who were fleeing to One Nation voters. Here is what he said about an emissions intensity scheme in the past:

Part of the genius and wisdom behind the Frontier Economics proposal is the fact that [it will result] in dramatically lower electricity prices in the near and medium term...

[It] has been demonstrated to deliver lower electricity prices...

Frontier's work shows the scheme can actually be made twice as green at a much lower cost to consumers and the broader economy, and a net improvement of 68,000 in regional jobs...

Frontier Economics who had done the work that we had commissioned to look at a cheaper, greener and smarter way to cut emissions which would result in much lower electricity prices.

All those quotes are from back in 2009. We know that he was in South Australia, even recently, in the last year, talking to the Liberal Party here and trumpeting the fact that South Australia has been leading the way in investing in renewable energy. But all of that has gone out the window now because he needs to make this very shallow, political play on a national scheme to keep his job.

We have seen many failures in the system in the last month. Just in February in South Australia we had a privately owned gas-fired power station sitting idle while demand was peaking. The national operator refused to order that power station on, then instead forced load shedding for less than an hour. The privately owned electricity distributor, SA Power Networks, then stuffed up and shed three times as many houses as was necessary. We know that this was all completely avoidable because almost exactly the same proposition happened exactly the following day. AEMO ordered on the Pelican Point power station and no load shedding was necessary across South Australia.

We have also heard revelations recently that AEMO does not look at the Bureau of Meteorology's (BOM) forecasts. They do not look at what we all look at on the nightly news, the service our taxpayers' dollars pay for, to make use of the very advanced systems at the BOM, and

instead they contract some other private weather forecaster who was wrong on this occasion, and the bureau was right.

So, now in South Australia, we have the Leader of the Opposition saying that the South Australian government and the parliament should have even less influence over energy policy in this state. They want to give Canberra complete control over our energy future. They want to attack renewable resources in this state. They want to attack our gas industry. The only thing they seem to support is interstate sources of coal.

South Australia has always had to take a stand on our national interests. We cannot be reliant on other states and Canberra to look after us. Just like we have seen with the River Murray, just like we have seen with Holden, the submarines, education and health funding, South Australia needs to take a stand to fight for itself. We believe we need to take this approach to electricity and take steps that we need to look after our own energy future.

Unfortunately, the Liberals do not agree and they will hand back policy control to Canberra. They are not here to do the best for South Australia. They are putting Turnbull's interests, the Prime Minister's Liberal Party's interests, ahead of our own interests, just like they did with Holden, just like they did with the submarines and just like they did with the River Murray.

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (12:41): It will be no surprise to those on this side of the house that I support the motion. What I have found intriguing is every contribution so far from the Labor Party: the Premier, the Treasurer, the member for Lee, the Deputy Premier, and of course the member for Karna, who is auditioning for the Treasurer's role for after the next election. The opposition benches we were all given a history lesson, and this history lesson is going on and on and is full of inaccuracies.

When the lesson cannot be inaccurate, it gets personal, especially from the member for Lee. We heard his contribution today, and it was a contribution from a man who is fighting for his own job because he wants to be in the top job. He knows he is getting pressure from minister Malinauskas who is going to come down here and take his job. He is out there pretending that he is talking to his community, that he is doorknocking every Saturday.

We know that if he were doorknocking every Saturday, he would put it on Facebook like the Speaker does, who puts his letters in his basket on his pushbike and lets everyone know that he is out doorknocking. I have not seen that contribution on social media once from the member for Lee, so of course we know he is not out there doorknocking. When he does, he is doorknocking those hard Labor voters in the Port, saying, 'What do you think of Steven Marshall?' Of course, they are going to say the Leader of the Opposition is doing a poor job.

An honourable member: Because he is.

Mr DULUK: He is not at all, he is doing a wonderful job. He is doing a great job because he is out there fighting for South Australians and he is out there putting motions like this on the table that we are debating today in this parliament. As the history lesson goes on, nothing is mentioned about Pelican Point. We know that if ETSA had not been privatised, then Pelican Point would never have come online because it was private investment that built Pelican Point, and of course it is gas which the Treasurer, especially, talks about as the panacea for our energy needs. Privatisation is not the problem in this debate.

However, that is not what I want to talk about so much today. What I want to talk about is the human face of this problem that is facing South Australia. We have not once heard from those opposite about the human face of the crisis. They have not talked about the people in their electorates who have been hurt by this government's energy failure. We have not heard about the small businesses in their electorates that have been affected by this energy failure. We have not heard of Whyalla that is hurting because of this energy crisis in South Australia. They are too embarrassed to get up and talk about their communities and their electorates that are hurting.

Why does the Treasurer not come to the house and talk about people who have breathing difficulties and are on respirators being cut off when there is an electricity blackout? They are not prepared to talk about that because they do not know to fix the problem. They do not have the solutions and they never will.

South Australia is suffering, and people are sick of the blame game. If you listen to talkback radio or read the newspapers, they are sick of the blaming, but all the Labor Party can do, all this government can do after 15 years of tired hard Labor, is point to the picture of Sir Thomas Playford—and we all venerate Sir Thomas Playford—and hark back to what it was like in the 1950s. I personally am a bit of a 1950s boy as well in terms of my politics. He was a wonderful leader, but the Labor Party harking back to him and trying to pretend that the Liberal Party somehow has decimated the legacy of Sir Thomas Playford is an absolute disgrace.

Sir Thomas Playford looks down with shame on the Labor Party. When the member for Kaurana, the member for Lee and the member for West Torrens invoke Sir Thomas Playford, let it be known that he would never, ever support any of the decisions that this Labor government has taken over the last 15 years.

Getting back to the human element of this energy crisis, small business operators cannot operate their business when there is a crisis. The Coromandel Valley fish and chip shop has lost stock time and time again after a blackout. Banana Boys Mitcham, a fruit and veg shop where they make their own dips, had to throw out \$8,000 worth of stock when there was a blackout. There is a Mitcham Square newsagency owner who calls his staff in to open. When there is a blackout, there is no trade, but of course he still has to pay his staff's wages.

There is the Magarey Orchard in my electorate that needs to invest in diesel-generated backup and solar panels because of the unreliable electricity in South Australia, and that is a real cost that is affecting our society. When the baker cannot sell his pies, he throws them out. When the butcher cannot sell his meat because of a blackout, he throws it out, and that leads to a lack of confidence in our society.

As the member for Finnis mentioned, we have had Glenn Cooper talking about how electricity policy affects his business. An iconic South Australian business, Coopers employs hundreds of South Australians and produces a product that is enjoyed by many. It is the lead product of the Fringe Festival at the moment. Glenn Cooper says government ideology and lack of ability to deal with energy in South Australia is the problem.

The blame game needs to stop. We need to look at what we can do collectively to solve this problem. It is not just a problem for Canberra: it is a problem for all of us in the nation, as we are on the grid. We all know that the Labor Party is not going to nationalise energy. It is not going to happen; it is not reality. I would love to see the energy minister come clean with what his plan is for South Australia, because I bet he has no plan for South Australia.

We on this side of the house have talked about many policies and what we can do to create consistency in the grid, because that is what we need. We need consistency so that business has consistency and can make its investment decisions. At the moment, we have ad hoc decisions from this Labor government that create inconsistency in the market—a market that is heavily subsidised. When you have a market that is heavily subsidised and inconsistent, then businesses cannot plan.

South Australian business needs confidence so that it can, for the next five, 10 or 15 years, understand what the market will be doing, so it can make the right investment decisions. If it cannot do that, then it will lead to failures, as we have seen at the moment, because of this Labor government. When we see failures in the energy market, we see mums and dads getting hurt. We see people who are living at the margins on disability support getting hurt. People who cannot afford to get off the grid get hurt when the grid becomes more expensive, and this cost is all because of those opposite.

This Labor government that pretends to look after the worker and pretends to look after the marginalised are actually doing the most damage to the community who they pretend and purport to represent. It is only we on this side who have the solutions that will lead to stability in the grid and a better economic society for all of us.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (12:48): This is an incredibly frustrating debate. I have been involved with renewable energy going back to the 1990s. In fact, I knew Malcolm Turnbull when he was a decent human being and not a shrinking human being who is a captive of the far right of the—

Mr Whetstone: How is Whyalla going with power?

Mr HUGHES: Whyalla will have its own solutions, and very good solutions. You will just have to stay around for a few weeks, and you will see what some of those solutions are. I remember a Malcolm Turnbull who, when he was an environment minister in the Howard government, actually backed a solar project in Whyalla with storage. Unfortunately, that project did not eventually get off the ground, even though it physically started. It would be of interest to the member for Stuart because that was a concentrating solar thermal project, with storage, back in the 1990s—but we were way too far ahead of ourselves at that time.

I come from an electorate with some of the state's major electricity users, and it is also an electorate with a major gas user. The major users, Arrium and BHP Billiton, are the largest employers in the electorate of Giles. It is also an electorate that has many people who get by on low incomes. Both in South Australia and elsewhere in Australia, it has been people on low incomes who have been disproportionately hit by rising electricity prices over recent years, whether it has been the pensioner living in a Housing SA property or a large company that supports employment, and all those people and businesses in between. Clean, reliable and affordable electricity is a basic requirement.

We need consensus at a national level on the need for clean, affordable and reliable electricity. Of course, there is no consensus. Not only is there no consensus but there is no coherent energy policy at a federal level. Instead, we have short-term politics driven by the Prime Minister's need to placate the extreme right of his party. The stop-start approach, with the addition of policy reversals on energy policy, undermines the long-term investment certainty needed to transition to a clean energy future, a clean energy future that holds the real promise of cheaper electricity.

The lack of vision and the lack of policy coherence at a national level are deeply concerning. It will inevitably result in higher electricity prices and it will undermine reliability, and we already have the evidence that it is leading to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions. We have signed up to the Paris agreement, but on current projections we will not meet our modest commitments. Emissions have gone up 3.4 per cent since last year, and 7.5 per cent since Abbott and Co. scrapped a price on carbon.

Partly as a consequence of the lack of policy coherence at a national level, we have a National Electricity Market that is no longer fit for purpose. I say 'partly' because, when it comes to the National Electricity Market, we are dealing with a legacy of regulatory framework that was designed for a 20th century energy system and what I see as a misplaced faith in market-like systems to effectively operate an essential service. That 20th century energy system reflected the technology options of the day with highly centralised electricity generation—it was a hub and spoke model.

The model is broken. It is broken because of the growth of distributed energy technologies that are scalable from the household level to the utility level. The marginal costs of new clean generation technologies are negligible, and the capital costs continue to fall. Falling capital costs and negligible marginal costs are a good problem to have. It is a problem, though, because we do not have a coherent and principled national policy and we have a NEM that does not work. The result is that we will face a disorderly transition and all of the problems that will cause, instead of an orderly transition to a clean energy future with cheaper reliable electricity.

Instead of solid policy at a national level, we see silly stunts with the passing around of coal in the House of Representatives. We have the spruiking of that corporate coal PR-developed term 'clean coal'. Despite all the major private sector generating companies in Australia rejecting clean coal and stating they will not invest in it, the Turnbull government continues with its folly-rich frolic. We have everything apart from sensible policy at a national level. Industry knows it, the union movement knows it, peak industry bodies know it and the various expert bodies know it. The federal government will not listen, and it will not listen because the Prime Minister has to appease his right wing—the 'Trumpian' coal-loving rump of his party.

I know people are sick of the blame game, but it is difficult to go past the lack of coherent energy policy leadership at a national level. It is difficult to go past the need to seriously reform the National Electricity Market. It is difficult to go past the loss of control over our generation and distribution assets as a result of privatisation. It is difficult to go past the level of market concentration and its impact on competition and prices.

It is also difficult to go past how a nation that is about to become the world's largest exporter of gas is also about to starve our manufacturers of an essential input unless they are willing to pay very high prices. People want us to come up with solutions. Unlike the opposition, we are not going to promise the people of South Australia that we can guarantee there will be no blackouts. There are blackouts in systems around the world. In fact, the biggest blackout in the world was in the north-east of the United States and the south-east of Canada. Over 56 million people were blacked out and that was a transmission issue. So, people do want us to come up with solutions.

What we need as a state and as a nation is a 21st century version of Playford's nationalisation of the electricity system in South Australia. That does not necessarily mean nationalisation. Playford put the public interest first in 1946 and the private interests of the owners of South Australia's electricity system last. He did so with the active support of the Labor Party at a state level. He did so with the very active support of the Chifley Labor government, which provided the means to nationalise the system.

A 21st century version of Playford's nationalisation would mean putting the public interest at the core of our electricity system, and that does mean the delivery of clean, affordable and reliable electricity. A 21st century energy policy for South Australia does not shy away from the fact that we have some of the best renewable energy resources in the world. A 21st century energy policy recognises that, when it comes to electricity, we are witnessing a shift from a fossil fuel, resource-based system to a technology-based system. It recognises that the marginal cost of operating solar or wind generators is negligible and that capital costs continue to fall.

Bidding processes overseas have seen utility scale solar beat other energy options, with a number of projects that have levelised costs of electricity production in the \$20 to \$50 per megawatt hour range. Manufacturing at scale is driving down costs and ongoing innovation and smarts about soft costs will continue to drive down costs. We should not be demonising renewables, we should be embracing and supporting them.

Cost-effective storage and other forms of backup are essential, as is becoming a lot smarter about how we use energy efficiently, and that is demand management. We have sufficient backup in South Australia, but it is not always readily available due to how the market operates. That needs to be addressed by either exploiting that unused capacity through appropriate non-gouging price signals or bringing into the market potentially cheaper and more flexible storage back-up options. In my electorate, two pumped hydro proposals are being looked at; one is to the north of Whyalla and would use sea water. ARENA is going to fund the study and it is early days, but a serious study is something that I would warmly welcome.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.R. Kenyon.

Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

The SPEAKER: I direct that the written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

Parliamentary Representation

CONGRATULATORY REMARKS

The SPEAKER: Before I call on the minister, I am told, reliably, that the member for MacKillop has become a grandfather again—Georgia, nine pounds, 10 ounces.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament today students from Concordia College, who are guests of the member for Unley and, no doubt, no longer subject to the corporal punishment once inflicted on them by the former member for Playford.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Health (Hon. J.J. Snelling) on behalf of the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse (Hon. L.A. Vlahos)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Public Intoxication—Revocation

By the Minister for The Arts (Hon. J.J. Snelling)—

Carrick Hill Trust—Annual Report 2015-16
Country Arts SA—Annual Report 2015-16
History Trust of South Australia—Annual Report 2015-16
Libraries Board of South Australia—Annual Report 2015-16
South Australian Museum Board—Annual Report 2015-16

By the Treasurer (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Aboriginal Lands Trust—Good Order Audit Summary of Findings Report for Period
October 2015

By the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Variation of the Environmental Authorisation under the Whyalla Steel Works Act 1958

By the Minister for Forests (Hon. L.W.K. Bignell)—

South Australian Forestry Corporation Charter—Charter

By the Minister for Education and Child Development (Hon. S.E. Close)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Native Vegetation—General

Question Time

ELECTRICITY GENERATION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:04): My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Does the minister stand by his statement on radio this morning that, when the government takes back South Australia's electricity generation assets, load shedding 'won't ever happen again'?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:04): I think the real question is: does the Leader of the Opposition stand by the member for MacKillop's remarks when he said 'Privatising ETSA was for the benefit of—

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

Ms CHAPMAN: The Premier opened with, 'I think the real question is'. That is clearly debate and we need to start to discuss another matter.

The SPEAKER: I think a minister is allowed just a little bit of licence at the opening of the question—all ministers, that is, except the Treasurer. That is very close to a bogus point of order, but I will let it go on this occasion. Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The whole question is predicated on essentially purchasing back assets. Does the Leader for the Opposition stand by the member for MacKillop's remarks when he said that privatising ETSA was for the benefit of South Australia or, indeed, the member for Stuart's remarks when he said that privatisation of ETSA was a necessary step? This is the guilty party. They are addicted to their former decision of—

The SPEAKER: Premier, splendid debating points. Could we have some information relating to standing by the minister's remarks on radio this morning?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: What we know is that South Australians have been put in a position for its electricity market which has been created by the sale of each of the various components of it to private companies—private companies owning the transmission assets, the distribution assets, the generation assets and also the retailing arrangements for the electricity trust of South Australia. Worse than just the sale of those assets was the way it was privatised. It was privatised in a way that severed the relationship between South Australia and New South Wales in an attempt to drive up the price of those assets.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Back your shadow minister. Back him up.

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is called to order and warned. The question was about, as I understand it—

Mr Marshall: Load shedding.

The SPEAKER: Well, nationalisation leading—

Mr MARSHALL: The question was whether or not the minister stood by his claim this morning that there will be no further load shedding in South Australia. We haven't been near that issue so far.

The SPEAKER: I thought there was a prelude to that where there was some discussion of taking back the asset leading to load shedding.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Premier, can you be seated.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call to order the members for Finniss, Stuart, Mitchell, Chaffey and Adelaide, and I warn the members for Finniss and Unley. Would the deputy leader read the question again?

Mr Marshall: It is my question, but I am sure she can read it.

Ms CHAPMAN: I am happy to read it, 'Does the minister stand by his statement on radio this morning that, when the government takes back South Australia's electricity generation assets, that load shedding—

The SPEAKER: So, it was about nationalisation leading to whether or not there would be load shedding after that happened.

Ms CHAPMAN: That was the statement: 'It won't ever happen again.' That was the statement he made—

The SPEAKER: Would the deputy leader be seated. I think the leader misled me in his point of order, and his remarks come very close to misleading the house by his representation of what was in the question. The Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Thank you, Mr Speaker. What we saw this morning was an example of an opposition who have got caught out. They thought they would sneak in here and make a few points about electricity, and we were prepared to have a full debate, a debate that will occur throughout the course of this afternoon because we will debate anybody anytime on this question. And the deputy leader—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: Not only is this matter irrelevant—

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order. I would like to listen to the Premier for about 30 seconds before I rule.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order, sir, if I may, and it's not just a question of relevance. The Premier is reflecting on a debate in relation to a matter that is currently before the parliament and about to resume after question time.

The SPEAKER: The opposition asked the question. If they were concerned about pre-empting the outcome of the debate, they wouldn't have asked the question. Would you like to withdraw the question?

Mr GARDNER: Point of order: surely the opposition is entitled to ask questions—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright is warned for cackling.

Mr GARDNER: —that are not pertinent to the exact wording of a motion that is before the house. The Premier is still debating the motion from this morning. This question is about a nuanced other matter.

The SPEAKER: Well, I don't know what to make of that point of order. Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I can help the deputy leader perhaps with a legal concept, one she would be familiar with: it's called a consciousness of guilt. The Liberal Party is returning to the question of privatisation because they know that the people of South Australia will hold them to account for their decision. They will hold them to account.

When you talk about taking back control of these assets and taking back control of the electricity system, there is only one reason why we need to contemplate such a proposition and that is that those opposite sold these assets and sold the control of our electricity system. Then when we are promoting year after year, for the best part of a decade, the solutions that would allow this National Electricity Market to operate effectively, they are scotched at every turn—the sabotage of national electricity policy.

It was this government that commissioned the Garnaut report. It was taken over by a federal Labor government when all of the states and territories at that point were Labor and combined together to commission that most important report. The single element that was at the heart of that report is that the world is changing. It will be a carbon-constrained future, and those jurisdictions that act first will minimise the cost for their jurisdiction and also gain the benefits for their citizens as they seek to adopt new technologies and to find a vision for a low-carbon future for their communities.

It is those opposite who stood trenchantly against that policy perspective. They have tried to destroy it at every turn and that is why we are contemplating taking back the charge of our energy system. It will lead to a more secure supply. It will lead to cheaper energy prices—

The SPEAKER: The Premier's time has expired.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —and it will lead to a cheaper energy system.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Mount Gambier is called to order, and the leader and the deputy leader are warned. Leader.

ELECTRICITY GENERATION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12): Supplementary to the Premier: can he explain whether there will be load shedding after he has implemented his strategy?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:12): What we will be doing in South Australia is taking back control of our energy system. What will happen when we implement our policies is that South Australia will have control of its own destiny. What won't be happening, if we get our way, is that a national energy operator will be running a local energy system in South Australia that leaves a power station at Pelican Point, one of the most efficient gas-fired generators in the nation, idle causing a blackout in South Australia.

Our policy objective will be to ensure that that absurd state of affairs does not continue. How can one seriously suggest that a system that permits those things to happen lawfully is anything other than a broken national electricity market? That is what we will be advocating for. Our changes will be directed at that matter. Of course, it would be desirable if we could have an outbreak of common sense at a national level and that there was national policymaking to assist us in that regard. If those opposite, instead of abdicating their responsibilities to Canberra, stood with us and stood for South Australia for once, we may be able to achieve something.

ELECTRICITY GENERATION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:14): My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. How will the minister deliver his commitment that there will never be load shedding following the implementation of the government's plan?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:14): No, this is between you and me. This is about your lack of leadership and your inability to actually debate this issue.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier will be seated.

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order, sir: I do not know what has transpired between you and the Premier, but it is completely out of order to present that proposal to the parliament. Unless we want to hear from the Premier what is in discussion between you as Speaker and the Premier, then it is completely out of order.

The SPEAKER: The Premier was, of course, referring to the Leader of the Opposition. It would have been helpful if the Premier had called him that. Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Yes, I will, sir. I was responding to the cacophony of noise when I chose to respond to the question because I am pointing out what this is fundamentally about. It is leadership and the lack of it. It is about the future or the past. It is about self-sufficiency or kowtowing to Canberra. It is about a clean energy future or a party which is addicted to coal. This is a party led by a man who, on one of the most important public policy issues facing our state, wants to abdicate that particular policy to Canberra.

Let's just analyse that. What we are talking about is the state-based renewable energy target. The Leader of the Opposition wants to abolish it and say, 'Canberra will handle that.' At a point in time in the state's history when it is widely regarded that energy policy is amongst the most crucial issues facing our state, we are seeking to stand up and take responsibility, and those opposite are seeking to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Will the Premier be seated for a moment. I am finding it hard to hear the Premier because of the shouting by the Leader of the Opposition. I warn the member for Mitchell and the leader for the second time, and if they make an utterance outside standing orders I will either eject them under the sessional orders or I will name them. The member for Unley knows the consequences of naming because he is at risk of an 11-day suspension. I don't want any more of this bellowing at ministers. If you have a point of order, take it. Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: This is a critically important debate. It is one where the South Australian government will stand up on behalf of South Australians. I won't be lectured to by somebody who in 2012 said to me, 'A premier who doesn't have the same focus on renewables as the former premier.'

Mr MARSHALL: Point of order, sir: I ask that you bring the Premier back to the substance of the question.

The SPEAKER: The Premier is finished.

Ms Sanderson: He sure is.

The SPEAKER: The member for Adelaide is called to order and warned.

ELECTRICITY GENERATION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Given the minister's commitment, will the government be taking over responsibility for providing guaranteed service level compensation payments in the event that load shedding occurs?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:17): Mr Speaker, you will see in the coming weeks the policy position of this government in relation to energy. We said on the first day, when we responded to that completely unnecessary blackout, that it was both unnecessary and it demonstrated that the National Electricity Market was broken and that we would be taking charge of our energy future. That is the vision we set for South Australia, and I must say I have been gratified with the—

Mr MARSHALL: Point of order, sir: I ask that you bring the Premier back to the substance of the question as to whether or not the government of South Australia will be taking up responsibility for service level compensation should load shedding occur.

The SPEAKER: Well, we're clear on what the question is. Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I am addressing the plan. It was said that when you reveal the plan, the preference was—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I am explaining the policy formulation of the plan.

The SPEAKER: Could the Premier go for more than 15 seconds before we judge whether or not he is being relevant?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: This is entirely germane. When we set out that ambitious goal to be self-sufficient in relation to our energy needs in South Australia, I was incredibly heartened by the way in which industry responded and, frankly, by how some of the national institutions responded to us in seeking to achieve that objective. We have been doing some very detailed analysis and work. It was well advanced before we made that call, but it will now be the subject of a detailed plan that will be revealed to the people of South Australia in due measure.

The SPEAKER: Could the Premier perhaps turn his attention to the question about compensation?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I will address all of these issues, Mr Speaker. All of the matters that will be addressed in the plan will be fully explained and discussed—all of the questions, including questions of nationalisation of our former assets, the way in which this will affect reliability, cleanliness and security of supply. All of those matters will be addressed. I will say this about the question of compensation, the primary responsibility for compensation which exists in a system which is entirely owned by private sector operators is on the heads of those private sector operators.

Ms Chapman: It's a big no.

The SPEAKER: Well, I think it is certainly a direct answer to the question. I call to order the member for Morialta and I warn for the second and final time, with a heavy heart, the member for Hartley.

ELECTRICITY SUPPLY

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:20): My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. What is the minister's response to claims by the Minerals Council of Australia that the 'push to renewable energy without transitional arrangements has led to a power price crisis that is deterring investment in South Australia'?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:20): It is no surprise that we hear from the Minerals Council of Australia because they have their man in the Prime Minister's office. The adviser on energy now in the Prime Minister's office comes directly from the Minerals Council of Australia. Those opposite do not actually understand that what is going on here is that coal-funded taxpayers' levies are being funnelled into a slush fund which is then being used to

influence public opinion as these coal-fired generators want to run these things right into the ground to make sure they extract every dollar out of them.

Forget security in the National Energy Market, forget reliability, forget price, forget cleanliness, they are interested in their dollar, and that is what is driving policy in this nation, because the Prime Minister is hanging on by a thread. He has been totally captured by the coal lobby and those on the other side of the house have been implicated in that design.

ELECTRICITY SUPPLY

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:21): A supplementary question: given the Premier's answer, what does he or the minister who was actually asked the question have to say about the Minerals Council of Australia saying that there is a lack of reliable and cost effective supply of electricity in South Australia that has cost the mining and minerals processing sector \$357 million in lost output?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:21): The orthodox answer to that is that when the huge cyclone knocked out the transmission network—

Ms Sanderson: Huge cyclone? Come on.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The huge cyclone—it was a small cyclone, was it?

The SPEAKER: The member for Adelaide is warned for the second and final time.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It wasn't Katrina, but 'the cyclone slightly slower than Hurricane Katrina' we shall call it from this point onwards. In fact, so devastating was it that at the Bureau of Meteorology, the forecaster there who had had 40 years' experience said he had not seen a weather system like it, and they get very excited about these things. I was less excited about it, but they were very excited about the super cell cyclone that was causing twin cyclones ripping through—

An honourable member: Seven.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Seven, in fact—ripping through the middle of our state, severing the backbone of our transmission system, setting off a cascading series of stoppages which led to the statewide blackout. That is what caused the losses. That is what fundamentally caused the losses. To suggest that it was anything other than that is simply mouthing the propaganda that emerges from the coal lobby. The truth is that any reliable expert will tell you that coal is not the future. Indeed, don't take my word for it: take the word of the Australian Industry Group because it simply is not going to be part of our future. The Australian Energy Council said:

While lower emissions coal-fired power stations could be considered theoretically, there is no current investment appetite to develop new coal-fired power in Australia.

The Chief Executive of the Australian Industry Group, Innes Willox said:

The problem with coal comes down to its affordability, the emissions it puts out, its flexibility, and most importantly its bankability. And you cannot find any serious investor who is looking to invest in coal at the moment given the economics behind it.

The head of a company that owns coal-fired power stations in Queensland said—

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: A point of order, Mr Speaker: I ask you to bring the Premier back to the substance of the question which was not about coal: it was about the Minerals Council's claim that the mining industry has lost \$357 million.

The SPEAKER: That is a bogus point of order, and you are fortunate not to be departing. If the opposition is unhappy with ministers' answers, you are not to take bogus points of order or make impromptu speeches or interject. You will point out to public opinion and to the media that you regard the minister's answer as evasive or the minister did not answer your question.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The head of CS Energy, Martin Moore—

Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: No.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —a company which owns coal-fired power stations in Queensland, says he:

...certainly has no intention of building any coal-fired power plants—

You would have thought he would know about that—

...And it would surprise me greatly if there was any more coal-fired technology was built in Australia...commercially the numbers don't stack up.

So, coal is the past, renewable energy is the future, and I think the overwhelming majority of public opinion says, 'Whatever the challenges of renewable energy, just get on and fix them because renewable energy is the future, and we want a national electricity market that accommodates us.'

ELECTRICITY PRICES

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. In addition to a meeting between the minister and the Coober Pedy council referred to yesterday, did the minister or his staff have any telephone meetings with representatives of the Coober Pedy council with respect to this matter and, if so, have notes of those telephone conversations been provided to the Department of State Development?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:25): Not to my knowledge, no. I'll check, but I doubt it very much.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (14:25): My question is to the Minister for Health. Does the minister stand by his statement in September 2015 that it would be foolhardy and dangerous to open the new Royal Adelaide Hospital in winter?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:26): Yes, I do; certainly, it would be the case to try to do it in the middle of flu season—that's right. That is why I made it very, very clear that the opening of the hospital will very much depend on when flu season hits.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (14:26): A supplementary: will the minister categorically rule out moving the hospital in winter 2017?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:26): I can't really add to what I said in my previous answer; that is, we will move when it is safe to do so, and I will rely on the advice of doctors and nurses about when that happens. We will do everything we can to be into the new hospital before flu season hits this year but, unlike the Hon. Stephen Wade, who thinks he knows better than the chief medical officer and he can predict when flu season is going to hit this year, I am not going to do that. We will very much take expert advice on when it is safe to move into the new hospital, but we will do everything we can to make sure that happens before flu season.

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:27): My question is also to the Minister for Health. How long after the new Royal Adelaide Hospital opens will the Repatriation General Hospital need to operate to support the safe, staged ramping up of the NRAH site?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:27): We expect to be off the Repat site before the end of the year, and we don't expect that to be at all driven by when we move into the new hospital.

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:27): A supplementary: how can the government sign a contract with ACH for the Daw Park site when it doesn't know when the new Royal Adelaide Hospital will open?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:27): I like the member for Davenport, I have known him for a long time, but he does need to listen to the answer I have given when he asks the next question. As I said, us getting off the Repat site will not be driven by when we move into the new Royal Adelaide Hospital. They are largely two independent events, so I don't expect them to have any bearing.

With regard to our contract, what we have in the contract is complete flexibility as to when we hand over the site. We expect it to be at the end of the year, but we are not contractually obliged. There is room in the contract that we have with ACH Group to do it later if we need to but, as I said, I don't expect us moving into the new RAH is going to have any impact on that at all. When we come off the Repat site will be driven by when the building works are completed at the Flinders Medical Centre.

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:28): So, when does the government anticipate signing the contract with ACH?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:28): Very soon.

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:28): Another question to the Minister for Health. Can the minister confirm that SA Health sleep services and SA Health radiology will remain on the Daw Park site after the closure of the Repatriation General Hospital?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:29): I will double-check. My recollection is that we are moving everything but the prosthetics service off that site, so my understanding is that sleep and radiology would be moving off that site, but I'll just check that nothing has changed and come back to the house if that's not correct.

CLARE OVAL SITE REDEVELOPMENT

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:29): My question is to the Minister for Regional Development. Can the minister explain to the house why he chose not to support a grant application by the Clare and Gilbert Valleys Council for the Clare Oval redevelopment project?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:29): He is not here, so I will take that question on notice and get back to the member.

CLARE OVAL SITE REDEVELOPMENT

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:30): I will add a supplementary question for the minister to take on notice, if that is alright. Why did the minister only respond to the Clare and Gilbert Valleys Council's request for support on 28 February, which is the date the grant application was due, when they actually provided him with information about their request 12 months earlier?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:30): I don't think that makes any sense, but what I will do is try to decipher the *Hansard* and get back to the house as quickly as possible.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Was the leader interjecting?

Mr Marshall: No, sir.

Mr Gardner: He was talking to us, sir.

The SPEAKER: I see. Well, that's alright then. The member for Hammond.

ROAD MAINTENANCE

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:30): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister inform the house what measures are being taken to ensure new sections of the Mallee and Dukes highways, alongside the Taillem Bend motorsport park, do not melt again when the temperature rises above 35°?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:31): I thank the member for Hammond for his question. Indeed, the member for Hammond alerted me to this problem quite some weeks ago now, I think, perhaps before the end of last year. As members would be aware, there is a very significant development occurring at Taillem Bend for the new motorsport park, and that has required some works to be done to the highway, particularly for a new entrance and exit for that new facility as well as, I think, a slip lane for turning movements so that they can be safe and protected.

The contractor who was required to do that work did not lay the appropriate seal on that part of the road, so the surface of the road, when it got to a high temperature, was what they call 'bleeding'. There was excess bitumen out of the asphalt, which was bleeding out of the rest of the aggregate which comprises the other part of the asphalt.

My understanding is that following the member for Hammond's raising this issue with me, I raised it with the chief operations officer of the department who was following up with the contractor. I have to come back to him with an update as to whether the rectification has been done, although I am assuming that given the member for Hammond is asking me a question right now, and given that he travels on that road very frequently, that perhaps it hasn't. So, leave it with me, and I will come back to the house with an answer.

ROAD MAINTENANCE

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:32): Supplementary: can the minister then explain why, when I explained to him earlier in the piece that there was 'bleeding' bitumen as such, the final line marking was painted on that surface, which was faulty?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:33): It may be that the department had not yet reached out to that contractor before they took the next stage of the work, which was line marking, as well as not repairing it. But I will seek a full briefing—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —and come back to the house, as well as the member for Hammond.

The SPEAKER: The leader sounds to me like he is interjecting—because it is contrary to standing orders to interrupt in any way, even if it's a conversation with another member.

ROAD FUNDING

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:33): My question is again to the member for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister inform the house when the government is going to allocate the emergency road funding that is required in the Langhorne Creek region, as a result of the flood damage some six months ago?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:33): Yes, that is a good question, and I will come back to the member for Hammond with an answer.

ADELAIDE HILLS COUNCIL

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:34): My question is to the Minister for Local Government. Does the minister intend to approve the request of the Adelaide Hills Council to abolish their ward system, despite the opposition of the vast majority of the hundreds of public responses and despite that vote being taken when two councillors opposed to the abolition were on prearranged leave?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (14:34): I was at the Adelaide Hills Council the other night and I have had no official request from the Adelaide Hills Council.

ADELAIDE HILLS COUNCIL

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:34): Supplementary: when the minister does receive the request, as has been reported will be coming in the news today, what will the minister's actions be?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (14:34): I think that's a very hypothetical question. I just indicated I have not received any correspondence from the council, and I am certainly not going to make any decision here unless I see the actual contents of the letter.

The SPEAKER: Does the member for Morialta have another question? No, alright.

Mr GARDNER: Sir, I was asking if the Minister for Local Government received the government's media clippings.

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta will leave the chamber for an hour for making an impromptu speech.

The honourable member for Morialta having withdrawn from the chamber:

FINNIGAN, MR B.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:35): My question is to the Premier. What success has the Premier had in his attempts to recover the salary paid to Bernie Finnigan for the period between his being charged and leaving the parliament, given the Premier committed to do so in a letter dated 1 December 2015?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:35): I will take that question on notice and bring back an answer.

SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT FUND

Mr GEE (Napier) (14:36): My question is to the Minister for Small Business.

Mr Pengilly: Give them one of yours, not one of theirs.

Mr GEE: Clean coal. Can the minister advise the house on outcomes for round 5 of the Small Business Development Fund program?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:36): I thank the member for his question. He represents a lot of small businesses in the north. That's why I am happy to announce the outcomes for round 5 of the Small Business Development Fund, a \$10 million program which the government implemented in the 2016 budget. The house will recall that this program targets businesses in the Playford, Port Adelaide Enfield and Salisbury districts.

Applications for round 5 closed on 17 January 2017. There were 31 applications received. The start-up business grants, which are grants of up to \$20,000 and are available to new businesses on a one-for-one matched basis, were offered. Six start-up grants were awarded, totalling \$87,250, to the following businesses: 3RD Eye Analytics, \$14,000; Clique Travels Pty Ltd, \$20,000; Derek & Sam Pty Ltd, \$20,000; Forge Mill CNC Machining, \$18,500; NY Handyman and Cleaning Services, \$11,000; and The Athletic Compound, \$3,750.

The Business Expansion Grants, which are grants of between \$10,000 and \$100,000, are available on a one-for-one matched funding basis. There were five expansion grants approved in this round, totalling \$347,981, to the following businesses: Adelaide Weighing Equipment, \$100,000; Bullet Cylinder Heads, \$100,000; QPE Fabrication Pty Ltd, \$85,481; SA Insulation Pty Ltd, \$15,000; and Surman Metals, \$47,500.

As at 22 February 2017, 35 start-up and 41 business expansion grants, totalling over \$3.3 million, have been approved (\$3,355,000 plus GST). Based on the grants awarded to date, it is

anticipated that 253 new full-time equivalents will be created within 12 months. Actual job creation will be reported 12 months after the conclusion of each round. Extensive consultation with industry groups was undertaken in the design of the program, which will support acceleration of business and jobs growth in northern Adelaide. Round 6 applications are still open. I would encourage businesses to apply—they close on 14 March—and I look forward to updating the house on the outcomes of subsequent rounds.

ADELAIDE FESTIVAL OF ARTS

Ms COOK (Fisher) (14:39): My question is for the Minister for The Arts. Minister, how are preparations coming along in the lead-up for the weekend start of the Adelaide Festival of Arts?

The SPEAKER: The cultural attaché.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:39): I thank the member for Fisher for her passionate advocacy for our arts community. While the Adelaide Fringe is underway, it is time to step it up a notch for the Adelaide Festival, Australia's best artistic festival, kicking off this Friday night. Over the weekend, we heard that the Festival had already made history, breaking the \$3 million box office mark, making it the most financially successful festival in 20 years.

While we expected Barrie Kosky's production of Handel's *Saul* to sell out, the Festival has been blown away, with *Betroffenheit*, *The Drunken Botanist*, and the Chamber Landscapes mini-festival, curated by Anna Goldsworthy and hosted at the Ukaria Cultural Centre at Mount Barker, also selling out. Although the Festival showcases some of the best arts and culture from around the world, it is good to know that some of our local favourites will also be standing out over the next couple of weeks.

The ASO and State Opera have been working tirelessly with the team from *Saul* to bring together what promises to be an incredible operatic masterpiece. The State Theatre have bumped in and are putting together the final touches to their production of *The Secret River*, which premieres at the Quarry in the Anstey Hill Recreation Park this evening. The *Secret River*, I'm pleased to say, is the highest grossing production and fastest selling show in the company's history.

It would be remiss of me not to mention local acrobatic troupe, Gravity and Other Myths, who, after getting their start at Cirkidz and performing sell-out shows on the fringe festival circuit for the past two years, will be making their Festival debut, performing *Backbone* in the final week of the Festival. The other local company which I'm incredibly excited to see in the Festival program is Restless Dance, who are performing their new show, *Intimate Space*, at the Hilton Hotel. *Intimate Space* promises a festival experience that you don't want to miss.

Last night, the Festival held the soft launch of their incredible new venue, the Palais, which at night looks stunning and, together with the Royal Croquet Club and the Adelaide Oval, makes the Riverbank Precinct a truly magical Festival hub. The Palais kicks off officially on Sunday night, with arguably one of the greatest songwriters of our time, Neil Finn, playing a free concert on the Palais and across Elder Park.

This year has seen a changing of the guard at the Festival, with new directors, Neil Armfield and Rachel Healy, a new chair in Judy Potter, and a new chief executive, Sandy Vershoor. They, together with the board and the staff, have delivered a fresh and exciting program. We should consider ourselves fortunate to experience it over the next two weeks. Can I wish the team all the best and encourage all members of the house to get along to what promises to be an incredible Adelaide Festival of Arts.

STRATHALBYN HOSPITAL

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (14:42): My question is to the Minister for Health. Will the minister assure the house that the Strathalbyn hospital will continue to operate as an inpatient facility and not be converted to a residential aged-care facility?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:42): Yes, absolutely I can. Can I quote from that wonderful paper of

record, the Mount Barker *Courier*, and the comments that it quotes from the Strathalbyn medical clinic co-director, Dr Gerard Cobiac. He says, and I am quoting from *The Courier*:

Dr...Cobiac said under the new system ambulances would be redirected to the Mt Barker hospital overnight, with the Strathalbyn hospital...treating minor emergencies.

He said the introduction of a 24-hour emergency department in Mt Barker would help to relieve a system that was 'hardly sustainable' and dangerous.

'This will take some of the burden off us and keep us from working 16-24-hour days, which is when mistakes are made,'...

That is from Dr Cobiac. There is a wonderful front page of the Mount Barker *Courier*. I think this is great outcome and absolutely can guarantee the future of the Strathalbyn hospital.

KALIMNA HOSTEL

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (14:43): My question is again to the Minister for Health. Will the government immediately release the CFS fire safety report, the engineering report and all documentation related to the accreditation of the Kalimna Hostel at Strathalbyn?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:44): I am more than happy to release what I can. I will have to get advice just to see that there is no reason why I can't, but certainly I am quite happy to be completely open and transparent about this. The simple fact is that there was a change of federal government rules for aged-care facilities.

Mr Pederick: Let's see.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The distinction between low-care and high-care facilities was removed—

Mr Pederick: Let's just see that.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: It meant that Kalimna House at Strathalbyn had to meet the high-care facilities. We got an engineering report.

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond is on two warnings.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The engineering report said that it was not possible to make modifications in order to make that building comply, and we have had to take appropriate action. I am more than happy to be as open and transparent about this as we can. We have absolutely nothing to hide.

I am very disappointed by the remarks made by some people trying to whip up fear and misinformation about this decision and to suggest that somehow this decision is a precursor to a decision to close the Strathalbyn hospital. Absolutely it is not, and those people should examine their consciences about whipping up fear and using aged and vulnerable people for base political purposes. I think it is pretty disgraceful.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: We have worked with families of residents to make sure that those residents are accommodated in a way that works for those families as far as we can, but we are simply not in a position to continue providing that sort of accommodation at Kalimna House.

SAFEWORK SA

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (14:45): My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations. Minister, how is the transformation of SafeWork SA improving safety in workplaces?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister

for the City of Adelaide) (14:46): As it happens, I do have an answer. As members would be aware, in 2015 I announced details of a new operating model for SafeWork SA that essentially split SafeWork SA into two separate operational units—a regulator and an educator. This was following very strong feedback from employer and employee groups that they wanted to see stronger compliance and enforcement, as well as more help, so that people can meet their work health safety obligations and make workplaces safe.

It is very interesting in all this area to get identical feedback virtually from both employer groups and employee groups, where they are saying that it is very hard for somebody to be, metaphorically speaking, the black hat and the white hat at the same time. What they want to know is who they are talking to.

In any event, this model took effect in an administrative form from 1 July last year, and I am very pleased to inform the house that recent data shows that the restructured organisation is delivering very positive results. Very positive feedback has been received from many quarters. In just eight months, SafeWork SA has received over 500 requests for help from business. These requests have come across all types of industries especially high-risk industries, including construction, agriculture and manufacturing.

What is more pleasing is that an overwhelming majority of people who have used this service—over 98 per cent—have rated the service as very useful. Some of the customer feedback received has said that 'the information and friendly advice will be able to be put in place easily', that they have received 'outstanding advice' and that the advice was 'amazingly helpful in getting our business up to scratch'.

I encourage any business in need of help to contact SafeWork SA and to engage this free service. Can I add that industry organisations and industry groups would also be encouraged to see how they can work with SafeWork SA to use their connections with their own industry participants to develop programs to reach particular industry sectors.

I would like to take a moment at this stage to thank Marie Boland. In her role as executive director of SafeWork SA, which she held for the last couple of years, she has done an outstanding job and she was instrumental in leading the implementation of this restructure. It is fair to say that Marie is universally well regarded. All the people with whom she worked, whether they be employer groups or employee groups to whom I have spoken, have all had nothing but praise for her in terms of the way she has discharged her duties. She has made a tremendous contribution to South Australia.

She recently resigned from the position to take on other activities for her own personal reasons. I personally am very sad to see Marie go. She has done an outstanding job, and I wish her well in whatever she chooses to do in the future. Obviously, she leaves very large shoes to fill, and for the time being we have Mr Soulio acting as a pro tem acting executive director whilst the recruitment process is undertaken.

SAFEWORK SA

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:50): Supplementary: now that the task of separating the two areas of responsibility of SafeWork SA has been completed and the prosecution in respect of the new RAH deaths of two men, will the Attorney, as minister, release the SafeWork SA report and confirm for the parliament which of those recommendations, if any, has been implemented?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:50): I'm not quite sure exactly what that question is meant to mean, but if the deputy leader can identify exactly what she is specifically asking for I will attempt to provide her with an answer.

MOTORSPORT

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:51): My question is to the Minister for Sport. Minister, can you update the house on the future of motorsport in South Australia?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (14:51): I thank the member for Little Para for the question. I just ducked out to Clipsal during the lunch break. It was fantastic to get out there and meet a couple of 10 year olds, Jessica and Christian. They have been racing for three years in the karting series and they are great little racers.

We introduced them to Nick Percat, who also started out in South Australia in the go-kart series and of course won the Clipsal 500 last year in the rain. He was a third generation Holden worker before he got his big tick and moved into the Supercar Series. He is doing a terrific job and has been picked up by Brad Jones Racing this year. The South Australian government has the state brand on the bonnet of the car. Nick is doing a lot of promotion of South Australia for us. He is also working with us to help get the message across, particularly to young people because he is in his mid-20s, about the importance of road safety.

We are actually sponsoring the series for these young go-karters this year in the 10 to 12-year-old category. We are giving them a set of tyres each for their go-karts and we are paying their entry fee so that they can be out there and competing because we have a very bright future for motorsport in South Australia.

The Peregrine group, through the Shahin family, is spending about \$100 million developing the Bend motorsport complex at Tailem Bend. That is going to be an absolute game-changer, not just for South Australia but for Australia. There is nothing like this in what it can offer up. We have three racetracks at the moment for go-karting. There will be four once Tailem Bend comes online. It will be a really great incentive for people of all ages to get out there and try their hand at motorsport.

We know that we only have about 7 per cent of Australia's population in South Australia, but we have 12 per cent of the people who compete in motor racing or who are involved in motor racing, which is a big statistic given that up until now we have only really had Mallala as somewhere that they can go to compete. I spoke to the president of Karting South Australia, Craig Denton, and he said that the number of girls coming through has improved. It's at about 10 per cent, and we would love to see that up at 50 per cent to reflect the wider community population.

One way we are doing that is by getting rid of the money that we used to spend on the grid girls and paying for Simona de Silvestro, a Swiss motor racing driver, to come down here. She has competed in Nascar and plenty of other racing formats around the world. She is internationally renowned. She is the first person to compete in the Supercar race here on the Clipsal 500 circuit. I am going to be out there cheering her on, like a lot of people this weekend. She is also going to be competing in the whole season of the Supercar series, which is terrific news as well.

In the other classes of racing, it is really good to see that we also have record numbers of women competing, because when girls and young women come along to the Clipsal 500 each year we want them to aspire to be racing car drivers or engineers, or to be working in the pits with these fantastic racing crews, not just to be out there to become models. We have the Adelaide Fashion Festival for that, if they want to be models. That is another great initiative of the South Australian government. We have done it with the Tour Down Under, we have done it with the Supercars, and we are very proud we are promoting women's sport.

The SPEAKER: The minister never relinquishes a second of his four minutes. The member for Reynell.

AFL NATIONAL WOMEN'S LEAGUE

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:55): My question is to the Minister for the Status of Women. How is the AFL women's competition advancing the status of South Australian women?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (14:55): I pass on my thanks to the member for this important question. For so long, women have been spectators, standing on the sidelines watching and cheering on the blokes. For so long, our passion and knowledge of

the game has been questioned. For so long, our inclusion was merely tolerated by some and aggressively opposed by others, but now it is our turn.

The launch of the AFL women's competition is important because it shows young girls across the nation that their highest sporting dreams are possible. How heartening to know that 'she can'. Eight clubs have chosen to take part in this inaugural women's competition: Adelaide, Carlton, Collingwood, Melbourne, Fremantle, Brisbane, the Greater Western Sydney Giants and the Western Bulldogs. South Australia is represented by the Adelaide Crows women's team. Let me be clear: it will be the only time I support the Crows. I am very much looking forward to Port Adelaide fielding a team in future games.

Seeing these talented footballers line up in their uniforms for the first time, singing their club song with pride and joy, was a moment that transcended sport and club rivalry. It was a glimmer of empowerment, a significant step forward for women in Australia and a solid reminder that excellence knows no gender. Our government supports the significant role of women in sport, and that is why our Premier established the Women in Sport Taskforce, led by the member for Reynell, to encourage the development of women's sport in our thriving state.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright is warned for the second and the final time.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: In our last budget, we committed \$10 million to upgrade or build female change rooms at sport clubs across our state because this government firmly believes that female athletes deserve access to the same level of facilities as our male athletes. I spent many a Kapunda netball match—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Let me thank the member for Reynell for her commitment to advancing the interests of women in sport in all facets of our community. She was amongst the thousands of South Australians at Thebarton Oval last month cheering on our women's team, and her work as the chair of the South Australian Women in Sports Taskforce is notable. A change is happening. From our Premier to the Treasurer, from the Minister for Recreation and Sport to the member for Reynell, every single member of this government stands with our female athletes.

The first step towards equality is visibility, as the women on this side of the house can be seen. The AFL women's competition shows young girls that they too can achieve the highest sporting dreams, that their gender is not a hindrance and that it is possible. As Minister for the Status of Women, I draw members' attention to Wednesday being International Women's Day. I ask that all members of parliament celebrate this special day when we reflect on our ambition to have 50 per cent representation of women in parliament.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:59): My question is to the Minister for Housing and Urban Development. Of the five parties who have registered an expression of interest in the Gillman land, how many of them have submitted plans for the purchase and/or development of the whole of the land? If so, how many?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:00): I thank the member for Unley for his question. We will not be revealing any details of the bids until we have gone through the appropriate selection and negotiation process with whoever the successful bidder might be. We certainly don't want to compromise any of those five parties who have made a submission to this process.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:00): A supplementary question: when did the minister or his agency, Renewal SA, publicly disclose that interested parties would be able to bid for part of the land?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:00): I will check this, but my recollection is that when

we announced what the details of the settlement of the legal action were, we made it clear that we would be going out to tender for all or part of the land.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TOURISM COMMISSION

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:01): My question is to the Minister for Tourism. Can the minister explain why the CE of SATC authorised reimbursement for an employee's expenditure for three pairs of underwear, and does he think this is an appropriate use of taxpayers' money?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (15:01): What have we got left? Three minutes? Jocks-gate!

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: I don't know. I think if he had been on a trip to India or somewhere, we might be able to look at some reasons why he needed the three pairs of jocks. I am not exactly sure what the reason was.

Mr Hughes: Tell them you'll get a brief on that one.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: The member for Giles suggests I get a brief—very good work. This was a trip to Darwin, where I think the food is pretty good, so it couldn't have been the food. That actually wasn't the CE of the Tourism Commission who authorised the spending of money on reimbursement for three pairs of jocks. It was under the old regime where we had a Motor Sport Board which was set up by the opposition when they ran the Clipsal 500 back in 1999.

My thought was, if I am going to cop responsibility for someone getting reimbursed for three pairs of jocks, I don't want to outsource that to someone who doesn't tell me what they are doing. So, what we did was we decided to get rid of this Liberal invention of a Motor Sport Board so that we had more control over what was going on. Of course, the people involved in the Motor Sport Board kept telling me that it would be a disaster, that the Clipsal 500 would be a disaster, without the Clipsal 500 board, the Motor Sport Board, but my thoughts were that if we could run the biggest bike race in the world outside of the Tour de France, then we could probably do a pretty good job of running the motorsport race here, the Clipsal 500. One of the big advantages of taking it away from the Motor Sport Board and getting rid of them was that now that it is under tourism—

Mr MARSHALL: Point of order, sir: I ask that you direct the minister to return to the substance of the question.

The SPEAKER: The minister will return to the content of the question.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: The question was wrong in the fact that it asked why the CE of the South Australian Tourism Commission approved it. As I have pointed out, the CE had nothing to do with it because it was done under a Liberal regime set up by the Liberal Party with the Motor Sport Board. We had no sight on this approval.

Mr Bell interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: I thought the member for Mount Gambier might have asked me about the extra \$1 million that we are putting into the Mount Gambier Airport, taking our commitment up to \$4 million, when the local member down there—the biggest Poindexter in Australian politics—Tony Pasin, hasn't put in a cent.

Mr Bell: What are you talking about? I'm in opposition.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: No, you are a good bloke. We like the member for Mount Gambier.

The SPEAKER: Point of order, member for Bragg.

Ms CHAPMAN: Mount Gambier is a long way from the underpants scandal.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Jocks-gate I think sounds better.

The SPEAKER: Can we come back to the underpants?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: I reckon we are done.

Grievance Debate

POWER OUTAGES

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:05): The good people of Morphett living in their single residences, in their apartments, in their flats, and also the many hundreds of small, medium and large businesses that exist in Morphett, deserve something better than intermittent power supplies in South Australia. It is absolutely no fun to watch your stock wither, the ice-cream melt or be stuck in a lift in one of the high-rise buildings at the Bay because there is no power.

This government has absolutely failed the people of South Australia for 15 years now, and what do we see? No solid answers at all from this government, only excuses and more and more blame. If you own one of the 160 restaurants and cafes that are within walking distance of my office, you are working very hard to make ends meet nowadays. If you go down Jetty Road with me—and people are welcome to come with me down Jetty Road—and talk to the shopkeepers and business owners, they will tell you that the money is still there but that you have to work three times as hard to get it.

When the power goes out, when there are interruptions and when there are business costs that you have not budgeted for, margins are tight and that can sometimes push you over the edge. It is just not fair. All the people of South Australia want is a fair go. They can understand that, when the wind blows in storm-force gales like we had and trees come down, there will inevitably be some interruptions. We all know and accept that but, when we have a system that is reliant on an intermittent source of power with a reduced base load, then we start to worry.

How are you going to invest in your business? How are you going to want to build a nice new home and have the comforts of home without having a reliable power source? Even this morning, I was talking to a business owner who is having to spend \$70,000 more every year on electricity to run their business. It is a huge impost on what they are doing. What does the Labor Party say? They say that it is because we privatised power. That is absolute rubbish.

The real facts of life are that, when you look over the border to the ACT and Victoria, they privatised their electricity markets a long time ago, and it is the generation mix, not privatisation, that has caused the current crisis. Victoria has some of the lowest average prices in Australia. The ACT prices are right down. When you look at the base future contract prices for South Australia compared with prices in Victoria and the ACT, ours are far above those in Victoria and the ACT where they have privatised their electricity assets. It is not the privatisation of power.

What does this government say about the Liberals? They say that we hate renewable energy. That is absolute rubbish. We have been very supportive of renewable energy for many, many years. What has caused the issues in South Australia is Labor's reliance on renewable energy. They have forced energy prices up and up, and businesses are having to pay for that now. We understand that a generation mix is necessary, but let's make sure we have that base load mix. Let's make sure we have reliable power in South Australia. It is not because of privatisation and it is not because the Liberals have this mythical hatred of renewables, which is an absolute untruth. The answer is out there, but this government just does not have it. The Labor government also say that the Liberals have no answer.

I can tell you the answer is there, the answer is coming and we have a very good plan for the short, medium and long-term future for South Australia's energy supplies. Accelerating large-scale storage of renewables, improving competition in the energy market, sufficient interconnector capacity into the rest of the National Electricity Market and enabling better demand management for consumers are just the start.

We need this government to wake up, stop the blame game and think about the people of Morphett and all the other constituents throughout this state—the businesses that are working so hard to try to make ends meet. Give them a fair go, think about them, not just yourselves, and do what is right for the people of South Australia. If you cannot do that, then get out.

SOUTHERN SUBURBS HEALTH CARE

Ms COOK (Fisher) (15:10): I rise today to talk about health care in the south. I started my career working in health care in the mid-1980s, amidst the biggest reforms in the career structure of nurses that SA had ever seen. Nurses were concerned, other healthcare workers were worried about their own positions within the health system and patients became nervous as they saw rolling work bans, strikes and rallies, but the nurses led the negotiations systematically, using evidence as their base. Clinicians supported the changes as the evidence was placed in front of them. The confidence of the patients increased, and the challenges facing our healthcare system, while highlighted in the past two years, are not new.

There have been a number of changes made within the system over the past three decades. There have been processes, such as Redesigning Care. No bells and whistles or noises have been made, just a concerted effort made by clinicians and administrators to improve the patient journey within hospitals. We saw changes made within the emergency department, which stopped patients from lining the corridors on barouches. We saw the emergence of transit, or discharge lounges, and we saw the arrival of more complex electronic systems, including patient dashboards and ambulance journey boards.

All of these and more made inroads into reducing the length of stay and improving patient outcomes. None of these reforms was as complete, integrated and complex as the current changes occurring, which take the acute-care pathways across the entire metropolitan area and address patient outcomes, length of stay and the use of our resources in a targeted, systematic and evidence-based way. This is a sustainable reform.

As a clinician, I am challenged by many of the changes. I know the way change worries healthcare workers and consumers, but I know that the only way we can provide the best healthcare services in the most expert way moving forward is this way. The false and twisted information being put out into the public sphere is a disgrace. The voice being given to people on the opposing side of the change outcome, in particular people not working the system or considered as leaders in health, is worrying.

As I said before, I am challenged by many of the changes, and I have been working with hundreds of healthcare colleagues and constituents to ensure their voices are heard in the process. With the support of the members for Reynell and Kaurua, the Noarlunga Hospital emergency department was given a voice. Amongst several changes to the plans proposed, we now see the emergency department remain under the main roof of the hospital, rather than its proposed move to the separate GP-Plus area. An upgrade, including a specialised paediatric section, was also secured.

As well as this, I worked with the community to present a voice to the minister regarding the downgrading of neonatal services at Flinders Medical Centre. This made no sense to me, to force vulnerable families further apart as they travel to the city for the only level 6 care in this state. The decision to downgrade this service was reversed. I also questioned the move of our PTSD unit to Glenside, but the evidence was in opposition to the position I put forward.

I also put forward a position regarding maintaining palliative care services at Daw House Hospice. Again, the evidence, as well as my own lived experience with my mum as she passed away, and the position of experts were not in line with position I put forward. I will speak more on the work I am doing in this space soon.

I am excited about the realignment of the acute and subacute services in the state, but those particularly in the south. I am also very proud of the work of many of my colleagues as they lead the movement of clinical services. With further confusing reporting and messaging coming to light this week, I want to place on the record some of the facts about the southern health services.

Between 19 April 2017 and 2 May 2017, it is proposed that Noarlunga's Whittaker ward will transfer its inpatient beds to 4GS at FMC (an existing upgraded 18-bed medical ward) and will be combined with existing general medical services, which can also flex up an additional eight beds if needed. There will be no impact on patient care during this reconfiguration. Whittaker currently only has three to four admissions a day, and it ran at 50 per cent capacity over January due to the reduced demand and successful strategies to reduce length of stay.

FMC is the safest and most appropriate place for patients with acute medical conditions who require admission because it has a much wider range of specialties and diagnostic services. If you doubt this, ask the doctors, the clinicians, who have been working in the south and driving this for decades. They are happy. The Medical Ambulatory Care Service (MACS) has been established in the GP-Plus clinic, and this allows for patients to stay in contact with medical specialists down south. It helps them to avoid an admission to hospital and being seen in the emergency department. It has been a huge success.

The clinicians are implementing clinical improvement initiatives to reduce length of stay, improve patient flow and create capacity. We have seen an eight-hour reduction in length of stay in the south. The state government is building nearly \$200 million in new infrastructure and Noarlunga Hospital will have inpatient beds. There will be two medical wards focused on world-class care for the elderly as well as overnight surgical beds available for those who need to stay. Facts are vital and, unlike those who wish to politicise the advancement of health care in this state, I will not stop laying the facts in front of our community.

WITTUNGA BOTANIC GARDEN

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:15): I rise today to discuss the importance of the Wittunga Botanic Garden, a beautiful 13-hectare garden tucked away in suburban Blackwood.

Ms Cook: I worked there.

Mr DULUK: The member for Fisher did work there, and I remember seeing her at the celebrations there last year. Wittunga Botanic Garden is important both for what it represents and for what it offers our community. It is described on the Botanic Gardens of South Australia website as a 'hidden oasis'. It is a shame, indeed, that it is hidden, failing to share the profile of South Australia's more prominent botanic gardens, being Adelaide and Mount Lofty. Most South Australians are simply unaware of what is on their doorstep, but its beauty is undeniable.

The eclectic mix of indigenous flora, a billabong and a large collection of waterwise plants from Australia and South Africa is a magnet for a variety of native birds and animal life. It is a haven for wildlife and a natural wonderland, a place I encourage everyone to visit, to explore the walking trails or just enjoy a simple picnic. It represents the very best of Australia's native wildlife and it represents the very best of our passionate and committed naturalists.

Wittunga was originally the private home of Edwin Ashby, an English-born estate agent and naturalist. Ashby worked tirelessly to raise public awareness for the beauty and importance of Australian flora. Over the years, Ashby collected an array of birds, butterflies and plants, with today's bird garden and butterfly garden a reflection of his enthusiasm. In 1965, Edwin's son, Keith, bequeathed Wittunga to the Botanic Gardens of South Australia and in 1975 it was opened to the public.

The Botanic Gardens of South Australia have done a wonderful job in maintaining and extending Wittunga to be the outstanding showpiece that it is today. I would like to pay tribute to the many volunteers involved in Wittunga, being the Friends of the Botanic Gardens of Adelaide, for their tireless efforts to preserve our precious gardens. Wittunga offers a wonderful opportunity to our community. It is a place where you can escape the noise and pace of modern life, spend time outdoors immersed in nature, listening to the birds singing and enjoying the natural beauty of Australia's unique flora and fauna.

Sadly, it seems too often we forget what a place like Wittunga has to offer and instead focus too heavily on what we cannot do. The signage at the front is an unfortunate example of this, with a long list of no-go areas: no dogs, no bikes, no prams, no barbecues and no alcohol, amongst other things you cannot do in this beautiful space. Whilst I am not proposing that any of these items should or should not be allowed at Wittunga, I do believe we need to be more positive and inviting so people are attracted to what they can do at Wittunga, not what they cannot do.

Even the closing time is a deterrent. Wittunga closes at 4pm weekdays, even during daylight saving, which means commuters who get off at Coromandel station cannot walk through the beautiful gardens on their way to their homes in and around Blackwood. Ideally, Wittunga would open longer so people could enjoy the gardens late of an evening. It would be wonderful to see the garden used

more often. That is why I am a strong supporter by efforts by Mitcham council to develop a nature play space within the Wittunga Botanic Garden.

A nature play space would be a welcome addition to what you can do at Wittunga and it would provide another important avenue of connecting people to plants and nature. If realised, the proposal would provide an active outdoor play space, which allows children to explore their environment while enjoying essential exercise. Children who play regularly in natural settings are less likely to fall ill, as mud, sand, water, leaves, sticks, pine cones and gumnuts can help stimulate children's immune systems, and children who spend more time outdoors tend to be more physically active.

Play spaces not only open up the possibilities of creative play for children but they also play an integral role in encouraging families to spend time together in the outdoors and facilitate creative and new interactions across families, which is an important part of building community. I welcome the support of Nature Play SA and the Botanic Gardens of South Australia to develop a nature play space at Wittunga.

The Botanic Gardens' recent commitment to donate 2,000 square metres of land to the project is significant and appreciated, and I appreciate the minister's in-principle support for the proposal. I hope this project can progress quickly and I strongly encourage the state government to extend its in principle support for the nature play space at Wittunga Botanic Garden in a financial way.

WHYALLA STEELWORKS

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:19): I rise today to talk about the steelworks in Whyalla and, hopefully, I will also touch upon some of the comments that have been made in this chamber about the power contracts between the Coober Pedy council and EDL. Before starting, I was interested in the comments the member for Morphett made about the privatisation of electricity in Victoria and in the ACT. He mentioned that in order to point out that both those jurisdictions have lower electricity prices and that, just like South Australia, they had their systems privatised.

What he failed to mention, especially in relation to the ACT, given the attack on renewables in this state, is that the ACT also have a renewable energy target, but it is a target that is far more ambitious than the one that operates here in South Australia. In fact, the ACT have brought forward their target. They are aiming at 100 per cent renewable energy by 2020, and they are well on the way to achieving that particular target. They have done it through a series of reverse auctions, which have benefited a number of states with their projects as a result of the policy pursued in the ACT.

The other funny thing about the comparison between the privatised jurisdictions is that it does not compare apples with apples or oranges with oranges. The nature of the generating assets and the distribution assets in the various privatised states actually differs. There is a really, really salient point about the differences between these two states and one territory: that is, both Victoria and the ACT have relatively large populations in a very small landmass. Electricity prices in South Australia could be cheaper if we were not at the end of the National Electricity Market. The other element is that our distribution network covers a vast area. It is the fact that it covers that vast area with a very small population that generates some of the vulnerabilities that our electricity system has in South Australia.

I am a regular visitor to the member for Flinders' part of the world. I used to go fishing there before I was elected to this place. Over the years, I have fished at Streaky Bay, Locks Well, Elliston and a whole range of places on West Coast. The member for Flinders knows that over the years you get a lightning storm and other weather events on Eyre Peninsula, and those communities are often cut off, and often cut off for an extended period of time.

In fact, one of the answers to the issue about the dependability of power on Eyre Peninsula would be a commitment to the Green Grid proposal that was put up when Mike Rann was in government. It would have meant a strengthening of the transmission assets on Eyre Peninsula and, if we did have another in contractor, the capacity to utilise that massive globally significant wind resource on Eyre Peninsula. The Green Grid study identified that there are 10,000 megawatts on Eyre Peninsula but that you could readily exploit 2,000 megawatts of that fantastic resource.

Another great strength of Eyre Peninsula is that it is cheek by jowl with places like Whyalla in the north of the state, which also has a globally significant renewable energy resource largely in the form of solar. We know that solar complements wind to a degree. If we just had that missing nexus storage—which is coming—this state will put itself in a fantastic position: it will be low cost electricity and very dependable electricity.

MATTHEW FLINDERS STATUE

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:24): I rise today to speak about an event that occurred in Port Lincoln last weekend, on Saturday 25 February, exactly 215 years to the day since Captain Matthew Flinders of the Royal Navy was in what became known as Proper Bay or Boston Harbour. On Tasman Terrace underneath the Flinders Arch, we unveiled a statue of Captain Matthew Flinders complete with his cat, Trim. Poised there on the footpath, it is a wonderful statue.

Gathered there were identities from all over the world. Media personality Jane Doyle emceed the morning. Governor Hieu Van Le was invited and unveiled the statue, ably assisted by our own mayor, Bruce Green. The City of Port Lincoln has had for some time a twin city relationship with the City of Lincoln in Lincolnshire where, of course, Matthew Flinders hailed from, along with his great supporters, Joseph Banks and Captain William Bligh. It is a fascinating story.

From Lincoln in Lincolnshire, Mayor Yvonne Bodger was present, as was her assistant, Ms Kate Fenn, who only a few years ago organised for me to visit the Guildhall in the City of Lincoln. It was nice to finally meet her. Also present was the commissioned sculptor, Mr Mark Richards, who came from the Welsh borders. I think he is based in Ludlow in Shropshire. He was present at the unveiling, and it was a very proud moment for him.

The Royal Australian Navy Hydrographer was present. Of course, he is the equivalent of Matthew Flinders in this day and age. In his speech, he highlighted the changes in technology that have ensued in the last 215 years. Flinders' charts remain an extraordinary feat, in that their accuracy was unsurpassed. In fact, his charts were so good that they were used right up until World War II. There was some difficulty even in those days establishing longitude. The newly invented chronometer was in use, but there were still many calculations in relation to time to be made to establish longitude.

I must make special mention of Mr Roger Lang of the Lang Foundation, who is a great supporter of many things in Port Lincoln and in fact put up the money for the statue. We are forever grateful to him. In fact, on the Friday night before the unveiling, in the city council chambers, Roger had given a presentation on the life of Matthew Flinders. For Roger, Flinders has become a passion.

If there is anything we did not know about Matthew Flinders before that evening, we certainly know it now. It was a wonderful presentation attended by 100 or more people. I was pleased to be a part of that as well. Of course, I represent the electorate of Flinders and I am proud to say that, of all the 47 electorates in South Australia, Flinders is the only one to retain its original name, which it has had since the 1850s.

Many of the place names around Port Lincoln and Lower Eyre Peninsula have been lifted straight from the map of Lincolnshire, and Flinders did that quite deliberately. For Mayor Yvonne Bodger and Kate Fenn, names like Donnington, Stamford, Louth, Boston and others are only too familiar. After the unveiling of the statue, we moved north along the foreshore to the Axel Stenross museum where the members have been hard at work for some time refurbishing and reconditioning the ketch *Hecla*.

The *Hecla* was built in 1905. I understand that *Hecla* is the English version of a volcano in Iceland. The *Hecla* is the last ketch that was in service plying the coastal trade in South Australia. Some 2,500 hours of volunteer labour have gone into refurbishing the *Hecla* and about \$54,000 of museum money, which is a huge outlay for a small museum, but they are an enthusiastic bunch.

I congratulate them on their work. Governor Hieu Van Le, once again, was present for the unveiling. He unveiled the ketch along with members of the museum committee and the workforce, and it was a sight to behold. I would urge anyone visiting Port Lincoln to drop into Axel Stenross and have a look at the *Hecla* which is now fully refurbished, complete with decking, sails and rigging.

CLEAN UP AUSTRALIA DAY

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:30): Over the last 26 years, Clean Up Australia Day volunteers have donated more than 31 million hours removing more than 331,000 tonnes of rubbish from their streets, beaches, parks, bushland and local waterways. On Sunday morning, members of the Torrens community will be joining me for this great annual Clean Up Australia volunteer event. Residents, including members of the Windsor Gardens Neighbourhood Watch and Windsor Gardens Residents' Association, will volunteer their time to clean up along the walking path and banks of the Torrens in Windsor Gardens.

On the official website of Clean Up Australia, it says that the 331,000 tonnes of rubbish that has been cleaned up over the past 26 years is equivalent to end-to-end-fully laden utes from Sydney to Brisbane via the coastline. It is really amazing to think that this homegrown initiative, the brainchild back in 1989 of sailor and lover of the world's marine ecologies, Ian Kiernan AO, has grown into Australia's largest community-based environmental event.

Many of us can remember how different our suburban and regional areas were before we became aware of the damage that pollution can do. There was a time when our beaches, parks and bushland were littered with glass and plastic bottles, food packaging and cigarette butts. Our waterways were depositories for unwanted items large and small, and our roads were lined with debris tossed without even a moment's consideration from passing cars. Many people then thought little of it and, while today many more are environmentally aware, we still have a long way to go.

Released in March 2016, the annual Rubbish Report showed that the chief contributor to the tonnes of garbage removed on Clean Up Australia Day was plastics, which has in fact averaged 30 per cent of the total collection over the past 10 years. In South Australia, we are enthusiastic recyclers and of course we have a container deposit scheme that is the envy of other states, but plastics are still a problem, as the numbers show.

Those discarded bottles and food packaging are produced from non-renewable resources using coal, natural gas and oil. They take tens and even hundreds of years to decompose and are a major component of our landfill. Of course, we know that they can cause serious problems where they cannot be seen. They are light and they float easily. It is estimated that every year more than 46,000 pieces of plastic per square mile of ocean enter our seas, and we know they are deadly to marine life.

It was Kiernan's participation in the 1987 BOC Challenge solo around the world yacht race that inspired Clean Up Australia Day. Sailing through the oceans of the world in his yacht, *Spirit of Sydney*, he was shocked and disgusted by the pollution and rubbish that he encountered in areas such as the Sargasso Sea and the Caribbean. On returning to Sydney, he initiated Clean Up Sydney Harbour in 1989, receiving an enormous public response, with more than 40,000 Sydneysiders donating their time and energy to clean up the harbour. The following year, 1990, the first Clean Up Australia Day saw almost 300,000 volunteers turn out, and that involvement has steadily increased ever since.

The next step was to take the concept of Clean Up Australia Day to the rest of the world. With the support of the United Nations Environment Program, Clean Up The World was launched in 1993. In its inaugural year, Clean Up The World involved approximately 30 million people in 80 countries, and that has grown to an estimated 40 million people from 130 countries annually taking part.

Clean Up The World has demonstrated that this simple Australian idea has universal appeal, and the health of the environment is a concern to people and communities worldwide. One Indian-born Australian resident of Torrens told me that our message about caring for the environment in which we live as part of Clean Up Australia and Clean Up The World has been adopted in India, where the Prime Minister invited staff, ministers and staff members to clean up their suburbs—an interesting idea.

Clean Up Australia Day is a demonstration of community pride, of the power of volunteering and of the interest and care we take, individually and together, in making our unique living environment cleaner, healthier and more sustainable. That relatively small local initiative, launched

by Kiernan 29 years ago, has grown into the huge national event Clean Up Australia Day, in which tens of thousands will participate in Australia on Sunday. I thank in advance the residents of Torrens and others who join me on Sunday morning in Windsor Gardens. Their contribution to help protect and care for our environment is greatly appreciated.

Parliamentary Procedure

STANDING AND SESSIONAL ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (15:35): I move:

That standing and sessional orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable Private Members Business, Other Motions, Notices of Motion No. 1 set down on the *Notice Paper* for today to take precedence over Government Business.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There not being an absolute majority present, ring the bells.

An absolute majority of the whole number of members being present:

Motion carried.

Motions

ELECTRICITY MARKET

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Marshall (resumed on motion).

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:37): I rise to speak on this motion:

That this house expresses its concern at the state of the South Australian electricity market and in particular, notes—

- (a) the state government's energy policy over the last 15 years has delivered South Australian consumers the worst outcomes in the nation;
- (b) the first ever statewide electricity blackout in Australia occurred in South Australia on 28 September 2016;
- (c) electricity supply reliability in South Australia is the lowest in the nation;
- (d) electricity prices in South Australia are the highest in the nation;
- (e) the impact that high household electricity prices add to cost of living pressures;
- (f) the impact that high business electricity prices add to unemployment pressures;
- (g) unemployment in South Australia is the highest in the nation;
- (h) both the Victorian and South Australian electricity markets were privatised at similar times, yet Victorians pay the lowest electricity prices in the nation; and
- (i) the closure of the coal-fired electricity generator at Port Augusta has led to the increased importation of coal-fired electricity from Victoria.

I fully support this motion. We know that, after 15 years, this government has South Australia in an electricity crisis. They cannot keep the lights on in South Australia. Wherever you go across South Australia or around the nation, that is what people say immediately when you tell them you are from this state. They want to know why the Labor government in South Australia cannot keep the lights on. Business, in particular, is really feeling the pinch.

As we said, 15 years and the Labor government's policy in South Australia to bank on intermittent renewable energy has pushed out the reliable and affordable base load power in South Australia, and now businesses struggle to have the base load power they need to run their businesses. We know about the blackout—we mentioned the statewide blackout in September last year—and consistent blackouts across the board in South Australia, because this government in its energy policy has put an unrealistic reliance on renewable energy.

There is an excessive amount of wind and solar-powered energy in South Australia and the mix is wrong. The state Labor government has got the mix wrong, the point being when the wind does not blow and the sun does not shine, there is a power crisis in South Australia. That is what causes the problem. Where do we go when the wind does not blow and the sun does not shine? We

go to the interconnector with Victoria and we get their coal-powered electricity. That is how we top up our system in South Australia. Of course, if capacity is pushed over the limit when we are using the interconnector in Victoria, then we have the rolling blackouts and the load shedding, as this government has come to deliver to all South Australians across the board.

We know businesses are struggling, and I get out and speak to businesses regularly. It is the number one agenda item whenever I visit them. Be it a small business, be it a large business, power is the key issue. They just want to know when the lights are going to be kept on, when they can get reliable energy. Big businesses looking to invest in South Australia, and small businesses for that matter looking to invest in South Australia, just cannot get that reliability. It puts uncertainty into the market.

Businesses say, 'Why am I going to set up in South Australia?' They say, 'Why am I going to stay in South Australia?' One business I spoke to last year said comparatively to their operations in WA, which are a little bit larger than they are here in South Australia, they pay exorbitant amounts more for power in South Australia. So, they are looking at what they are going to do, whether they rationalise, whether they stay in South Australia or whether they move to WA where they have other interests. The push is on for them to go to WA. We are seeing jobs leave South Australia because of it and that is disappointing.

We heard about Coca-Cola just last week. Again, they do their rationalisation. They are willing to invest \$90 million in Queensland and shut down operations here. They are alarm bells, and the alarm bells are ringing nice and loud. Since the government allowed Alinta to close down—again, losing good reliable base load power and plenty of jobs from up north—the moment that happened, bear in mind that Alinta said to the government, 'We know that you are wanting to transform and we know we need to transform to efficient energy systems that are good for the environment. We know that. Everyone knows that, but it has to be a transformation that happens and does not shut down business, industry and jobs in South Australia.'

Alinta said to the government, 'Let's negotiate a deal and let's do this transition so that it is smooth and does not hit and have a big impost on businesses and workers in South Australia.' But the Treasurer, the blackout minister as he is also known, said, 'No, don't worry about that. You go your own way.' The moment Alinta said that they were leaving, power prices in South Australia went up.

A local business in my area, just so you have the numbers, was paying 6.926¢ per megawatt hour at peak and off peak, 3.617. The moment that changed, the prices went up to almost triple what the prices are now. From 1 January 2017, their peak power is 16.615¢ per megawatt hour, and their off peak is 8.273. So, off peak is now more than peak, all because this government closed down the Alinta power station willy-nilly, let it go, let it depart, and just said, 'No, we are going to rely on the system,' and that is the system they put in place—the system that has wind power and solar power and has not got that base load generation. That is the sort of cost that is hitting business, and as a result that rolls on to families as well.

We know from the September blackout, figures have come through from Business SA which has calculated the cost to South Australia at \$367 million. Those on the other side will say it was a weather event, it was a storm, it was everything else—and it was. There was a storm, there is no denying that. Queensland has storms all the time but the whole state does not black out. That is the imperative here: the whole of South Australia, right to the border, north, south, east and west, blacked out in its entirety, and that is what we have been given from this state Labor government.

The whole state can be blacked out because there is a storm. Then there was the time it took to recharge. We all know, and it has been reported quite widely, that it took so long to get things going because we did not have the base load power in the system to fire the system back up again after the weather event. It is really a great shame that, when you travel the state and travel the nation and you speak to people, they say, 'Why can't the powers that be—the state Labor government—keep the lights on in South Australia?' It falls very heavily and squarely with the Premier and the energy minister, who is also the Treasurer, or, as they are often known, the blackout Treasurer and the blackout Premier, and it is a real disappointment.

The figures showing the rise in power prices are astronomical for business. It is really hard for businesses to survive when they are paying those sorts of prices, and that results in jobs coming out of South Australia. We know South Australia, again on trend, has the highest unemployment rate in the nation and has done for 23 of the last 24 months. We are sitting at the bottom of the table. We are cellar dwellers in that area, and that is often raised with me when I am out talking to people.

Youth unemployment is another incredibly high figure for South Australia, and the latest for youth unemployment in South Australia is 16.9 per cent, which is just astronomical. For underemployment, we are also the highest on the mainland, at 9.8 per cent, and underutilisation is 16.7 per cent, which is again the highest on the mainland, which is a real disappointment and an alarming problem.

I spoke about Alinta. When you go back even further, this state government was warned in 2005 by ESCOSA that, if it went beyond 20 per cent of renewable energy, the grid would suffer. The state government was warned again in 2010 by ESCOSA about the same situation, that if they went above 20 per cent of renewable energy, the grid would suffer. It is about getting the balance right. Of course we want more renewable energy, we want to move in that direction, but it is about the rate at which we move, and this government has gone too fast, got the balance wrong and South Australian businesses and families are suffering as a result.

This state government has a renewable energy target of 50 per cent. Federally, it is 23 per cent, but the state government is pushing ahead with a bigger renewable energy target—a target we do not think is right and good for South Australians, South Australian businesses and, as a result, South Australian jobs. They were warned in 2005 and warned again in 2010, but the state government decided that they would just keep going on regardless. They would do this to the detriment of South Australians and, as a result, South Australians would suffer, from small households, as we said, to large employers.

This government just pushed ahead anyway with its renewable energy target of 50 per cent. Despite the warnings, that is what they did, and as a result, after being warned in 2005 and 2010, here we are in 2016 and 2017 seeing constant blackouts, and South Australians are feeling it as a result. That is the real underlying current of this issue. The Treasurer wants to spin it any which way in this place and, boy oh boy, does he try. I think, if you could harness some of the wind that comes out of his mouth when he is spinning this away, there would probably be some energy that could help with the problem.

The fact of the matter is this is the situation we are in, and we are in this situation because of the policy, after 15 years of a state Labor government that has got the mix wrong, and as a result South Australians are suffering. I have talked in this place before about the premiership table and where South Australia sits. Again, because of this state Labor government, we sit at the bottom.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (15:48): Deputy Speaker, you may well remember cracker night because I think you are around a very similar age to me.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I was born on Guy Fawkes Day, so I know exactly what cracker night is.

The Hon. P. CAICA: There you go—you know Guy Fawkes Day and you know cracker night. If you were anything like me, you would have bought what they used to call threepenny bombs. I am sure what the opposition leader was hoping today when he came in to introduce this particular debate was that he would go off like a threepenny bomb. The reality of the situation is you know those other little ones that are either called squibs or duds—those ones that do not go off—and that is more like the performance that we saw today.

I can say this to you, Deputy Speaker, and I know you might rule me out of order. I have been here for 15 years, and it will be 16 years by the time of the next election. I would say that, without doubt, this is the weakest opposition I have seen in my time here—there is no doubt about it.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the interjections could stop, you might hear me asking the member for Colton to come back to the nub of the debate.

The Hon. P. CAICA: One thing is for certain: you may well say that—

Mr Marshall: We'll let him go; he's having fun.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are enjoying it.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I was slotted? But the reality is that the opposition never laid a glove on me in that time and you have yet to lay a glove on any one of the—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Well, seven years is long enough, and I hope one day you become one. I find that very doubtful because I do know about the lack of talent there should they ever get into government. Anyway, I think it is one of the most pathetic oppositions that I have seen in my time here.

I often hold street corner meetings, like we all do. I held one last week—the week before last, four; and the week before that, two—in the lovely suburb of Lockleys, in the electorate of Colton. One of the issues raised there was the reliability of power, the cost of power and, just as importantly the shedding. We had a good conversation with the people who were there. Fortunately, we had a person—Paul Roberts is his name—

An honourable member: Paul?

The Hon. P. CAICA: Not the Paul Roberts who is with Power Networks, another Paul Roberts (Polly). He was very useful because he was able to explain, from his perspective of working on Torrens Island, where he had worked for 30 years, some of the difficulties associated with the system we have in place. What we need to understand, and the point was made very well by both the Minister for Energy and the Premier, is that we have a system that is not working at the national level. It is broken and it needs to be fixed.

I also explained to them that the shedding that we had that night never had to happen. It never had to happen. Indeed, not only did it not have to happen, but some person decided they were going to shed more than they originally thought they needed to do. So, it is an issue out there. What I would also like to say is that what is not striking a chord with the people who are in my electorate in particular—and I presume that the people of my electorate are no different from people in other electorates—is that it is not, in their view, and they do not believe that it is, renewable energy that is causing the problem. In fact, they support renewable energy.

They want to see a day when all our electricity is guided by a system that has within it certain componentry that provides different forms of renewable energy. Storage is one of them.

An honourable member: Transition, Paul.

The Hon. P. CAICA: You talk about transition. I think your trouble, if you ever do get into government, is you making the transition to government from opposition. That is the transition you should be mostly worried about.

An honourable member: We look forward to the challenge, Paul.

The Hon. P. CAICA: It will be a challenge for you, that's for sure.

An honourable member: We look forward to it.

The Hon. P. CAICA: It will be a challenge, yes, and whether you are up to it or not, time will tell.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Yes, that's right. That's where you deserve to be. If we look at the Prime Minister, for example, I do not want to be too horrible, but he is a hollow man. That is what he is: he has become a hollow man. He is a captive of people within his party and he is succumbing to their views, even though he does not believe in them, purely for reasons of survival.

Even my wife said, 'I could vote for this bloke.' I said, 'No, you couldn't, darling. He's not in the right party.' But she and others were attracted to him because they saw him as a breath of fresh

air, someone who was holding up high policies on renewable energy, policies on a whole host of issues that were indeed sound, sound enough for my wife and others to say, 'I could vote for this bloke.' But he has let the people of Australia down. He is a hollow man, and it appears that he is not going to take us anywhere. Indeed, the Leader of the Opposition is falling right behind a Prime Minister who is a hollow man and is certainly not the person people thought he was. Either he did not believe in those things in the first place, or he has just changed his view for base political reasons.

I was not in parliament at the time of the privatisation and the sale, but I know that the member for Wright was at the time when we were in opposition and I know that you were, too, Deputy Speaker.

Mr Gardner: So was the member for Waite.

The Hon. P. CAICA: In fact, the member for Waite was the person we feared most of all when he was leading the opposition. He was actually in charge of what was the best opposition we have had over the last 15 years. You interjected, 'If you lead with your chin and you are going to get it back at you.' The member for Wright was here and the Deputy Speaker was here—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Yes, and you would recall the press releases that were issued by the Leader of the Opposition, Mike Rann, at that stage. Those press releases serve as a reminder of what was going to happen.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: When members would like me to enforce the standing orders, do let me know, but if you continue to interject and respond to interjections it is going to be a very long afternoon.

The Hon. P. CAICA: The outcome of privatisation was well detailed in those press releases. Lo and behold, that is where we find ourselves today—exactly where, when we were in opposition, we said we would be through the privatisation of ETSA in South Australia. I know that my friend the member for Giles, a very good-looking man—

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: You have a similar hairstyle.

The Hon. P. CAICA: That's right. He forgot to seek leave to continue his remarks, so I am going to touch on a couple of issues that he wished to raise. In contrast to the opposition, these are the alternatives that need to be considered. This is what we can do, from South Australia's perspective, to be of assistance in fixing the mess that is the National Electricity Market.

The first thing in and around the Whyalla area is the possible hydro proposals that are being looked at, which would use sea water. Of course, that is just one component of renewable energy that could assist in making sure that our electricity is more reliable than it previously was. I understand that ARENA is going to fund that study. It is in its early days, but it is a serious study and it is something that I, along with the member for Giles, warmly welcome.

He also wanted to acknowledge the work done by former BHP senior engineer John Scott, who has lobbied many people about the potential for marine-based pumped hydro in the range of hills that run parallel to the coast between Whyalla and Port Augusta. The point I am trying to make is that we on this side will continue to support alternatives with respect to reliable energy so we do get that mix of renewable, reliable energy because of the breadth of the initiatives that will exist, that is, those energy technologies that will exist.

We have talked about power prices. I was what was called a legacy customer with AGL and I think to a great extent AGL took advantage of me. I was too lazy to shop around. I came home one day and my wife, Annabel, said, 'You better talk to this bloke.' He was a young fellow and he was working for a company.

Mr Whetstone: Power prices too high?

The Hon. P. CAICA: No. I think I am getting a very, very good deal. I hear people talk about the cost of electricity, and in reality I am getting the cheapest bills I have had for over seven or eight

years because I have shopped around. AGL took advantage of me and I was paying way too much. The only time I ever heard from them was when they were required to come back and talk to you when you change over. So, I told the bloke, 'No, nick off. You're only ringing me up now because you want me to stay and I am not going to.'

So, if you do shop around—and I know it might seem like a pretty pithy point, but it is not—you can get a much better price than is offered by some other providers. I am going to finish off there. All I want to say is that I wish that the opposition would show some leadership and come up with some alternative ideas, instead of being the carping, bagging mob that they are.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:58): I rise to support the motion put by the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Dunstan. I think it is one of the most important private members' motions that has been put to this parliament all year. Even though the year is only but a pup, we are dealing with one of the biggest issues in South Australia. The issue is affordable, reliable power in South Australia and how we address it.

For far too long we have heard the blame game from a lazy government. I listened to the member for Colton talk about a lazy opposition. Well, goodness me, the government has been in power for 15 years and what are we seeing now? We are seeing arrogance, a blame game and the responsibility shifted onto someone else. A famous musician Joe Strummer once said:

When you blame yourself, you learn from it. If you blame someone else, you don't learn nothing, cause hey, it's not your fault, it's his fault, over there.

This pretty much started two years ago, when large power consumers came to me and every MP in this place to protest against the cost of power and the cost of doing business in this state. Sadly, the shift has gone only to power. It has come down to not only the cost of power but also the issue of reliability. We have now become South Australia, the Genset capital of the globe. We are now seeing adverts in the media—on radio, on TV and in the papers—about backup generators for businesses and homes. If you cannot afford to buy a generator, maybe you should go out and buy bulk candles because that is one way of keeping the lights on in South Australia.

I do not want to talk about the blame game, and I do not want to talk about the state government using every excuse under the sun and that it is everyone else's fault and not theirs. However, I want to talk about something that is dear to my heart, and that is the far-reaching impact of both power reliability and cost in South Australia. It goes to the heart of what it is all about.

South Australia's manufacturing and agriculture sectors, all our industry and economy, were based on affordable and reliable power. It was built around affordable and reliable power to invest, to draw investment into South Australia. While we are trying to bring investment into South Australia, and while we are trying to grow confidence in already existing businesses, all of a sudden the primary South Australian business advocate, Business SA, has done a blackout survey about the cost and impact on South Australian businesses. The \$367 million is a blight on investment and confidence in South Australia.

It is all about how we can grow our businesses, how we can grow our economy and how we can look at exports. The telltale is in today's ABS statistics, which show merchandise has now free-fallen to \$10.5 billion from \$11.5 billion in 2015-16. The minister's target was \$18 billion by 2017. Well, the last time I looked it was 2017. That revised figure of \$18 billion was another revised figure. It is beyond belief that a lazy, consumed and arrogant government continues to revise their figures. They are not revising their figures up; they are revising all their figures down. The Australian Industry Group chief, Innes Willox, said:

...SA's current energy crisis has many causes, but the closure at Port Augusta has helped set the scene.

'The loss of that generation capacity raises the likelihood that shortfalls in the interconnector or renewable generation send prices soaring,'...

That is called the futures, which is about how we set that price and about the scare mechanism in our market. When Port Augusta closed, it sent out a wideranging forecast of fear within the energy supply in South Australia. Willox continues:

'But most of all, the closure happened so fast that the market had little time to prepare or adjust. It's a clear marker of the danger of disorderly transitions.'

I think that is what we need to focus on. It is not that the South Australian opposition backs coal. We back renewable, clean energy, but we also back a transition into those renewables. We back a progressive transition, not just this step change. We all know that no-one likes step change—no-one. Whether it is the price of food or day-to-day living, no-one likes to be hit over the head with change, and that is what happened in the power market in South Australia.

Yes, ETSA was sold in the late nineties. We continually hear the government carping on about the sale of ETSA. That was 20 years ago. You guys have been in power for 15 years and nothing has changed. What has changed, other than the blame game? Nothing, not a thing. We continually hear about the blame game. No-one is putting solutions on the table and no-one in the government is putting forward policy settings to the people of South Australia—no-one.

We continually hear, 'Where are your policy settings?' Well, hang on a minute. We are in opposition: you are the government. What are you doing to lead the state to greater prosperity. What are you doing to lead South Australia to be the great state it was before 2002? What are you doing about getting South Australia's exports back up to the 7.4 per cent national footprint that we had? Today we hit a 6-year low—4.08 per cent of the nation's exports. That is an absolute disgrace.

We hear the member for Colton talking about the shining star, the new trade minister, saying that he is the guy they most feared. On his watch, we are seeing exports fall to a low. This is an absolute disgrace. As a proud South Australian, as an exporter for 25 years, I watched our exports grow. I came into this place to make a difference and I am watching exports disappear. They are going south: they are not going north. No-one over there has any solutions.

You have your star minister. They are taking myriads of businesses over to all our export destinations. Well, what is happening? Where are our export figures? Here he is. Come in. Join the conversation, minister. Come and show your credentials. Tell us about the latest ABS statistics. Tell us about business confidence in South Australia. Tell us about the energy crisis in South Australia. I am sure you have a solution for it. Just get into the conversation and be a part of it.

To date, what we have seen from you is a criticism of a party you once led. The best thing that ever happened to this party was that you walked away. That was the best thing that happened to this party. We do not have party room leaks. We do not have disgruntled members of our team.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Point of order: I ask the member to address his remarks to the Chair, perhaps.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, and perhaps to the motion before us would be useful.

Mr WHETSTONE: Thank you for your protection, Deputy Speaker—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is a really broad interpretation of what just happened.

Mr WHETSTONE: —but one thing that is really getting under every South Australian's skin is the blame game. It is about the solutions that we are not seeing.

The Hon. M.L.J. Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

Mr WHETSTONE: The blame game.

The Hon. M.L.J. Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

Mr WHETSTONE: No, I am putting facts on the table. What we are trying to do is talk about driving the South Australian economy, building business confidence, putting that confidence in place so that we can grow our economy. The ABS numbers do not lie. Today, we have seen another example of where our trade figures are going. Our merchandise numbers are heading south and all we hear is, 'Let's talk positive because that's going to fix it.' Let me tell you, business confidence in South Australia is at a low.

If you want to talk about business confidence, let's talk about the businesses that are actually driving our economy, such as the Central Irrigation Trust. Their power costs have gone from

\$1.3 million to over \$5 million in seven years. Let's talk about the barriers to making South Australia competitive. The almond industry is one of the shining lights in South Australia's economy, yet Almondco, a great Riverland business, has just invested \$25 million in New South Wales. Why? Because the power to run a hulling plant is too expensive in South Australia.

Why are all our wineries complaining about the cost of power? Why is Kingston Estate Wines investing over \$1 million in diesel-powered generators? They are investing money in generators instead of investing money in growing their business and making their business a better South Australian exporter. The power issue in South Australia needs to be addressed but with good policy settings.

Time expired.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (16:08): I am delighted to respond and I hope the member remains in the chamber. I am a little disappointed with the contribution of the member for Chaffey. I predict that the member for Chaffey will struggle against the Xenophon candidate to hold his seat at the next election for a host of reasons. He demonstrates, in what is supposed to be an energy debate, a lack of understanding of both the energy market and the very basics of trade and investment in this state. Because the two are connected and because the member has used a bit of licence and gone into trade rather than energy in his debate, I will ask for the same licence.

The reason that South Australia's share of exports is not as great today as it was 10 years ago, I say to the member for Chaffey, is that there was a little thing called the mining boom. To give you an example, in Western Australia exports rose from 2002, from around \$20 billion a year to nearly \$100 billion a year on the back of the mining boom. During the same period, ours have risen from around a little over \$9 billion a year to around \$15½ billion a year, so they have gone up by 500 per cent and we have gone up by about 50 per cent. This is grade 7 arithmetic.

When Western Australia, Queensland and New South Wales go up like that and we only go up like that, and our share of the national cake appears to have declined and we do not have oil, gas, coal and quantities of iron on the massive scale seen in other states, of course there is a difference. He quotes statistics without understanding them. You have to analyse what the statistics are telling you. No matter how hard you try, you will never have mountains of coal in South Australia. You will never have the multibillion-dollar investment opportunities of WA, Gorgon and what is going on in the Northern Territory. These are monumental scale infrastructure enterprises based around resources. We just do not have that.

It is ignorant to try to compare the two and look at the statistics and try to make the case the member tries to make that somehow the government is not working hard enough to help lift our exports because we have not enjoyed the mining boom. It just demonstrates how unprepared the members opposite are for government. You have to look at the things you can influence as a government, and we cannot influence commodities on a massive scale. We can influence wine, food, education and services. There are SME sectors and we can help them, and we have been helping them. They are overwhelmingly happy with what we are doing. They keep complimenting what we are doing.

I just point out to the member that what we have implemented is the very policy I took to the last election when I was on the other side of the bench. I have done exactly what you would have done, and I have done that because if things had worked out better, and those opposite were able to run a competent campaign and did not have a leader who got up and told everyone to vote Labor and had come out with the resources policy that I had written and given to them months before but did not run because they were afraid of what the Greens might say about it, and if they had just demonstrated a little bit of discipline, a little bit of organisation and a little bit of competent campaign management, I might very well be over there doing exactly what we have done now.

But do you know what? I lasted 14 years—14 years I will never get back—with an incompetent group of people. I even tried to fix it. This is the party that was divided in the seventies and that stabbed Dean Brown in the back before I was even there. If you want to talk about leaking in the Liberal Party, go back and look at what they did to Dean Brown. I was not even there then. I

came in and had to witness the counterattack when the moderates decided to destroy the premiership of John Olsen, and it was unbelievable to watch. I sat there silently in gobsnacked awe.

I had come in from a disciplined career of 24 years in the Army. I remember my first party room meeting—it was like Syria. I thought I had made a serious mistake going into state politics. I could not believe the behaviour of the people in the room, that is how bad it was, and it was that bad for the whole 15 years I was there.

Mr Whetstone: I saw you in action.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Did you?

Mr Whetstone: Yes, I did.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Did you? When I was the opposition leader, we actually got our primary vote up from 29, the lowest it had ever been since World War II, to fifty-fifty. If you want to look at someone in action, when I was the leader we decided to move football into the city. We actually came up with policy ideas. We engaged in the battle of ideas, member for Chaffey. What are you doing now? You are going out and telling everyone to vote for the other side. What you do now is wok-in-a-box economics. What you do now is come in here and try to spin arguments about what is wrong with trade investment—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: —without even understanding the facts.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey, you are on two warnings. No, you are not: you can have another one.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: But let me get to the nub of the issue with energy. Let me get back onto the subject we are here to debate because I could repartee with the member for Chaffey, but it is a little bit like the boat trip on *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest*—you will not get much sense out of it.

What we are here to discuss is energy. Again, let me point out to members opposite that they need to understand the market here. The world has changed. We are not living in the Dark Ages anymore, whether the opposition like it or not. The world is moving on to a cleaner world where renewables, not brown and black coal, will dominate energy generation. It is an inevitable process. It is global. The vast majority of Australians are signed up to it. They understand the need for it. They do not want to kill the planet with what remains of our carbon fossil fuel sources and walk away from renewables—they just do not.

The momentum is unassailable. What the energy market needs to do is respond to that change. Yes, there will be a place for coal in the world for a long period to come, particularly in large countries like China and India, and also probably in Australia, but its days are numbered. That is why people will not invest in coal. They see no future in it. They know that a future government is more than likely to sway to the momentum, the inevitable momentum, of global movements towards renewables. We need a market that has a set of rules which recognises renewables are now part of the mix and which is able to adjust.

We have a 21st century energy generation mixed with a 20th century management system. We need to fix the rules. We need to build the transmission lines that were sold. I just want to say that I was with members opposite when we decided to sell ETSA, and I supported that decision. I think at that time it was the right thing to do, but we were told two things: firstly, that a regulatory regime would be put in place to ensure that the market competition and the rules provided for no unreasonable increase in prices for punters and, secondly, that a transmission line, called Riverlink, would be built into New South Wales to ensure interconnectivity. They were the guarantees we were given.

Of course, neither of those two things has happened: we do not have a satisfactory regulatory regime, and we do not have the promised transmission line. I am saddened by that because I think

that what was fundamentally the right decision was messed up by the failure to deliver those two things: a proper regulatory regime and a transmission line to New South Wales. We were told at the time that would happen; it was later changed, and I am very disappointed about that. We need to fix the system. There needs to be new generation and there needs to be a new set of rules. We need new generation and more competition in the Australian market.

The answer is not to rip down wind turbines, tear up solar and start building brown coal burning power stations all around the country—that is not the answer. Technology is transforming the sector. Consumers are driving change. We need to change the market to reflect that. We need more interconnection. Technical standards and markets need to be improved. Gas is the transitional fuel, yet we are exporting our gas in liquefied form instead of keeping gas for our own use one way or the other. We should have cheap gas—we do not.

We are a major gas exporter. We have the market wrong. There needs to be greater competition and firmer market power, innovation and better governance, and until we get those things we will not have an answer. Sadly, those opposite, instead of wanting to contribute solid solutions, simply want to criticise. The solutions I have heard in the debate today have been poor. What would you do? What I have heard will not work. Let's have a battle of ideas instead of a battle of insults and we might get somewhere.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (16:18): I rise today to speak on this motion and also to defend our government's proud record on energy generally, on renewable energy and on ensuring the sustainable future of energy networks within the constraints of a privatised power system, constraints continuously and relentlessly defended by those opposite. For 17 years, I had the great privilege of representing workers in the energy industry, highly skilled, technical workers with the knowledge and expertise to run South Australia's energy network. These workers worked originally at ETSA and then in power stations, at SA Power Networks, at ElectraNet, at AGL and at many other organisations engaged in many different professions.

I remember when our South Australian electricity trust was privatised by those opposite, and I absolutely know the difficulties that these workers, who were subsequently engaged by different companies from around the world, have faced. These workers have continued to provide extraordinarily high-quality service to South Australians but were forced by those opposite into doing so in an environment which increasingly had sections of its workforce contracted out, where bargaining across the industry for decent wages and conditions became fragmented and more difficult, and where they were forced into being at the front line of dealing with the South Australian community's anger at the privatisation of one of our state's best assets.

In every one of our debates in this place, these facts are something that those opposite have continued to ignore, have continued to pretend did not happen. These workers know, and South Australians know, what the selling off of ETSA meant to our energy prices and what it continues to mean. I encourage those opposite to talk with these workers. They are absolute experts on the energy market and I think that they could provide some excellent information to them.

Our government is committed to ensuring South Australia's clean green energy future, and we have announced a series of comprehensive policies that will take us towards that future. I am proud, as I know all on this side of the chamber are, that in 2014 our government set a renewable energy target of 50 per cent by 2025. We have already been considered leaders in the nation and the world for this commitment, with a network consisting of more than 40 per cent renewables.

Renewable energy is the only future for energy in this country and, indeed, the world. Those who do not believe this are climate change deniers and do not understand that there is a much greater threat, that of climate change, that we must be concerned about. Renewables are safe. They are reliable and they are efficient. They are our future. They are what will keep our planet safe for future generations of South Australians.

Additionally, every renewable project in South Australia has been underwritten by federal Liberal government subsidy through its Renewable Energy Certificate program. This has bipartisan approval. Yet, from this opposition, with our current challenges and as we further shape a plan for our future, all we hear is negativity. This ongoing negativity is an interesting tenet from the very same people who privatised ETSA, who sold one of the South Australian people's best assets. Their

cronies in Canberra now do not have solutions either, only finger-pointing and absurdity. As our Premier said last month:

South Australians are not prepared to put up with being ridiculed and having the finger pointed at them by a federal government that has absolutely abdicated its responsibilities.

The opposition, as we have heard all day, have little grasp on the realities of energy generation. They are far too focused on blaming others than developing policy. They are anti renewables, they are negative about our energy future, they are negative about our state and they are incapable of understanding the complexities of our system.

They have no plan for the future. That, to quote the member for Chaffey's words, is indeed 'a disgrace'. The Leader of the Opposition has announced a ban on gas fracking and now they are planning to scrap the state's renewable energy target. In this day and age, this is also a disgrace. I am no longer sure of what their position on nuclear power is. I think it depends on which of those opposite you speak with. The opposition must stand up to Canberra, to Mr Turnbull and the rest of the climate change deniers who now make up our federal government. They must join us in pursuing a positive plan for our energy future, and I invite them all to do just that.

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (16:23): I am very pleased to speak in favour of the Leader of the Opposition's motion, which is a very important motion. The motion, I should remind members, is that this house expresses its concern at the state of the South Australian electricity market. I hear from the government accusations that the opposition has been relentlessly negative in this debate, but I think it is entirely reasonable for the opposition to express its concern at the state of the South Australian electricity market.

Anyone over the last four months who is a member of parliament who has been circulating in their community and who has not been getting feedback from members of their community expressing concern at the state of electricity in South Australia has not been listening to people in the community. Over the summer break, almost every conversation I had with a constituent at an event or walking down the street or going to a supermarket or in between Christmas and new year just being at the shops tended to start with questions about what we are going to do about the state of the South Australian electricity market.

If, as I suspect, the government vote against this motion in the next hour or so, then I remind members of the government that they are putting their names against a motion that is moving that this house expresses its concern at the state of the South Australian electricity market. Members of the government who vote against this motion are voting against a motion that notes the following:

- (a) the state government's energy policy over the last 15 years has delivered South Australian consumers the worst outcomes in the nation;

By voting against this motion, I assume government members are therefore suggesting that they think we do not have the worst outcomes in the nation, yet when our prices are the highest and our reliability is the lowest, it is just fanciful to suggest that the first point of this motion is not entirely reasonable and correct. The second part of this motion notes:

- (b) the first ever statewide electricity blackout in Australia occurred in South Australia on 28 September 2016;

I have heard a lot of accusations of fake news this week from the Treasurer and others in the government, but I am fairly sure that even they would have to admit that that point is true. The motion goes on to identify that this house should note its concern that:

- (c) electricity supply reliability in South Australia is the lowest in the nation;
- (d) electricity prices in South Australia are the highest in the nation;

These are just plain facts. The motion goes on to identify that we express our concern at:

- (e) the impact that high household electricity prices add to cost of living pressures;

I am concerned about that, and my constituents are concerned about that. My constituents facing those increased cost of living pressures, based on having the highest electricity prices in the nation, are concerned about that. I invite government members to identify if they are not concerned that their

households are facing those high electricity prices. The motion goes on to identify that we should be concerned about:

- (f) the impact that high business electricity prices add to unemployment pressures;

When I first ran for the parliament at the 2010 election, the state government—the Labor Party—had a policy, a promise, that they would deliver 100,000 new jobs by 2016. We are now past 2016 and the jobs they promised they would deliver by then are nowhere to be seen. The unemployment rate over that period has continued to scrape along the bottom of the national barrel, and businesses in South Australia are facing the highest electricity prices in the land.

We hear example after example of businesses in South Australia identifying that the cost of electricity is what is causing them to doubt their future here in South Australia. It is causing them to doubt that there is any opportunity for expansion or investment here in South Australia. For members of the government to argue against a motion that says we should be concerned about the impact that high business electricity prices add to unemployment pressures only identifies to me that these people who stand against this motion are not fit anymore to be the government, if they ever were. The motion goes on to identify:

- (g) unemployment in South Australia is the highest in the nation;

I know over the period of time it has been. It certainly was when notice was given of this motion, but even when we have not been the highest we have been the second highest. That goes back and forth, but we are consistently the highest in the nation, and we have been getting worse and worse over the years. The motion goes on to identify:

- (h) both the Victorian and South Australian electricity markets were privatised at similar times and yet Victorians pay the lowest electricity prices in the nation;

Again, these are just bald statements of fact, and we are noting that we are concerned about these facts. Finally, the motion closes by stating that this house expresses its concern and notes:

- (i) the closure of the coal-fired electricity generator at Port Augusta has led to the increased importation of coal-fired electricity from Victoria.

In reading this motion, I identify those individual points and invite government members who are still to speak to explain exactly which of those points they are voting against. Are they saying they are not concerned that the cost of living facing South Australian households is unacceptable? Are they voting against this motion because they do not consider that it is something to be of concern that our electricity supply is not reliable?

Are members of the government considering voting against this motion doing so because they are arguing that there was not a statewide electricity blackout on 28 September 2016? It baffles me, yet the member for Reynell and other government members accuse us, the opposition, of just being relentlessly negative. It is an extraordinary piece of sophistry for the government to argue that the opposition is being negative for expressing the concerns—the entirely reasonable concerns—of members of our community. We need to be focused on how we can make the lives of the people in our communities and the people in South Australia better.

The environmental future of the nation and of the world is beyond dispute important. The fact that renewable energy is going to play a key and critical role in that future is not disputed. The transition point between the electricity generating capacity that we have at the moment and have had in the past, and how we get to a carbon-free future, is the key question of the concern. But it is not of concern, it seems, to the government because they have expressed no interest in dealing with that transition.

In fact, the debate today has been an appalling example of just pure partisanship and political advantage brought out by the government who seem to be identifying this motion in ways that it is not. By voting against it, they are demonstrating that they are only interested in political outcomes and have absolutely no interest whatsoever in the best interests of their communities.

We need to be focused on the reliability of our electricity supply because the people in our communities expect it, deserve it, demand it, and they have every reasonable expectation that we in

government and we in the parliament are going to deliver it. This is a 21st century First World nation, and a state that should be proud and able to offer perfectly reasonable services to our community.

People should not be worried about whether their embryos are going to be safe at the Flinders Medical Centre. People should have absolutely no stress about whether medical equipment in their hospitals and in their homes, potentially, are going to be sound. People should not be stressed about food going off in their fridge because the power is going out due to unseasonably warm weather in the summer when the wind is not blowing. This is not something that is reasonable for our communities to be putting up with. It is completely unacceptable and we should not accept.

Energy reliability is important, and that is what this motion identifies. That is what the Leader of the Opposition has been saying. The Leader of the Opposition has identified that no solution should be taken off the table to ensure that energy reliability is our first demand. Energy affordability is equally a very important matter. That is what the rest of this motion identifies: the impact that higher household electricity prices are having on our communities, the impact that higher power prices are having on our businesses, on our economy, and on employment and jobs for our future. These are entirely reasonable concerns for the opposition to put forward in the parliament—and the government calls us negative. It is an extraordinary state of affairs that they would do so.

The transition from the types of electricity generators that we have been using for many years to those that are going to be more prevalent in the future is a challenge. Nobody is saying it is not a challenge, but this government has vacated the field on even trying to have a challenge because they are interested in a political argument and rhetorical debate.

I was a candidate in that 2010 election when Mike Rann (who was then the Premier) used this as his central point, being so proud that his government had driven the increase in renewable energy in wind and solar to being the highest in the nation—he took credit for it. So it is entirely disingenuous now for the government—the Treasurer, as he so often does—to say, 'Oh no, that's all Canberra's fault. It's the federal Liberal government that's doing that.' This is the government that has been claiming credit for that for 10 years, right up until the point where the lights started turning off. They cannot have it both ways.

The member for Reynell and others cannot say that the opposition, the Liberal Party, are negative and climate deniers, while at the same time the Treasurer is blaming Canberra for the renewable energy schemes that are going national. We need a national scheme, but having a state scheme is entirely counterproductive and negative. The motion that we are talking about today is entirely reasonable, and I urge all members to vote for it.

Ms COOK (Fisher) (16:33): I rise today to vehemently oppose the motion moved by the opposition leader because it is not my wish to rob our children of a cleaner future. In late September, South Australia saw freakish, never before seen cyclonic storms, we saw tornadoes tear 23 transmission towers from the earth and we also saw outages on 27 December as a consequence of winds which recorded speeds of over 110 km/h, with falling trees bringing down 350 powerlines. These events make it almost seem that the climate in South Australia is changing.

We have been hearing a lot about climate change, so maybe as a reminder to members present we may just want a quick recap on what it actually is. The international scientific community accepts that increases in greenhouse gases due to human activity have been the dominant cause of observed global warming and climatic change since the mid-20th century. Continued emissions of greenhouse gases will cause further warming and changes in all components of the climate system.

South Australia has seen these unusual, never before seen climate events happening, and what do we see from the opposition? They say we need more coal, more greenhouse gases, more unseasonal and unforeseen weather events. The opposition leader has called for the Northern coal power station to be put back online, pumping more greenhouse gases into the atmosphere, bringing about more extreme weather events and making the planet more uninhabitable for our children.

So, when AEMO handed down their report that put storm damage for both of these blackouts down to extreme never before seen storm events, did the Liberals back down on their attacks on renewable energy? No. When asked what he wants to do with the state's renewable energy target, his only answer is to hand it over to the federal government, which has the most dysfunctional environment and energy policy of any federal government.

We have a Prime Minister who supports a price on carbon, and then he does not, and whose only policy now is to bury his head in the sand and hope that it goes away. But is that the position of the rest of the federal Liberal Party? No, I do not believe that. They have a Treasurer who is obsessed with coal, openly brandishing it in parliament and extolling its virtues. If the Leader of the Opposition had his way, these are the people he would turn our energy policy over to. He thinks they are the best people to handle our energy policies, the right wing of the federal Liberal Party. It is unable to see eye to eye with anything related to energy with the party's far right wing.

In Western Australia, leading up to the election, they are also currently partnering with our friends in One Nation. They are not supporters of climate change fact. Thankfully, the state government can see through them and quite rightly sees that this federal government is not fit to set South Australia's energy policy. We wholeheartedly stand by the renewable energy target, which ensures that South Australia is playing its role in trying to prevent global apocalyptic climate change.

We would very much like to see the federal government break its internal impasse, do something to benefit the country and have some coherent vision for Australia's energy future, but it does not. Whilst the federal government occupies its time dealing with splitters and unhappy former leaders, we are unable to foresee a time when they will be ready to pick up the mantle and lead on climate change.

On 8 February, we saw AEMO decide to engage in power shedding across Australia whilst Adelaide blistered in 41° heat. Unable to see that a hot day might increase the demand for electricity, they made incorrect calculations on what power sources needed to be running on the day. South Australia had extra capacity to produce energy, but the market operator decided to stand up for the profits of the privatised electricity generators and not for the energy security of South Australia.

The South Australian Labor Party opposed electricity privatisation and we are now paying the price of the short-term decision-making of that previous government. The private market simply cannot deliver on the energy security required and expected for South Australians. I look forward to hearing the state government's proposed interventions into the electricity market to take back control of the state's power supply and security and unpick the damage of privatisation.

The market is just not delivering for South Australians. South Australians have faced significant trials recently with energy security. We cannot turn our back on renewables—because they are the only tool we have to deliver the energy needed without exacerbating the issue of energy supply with more extreme climate events.

Mr GEE (Napier) (16:38): I rise to oppose the motion. I became involved in the energy debate early in 2000 when the organisation that employed me decided to look at the science of climate change at the time. It was a difficult time because so many of the people we represented worked in those industries that contribute towards global warming. We examined what the future would look like, what had to change and what would happen if change was not embraced. Fortunately, over a couple of years of engaging the membership of around 200,000 people, the science was overwhelming.

Policies were made to campaign at local, national and international levels to see governments and progressive movements become climate activists. South Australia is at the forefront of the challenge, along with Tasmania. It looks like we need to challenge those states that have their heads in the sand when it comes to renewables. Those opposite really have to abandon their love of coal. It will be the death of them and the rest of our planet. They are not listening to the community. The community will choose life and a long future. The future is not coal.

One of the concerns that we looked at 20 years ago was at what stage humanity would need to start living below the ground. It sounds dramatic, but had the international community not adapted strict reductions in carbon emissions this would be a reality. The relentless use of our fossil fuels is happening at a rate never seen before. The release of carbon into the atmosphere is causing our oceans to heat at a rate that will be catastrophic for all sea life. All sea life can really exist in only a very small range of temperatures within the ocean.

In terms of the way the oceans are heating now, we see examples in the Arctic, where massive shelves, tens of thousands of kilometres long and 20 to 30 kilometres inland, are now

breaking away from the main ice and slipping into the sea. With oceans warming, the prediction is—and I hope this never happens—that, if that shelf ends up in the sea and melts, ocean levels would cover Mount Lofty; there would be no life left. When we talk about global warming, we do not talk about how hot it is outside, that we have had too many hot days; we talk about how much carbon is in the air and how it is heating the ocean.

One of the really important things is how many resources we use as humanity. Instead of using fewer or using them smarter, which is brought about by the use of renewables, we are using more than ever before. The targets were set up for around 2050, which is around the date that we thought we would have to start living more and more underground. Coober Pedy is a good example of that, which has been the case for a long time. It is happening at such a rapid pace that—I hate to say this—if we were to reduce the population of the world by 50 per cent now, we would probably make those targets. That is how far behind I think we are in terms of surviving climate change.

It is a much bigger issue than the problems expressed by those opposite in terms of people experiencing blackouts and not having reliable power. Our government is looking at having a grid that is modern and clean and can deliver a future, a long future, of sustainable energy in this state. We need other states to buy into that. We need a federal government that will buy into that. We need an opposition that wants to work towards that goal. I cannot understand an opposition that wants to get into power and then reintroduce fossil fuel. What I say to the opposition is: wake up. If you want to be re-elected at some point in the future, you need to get on board with what the community really wants.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (16:43): I will briefly start my contribution by taking up a point made by the member for Morialta, who said that the government is only seeking a political outcome. If this motion sought to be anything other than political, it would have included some sort of policy prescription. It might have included some sort of contribution to the policy debate. We do not have that. What we have is a purely political motion from the Leader of the Opposition. So, contrary to the claims of the member for Morialta, it is not us who are being political: it is those on that side who have wandered in with a motion aimed at negatively portraying the problems and challenges that this state faces.

The fundamental problem, of course, comes from the sale of ETSA—the fundamental problem of a loss of control of a power network. We sold the interconnectors or the transmission system separately, we sold the distribution system separately, we sold the generation separately and we sold the retailing separately. We broke it up, we sold it off and we lost control.

It is very difficult indeed for a state government to control the way the energy generators switch on and switch off when control of the generators themselves have been passed to the private sector which, quite rightly, operates for money. They have never pretended to be doing anything other than operating for profit, rather than for the economic good of the state or the social good of the state, as Playford intended when he first nationalised the system back in the forties. One of the problems with the national market is the lack of interconnection between South Australia and New South Wales.

That is the result of a roadside bomb left by the Hon. Mr Lucas in another place when, in the process of selling the assets, he ramped up the price by making competition all the more difficult. That scotched the interconnector. But a national market requires a national solution and national leadership. We are not seeing that from the federal government and that is part of the problem. We certainly need the federal government to be involved in a discussion about the energy distribution system and the energy generation system in this country, and we are not seeing that. These are all parts of the problem.

The only solution I have seen the opposition offer up was on 9 February when the Leader of the Opposition suggested that we look at nuclear power. I must say I am deeply ambivalent about nuclear power. I am more than happy for someone to do it should they choose to, but everybody who has ever looked at it in an economic sense has said that it is expensive and probably too expensive. Even the royal commission found that.

The royal commission found that the nuclear power option for the state was not economic. They found that the nuclear waste proposal was economic and certainly worth investigating further,

but the Leader of the Opposition and the Liberal Party did not choose the economic option: they chose the uneconomic option. The irony is that nuclear power, of course, uses nuclear fuel which, over time, becomes spent. The spent nuclear fuel requires a repository, so we would still have to build the dump: we just would not have overseas people paying for it. We would take the full cost. Burying the nuclear waste from one generator is almost as expensive as burying the nuclear waste from 100 generators.

The incremental difference is some tunnelling, but the costs associated with building a nuclear waste dump are site selection, which you would have to do for both options, geological studies underground, which you would have to do for both options, and building a decline down to the depth, which you would have to do for both options. The only difference between the two is how much tunnelling you do to store the nuclear waste you need to put in.

It is an incremental increase in cost to store, for instance, waste from multiple sites, including that from overseas, on top of the cost of building it just for one. The Leader of the Opposition is not proposing to take foreign income to pay for building a nuclear waste dump that would be an inevitable result of building a nuclear power station, so he is actually increasing the cost of the waste storage and having none of the benefit that the royal commission found is very likely to be available as a result of storing foreign nuclear waste.

I welcome the opposition back to the discussion about nuclear power because I think it needs to be had. I think we need to have the interconnection to New South Wales and changes to the national rules, again with the help of the federal government, that may actually make nuclear viable. That is a discussion worth having from my point of view. I think all those on this side of the house would welcome that discussion about whether in fact nuclear power, in a truly integrated national market, has a contribution to make.

I welcome the Liberal Party back to that discussion, but they have to necessarily accept that that means we are also having a discussion about a nuclear waste repository, and that means we need to work out how we are going to pay for that and whether we want to accept the full cost of that repository being borne by the electors of this state or whether we want to accept foreign waste to help us pay for that.

In fact, deciding to use nuclear power to help solve the energy challenges that face us actually makes a foreign solution to nuclear waste, or at least storing foreign waste, more likely because that would be one way to offset the enormous costs we would face in building a repository for one nuclear power station.

I am more than happy to get involved in that debate. I have been advocating for it for a very long time. I will continue to advocate for it and I welcome the Liberal Party to that discussion, but they have to do it in the full knowledge that we are back to talking about a nuclear fuel dump via the back door, and that is a discussion, in my view, that is definitely worth having.

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (16:50): I will be very brief, but I just want to make a couple of comments. I rise in support of this motion.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before you start, it has just been drawn to my attention that we need to extend before 5pm.

Sitting extended beyond 17:00 on motion of Hon. G.G. Brock.

Mr BELL: I think there are a couple of points that have not been made in this debate. The first one is that it is okay to set a renewable target that you want to achieve. Nobody is debating that and, in fact, we have a national target. But when a state decides to set an overly ambitious target without any consideration of the overall effect on the network, it is reckless at best and negligent in many other ways.

Knowing the system, a 40 per cent renewables target means that we were always going to be running into problems. It is like saying to every man, woman and child in South Australia, 'Here is a car. You need to drive on the roads. We have no public transport.' All of a sudden the roads start clogging up and you look for somebody else to blame (i.e. the federal government is not doing enough to improve the roads in South Australia).

As to the renewable energy system and also the market, the Treasurer has stated in this house in a committee hearing in 2015 that the National Electricity Market has delivered high levels of reliability to South Australia. In fact, he is quoted as saying, 'We have designed it, we have built it and it's worked and served us well.' Well, 2015 was not that long ago, so obviously the Treasurer at that point was not fully aware of the issues or did not have his eye on the ball. He comes in here and says that the operators have been gaming the system. I ask the Treasurer: what have you been doing about it? You have been in government for 15 years and, if there are examples of operators gaming the system, what have you been doing about it?

The renewable energy target is one issue that is very rarely brought up in this place. The RET, for people's information, creates a market where certificates are currency, so one megawatt hour of renewable energy becomes one certificate. They are created by power stations and bought by electrical retailers. To participate, you must be an accredited renewable energy power station. Those producing power above what is called the baseline (which I believe was created in 1997) are able to sell, trade or offset the cost of generation, but it is a floating price—one certificate, as of 23 February, was about \$85—so that puts a price on power straightaway.

The problem with renewable energy, particularly wind energy, is that it is intermittent, so it has to be backed up by base load power, a fact that is quite often lost on those opposite who do not understand the market. The other problem is that it is very tricky to balance the network and keep it in harmony. To keep it in perfect harmony, it has to be within 50 hertz every second of every day. If the frequency gets out of tune, the system identifies a fault that could destroy it and trips the shutdown switch. This electrical harmony is called synchronous supply, and thermal power is very good at delivering this to the grid.

Wind power is asynchronous. Its frequency fluctuates with the breeze, and it has to be stabilised by the give and take of other sources of demand and supply. With 40 per cent of our energy mix generated by wind and a high uptake of rooftop solar panels, the reduction in demand driven by rooftop cells, coupled with the low price that subsidised wind farms can bid into the electricity market, has shut down all of the state's coal-fired power plants. Now we rely on three sources for power: wind, gas and—and this may come as a big shock to the government—coal-fired power imported from Victoria through two interconnectors that are the lifeline to the National Electricity Market.

This government bemoans the National Electricity Market. I go back to my point before: if they have realised problems, why have they not done anything about it? They have been in government for 15 years, and I think the people of South Australia are getting sick and tired of this government blaming everybody except for themselves. The National Electricity Market has five trading regions: New South Wales and the ACT, Victoria, Queensland, South Australia and Tasmania. The trading regions are interconnected via high-voltage transmission lines.

There are some rules governing how the AEMO manages this trading. Maybe this is where the Treasurer can find some of the work he needs to be looking at. The demand for electricity is matched with supply from generators in five-minute periods in the order of generator bid price. Nowhere in this chamber have I heard the term 'bid price', yet if you talk to anyone who knows something about the energy market they will say that one of the problems is that a renewable source can bid in at a low price knowing, via the rules, that the National Electricity Market regulator then takes the highest point at that five-minute interval and sets all the bids at that highest price.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: Any generator can do that.

Mr BELL: Exactly. Why is the Treasurer not looking at that as an area of reform? No, not every generator can do it, because they have a break-even point without subsidies. That is what has forced coal out of the South Australian market. Six dispatch prices are averaged every half an hour, which determines the spot price for regions at each half-hourly trading interval. The National Electricity Rules stipulate a maximum spot price of \$12,500 per megawatt hour, which is the market price cap—and quite often we have been paying that—and a minimum spot price of minus \$1,000 per megawatt hour, which is the market floor price.

This negative market floor price allows generators to pay to stay online when the cost of staying online is lower than the cost of shutting down and restarting their plants. For a renewable generator, staying online may also cost less than the generators receive from support mechanisms,

such as the RET scheme, plus their own costs. What I am trying to get at is that we hear a lot of rhetoric in this place. If this government is serious about sorting out the power crisis that is engulfing this state, then they need to look at some of the rules and bring proactive solutions to this parliament.

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (16:59): I would like to conclude by thanking everybody who has made a contribution. The reason this particular motion was brought to the house is that the Liberal Party has been raising very legitimate and sensible questions about the energy policy of this government, not just for days and weeks and months but, in fact, for years. The Liberal Party has raised very legitimate questions about the government's ideological pursuit of their utopian ideal to have the entire state supplied by renewable energy. This is what the government has pursued and the opposition, of course, has been asking legitimate questions.

This week has been a perfect example, with question after question to the government with no answers—no answers whatsoever to very basic straightforward questions. There was some sort of rhetoric, some sort of rubbish that came from the minister's mouth for minutes, and then today, of course, he was completely cut off by the Premier. I think even the Premier is sick to death of hearing him, so he answered all the questions today but, unfortunately, the content was no better.

Today we had a line-up of people from the government trying to talk about this very important point that we need to be considering, and it was disappointing. I think the kindest thing I can say about the contribution from the government today is that it was variable. There was a lot of variety in the answers but they were all around a single theme, which was to blame somebody else and take no responsibility. Quite frankly, I think the people of South Australia are sick to death of that attitude. We are where we are. It is a mess. The mess was created by Labor. Take it on the chin.

Where do we go going forward? We have heard virtually nothing. The parliament has been consumed with this issue for hours now and there has been virtually nothing from those opposite. They are the ones, of course, who have put this current ideological position in place. By contrast, on this side of the chamber we have been raising legitimate concerns for years about the penetration of intermittent renewable energy in South Australia regarding the viability of the Alinta plant at Port Augusta, regarding the response of the government to the call from Alinta representatives to provide a subsidy to keep that facility open, to manage the transition to renewable energy in a more orderly fashion and in a way that would ensure that we maintain energy affordability and energy reliability in South Australia.

All those legitimate concerns raised by the opposition over an extended period of time were dismissed by the government, who knew better. However, now we find ourselves in the situation where we have the highest electricity prices in the nation and the least reliable grid in the entire nation. We have become the laughing stock of the entire nation because the Premier and the minister's energy policy has humiliated this state and, of course, has done almost irreparable damage to the future attractiveness of this state to attract investment capital at a time when we so desperately need it.

What else have we been talking about on this side of the chamber? First of all, we have come out with our plan to scrap the renewable energy target at the state level. We do not want to see our state put at a disadvantage to the other states, those states that we have to compete with. We do not accept that we should have significantly higher rates than the Victorians. It is soul destroying for producers and families in the South-East and in the Riverland who can see into another state and know that the power there is half the price of what it is here in South Australia.

The human face of the government's policies is absolutely soul destroying. Families are doing it tough, businesses are doing it tough and, of course, unemployment is going through the roof. The Liberal Party says: let's scrap the state-based renewable energy target and let's put everything back on the table. Let's take a look at whether or not we can get the Alinta plant at Port Augusta fired up again for a transition period as we move through to renewables. Let's look at managing our demand, lowering our peak demand in South Australia and therefore lowering our overall costs of energy in this state.

Look at improving base load: that base load cannot be from where the government is finding it from wind energy, it has to be from areas like coal, potentially nuclear, solar thermal, for which the

member for Stuart has been advocating for quite some time, or from pumped hydro—a project which the Prime Minister himself is very positive about.

We have also been saying that it is great to have all this intermittent energy, but what we need is the storage of that intermittent energy so that we can use it when we need it. The Finkel report is about to come down, the AEMO final report is about to come down. They will be instructive. It is now over to the government to tell us what their plan is, listen to the experts, tell us what the plan is and how they are going to dig us out of the hole which they have created for South Australians. I commend the motion to the house.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 17
Noes 22
Majority 5

AYES

Bell, T.S.	Chapman, V.A.	Gardner, J.A.W.
Goldsworthy, R.M.	Griffiths, S.P.	Knoll, S.K.
Marshall, S.S.	Pederick, A.S.	Pengilly, M.R.
Pisoni, D.G.	Sanderson, R.	Speirs, D.
Tarzia, V.A.	Treloar, P.A. (teller)	van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.
Whetstone, T.J.	Williams, M.R.	

NOES

Bedford, F.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Brock, G.G.	Caica, P.	Cook, N.F.
Digance, A.F.C.	Gee, J.P.	Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.
Hildyard, K.	Hughes, E.J.	Kenyon, T.R. (teller)
Key, S.W.	Koutsantonis, A.	Mullighan, S.C.
Odenwalder, L.K.	Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.
Rankine, J.M.	Rau, J.R.	Weatherill, J.W.
Wortley, D.		

PAIRS

Duluk, S.	Close, S.E.	McFetridge, D.
Vlahos, L.A.	Wingard, C.	Snelling, J.J.

Motion thus negatived.

Personal Explanation

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TOURISM COMMISSION

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (17:09): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Earlier during question time during the jocks-gate discussions, after a question from the member for Mount Gambier, I stated that the expenses form claim of the former executive director of the Motor Sport Group had not been approved by the Chief Executive of the South Australian Tourism Commission. I was actually confusing two trips to Darwin made by the Motor Sport Group: one went there under the Motor Sport Board and a second one went up there to take part—

Mr Pisoni: Just read it. You'll muck it up again. Just read it.

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned, and if he interjects again, he will be named.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: So, there were two trips to Darwin: one went up for the supercars championships and there was a second one later in the year, which went up there as part of the Bridgestone solar challenge from Darwin to Adelaide.

Mr WILLIAMS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker. Did the minister seek leave to make a personal explanation?

The SPEAKER: He did.

Mr WILLIAMS: Does that give him the opportunity to debate—

The SPEAKER: Range widely? No, it doesn't.

Mr WILLIAMS: Thank you, sir.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: I have since been informed that the chief executive did approve the reimbursement of the cost of three pairs of underwear purchased while the Motor Sport Group were in Darwin in 2015. The \$15 was included as part of an invoice totalling \$65 which, other than the boxer shorts, contained kitchen supplies that were legitimately purchased for the Darwin to Adelaide World Solar Challenge. This expense was after the integration of the Motor Sport Board into the South Australian Tourism Commission and while the team were in Darwin for the World Solar Challenge.

The South Australian Tourism Commission Chief Executive approved the total invoice, due to the underwear component not being clearly identified on the receipt, with it being listed as 'woven boxers' amongst other kitchenware items. The chief executive has since reminded his executive team of the importance of scrutinising all credit card purchases by their staff and asked them to remind all staff of their obligations in this area.

Bills

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 February 2017.)

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (17:13): I would like to make a brief contribution to support the Local Government (Boundary Adjustment) Amendment Bill 2016. The bill is a move in the right direction, and I understand that, importantly, it is supported by the LGA and councils generally across the state. This bill looks at opportunities for councils to alter their boundaries, and it frees up the existing system, the existing act, which is quite restrictive. The reality is that very little reform of boundaries has taken place because it requires a whole range of people to agree to it, and invariably that has not occurred.

In my own local area, I am on record over many years as suggesting that the boundaries of the Town of Gawler, which I had an interest in previously, should be allowed to be modified to incorporate parts of the Light Regional Council and also the Barossa Council. That is nothing new; I have been saying that since I was on the council many years ago, but the existing legal framework prevents that from occurring. We need a system that encourages councils to review that but also provides some certainty.

The arrangement of council boundaries in South Australia has varied since the mid-19th century, often reflecting changes both in the roles played by councils and the public's expectations. Just to give you an idea, when I first entered council, I think there were 162 or 164 councils. I know it is some time since I entered council in 1981; maybe 140 councils might be a closer figure. I cannot remember the exact figure, but there were over twice as many councils as there are today.

For example, I started my life in the district council of Munno Para. When you look at the history of that council, it changed. In fact, at one stage the district council of Munno Para's offices were actually in the Town of Gawler's council area. There is a whole range of other anomalies which indicate that over time communities have grown in different ways and the boundaries have not kept up. The essence of this bill is about ensuring that council boundaries reflect those community boundaries. That is very important. That is important from a planning point of view, in other words planning for your community. That includes things like physical planning, and also transport corridors, transport routes and planning for delivery of services. This bill will enable that to happen.

Over those years, a number of smaller councils have been aggregated, but there has also been a continuing appetite for communities to participate in local decision-making. I give Gawler again as an example. The Gawler council originally was just between the two rivers. There was a Gawler South council. In fact, for people who know the racecourse, the racecourse was actually surrounded by the district council of Munno Para when I was first elected, only the racecourse itself was in the Gawler council. In fact, the Vadoulis nursery, which is a huge icon in Gawler, was part of the district council of Munno Para.

Gawler West was in the district council of Light, and Light was actually the result of a merger between the district council of Mudla Wirra and the district council of Freeling. I know the member for Goyder used to be the CEO of a council. I am sure he has served on some councils that were previously a number of other councils, and he became the CEO of the merged councils. I think that was in the Mid North, where he became CEO of one of the federations, which was four councils, which became two councils, and the two then federated. I do not recall how successful that was.

Mr Griffiths interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Of course, it was successful; the member for Goyder was the CEO. I think that is what he is trying to tell me. I remember having a discussion with him some years ago when I was interested in the federation model. I think I wrote to him at the time seeking some advice on how it went; that is by the bye. Communities have changed, not only in a geographic sense, but technology has changed. That is a very important factor. You do not have to go into your council offices to use a whole range of services these days. You can go online and lodge applications, pay bills, etc.

The last period of significant amalgamation of councils occurred in the late 1990s. I am also advised that the last full council amalgamation was the merger of the corporation of Naracoorte, the district council of Naracoorte and the district council of Lucindale to form the Naracoorte Lucindale Council. That was some time ago as well.

It should not be amalgamation for the sake of amalgamation either. I think boundaries need to be changed to make sure we have the best possible opportunities for communities to engage with their local government authority, to provide the best use of limited resources in that community and also to ensure that the boundaries reflect an opportunity for those communities to plan effectively.

In the case of Gawler, for example, I am not talking out of school when I say that most people think Hewett is part of the Gawler community. Certainly, people think they are part of Gawler. I recall when I was the mayor of Gawler, I was once invited to a function in Hewett. I was talking to the organisers and I said, 'Your mayor can't make it today? They said to me, 'Aren't you our mayor?' I said, 'No, I'm not. The mayor is the Light Regional Council mayor.' That is how people identify in those communities, so clearly the boundaries have not kept up. That is also true for the Barossa: there are parts of the Barossa Council between Light and the Barossa that should change to ensure that the Barossa Council reflects the true Barossa region.

Mr Knoll: You're a brave man for saying it, Tony.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I said it 20 or 30 years ago. It was true then, and it is still true today. When you talk to people one to one, they see the sense of it, but sometimes local politics gets in the way. I would go so far as to say that in my region—if you include the Barossa region in terms of a state administrative area, which includes the Town of Gawler, the Barossa Council, the Light Regional Council, and the Mallala council—I think there is room for change.

It would be silly to say there is no room for change. You could still have a strong rural council, but some of those more rural living areas and those urban areas should become parts of other council areas, and they are much better managed. Importantly, this proposal puts it in the hands of local government and an independent commission. It is not for us to decide: it will be decided at the local level, which is very important.

The voluntary approach is in contrast to the more directive approach, and this bill is about a voluntary approach. Other jurisdictions, for example, Victoria (under the Kennett government) and also Queensland, to some extent, had forced amalgamations. More recently, former premier Baird decided on the voluntary merger of some councils, which I think was part of the reason he lost some favour in his state. So, this is actually a very good model.

The government is opposed to forcing councils to amalgamate simply on the basis of the belief that fewer councils mean better local government. I would like to reinforce that. In itself, there should not be amalgamation for the sake of amalgamation. It should deliver tangible benefits to the community. In that regard, I am reminded of a report, which was prepared some time ago by the Australian Centre of Excellence for Local Government, the Local Government Association of South Australia, and Local Government New Zealand. It is called 'Consolidation in local government: a fresh look', and it goes back to May 2011.

Some of the findings in that report are very interesting. One of the key questions often talked about regarding amalgamation is: does it deliver cheaper rates? The short answer is: not necessarily. It does not necessarily deliver cheaper rates because what often happens is that the new entities use those savings to run a whole range of other improved community services.

One of the key improvements of having larger councils and appropriate boundaries—and this is what the report found—is that it gives those local government authorities the capacity to do a lot more; it gives them the capacity to hire better staff; and it gives them the capacity, for example, to borrow more and do more. That is the most important thing: the bigger rate base enables those councils to do a lot more. Often, the very small councils are effectively doing maintenance work—just maintaining things. Those bigger councils do a lot of capital works and projects.

Referring to the conclusions, apart from those I have mentioned, in terms of efficiency and economy of scale, the report stated that there was a strong link between efficiencies and economies of scale. In other words, the slightly bigger councils lead to greater economies of scale, and a shared services model also improves efficiencies and economies of scale. The report found that there was a very weak link in regional collaboration. Regional collaboration did not deliver the same economies of scale as amalgamation or shared services.

In relation to the strategic capacity—the capacity of the council to do a lot more—this independent report prepared some years ago found that there was a very strong link for amalgamation. Again, regional collaboration is a weak link, shared services has the potential for some link, but amalgamation delivered better outcomes in terms of the councils' capacities.

In terms of service improvement and innovation, this is also linked to strategic capacity. There is a very strong link between amalgamation and service improvement and innovation because those councils have the capacity to do new things and deliver more services, and they build the capacity to innovate. That is not to say that small councils are not innovative, but their capacity to deliver on a bigger scale is limited. Again, they found there were some potential improvements in regional collaboration but not as much as if there were amalgamation.

One of the things about bigger councils—and you have to acknowledge this—is the potential risk of less community participation, less involvement by voters and electors in the community. If you were to look just at sheer involvement in elections as an indicator, those smaller councils do have a higher voter turnout than the large councils. That is partly because of size, but it could also be because those councils are more rural and not urban, metropolitan councils, and there has always been a higher level of participation in local government in country areas. However, the report says that that is a risk that can also be managed through appropriate policies and practices.

This bill goes a long way to enabling those sorts of boundary changes to take place and also enabling those councils that believe things could be improved in regions to take place. The critical

factor in deciding whether council boundaries ought to be changed or amalgamated is the issue of how communities can be best served. This is an issue that deserves attention and debate, and that simply has not happened in a formal, constructive manner for nearly 20 years.

The legislative provisions guiding council boundary changes have not been altered since the Local Government Act 1999 came into operation. The Boundary Adjustment Facilitation Panel was originally intended to be an interim body that could make refinements following the significant amalgamations of the 1990s—and I must acknowledge that was during the Liberal government, either the Brown or the subsequent government—although it had continued until being abolished as part of the review of boards and committees in 2015. There has been little in the way of significant council boundary changes during that period. That is not to say the panel has not done its job, but it had a very narrow charter in what it could do.

The bill is based on work associated with a discussion paper released by the LGA, and I acknowledge that the minister has worked very closely and over a long period of time with the LGA and local government to achieve this result. We should not underestimate how big a result this is. To get the LGA and local government on side to enable this to happen has involved some tough negotiations, I am sure, but also a willingness to look at this. This is a major achievement for the Minister for Local Government but also for the LGA in managing individual councils, because I know that there are people out there who are totally opposed to any change.

The key elements of the bill include:

- providing a simpler and broader initiation process, allowing for single council, ministerial, parliamentary or public initiation of submissions for boundary change;
- introducing a streamlined assessment pathway for insignificant boundary change proposals;
- establishing an independent commission to undertake initial assessment of proposals—which is important to ensure that any proposal should have strong grounds for any proposed changes—and overseeing investigations and making recommendations to the minister; and
- providing for an independent analysis of significant boundary change or amalgamation proposals by investigators with expertise relevant to each proposal.

Unfortunately, the current system does not enable that to occur. It is proposed that this legislation come into operation following local government elections, which are scheduled for November 2018. This will allow recently formed councils to consider issues about the nature of council boundaries. It would also enable people who perhaps want a change to run for council, and that would be a good thing. If there are communities who are looking for reform they will be able to vote reform-type candidates into their councils in November 2018.

It is intended that, subject to the bill's passage through parliament, work will be undertaken to prepare the Local Government Grants Commission to take on a new role, to provide advisory expertise and also to assess the proposals, to oversee the council boundary change process. This will include the development of detailed guidelines about the working of the commission, including requirements for transparency and appropriate levels of consultation, which are very important. The local government sector and council employee representatives will participate in the development of commission guidelines.

The bill provides for the commission to recover costs incurred by investigating proposals from the person or body who initiated it. The intention is to encourage the submission of sound proposals and allocation of resources to avoid delays in progressing investigations. I think that is very important.

When I was a member of the Gawler council, just before I became mayor there were proposals under the old 1999 act. I remember that there was a proposal to alter the boundaries of Gawler, Light Regional Council and Barossa. A whole range of different models was proposed. If I remember correctly, close to a million dollars was spent in that region on development proposals and they went nowhere.

This process makes sure that a proposal has some legs before moneys are spent on the detailed assessment and analysis, and I think that is a very wise step. In my own area, council amalgamations of boundaries have not been that successful. Hopefully, when it is passed this bill will incentivise the region to look at that. In the end, there may be some minor changes, but hopefully it will lead to some improvements.

Alternatively, there may be some quite drastic changes to reflect the changes in the demographics of the region over the last 20 years or so. I am aware that the Gawler council has a quite clear policy that it wishes to amend its boundaries to reflect the community boundaries. As I mentioned, that will probably include places like Hewett, parts of Kalbeeba and perhaps even parts of Gawler Belt, which are in the two adjoining councils. However, that is something to be discussed by those communities at the appropriate time.

Hopefully, this proposal will also work through some of those historical anomalies. In the days of the horse and cart and poor telecommunications, boundaries were designed to reflect the limitations of the day. I am also aware that some councils have been agitating for change. I know there are some very progressive councils on Eyre Peninsula, for example, who have been agitating for reform of the act to enable them to explore proposals.

I would not be surprised if some of those Eyre Peninsula councils are some of the first to put up their hands and say, 'We will go through this process,' and that would certainly be a good thing. I think there are eight councils on Eyre Peninsula. Not all eight should join to make one council, but there might be a smaller number than there is now. That would not only build capacity for that region but also address some of the infrastructure and planning issues.

Quite clearly, there are bigger communities of interest than exist now in those council areas. I was quite impressed by the progressive nature of those councils in that region when I visited them. I support this bill and commend both the minister and the Local Government Association for the great work.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (17:33): I thank members for their contributions to the debate on this bill, particularly those who have focused on the substance of the bill, reforming the council boundary change processes, which is what this bill is about, and for sharing their views and experiences about local circumstances across their local government areas. I would especially like to thank the previous shadow minister, the member for Goyder. He was a great part of this consultation and the communication between my office and the shadow minister was greatly appreciated.

In bringing the debate to a close, I would like to draw members' attention to a couple of government amendments that have been filed to provide further clarity about the workings of the proposed independent commission. The first amendment relates to requiring the commission to prepare and publish guidelines that will explain the process the commission will use in determining costs. The second amendment addresses matters related to the independence of the commission. I anticipate that we will deal with both of these matters in more detail during the committee stage of the bill.

As indicated previously, given the shortcomings of the existing council boundary change process, which has delivered little in terms of significant boundary reform, I was committed to reviewing the process and presenting to parliament an alternative framework that provides for both minor council boundary adjustments and more significant boundary adjustments and structural reform to occur in an efficient way and in a way that promotes the best interests of local communities.

I submit that this bill will provide the framework to deliver the necessary timeliness, efficiency and also expertise required to ensure better outcomes for our communities. I am also aware of the amendments the member for Unley would like considered as part of the debate on this bill as indicated by the contingent notice of motion. In short, apart from seeking to rename the bill I have introduced, the member for Unley's amendments revisit the rate capping mechanism that was included in the member for Goyder's private member's bill which was rejected by this house last year.

Mr KNOLL: Point of order, Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, member for Schubert.

Mr KNOLL: When I was seeking to make comments about a rate capping amendment on the contingent motion that the member for Unley is seeking to put, I was told that I was not allowed to talk about it, yet the minister is allowed to talk about it in his closing remarks.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I ask the minister to come back to the relevance of the closing remarks.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: I will be guided by the views of the Deputy Speaker. Assuming that the member for Unley does move this motion, I hope that any—

Mr KNOLL: Point of order, Deputy Speaker: the minister is defying your ruling.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think he is probably confused about what it might mean. Perhaps if we just get to the end of the bill.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: Yes I certainly will. Thank you, member for Schubert. I will close by thanking members for their contributions. I would also like to thank the Local Government Association, the Electoral Commission, the councils and the local government sector as a whole for contributing so much to this bill. Thanks also go to the Office of Local Government, parliamentary counsel and to my staff for their hard work in preparing this legislation.

Bill read a second time.

Mr PISONI (Unley) (17:36): I move:

That it be an instruction to the committee of the whole house that it have power to consider amendments relating to local government rate increases and caps.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You can speak to that now. You need to speak to the instruction.

Mr PISONI: I understand that. My understanding is that the standing orders allow me to speak to the narrow points of the motion. The reason for introducing this at this time is to take advantage of the fact that the government is considering what is a significant change to the Local Government Act that does have an impact on cost or on efficiencies in the running of councils in South Australia. My amendments are an extension of those efficiency gains, cost savings and improvements to the Local Government Act that the government is introducing.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (17:38): The motion is opposed.

The house divided on the motion.

Ayes 16

Noes 20

Majority 4

AYES

Bell, T.S.
Gardner, J.A.W.
Knoll, S.K.
Sanderson, R.
Treloar, P.A.
Williams, M.R.

Chapman, V.A.
Goldsworthy, R.M.
Pederick, A.S.
Speirs, D.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

Duluk, S.
Griffiths, S.P.
Pisoni, D.G. (teller)
Tarzia, V.A.
Whetstone, T.J.

NOES

Bedford, F.E.
Brock, G.G.
Gee, J.P.
Hughes, E.J.
Koutsantonis, A.
Piccolo, A.
Rau, J.R.

Bettison, Z.L.
Caica, P.
Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.
Kenyon, T.R. (teller)
Mullighan, S.C.
Picton, C.J.
Wortley, D.

Bignell, L.W.K.
Digance, A.F.C.
Hildyard, K.
Key, S.W.
Odenwalder, L.K.
Rankine, J.M.

PAIRS

Marshall, S.S.
Vlahos, L.A.
Redmond, I.M.
Weatherill, J.W.

Cook, N.F.
Pengilly, M.R.
Snelling, J.J.

McFetridge, D.
Close, S.E.
Wingard, C.

Motion thus negatived.

Committee Stage

Clause 1.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

STATUTES AMENDMENT AND REPEAL (SIMPLIFY) BILL*Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendments indicated by the following schedule, to which amendments the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

No. 1. Clause 57, page 23, line 4 [clause 57, inserted subsection (7a)]—

Delete 'If ' and substitute 'Subject to subsection (7b), if'

No. 2. Clause 57, page 23, after line 11—After inserted subsection (7a) insert:

(7b) The Minister must, before cancelling an authority under subsection (7a), make a reasonable attempt to give notice of the Minister's intention to cancel the authority to any person noted on the register of authorities as having an interest in the authority.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

Motion carried.

At 17:45 the house adjourned until Tuesday 28 March 2017 at 11:00.

*Estimates Replies***MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES**

In reply to **Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (3 August 2016). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse): I am advised:

The commonwealth government was wholly responsible for their decision to cease funding for a range of important mental health projects in South Australia on 30 June 2016.

As a result of this decision, \$20.1 million of annual funding was cut. All of these programs were funded by the commonwealth government.

EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS

In reply to **Mr TRELOAR (Flinders)** (3 August 2016). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse): I am advised:

The longest time that a mental health patient spent in an emergency department in 2016 was 106.95 hours.

I am advised, the consumer was safely managed on clinical advice by psychiatric nurses and doctors. The clinical team constantly risk assessed and evaluated the needs of MH patients requiring inpatient care.

I have made a clear expectation that no mental health patient should wait more than 24 hours for an emergency department bed.

Emergency department average wait times have halved since late 2014 and latest data show even further improvement.

DRUG AND ALCOHOL SERVICES

In reply to **Mr TRELOAR (Flinders)** (3 August 2016). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse): I am advised:

The number of people who have used Drug and Alcohol Services South Australia's services each year since 2010-11 as set out by financial year are:

- 2010-11 – 6,809 clients
- 2011-12 – 6,830 clients
- 2012-13 – 6,639 clients
- 2013-14 – 6,734 clients
- 2014-15 – 5,892 clients
- 2015-16 – 5,397 clients'

ATTRACTION AND RETENTION ALLOWANCES

In reply to **Mr DULUK (Davenport)** (3 August 2016). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse): I am advised by the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion and SA Health that:

Minister for Disabilities

Attraction, retention and performance allowances as well as non-salary benefits paid to public servants and contractors:

(a) 2014-15:

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
DCSI	Senior Consultant Psychiatrist	MD024G	Attraction and retention allowances	\$31,469.65
DCSI	Senior Practitioner	PO601	Attraction and retention allowances	\$14,086.74
DCSI	General Manager, DES	MAS301	Attraction and retention allowances	\$8,626.28
DCSI	Project Officer—NDIS Trial	ASO504	Attraction and retention allowances	\$5,549.46

(b) 2015-16:

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
DCSI	Senior Consultant Psychiatrist	MD024G	Attraction and retention allowances	\$29,903.60
DCSI	Senior Practitioner	PO601 / PO601	Attraction and retention allowances	\$13,422.30

Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse

Attraction, retention and performance allowances as well as non-salary benefits paid to public servants and contractors:

(a) 2014-15:

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
DHA	Director, Mental Health and Statewide Strategy	MD02	Attraction & Retention	\$12,725

(b) 2015-16:

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
DHA	Director, Mental Health and Statewide Strategy	MD02	Attraction & Retention	\$33,086

GRANT EXPENDITUREIn reply to **Mr DULUK (Davenport)** (3 August 2016). (Estimates Committee A)**The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse):** I am advised by the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion and SA Health that:

Minister for Disabilities 2015-16

The following provides information with regards to grants of \$10,000 or more:

Department for Communities and Social Inclusion

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant (GST exclusive)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Access2Arts	\$81,116.97	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Aged Care & Housing Group Inc.	\$176,693.59	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Amandus Lutheran Disability Services Inc.	\$2,012,970.71	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Anglicare SA Ltd	\$10,056,047.12	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Arthritis Foundation of SA	\$22,753.58	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Assured Home Care	\$736,182.08	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Autism Association of SA Inc.	\$5,419,410.80	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant (GST exclusive)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Avail Inc.	\$54,250.66	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Baptist Care (SA) Inc.	\$94,543.63	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Barkuma Inc.	\$2,460,510.92	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Barossa Enterprises	\$1,507,104.02	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Bedford Phoenix Inc.	\$2,440,139.38	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Brian Burdekin Clinic	\$69,993.79	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Calvary Home Care Services	\$1,347,188.18	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Ceduna Koonibba Aboriginal Health Service	\$38,599.87	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Centacare Catholic Family Services	\$5,626,766.01	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Central Northern Adelaide Health Service	\$632,936.50	Disability grant to other organisation type (non-NGO) to support the overall provision of services to people with disability	Yes
City of Onkaparinga	\$53,014.32	Disability grant to other organisation type (non-NGO) to support the overall provision of services to people with disability	Yes
City of Salisbury	\$183,260.88	Disability grant to other organisation type (non-NGO) to support the overall provision of services to people with disability	Yes
Community Accommodation & Respite Agency Inc.	\$28,997,810.61	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Community Bridging Services Inc.	\$1,059,352.62	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Community Business Bureau Inc.	\$233,329.11	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Community Living Australia	\$13,636,786.39	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant (GST exclusive)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Community Living Options Inc.	\$7,254,099.23	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Community Living Project Inc.	\$2,888,936.78	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Community Support Inc.	\$24,925.71	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
COMREC Australia Pty Ltd	\$2,631,176.01	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Corporation of the City of Port Augusta	\$168,156.99	Disability grant to other organisation type (non-NGO) to support the overall provision of services to people with disability	Yes
Country Health SA	\$2,134,052.01	Disability grant to other organisation type (non-NGO) to support the overall provision of services to people with disability	Yes
Country North Community	\$173,655.39	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Direct Care Australia Pty Ltd	\$66,567.58	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Disability Living Inc.	\$4,811,467.60	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Disability Services Commission	\$333,338.00	Disability grant to other organisation type (non-NGO) to support the overall provision of services to people with disability	Yes
Down Syndrome South Australia	\$101,501.81	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
EBL Disability Services Inc.	\$5,357,080.26	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Encounter Centre Inc.	\$171,416.60	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Endeavour Foundation	\$3,577,191.54	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Enhanced Lifestyles Inc.	\$1,163,553.00	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Eureka Care Communities (Salisbury) Pty Ltd	\$31,227.45	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant (GST exclusive)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Guide Dogs Association of SA & NT Inc.	\$2,131,876.47	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Hills Community Options	\$3,657,473.95	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Holiday Explorers Inc.	\$324,170.71	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Homecare Plus	\$3,408,942.94	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Inclusive Sport SA Inc.	\$179,168.18	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Incompro Aboriginal Association Inc.	\$458,367.00	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Individual Supported Accommodation Service	\$2,038,786.55	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Interchange Inc.	\$281,606.35	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
KinCare Homecare (SA) Pty Ltd	\$1,728,297.98	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
KnH Quality Time Services	\$203,483.09	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Kura Yerlo Council Inc.	\$33,444.34	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Life Without Barriers	\$5,312,945.97	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Lifestyle Assistance & Accommodation Service Inc.	\$1,474,989.08	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Lighthouse Disability (formerly Leveda Inc.)	\$13,835,323.53	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Lions Hearing Dogs Inc.	\$76,191.47	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Mary Mackillop Care SA Ltd	\$899,376.27	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant (GST exclusive)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Minda Incorporated	\$50,438,804.27	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Miroma Cottage Inc.	\$185,461.94	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Multiple Sclerosis Society of South Australia & Northern Territory Inc.	\$290,462.85	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Muscular Dystrophy Association	\$127,993.57	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
National Disability Services	\$208,439.70	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
No Strings Attached Theatre of Disability Inc.	\$55,327.94	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Northern Territory of Australia	\$527,537.26	Disability grant to other organisation type (non-NGO) to support the overall provision of services to people with disability	Yes
Novita Children's Services Inc.	\$12,021,670.76	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Orana Inc.	\$10,011,432.28	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Paradise Community Care Inc.	\$19,044.48	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Pika Wiya Health Service	\$117,066.65	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Restless Dance Theatre Inc.	\$41,987.87	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Riding for the Disabled	\$155,927.09	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Riverland Respite & Recreation Service Inc.	\$979,115.54	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Royal District Nursing	\$1,354,381.88	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Royal SA Deaf Society Inc.	\$404,107.88	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant (GST exclusive)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Royal Society for the Blind of South Australia Inc.	\$3,039,610.30	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
SA Care Lifestyle Support Service	\$83,481.85	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
SA Support Services Inc.	\$82,025.44	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Skill Teaching & Resources Inc.	\$443,630.83	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Sorento Care Ltd	\$1,414,811.43	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Spastic Centres of SA Inc.	\$7,997,294.52	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Tauondi Incorporated	\$40,887.39	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Technical Aid to the Disabled	\$73,659.30	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
The Barossa Council	\$150,004.96	Disability grant to other organisation type (non-NGO) to support the overall provision of services to people with disability	Yes
The Brain Injury Network of SA	\$412,116.25	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
The Broughton Art Society	\$36,230.38	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
The Flinders University of South Australia	\$181,854.50	Disability grant to other organisation type (non-NGO) to support the overall provision of services to people with disability	Yes
The Trustee for the Nextt Health Trust	\$374,907.29	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Tony Doyle Visions	\$78,303.78	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Total Support Services Pty Ltd	\$287,399.31	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Townsend House Inc.	\$650,934.43	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant (GST exclusive)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Tullawon Health Services Inc.	\$429,420.31	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Tutti Ensemble Inc.	\$447,715.61	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Uniting Communities	\$946,462.21	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
UnitingCare Wesley Country SA Inc.	\$83,608.49	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
UnitingCare Wesley Port Adelaide Inc.	\$798,715.43	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Various *	\$15,102,062.27	Individualised Funding program which provides people with disability with the ability to manage their personal support budget, as allocated by Disability SA	Yes
Windamere Park	\$1,213,106.52	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Women's & Children's Hospital	\$1,144,526.25	Disability grant to other organisation type (non-NGO) to support the overall provision of services to people with disability	Yes
Workers Educational Association of SA Inc.	\$144,317.71	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes
Xlent Disability Services	\$1,159,943.61	Disability grant to contract an NGO to provide a range of services to support people with disability	Yes

*The highest Individualised Funding amount was \$291,262.32. All Individualised Funding payments are paid to individuals who manage their funds. These funds are subject to an Individualised Funding Agreement.

Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse 2015-16

The following provides information with regards to grants of \$10,000 or more:

(Department for Health and Ageing)

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant (GST Exclusive)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Beyond Blue Limited	278,000.00	National depression initiative	Y
Carers Association of South Australia Incorporated	24,080.00	Support services for relatives and friends of the mentally ill	Y
Department For Communities and Social Inclusion	540,320.00	Supported Residential Facilities (SRF)	Y
Department For Communities and Social Inclusion	107,000.00	Support client regarding exceptional needs	Y

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant (GST Exclusive)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Mental Health Australia Limited	20,249.00	Facilitate the National Mental Health Consumer and Carer Forum (NMHCCF)	Y
Mental Health Coalition of South Australia Incorporated	109,000.00	Lived experience workforce program	Y
Mental Health Coalition of South Australia Incorporated	80,000.00	Mental health promotion	Y
Mental Health Coalition of South Australia Incorporated	302,843.00	Provide leadership and co-ordination to the mental health non-government sector	Y
The Jam The Mix The Gig Incorporated	10,500.00	Provision of core workshops and performance programs	Y
University of South Australia	150,000.00	Chair in Mental Health	Y
University of South Australia	100,000.00	Undertake a communities of practice approach to mentor, support and guide nursing staff	Y
South Australia Police	13,700.00	Funding for Offender Management	Y
Australian Refugee Association Incorporated	10,000.00	Suicide prevention program	Y
Kairos Prison Ministry Australia	10,000.00	Suicide prevention program	Y
Lifeline South East (SA) Incorporated	66,667.00	Lifeline Support	Y
Minda Incorporated	10,000.00	Suicide prevention program	Y
Mosh Australia Limited	10,000.00	Suicide prevention program	Y
Pangula Mannamurana Incorporated	10,000.00	Suicide prevention program	Y
Northern Adelaide Senior College Council Incorporated	10,000.00	Suicide prevention program	Y
Silent Ripples Incorporated	10,000.00	Suicide prevention program	Y
Trojan's Trek Foundation Limited	10,000.00	Suicide prevention program	Y
Umoona Tjutagku Health Service Aboriginal Corporation ICN 7460	10,000.00	Suicide prevention program	Y
Unitedcare Wesley Adelaide Inc.	133,333.00	Lifeline Support	Y
Vita Living Psychology Services	10,000.00	Suicide prevention program	Y

TARGETED VOLUNTARY SEPARATION PACKAGES

In reply to **Mr DULUK (Davenport)** (3 August 2016). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse): Information on TVSP's can be obtained from the Auditor-General's Annual Report to Parliament.

There is no budget over the forward estimates and any packages offered are to be funded within existing agency budgets.

MINISTERIAL STAFF

In reply to **Mr DULUK (Davenport)** (3 August 2016). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse): I have been advised:

For a list of ministerial staff and salaries please refer to the Government Gazette.

Non-Ministerial appointments are as follows:

FTE	Classification
1	ASO8
1	ASO7
1	ASO6
1.8	ASO5
2	ASO4
1	ASO3
1	ASO2
1	ASO1

OUR JOBS PLAN

In reply to **Mr WINGARD (Mitchell)** (3 August 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy): I am advised:

1. The cost of administering the manufacturing components of Our Jobs Plan from the 2013-14 financial year to the 2015-16 financial year is \$541,000.

2. The following programs are administered under the Manufacturing and Innovation portfolio (including Our Jobs Plan component programs):

- Building a Stronger South Australia – Our Jobs Plan
- Northern Economic Plan
- Strategic Industry Development Fund
- UniSA Centre for Business Growth – Growing South Australia's Companies
- Upper Spencer Gulf Fund
- Business Transformation Voucher Program (Our Jobs Plan)
- Next Generation Manufacturing Investment Program (Our Jobs Plan)
- Innovative Manufacturing Co-operative Research Centre (Our Jobs Plan)
- South Australian Clusters Program (Our Jobs Plan)
- Industry Roadmaps (Our Jobs Plan)
- Expansion of Existing Manufacturing Works Initiatives (Our Jobs Plan)
- Polaris Centre Digital Growth Program (Our Jobs Plan)
- Innovyz Start (Our Jobs Plan).

AUTOMOTIVE TRANSFORMATION TASKFORCE

In reply to **Mr WINGARD (Mitchell)** (3 August 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy): I have been advised:

1. To date, around 120 jobs will be retained in supply chain firms as a result of program funding provided for their diversification efforts under the Automotive Supplier Diversification Program.

The Automotive Workers in Transition Program is a voluntary career and transition support program which provides case management to workers to pursue new career options. No modelling has been undertaken to predict future job growth from this program.

2. The \$10 million is divided between the Automotive Supplier Diversification Program and the Automotive Workers in Transition Program. The funds are not exhausted due to the demand driven nature of these programs. Greater uptake is expected closer to GM Holden's closure.

NORTHERN ECONOMIC PLAN

In reply to **Mr WINGARD (Mitchell)** (3 August 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy): I am advised:

Employment in northern Adelaide increased at an average annual rate of 1.1 per cent per annum between 2010 and 2015. In the 12 months to June 2016, employment was comparatively stable at around 151,900 FTEs, up 1,700 over the year.

Many of the Northern Economic Plan projects are in pre-implementation phase, early implementation or relate to improving community resilience rather than job creation. The Northern Economic Plan team is working across government agencies and the private sector to implement the projects.

Funding is being invested in areas that directly create jobs for South Australians, including initiatives such as:

- Small Business Development Fund—expected to generate 158 jobs from the projects supported to date.
- Gawler East Connector Link Road—estimated to create 47 full-time equivalent jobs per year, during delivery of the project.
- Upgrades to Playford International College, Swallowcliffe Primary School, Evanston Gardens Primary School and Keithcot Farm Children's Centre—estimated to create 50 full-time equivalent jobs.
- Northern Connector—estimated to create an average of 480 jobs per year during construction.
- Public housing renewal—estimated to create an average of 80 jobs per year during delivery of the project.

INDUSTRY CAPABILITY NETWORK

In reply to **Mr WINGARD (Mitchell)** (3 August 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy): I am advised:

1. While the value of individual contracts is commercial in confidence, I can advise that over the period 1 July 2015 to 30 June 2016, a total of 50 South Australian-based companies recorded contract wins totalling \$55.36 million across the infrastructure, defence and resources sectors.

2. Due to the lag between publication of work packages and award of contract, the ICN does not undertake detailed forecasting.

INVESTMENT ATTRACTION AGENCY

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (3 August 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy): I am advised that from my portfolio, the following funding was reallocated to Investment Attraction South Australia for 2015-16 as part of the establishment of the agency.

Program 2.1 Industry and Innovation

2015-16—\$291,839 for the reallocation of two staff members and funds for minor operating costs.

Program 4 Science, Technology and Information Economy

2015-16—\$65,998 for the reallocation of one staff member.

MINISTERIAL STAFF

In reply to various members (3 August 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy): I have been advised of the following:

For a list of ministerial staff and salaries please refer to the Government Gazette.

Non Ministerial appointments are as follows:

FTE	Classification
2	AS07
2.4	AS06
2	AS05
2	AS04

SALES, GOODS AND SERVICES

In reply to **Mr GARDNER (Morialta)** (3 August 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy): I have been advised:

1. Income for the sale of goods and services predominantly relates to corporate income from the hire of facilities. These corporate overheads have been allocated across the agency according to program expenditure. Variations in overhead allocations between financial years occur due to movements in the overall expenditure for programs, for example a program that has a reduction in expenditure between years will receive a lower allocation of overheads and vice versa.

2. Actuals results for the 2015-16 financial year will be available in the 2016-17 Agency Statement.

MOBILE BLACK SPOT PROGRAM

In reply to **Mr GARDNER (Morialta)** (3 August 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy):

1. I am advised that the locations of Funded Base Stations and Funding recipients were expected to be announced by the Federal Government in early-mid September 2016. To date the federal government have not made an announcement.

2. I am also advised that the Department of State Development engaged Optimi Digital to assist the State Government with its participation in Round 2 of the Mobile Black Spot Programme. The value of the consultancy was \$20,000 ex GST.