

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 28 March 2017

The **SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)** took the chair at 11:01 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.

Parliamentary Procedure

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (11:02): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable the introduction forthwith and passage of a bill through all stages without delay.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the house and, as an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the house is present, I accept the motion.

Motion carried.

Bills

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT (ELECTRICITY SUPPLY EMERGENCIES) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (11:02): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Emergency Management Act 2004. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (11:03): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The national energy market is failing South Australia and the nation. The events of 8 February 2017 are a key example of how the system is letting down South Australians. Rather than directing an offline generator into service to meet a supply shortfall, the Australian Energy Market Operator decided that a large part of the South Australian community should be denied electricity in a time of extreme heat.

Another example is the events of 28 September 2016. In the lead-up to the statewide blackout, we contacted the Australian Energy Market Operator to express concerns over the Bureau of Meteorology's forecast of severe weather conditions. However, no direct action was taken by AEMO to reduce the risk of outages from any damage to the South Australian power system.

There has also been a distinct absence of national leadership on energy policy, particularly over the question of a price on carbon. This uncertainty has led to a lack of investment in new electricity generation, and we now have a small number of power companies with extraordinary control over the market pursuing profits at the expense of reliable, affordable power.

South Australians have faced blackouts throughout our history, and networks with above-ground infrastructure will always be vulnerable to weather and interruptions. Consequently, no government can guarantee that the power will never go out. However, South Australians have the right to expect the highest possible levels of electricity reliability and security.

On 14 March 2017, the South Australian government released a comprehensive energy plan to take charge of the state's energy future and deliver reliable, affordable and clean power for South Australians. Our plan is designed to put South Australia first and give our state greater control of our local energy security.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the deputy leader to order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The Emergency Management (Electricity Supply Emergencies) Amendment Bill 2017 is an essential component of the energy plan. It will ensure that, in times of electricity supply emergency, the minister responsible for energy will be able to make directions to protect the needs of the South Australian community. The minister responsible for energy will be provided with the power to declare an electricity supply emergency if it appears, on reasonable grounds, that the supply of electricity to all or part of the South Australian community is disrupted to a significant degree or there is a real risk that it may be disrupted to a significant degree.

There is an urgent need to enact these powers. We have seen a year of extreme weather events in South Australia, testing the power system. On top of this, we are seeing coal-fired power stations closing, which reduces supply in the National Electricity Market. Without clear national policy settings, little or no investment is occurring to replace the generation that has exited the system. Relying on existing provisions for the management of emergencies is not an option. Electricity supply emergencies occur very swiftly. Currently, where severe or prolonged electricity supply shortfalls occur, there are legislative powers under the Essential Services Act 1981 that enable the South Australian government to impose directions.

The Attorney-General has responsibility for the administration of the ESA, and process requires the Governor to declare a period of emergency and declare energy as a specified essential service for that period of emergency. On 8 February 2017, there was less than two hours between the notice of a lack of reserve and the instruction by the Australian Energy Market Operator to the network operators to shed load. Under the current process, it would not have been possible to act quickly enough to avoid load shedding. The bill establishes an efficient process for the declaration of an electricity supply emergency that gives a responsibility to the minister responsible for energy and allows the government to rapidly respond to scenarios as they emerge.

The bill also provides that the minister responsible for energy may refer matters regarding the electricity supply emergency to the Essential Services Commission of South Australia and the Technical Regulator for inquiry to ensure that South Australians are provided with transparent and efficient reporting on the management of these events. Exercising these powers will require the government to monitor conditions, to have information available to determine whether the electricity supply is insufficient or likely to become so, and have information to inform the issuance of directions.

It is likely that persons holding information relevant to the exercise of the powers under this bill will be willing to share information. However, they may question whether they have the right to provide such information. To provide clarity, the bill includes the right to require information from any person to support the minister's functions and at any time, not only when an electricity supply emergency declaration has been made. Electricity supply emergencies will be for a limited period of time. The bill recognises this and provides that an electricity supply emergency declaration can only apply for a maximum period of 14 days. A declaration can only apply for a longer period on the approval of the Governor.

During an electricity supply emergency, the minister responsible for energy may issue directions to a generator, retailer or the Australian Energy Market Operator. It is intended that the issuing of directions is only used as a last resort. The government expects that both market participants and the Australian Energy Market Operator will take all action available to them to ensure that the community needs are met in a potential or actual electricity supply emergency.

An important feature of the bill is that it removes any doubts that may have arisen under the ESA that the minister may, in the context of an electricity supply emergency, issue specific directions to the Australian Energy Market Operator. This will include directions requiring AEMO to restrict electricity flow over the interconnector, requiring AEMO to direct other market participants in accordance with the National Electricity Law, or requiring AEMO to suspend the spot market in South Australia.

Providing these directions is a function that government should perform, if necessary, in an electricity supply emergency. This is, in fact, complementary to the national electricity framework, which expressly contemplates governments performing such a role, with the National Electricity

Rules requiring the Australian Energy Market Operator to liaise with jurisdictions in relation to the use of emergency services powers. This bill represents one component of the government's energy plan. Overall, the energy plan will make our power supply more reliable and secure—

Mr Pederick: It couldn't get much worse.

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Hammond to order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —with the introduction of battery storage into the power system and increased energy security services such as inertia to help manage frequency disturbances. It is therefore considered appropriate that the bill provides for a review and report on the powers after five years of operation. South Australians are calling for action to ensure a reliable, competitive and clean power supply for all into the future. This bill represents an essential component for delivering these requirements to all South Australians. I commend this bill to members.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:10): I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 17
 Noes 21
 Majority 4

AYES

Chapman, V.A. (teller)	Duluk, S.	Gardner, J.A.W.
Goldsworthy, R.M.	Griffiths, S.P.	Knoll, S.K.
Marshall, S.S.	Pederick, A.S.	Pengilly, M.R.
Redmond, I.M.	Sanderson, R.	Speirs, D.
Tarzia, V.A.	van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.	Whetstone, T.J.
Williams, M.R.	Wingard, C.	

NOES

Bedford, F.E.	Bignell, L.W.K.	Caica, P.
Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.	Digance, A.F.C.
Gee, J.P.	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.
Snelling, J.J.	Weatherill, J.W.	Wortley, D.

PAIRS

McFetridge, D.	Bettison, Z.L.	Pisoni, D.G.
Brock, G.G.	Treloar, P.A.	Vlahos, L.A.

Motion thus negatived.

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (11:16): This is a most urgent bill for the people of South Australia and for securing our energy future as a state. This government has a very bold, well thought-out, considered plan for securing our energy future as a state. It has been documented, it has been thoroughly worked through, to secure our energy future for households in South Australia, to secure our energy future for businesses in South Australia and to not be reliant upon the whims of private companies, to not be reliant upon the whims of the federal government and its inaction in Canberra, and to not be reliant on the whims of the national market operator when they are not looking out for South Australia.

This bill has a very important part to play in this. We saw what happened on 8 February this year in South Australia when we were let down by the national market operator not turning on Pelican Point power station in this state. We had enough supply to manage the load in South Australia, but the national market operator, AEMO, refused to order on the Pelican Point power station, refused to provide the extra supply until it was far too late for that to happen, and we saw load shedding in South Australia. That did not need to happen; that could have been prevented.

How do we know that could have been prevented? Because exactly the same scenario happened the following day, 9 February, and on that day AEMO did take preventative action and did order on the second unit at Pelican Point power station, and we did avoid load shedding in South Australia, so what happened was entirely preventable, and that is why this government is bringing this very urgent legislation to this parliament.

Those opposite do not want to debate it now—they want to put it on the backburner—this is not important to debate. They wanted to adjourn it, but we want to debate this right now. Dealing with this is very urgent for South Australia. We need these powers restored for this parliament for our emergency management issues for this state.

The federal government has no energy policy whatsoever and flounders on this issue, which has led to the fact that there is no investment in energy across the country going in at the moment. Their response, after the 8 February event, was that we should have used our emergency powers. Well, that is what we are going to do in the future: we are going to use our emergency powers, but they are not going to be cumbersome like they were in the past, when we would have to organise a cabinet meeting and get the Governor to sign off on using them.

We are going to have emergency powers, where the government and the energy minister can take the action necessary to prevent these situations occurring in the future, because that is what South Australians want. South Australians want this government to take control of our energy future and to take control of generators when they are not providing. Of course, it is very clear that some generators—and it is happening not just in South Australia but across the country—will make more money if they have less generation turned on.

That is a failure of the National Electricity Market. It is a sad thing to say, but the National Electricity Market has failed and we need to reform it. This is a very important part of doing that. This is the first step in doing that, and there is a whole range of other ways that are part of our plan to secure South Australia's energy future. Another important way is that we are going to procure a faster new gas generator that will be owned by the people of South Australia. It will not be privatised—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

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

Mr PICTON: —like all the other generators in South Australia since those opposite and their predecessors privatised our energy assets in the 1990s.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is warned.

Mr PICTON: This will be a generator that will be owned, run and managed by the people of South Australia, all the taxpayers, for the people of South Australia, which is very important. It is not for private profit to be sent overseas or around the country: this is for South Australia's energy security. Very importantly, it will provide stability services to the grid and will also be there in times of peak emergency demand to provide energy security for our state. We are also investing in Australia's largest battery because we do have great renewable energy resources in this state and we need to make sure we are using them to the best capability possible.

Game-changing technology is happening in storage. We will be able to use that at different times of the day for the energy security of South Australians. We are also using our government load for hospitals, for schools and for all our government offices, and contracting that out with a new energy provider to bring another generator into South Australia to provide more competition so that households and businesses have another option to go to when they want to contract for their electricity.

More competition will bring down prices in South Australia. Sadly, one of the big problems we have had is not enough competition in our energy market. It is an oligopoly controlled by a very small number of market participants, and the people and businesses in South Australia are suffering because of that. We are going to use our powers in terms of our contracting load—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

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

Mr PICTON: —to bring another energy supplier into South Australia. We are, of course, also a gas state. That is very important. If we look at the gas prices and the increase we have seen, it tracks very neatly with the increase in electricity prices because we are a gas state. Sadly, we have not seen enough exploration and drilling of gas in South Australia recently, and a lot has been sent overseas. We are incentivising gas developers to get out there and drill for more gas—more gas in Moomba, more gas in the South-East.

We want to get the gas out of the ground. Very importantly, as part of those contracts they are going to be used for South Australian electricity generation for South Australian households and for South Australian businesses first. That is very important for the future of South Australia. What is the alternative policy?

An honourable member: A ban.

Mr PICTON: A ban—a ban on gas development in South Australia. That is what the opposition want to do. They want to ban gas developments happening in South Australia. They want to send shivers down the spine of every investor in gas developments in South Australia, which are of course the backbone of our electricity system in South Australia. The people of South Australia will be very wary of your ban. It is a cheap ploy to win a few seats from Nick Xenophon down in the South-East, and it is putting all of South Australia's electricity future at risk.

Ms Sanderson interjecting:

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

Mr PICTON: We are also going to introduce the energy security target. We have been working on this with Danny Price, who is Malcolm Turnbull's preferred electricity economist, because we have such a lack of action from the federal government, remembering that everybody—from BHP to all the energy companies, to the Business Council—wants to see an emissions intensity scheme introduced in Canberra because that is what will invest more money into getting new generation off the ground.

Sadly, we see no action on that front from Canberra, so we are having to take our own action in the interim to bring in an energy security target that will be important not just for providing security for our system but, also, the modelling shows it will help to bring down prices in South Australia as well, which is very important for businesses and consumers.

So, all of those packaged together is a well thought-out package. It is something about which you would think the opposition would say, 'We will support this. We will jump on board and support this in the bipartisan interests of South Australia.' But no. They have no policy whatsoever, except for banning gas, except for saying to Canberra, 'You can look after all our targets for renewables, we will have no say here in South Australia over our energy policy.' They will just say, 'Leave it up to Canberra, whatever is in Canberra's best interests.'

We have a different view. We say South Australia first. We say protect our state, protect our energy first, and that is what this bill is doing. This is a bill to bring in the powers we need to put our state first, to put households and businesses in this state first, and it is something that should be supported by this parliament on completely bipartisan terms. Unfortunately, that is probably not going to happen. This is going to be a significant test for those opposite. We will see if they really are supporting South Australia or if they just want to do Josh Frydenberg's bidding and support whatever it is they want to do in Canberra, because we know that the Prime Minister is now the South Australian opposition leader.

This is something all South Australians should support. We should support our government having the ability to control our energy future and be able to stop market manipulations happening that stop electricity being provided to businesses and households of South Australia. I hope that every member of this house will support this bill today.

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (11:26): I rise to address this urgent piece of legislation which has been brought to the house by the Premier, the Emergency Management (Electricity Supply Emergencies) Amendment Bill 2017. It is interesting that the very next speaker the Labor Party pops up is a backbencher who cannot even make his way onto the front bench on the opposite side. There is so much talent on that side of the chamber that he cannot even manage to get there, and he uses half his allocated time to talk about the urgent, urgent need for reform here in South Australia.

However, I applaud him because he has finally realised that the situation we have in South Australia is indeed a crisis. The question everyone needs to be asking is: why have we got into this situation here in South Australia? I will tell you the reason: it is because those opposite have been sitting on their hands for 15 years. In fact, until very recently they have been telling us that their plan is world class, their plan is world leading, and that South Australia has this new nirvana it is heading towards with this massive push into intermittent renewable energy here in this state, the highest penetration of intermittent renewable energy in the world.

Of course, the reality is very different. It is very different for every business, every householder here in this state. What we have, as a consequence of 15 years of Labor maladministration in terms of electricity, is the highest priced, least reliable grid in the nation. They are the facts, and those opposite cannot escape those facts. They have stuck a wrecking ball through the South Australian economy with the highest priced electricity and the least reliable grid in the country, and now they come into the parliament today and say, 'We've got a plan, emergency powers.'

Who do they want to give the emergency powers to? They want to give them to the perpetrator, the person who has been in this parliament as the minister in this area for almost six years. They want to give him increased power. Quite frankly, this government and this minister should hang their heads in shame for what they have done to the people of this state—emergency powers to direct different operators in the national grid.

We are here to have a look at this piece of legislation, but it begs the question: if the government were so intent that this was the solution, why would they not follow the normal practice of providing a copy of the legislation in advance of the debate to the people in this parliament? No such courtesy was provided. Why? Were they trying to hide something? Are there errors throughout this piece of legislation that they did not want us to find in the parliament for their stunt today?

This is completely and utterly unorthodox. If they were serious about fixing the mess they have inflicted upon the people of South Australia, they would be working with us on this side of the chamber but, instead, all they are interested in is playing petty politics. Hazelwood closes this week, and that is going to put us under enormous additional pressure in South Australia because the fragility of our grid will be further complicated when Hazelwood, which we have been so reliant on in South Australia, goes offline.

When we have asked the Minister for Energy what the consequences are of Hazelwood closing, he has publicly stated that this will be good for South Australia. It is very difficult to see how the closure of Hazelwood this week is going to have a positive effect on reducing prices and increasing the stability of our grid in South Australia. It provides more than 20 per cent of the energy into the Victorian market, and we know that we have become completely and utterly dependent on energy coming across the border into South Australia to shore up the stability of our grid.

The reason why we have had to do that is that this government has been ideologically obsessed with intermittent renewable energy. They have driven out the base load providers from South Australia by continuing to undermine the viability of these producers such that the only option for South Australia going forward is this interconnector with Victoria.

Deloitte Access Economics warned the state government about this several years ago when they said that by 2019 we will be using the full capacity of the interconnector with Victoria for 23 out

of every 24 hours. It does not sound to me like we have energy security in South Australia, but we did have energy security in South Australia. In fact, for a very, very long period of time, we had no blackouts in South Australia, and that was because we had Alinta operating the Northern power station at Port Augusta.

With regard to this power station, you will recall that Alinta announced to the market back in May 2015 that they would be exiting South Australia. Immediately after that happened, the futures contract price for energy in South Australia went through the roof. They closed that power plant in June 2016, and that was a very sorry day for every single South Australian business and every single household in this state because no longer did we have that base load power in our state to support keeping our prices low and also the stability of the grid. We know for a fact that there was a deal on the table. We know for a fact that Alinta had gone to the government here in South Australia and said, 'We have an opportunity to keep this plant open, and there are going to be consequences if we don't.' That has been widely publicised through the media.

It was interesting that, during the debate that was held between the Premier and myself only two weeks ago on the date marking one year until the next state election, when the Premier was asked to reveal the details of that offer, he said, 'There was no offer.' He said in front of 650 people, and then broadcast to the rest of the state that evening, that there was no offer. Of course, that was pretty embarrassing for the government because there clearly was an offer. The Treasurer was out at the next meeting saying, 'Yes, there was an offer.' They could not get their story straight within a 24-hour period.

The simple fact of the matter is the government rejected that offer. They still will not tell the people of South Australia what was contained in that offer, but I would bet my house on the fact that that offer was much better than the \$558 million that this government is now going to inflict upon the taxpayers in South Australia to solve the problem that they themselves have created.

We have a disastrous situation in South Australia. It could have been avoided, but this was the deliberate policy of those opposite. It was not an accident, it was not something that somebody else had done to us in South Australia: this was the deliberate policy of this failed government here in South Australia. They have had an ideological obsession with intermittent renewable energy and no focus whatsoever, at any point in time, on ensuring base load power in South Australia.

So, now we have this situation where the Premier comes out and says, firstly, that the NEM is broken, which is in complete contradiction to his minister who, when he stood in this chamber only a few months ago, said, 'In fact, we are the lead legislator for the National Electricity Market and, by the way, we have done a great job of reform here in South Australia.' Now, of course, it is the NEM's fault, it is the feds' fault, it is Victoria's fault, it is the interconnectors' fault, and it is coal's fault. It is everybody else's fault except for the government which has been in power for 15 years, the government which has designed our energy policies, and our energy environment in South Australia, and left us in a dangerous situation with the highest price and least reliable grid in the country.

The problem for South Australia is not just limited to the cost of our power or the instability of our grid, but also our reputation. South Australia is making national headlines and, in fact, often international headlines for all the wrong reasons. Travel interstate at the moment and people say, 'I brought a torch just in case you need it when you go back to Adelaide.' The Premier, the minister and the Labor administration have put South Australia in an invidious position in that every time we travel we are having to defend ourselves.

The most recent statistics published by the State Bank in terms of the level of state confidence show that the confidence level in South Australia, our level of state pride, is the lowest it has been since they started recording this measure over 20 years ago. That is a direct response to the energy crisis which is currently in place in South Australia. Moreover, the problem for us going forward is the fact that it will be more and more difficult for us to attract investment into this state, because who will invest in a state that does not have the ability to keep the lights on? Who will invest in a state if they know that their power bill will be significantly higher than in any other jurisdiction in the nation? This government—this hopeless, dysfunctional and divided government—has put us at a competitive disadvantage from people in other states.

Recently, the Liberal Party travelled to the South-East where we held a conference. We spoke to many businesses who told us that if they were on the other side of the border, just a couple of kilometres away, their price would be half of what it is in South Australia. It is the same situation with the member for Chaffey, where many businesses in his electorate are shutting up shop on the South Australian side of the border and moving over to the Victorian side where they have better electricity, more reliable electricity, and their government is more supportive of the private sector. They want to ensure that their businesses can survive. Why do they want to do this? Why are other governments around Australia focused so intently on having reliable and cost-effective energy in their state? I will tell you: because they care about the people of their state. They care about the fact that people want to have jobs in their state.

South Australia has had the highest trend unemployment rate in the nation for 27 consecutive months. For 27 consecutive months, South Australia has had the highest unemployment rate. It is completely and utterly unacceptable, but the government has no plan whatsoever to address it. I find it very frightening to look at the most recent population statistics. They are a culmination of the failed public policies this government has put in place over an extended period of time. Our growth rate in South Australia is now just half a per cent—half a per cent—around a third of the national growth rate. It is like a bike race where the peloton is cycling off and South Australia is getting further and further behind that peloton.

In fact, when you look at the net interstate migration out of South Australia, the statistics are even more frightening, with 6,500 people lost to interstate last financial year alone—6,500 people who could be here in South Australia, contributing to our economy. We have already spent the money educating those people through the secondary system and often through the university system. They have good quality qualifications, but they cannot find a job in South Australia. So, what are they doing? They are moving interstate to Melbourne, Sydney, Brisbane, Hong Kong or London—maybe even Rio de Janeiro. Who knows? What they do not see is a future in South Australia because this government has not focused on creating an environment where business will flourish.

This was made very clear to the people of South Australia when the Premier spoke at the Business SA Property Council lunch recently and said, in front of that 650-strong group of business leaders in South Australia, 'I am not a market guy.' He is not a free market guy. He is a socialist. He believes in big government, big taxes, governments deciding what sort of energy you are going to have, how you are going to live your life, where you are going to go to school and what sort of health system you are going to have. How is that working for South Australia?

Now their response to the energy crisis, which they themselves have created of course, is to say to the people of South Australia, 'We have made a big mess and you are going to have to pay for it—\$558 million.' Of course, \$360 million of that \$558 million is this new gas-fired plant. This is not going to be a plant that is going to operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week. When is it going to be used? Just when we have a blackout. This is a government that does not even trust itself to stabilise the grid because now they are saying to the taxpayers, 'You are going to have to spend \$360 million to have an emergency, stand-by, gas-fired, peaking plant in South Australia.' It begs the question: are we desperate for more gas generation in South Australia?

In fact, there is a huge amount of gas generation capacity in South Australia that is completely and utterly underutilised. Why did the government not say, 'Let's put out a tender to the market to have 250 megawatts of power on stand-by. We will underwrite the gas contract. Why don't we put that out to the market and utilise some of that excess capacity?' I will tell you why: because the Premier is not a free market guy. He thinks the only people who can do anything are the government.

Following that logic, we should all be in some utopian existence where we have 100 per cent employment in South Australia and we are all basically excited about living in this state. The lowest state pride in recorded history, the highest unemployment rate for 27 consecutive months, the highest energy prices in South Australia and the least reliable grid, that is exactly what you get after 15 years of the public policy crises that we have had in South Australia under Labor.

We should not be spending \$360 million of taxpayer funds to shore up Labor's failed energy strategy. There are better ways of ensuring the stability of our grid. One thing that is very clear is that \$360 million is not even where it ends—\$360 million is capital cost. Who is going to pay the interest,

who is going to pay the depreciation and who is going to pay the operating expenditure each year? The government has not even come clean on how much it is going to cost each and every year to operate this plant at loss. How is this going to interact with the NEM, which South Australia is the lead legislator on? There is no detail from the government whatsoever.

Moreover, when they first announced this \$360 million cost to taxpayers in South Australia, they said it would be in place by summer. They were not clear which summer, but they said it was going to be in place by summer. We do not know whether that is 2017 or 2018. Let us hope they do not put the health minister in charge of it. He does not have a good track record on delivering major projects on time or on budget. Three hundred and sixty million is just the guesstimate of what it is going to cost at the moment. We do not know where it is going to be, how it is going to interact with the market, how often it is actually going to operate or what the operating costs of this very expensive piece of kit are going to be.

I am concerned that we are heading for another desal white elephant. The government made a decision to double the size of the desal plant in South Australia. It was a very poor decision. Who paid for that desal plant poor decision? The water consumers in South Australia. It massively increased the regulated asset base that is now part of the maximum amount that SA Water can charge water consumers. Look at how our water bills in South Australia have gone up. They have gone up 250 per cent since this government came to power, and energy is exactly the same.

What we are going to have is a \$360 million piece of kit in South Australia. If the government put it out to the market, we could have that insurance policy in place by summer 2017. Instead, what we are going to have under Labor is a promise to install it by summer—maybe 2018, maybe 2019—and in the interim we will just spend tens of millions of dollars, with diesel-fired generators dotted all over the state. These are the clean, green aspirations of this government. We are going to have diesel, we are going to have more coal coming across the interconnector from Victoria. There will be no benefit to the environment whatsoever. It is a failed policy, it is a bad policy, but it is what we have come to expect from a government that has become tired. They have become bored.

I think the Premier nailed it himself when he was doing his interview on 891 at the end of last year. Matthew Abraham or David Bevan said, 'What is one of your great failings? What do you think is one of the things that you could improve on?' He said, 'Really, I just get bored very quickly.' This is the Premier admitting on a broadcast that he gets bored very quickly. He has clearly got bored with energy policy, and that is the reason why South Australia is now at a massive competitive disadvantage.

If this government were serious about solving the problems, they would be looking at issues like demand management. They would be scrapping the renewable energy target in South Australia. They would have been looking at storage years ago, before it became a crisis situation like it is now. There are plenty of things that need to be considered. The Finkel report is coming down in June this year. The Liberal Party will be putting out a very positive policy to lower energy prices in South Australia to return stability and investor confidence to 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) (11:46): I am obviously rising to speak in favour of the bill. I think it is important for us to consider how it is that we are here at the present time confronting this issue, and the answer is that we are confronting a market failure. We have a situation where a so-called free market for electricity has resulted in electricity being rationed around the country on the basis of how the producers of that electricity can maximise their returns on their investments.

We have a classic example of where not that long ago in South Australia, in February, we had the power switched off to three times as many people as needed to have it switched off in order to accommodate load shedding which could have been rendered unnecessary by turning on an extra power unit. They chose not to for whatever reason. As a result, we had consumers who had the stability of their power supply interrupted.

Interestingly enough, it does not suit some people who are in this debate to recognise this, but this is not a uniquely South Australian problem. In fact, a day or so after that, load shedding

occurred in New South Wales, which is the home of the coal-generating business. Because New South Wales had a particular contractual arrangement with a large aluminium smelter in New South Wales, that major consumer switched that off in order to make sure that consumption by the voting consumers in New South Wales was not interrupted.

But just remember this: that aluminium smelter in New South Wales was the subject of load shedding. As it turns out, there are contractual arrangements between that smelter and the government. I do not know that they have ever been relied upon before, but it is only because they shut down a smelter in New South Wales that they did not have lights going out there as well. So, all this rubbish about South Australia being unique in facing load shedding is completely false. We saw it only last month in New South Wales. It is just that in New South Wales they chose to do the equivalent of shutting down Olympic Dam rather than allowing consumers in New South Wales to feel the effect of load shedding.

In Victoria, as we all know, Hazelwood is closing down, but I will speak a little more about that later. The fact is that people want to have a conversation in this space and say it is all about South Australia, that South Australia is unique—not true. We saw the absolute proof of that only a couple of weeks ago. We have a national issue about the way in which the so-called electricity market is delivering for people and industry and business around the country. If there has ever been a market failure, this is it.

The people of South Australia have the reasonable expectation that the state government will do something to intervene in order to improve the reliability and security of the delivery of power in South Australia. That is not an unreasonable expectation for the public to have. The government accepts that, notwithstanding the fact that the present problems are not of the making of this current government, that is not really a conversation the public are interested in having. They are not so much interested in the fact that it was the former Liberal government that got rid of our power assets. They are not even interested perhaps in knowing about the failures of AEMO. What they are interested in is knowing what we are going to do about it.

The government has spent some time working up a plan to respond to this, and the plan is now the subject of public discussion. The plan has been generally well received by those people who are dispassionate observers of the market, and this legislation is a critical element of that plan. What this piece of the plan says is that the energy minister should have the capacity, when there is perceived to be a real threat of significance to the supply of electricity to South Australian consumers, to intervene and make certain mandatory requirements of generators and others in the market in order to put some stability and security into the market.

It is my view and the government's view that this is the sort of intervention that the public expects on the part of its government, and we are therefore taking forward this measure in order to ensure that the South Australian public know that their government, and in particular the energy minister, is empowered in circumstances where there is a real threat to the stability or continuity of supply of electricity to intervene on their behalf. At the moment, there is no such power on behalf of the minister, short of a state of emergency. Given the way the thing is currently constructed, that would involve a natural disaster, most probably in the nature of a bushfire or a flood. It involves cabinet meetings, Executive Council and the intervention of the Governor.

This proposal means that the energy minister will be able to respond in a nimble, timely fashion. Once he became aware of an event such as the outage that occurred in February, he would be able to move immediately to try to stabilise the power supply and ensure that there was not an interruption in South Australia. I think that that is the sort of intervention, the sort of response and the sort of leadership that the people of South Australia expect the government to deliver.

This bill is an important measure in respect of that. This bill needs to be dealt with as soon as possible. I was quite surprised to see that the opposition wished to simply adjourn the debate on this bill today. These are the people who made so much of a fuss about how terrible the circumstances are. We come in and bring that bill forward and we have the opposition making all sorts of noises about an urgent need for things to be done and asking, 'When are you going to act? When are you going to act?'

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Deputy Premier. The Speaker has given us instructions this morning to make sure that the debate is heard in silence, so I remind members of the standing orders and trust that their cooperation will continue when they speak as well.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: We come in here to move quickly through this. It is not as if everyone has been taken by surprise. This has been the subject of—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is a ruling on audible laughter.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: And canned laughter as well, I think, isn't there?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Faux laughter.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: What has happened is that we announced some time ago what we were intending to do. Today we are delivering, and what is their response? Adjourn it off. No hurry.

Mr Bell: No heads-up to the whips. No speaking lists.

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The other thing that has emerged over the last few weeks—

Mr Bell: You just rewrite history, don't you?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Mount Gambier will be leaving the chamber shortly.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —as more and more of the credible people are coming out of the woodwork to comment—and only as recently as yesterday, Professor Garnaut was again out of the blocks on this topic—is that if there had been a consistent price for carbon sitting in a marketplace for the last few years, long-term investment decisions by people, whether they be coal producers, gas producers, photovoltaics or whoever they might be—

Mr Bell: What did AEMO say today?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Mount Gambier, no. No more.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —could have been made by those people. There could have been natural decision-making by investors to renew, refresh and supplement the sources of power in the Australian market but, of course, courtesy of the Abbott government with the repeal of the carbon-pricing mechanism, all of that fell away—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —and we have no investment in coal-fired generators or gas generators for that matter or, in fact, any generators using fossil fuels. There is none at all. Why? Because there is no price on carbon. They know it is coming. They know we have signed up to the Paris Agreement, whereby we have promised to deliver emission cuts into the future. They know the only way that can be achieved is by changing the amount of use of carbon fuel. They know that, but they also know that, in order to achieve that, there will have to be a price on carbon.

They know there is no price now and they know they are not going to make a 40 or 50-year investment in plant worth hundreds of millions of dollars not knowing what the environment will be, other than to know the environment will definitely change and definitely change to add to the expense of carbon. The sooner we get a price for carbon, the sooner the market knows what is going to happen, and the sooner market mechanisms will work.

Everybody, except the current federal government and the opposition here, who wait for instructions—there is a red phone, a bit like the one that Commissioner Gordon had where Christopher Pyne gets on the phone, somebody picks it up at the other end, Christopher gives his instructions and they say, 'Yes, boss. No, boss,' and then put the phone down—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The leader is called to order.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Deputy leader! Deputy Premier, we will stop the clock. We cannot continue with continual interjections. I cannot hear what he is saying and I am sure Hansard cannot. Everybody needs to be afforded the same courtesy in the house. I know members understand the standing orders and I know they are feeling very passionate, but they will wait in silence to have their own turn to be passionate. Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Anyway, the phone goes and it is, 'What do we do now, Chris?'

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We have a point of order, which will not be frivolous, will it?

Ms CHAPMAN: This is clearly not relevant to the debate.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, I cannot hear what he is saying.

Ms CHAPMAN: Mr Pyne can be blamed for lots of things, but not this problem.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will listen to him now carefully. Rewind.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Can I make it clear that I am not suggesting that the member for Davenport gets these calls, and possibly not even the member for Schubert, but others do, I believe. What they do is follow this federal line. The only thing that surprises me is that they have not turned up here with lumps of coal to be able to make the point that—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Don't give them anything.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Okay, right, well, I will move on then, but I think I have made that point.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! We have new carpet. We do not want coal dust on the new carpet.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Let me get to another—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leader, I am loath to take you any further than a call to order.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The deputy leader already has a call to order.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Another fascinating intervention, which actually was—

Mr Bell: Diesel generators. Whose brainchild was that?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Not the member for Mount Gambier, who is warned for the first time.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —foreshadowed for some time. It is foreshadowed, of course, in the great immortal words of Banjo Patterson, where, in *The Man From Snowy River*, he talked about the colt from old Regret getting away. Of course, we had the man from Snowy River a couple of weeks ago and there he was, the colt from old Regret. We do not have a carbon price, but there he is anyway—the man from Snowy River, standing there talking about nation building. Let's get a few things clear. Number one is that the Snowy scheme is not a base load power generation scheme.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No; Mr Frydenberg got on the telly, and the man from Snowy River was up there, talking about how this was base load electricity—not true. It is a peaking plant. It is generated by water running down a hill. When the water runs out of the top of the hill, the water running down the hill stops, the generators stop. You could build another five, 10, 20 dams up there

and there would still not be enough to provide stable base load power; it is a peaking plant. If you have a look at what the Snowy River scheme does—

Mr MARSHALL: Point of order, Deputy Speaker: reference. I am wondering whether you could direct the Deputy Premier, who is also of course the Attorney-General in South Australia, to address the legalities of the issues contained within this bill rather than his current version of popular characters in Australia and world cinema history.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am sure, in his usual—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, leader!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am glad we raised the legals.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Just a second; sit down. Leader, you have made your point, then you spoilt your record by interjecting again. I was about to say that I am sure the Deputy Premier, in his usual stylish fashion, will draw everything together in the final 60 seconds.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Tie it all together.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That's right. You only have seven more minutes to listen.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I will start to bring the loose ends together.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I thought you would.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: On the Snowy River, I have been asked about legals. It may or may not be known to members that some years ago in effect the Snowy Hydro was taken away from the Snowy Mountains authority, which was a commonwealth government authority, and handed back to New South Wales and Victoria. One of the consequences is that all the state environmental laws apply in that region. It is an alpine region of Australia. Also, the EPBC legislation applies up there. So, I can assure members that any suggestion that you can go around digging great big holes and knocking over trees and otherwise interfering with wild rivers up there—

Mr Marshall: What about your bill?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —is fanciful. Hazelwood—I am allowed to talk about that because the Leader of the Opposition talked about it.

Mr Bell: You said it is going to be good for South Australia.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I don't believe the member for Mount Gambier is saying something.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: It's just gas. He has gas.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Back to the nub of the debate.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Hazelwood is a terrific yarn. There we have this large antiquated power station in Victoria that is 53 years old. The owners of that power station had the choice: do we spend money and make it all nice and shiny to run it for another 15 or 20 years or do we decommission the thing? What makes sense? What makes sense at the moment, given the uncertainty of the environment, is what we are seeing: they are turning it off. They are turning Hazelwood off.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Turning Hazelwood off has nothing whatsoever to do with renewable energy. Turning Hazelwood off has a lot to do with whether you reinvest hundreds of millions of dollars in a plant that is 53 years old when you do not know what the future looks like. That is what Hazelwood is about.

The interesting thing is that last week, or the week before, the opposition were berating the Premier and the Minister for Energy about why there was not some intervention to keep the Northern power station afloat. Northern power station should have had government intervention to keep it afloat.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: And, interestingly enough, I have an answer to that question, which is not my answer. It is from none other than the man from Snowy River himself. The other day, Mr Abbott, who often is very helpful in public discourse these days, got up and said to the Prime Minister, the man from Snowy River, 'Why don't you get in there and keep Hazelwood afloat?' For those who are not following this, Hazelwood is an analogy for Northern. 'Why don't you get in there and keep Hazelwood afloat?' That is what Mr Abbott said.

What was the response from the Prime Minister? The Prime Minister said, 'We're not doing that. That's outrageous. What a stupid suggestion that is,' and he knocked Mr Abbott about (metaphorically, of course) for saying such a foolish thing. There, not from me, from the Prime Minister of Australia, who is one of theirs, is what he thinks of their answer to the Northern power station. That is what he thinks of it.

Here we are, back on this very progressive plan. This plan is all about taking control for the people of South Australia of our future in terms of the supply of electricity. We have here bold intervention by a minister who is going to act in the interests of South Australia, not be content for a bunch of people chomping on cigars somewhere in the Eastern States to work out where the biggest profit margin can be made by the generators and not be concerned about whether turning on another power plant here will drop the price from \$14,000 per kilowatt hour down to \$200 per kilowatt hour and actually cost them something in terms of profit.

The minister will be looking after people having the lights on. Quite frankly, the people of South Australia are more interested in having the lights on here than whether or not some of the people involved in the generation market get to make a super profit. That is what the South Australian public want. They are not interested in super profits for an oligopoly of generators.

Mr Bell: How about super spin?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Spivs—exactly, good word. They are more interested in seeing direct action by the state government. I strongly applaud the Premier and the energy minister for taking these bold steps because this is what the public expects the government to do: to intervene, to do something positive and to do something to make a difference for the people in South Australia. So, I for one will be strongly supporting this bill. I think this bill is terrific.

Members of the public who have spoken to me have said, 'This is exactly what we expect the government to do.' They want a government to take action. They do not want a government to sit back and say, 'Oh, well, do what you like to me, market.' They want a government to take action and take control, and that is what this bill does, so I strongly commend the bill to the house.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I go now to the member for Stuart, who is the lead speaker.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (12:07): Yes, thank you. Let me say first of all that the opposition will not oppose this bill going through this house, but we will consider it in great detail between the houses. It will not surprise anybody here to know that, essentially, we have no choice but to take that position.

We want the very best for all South Australians, but we were given absolutely no notice that this bill was coming into this place—none whatsoever. We were not even given a copy of the bill and there was no discussion between the whips. There was no advice whatsoever that this was happening. Do you know why that has happened, Deputy Speaker? Because the government is running scared on this issue. The government is running scared on this issue and they are trying to rush it through this parliament.

This bill is actually a plan for failure. The government is doing nothing that it says is actually going to fix the electricity crisis, which it created. The first thing it brings into parliament is a bill that

seeks the right for emergency intervention powers for the failures that it predicts lie ahead of us. How absolutely ridiculous is that? What is worse is that they want the Minister for Energy to have those powers—the same minister who created the mess. This is the same minister who, on 21 October this year, will have been the Minister for Energy for six years.

He has been the Minister for Energy for 5½ years at the moment, soon to be six years. He is the one who has created the problem, along with all his government colleagues. They want him to have the authority to fix the mess. This is a plan for failure. It is an absolutely disgraceful situation. The government should be out there trying to fix problems so that they do not occur in the future, not giving themselves power to call emergencies in the streets of South Australia when the problems continue to occur, as clearly they predict will happen.

Absolutely none of this was necessary. After 15 years of Labor government and another year to go—do not worry about us, but I hope for all South Australians it is soon to be over—the government has created these problems, first under premier Rann and, secondly, under Premier Weatherill. They have created this absolute mess. It is not as if they were not warned; the government was warned.

The government was warned back in 2009, when it had a renewable energy target of 20 per cent and was contemplating moving that renewable energy target up to 33 per cent. It paid for external advice from two different consultants and asked those consultants, 'Tell us what might happen if we go from 20 per cent to 33 per cent.' The government was told by both consultants, 'Don't do it.' Both consultants said, 'If you move from a 20 per cent to a 33 per cent renewable energy target, you will destabilise the grid, and when you destabilise the grid you have wildly fluctuating prices and risk blackouts.'

They were given all of this advice. They received this advice and within a very short period of time moved from 20 per cent to 33 per cent anyway. There is no record of any other advice that contradicts the first advice. There is nothing that the opposition has been provided with by the government under freedom of information requests that says that it received any different advice that overruled the first advice. The only advice they had was, 'Don't do it,' and they did it anyway. They were warned; they were well and truly aware of where they were going. Subsequent to that, the government has moved from 33 per cent to 50 per cent renewable energy target, and that has made things much worse.

It is interesting that the government says that Danny Price of Frontier Economics is an independent person of national repute who supports what they are doing at the moment. Let me read you a quote from 25 January 2016, when Danny Price said on radio:

It's fine if people want more renewable generation that's all okay, it's just that it costs a lot more. It's more unreliable and it costs a lot more.

This is another quote from the same radio interview:

The options that South Australia have got are very limited now...simply because the Government keeps on driving towards a greater quantity of more expensive generation as part of their policy. The...South Australian government is to blame for electricity prices, not things that are outside their control.

This is the same person who the government says is a respected national economist and expert in energy. It is a shame that it did not listen to him back in January 2016. It is a shame that the government did not listen to the warnings that it received way back nearly 10 years ago. It is a great shame that the government seeks advice and that, if the advice does not suit its own political imperatives, it then just drives ahead and does what the government wants to do anyway in contradiction of that advice.

Do you know what the great shame about that is? All South Australians suffer. All South Australians are labouring under the highest electricity prices in the nation and the most unreliable electricity in the nation. Do you know what the worst part of it is? We have the highest unemployment in the nation. It is no accident that they go together. In South Australia, our largest electricity consumers are also our largest employers, so this goes right to every single household in the state.

There are households suffering from outrageously high electricity bills, suffering from blackouts and suffering from the fact that they do not have an income from a job coming into their

household. The government has knowingly created this problem. Now what does the government want to do about it? The government wants to spend \$550 million of taxpayers' money—keep in mind that South Australian taxpayers and electricity consumers are all the same people—and we have heard the Treasurer on the radio say, 'That's okay. Don't worry about where the money is coming from. We've got surpluses in the forward estimates, so you don't need to worry about the money.'

Those surpluses in the forward estimates belong to South Australians. This is not the government's money, it is not the opposition's money and it is not the Treasurer's or the Premier's money. That money belongs to South Australians. The government is going to spend South Australians' money to fix a problem that the government created for South Australians.

This electricity crisis that we are in at the moment has, conservatively, already cost our state half a billion dollars—\$500 million just in the last 12 to 18 months. It is not very hard to add up numbers in excess of that. So, roughly half a billion dollars created by the government's policy and now the government wants to spend in excess of another half a billion to fix it. That is just absolutely ridiculous.

I heard the Leader of the Opposition refer to a comment by the Premier in a radio interview when the Premier said he gets bored easily. Maybe this is his recipe for his boredom: create a massive problem and then challenge himself to fix it. That might be okay for him, that might be okay for the government, but it is no good for South Australians who are caught up in all of this. Every single South Australian, from the smallest household to the largest employer, is suffering under the mess that the government has made.

We know this government is responsible for this mess for another reason as well, another reason shared with us by the energy minister. The energy minister, not very long ago, came into parliament (in question time, I think it was) bragging about the fact that the South Australian parliament is the lead parliament in the nation when it comes to energy policies. He was bragging about the fact that South Australia had experts advising it, experts who have contributed to South Australia leading the creation of the NEM.

The energy minister's words at the time were, 'We built it.' That is what he said: 'We built it.' Now, of course, the government wants to blame the NEM. Now the government says it is everyone else's fault. It is the federal government's fault, it is the Victorians' fault, it is the retailers' fault, it is the generators' fault, it is the NEM's fault. The South Australian government has created this issue and the South Australian government now wants to be given the authority to oversee emergencies when they occur. As I said, this legislation is a plan for failure.

We have seen, very recently (I think it was Friday), AEMO put out a report forecasting that over the next two years there will be 125 days when South Australia will not have a sufficient reserve supply of electricity. That reserve supply is an amount of electricity determined by AEMO itself. In fact, it is 570 megawatts under an LOR1 rating. Just to be clear, AEMO is not saying that we are going to have blackouts on 125 days; it is saying that on 125 days in the next two years we are at great risk of a blackout. It would mean that if something outside of the forecast went wrong then we would not have enough electricity, our reserve supply would not be sufficient.

Maybe it is a bit hotter than expected, maybe a generator is not available when expected, perhaps the interconnector is not available when expected, perhaps there is an unexpected weather event, or perhaps the government dreams up another energy policy unexpectedly and that creates all sorts of problems, too. AEMO is saying that on 125 days over the next two years we are at risk. Let me tell you, we will have blackouts, very unfortunately for South Australians, for South Australian households and for South Australian employers, whose businesses risk going belly up if they do not have electricity and cannot produce their goods on time and on cost, as they have committed to do for their customers.

Those businesses are at risk of going under. If those businesses go under, those businesses cannot employ people. If they do not go under and business gets tougher and tougher, they will employ fewer people. This goes right back to every single household in the state. That is why that is such an important issue and that is why we in the opposition are so frustrated with the government but so determined to fix this issue. We are determined to contribute to fixing it from opposition, and determined to contribute to fixing it from government, if we are elected.

The Liberal opposition has put forward many very positive and constructive suggestions. We have said all along that of course we need to have a sensible, well planned transition away from fossil fuels towards renewable energy. For anybody from the government to try to paint us as opposed to that is completely false and flies in the face of everything that myself, the Leader of the Opposition and my colleagues have said on the record very publicly.

We know that we need to make that transition. We want to make that transition, but we also know we cannot make that transition overnight in an overzealous, philosophical approach by the government trying to paint itself as ultra green and ultra good for the environment and hoping to pick up extra votes from that. We know that what actually needs to happen is for it to be done in a sensible, well planned and well managed way—not to try to do it overnight in a vote-grabbing exercise as the government is trying to do and has been trying to do for over a decade now.

We said very clearly, when it was obvious that government policy was going to force the closure of the Port Augusta power station, that they should not do that. We do not want coal burning in South Australia for ever and ever, but we do know that reliable base load electricity of any form is imperative to make that transition. Until we can store renewable energy at scale we must have fuel-generated base load reliable electricity being generated in our state. We do not want coal for ever and ever—far from it—but we know that we needed to have the Port Augusta power station operating for two or four or six years (or whatever the right amount of time is) longer than the government allowed it to operate, so that we could have that sensible, well planned and well managed transition.

The government has very seriously impeded that transition. It has made it tougher than it needed to be. It has significantly extended the time frame of when we can actually get to it by taking that base load electricity out of the market and by forcing through its policy in the closure of the Port Augusta power station. Not only did the government policy force the closure of the Port Augusta power station, but the government very deliberately rejected approaches from Alinta to keep their power station operating for a while. The government has done everything it possibly could to refuse the opposition access to any of that information.

I put a freedom of information request in in May 2015—that was after being rejected and rejected and rejected. Finally, the Ombudsman said, 'You cannot reject this any longer. Take it to court if you don't want it.' At the last possible minute, the government released that information with enormous amounts of key detail blacked out. So, the government released information and said, 'Yes, an offer was made back in January 2015 by Alinta to try to keep the power station open.' However, it is continuing to refuse to share any detail whatsoever with the opposition about what the offer was, the details of it and how it was constructed.

They have refused to give us anything through freedom of information, despite many requests for well over a year and a half to try to get that sort of detail. They just refuse to give it. Do you know why? Because they are ashamed of it. They are ashamed of that information. But do not worry, Deputy Speaker, we will eventually get there. The Ombudsman, I am sure, will eventually—it might be months or years from now—force the government to share that information. The government could easily have contributed to easing the burden on South Australians, but it deliberately chose not to by forcing through its policy of the closure of the Port Augusta power station.

When Alinta went to the government and said, 'But if this happens, these will be the really serious consequences for the state,' the government said, 'That's okay, we don't care. Bad luck, we're not going to help anyway.' I say again: I am not suggesting the Port Augusta power station should have stayed open forever, but it should have stayed open temporarily to make that sensible, well planned and well managed transition.

There are other positive things that the opposition has contributed. We have said very clearly that wind farms are fine and renewable energy is fantastic, but that there are only so many of them that we can have in this state until the energy they generate can be stored and then dispatched on demand, as necessary. We are way beyond the saturation point whereby we can create electricity when it is windy or when it is sunny and hope that the market will accept it at that point in time, but also not accept it and hope that, in fact, the market does not need it at another time when it is not windy and it is not sunny.

We know that renewables are fantastic, absolutely right, but there are only so many you can have until you can store them, otherwise you have too great a share and your generation throughout the state becomes intermittent. Some of it intermittent, fine, no problem at all, but you get beyond a certain point where too great a share of it is intermittent and that starts to destabilise the market, and that is the advice the government got way back in May 2009 and chose to ignore.

So, through that we have said that we should have an electricity market impact assessment statement attached to every new wind farm development application, keeping in mind, as the energy minister very often likes to say, that the federal government provides the renewables subsidies to the builders of wind farms, but the state government provides the permission to develop. The state government is the one that says, yes, a development application can proceed, or rejects it. The federal government provides the financial subsidies, but the state government controls 100 per cent how many of them are built in South Australia, and they have approved too many, and that is clear for everybody to see by the destabilisation of our market.

We are not saying no more wind farms; we are just saying that every wind farm development application should have a market impact assessment statement attached to it. For example, if a wind farm can show that it is going to be built in a different corner of the state where it has a wind resource that blows at a different time from the rest of the state so it will put electricity into the grid at a different time from the rest of the wind farms, we would say, 'Fantastic, that would be great: more renewable energy at a time when we need it, not more renewable energy at a time when we don't need it.' We have been very firm that the government must not allow any more base load generators to leave until we have this large, grid-scale storage, that the government cannot allow any more base load to leave the state.

We have said that Australia must have one jointly agreed, between the federal government and all the states, renewable energy target. It does not make sense for different states and the federal government to all have different targets. Some are developed quite sensibly with regard to what is appropriate for that state, some are essentially just bidding wars for green fancy. Some of them, which are pushed way, way too high—far, far beyond anything practical—are literally just out there so the state government can say, 'Oh, look how green we are, look how special we are; please vote for us', which is certainly what has happened in South Australia.

We are not saying that it should be an incredibly low target; we are saying that there should be one jointly agreed target across all the states—one country, one environment, one target. It does not make sense to have different ones when the states, particularly in south-eastern Australia, are all interconnected through the National Electricity Market.

We have said for a very long time that the government should support, and in fact incentivise, the development of large-scale battery technology. We have some really smart people in South Australia and some very high capacity companies in South Australia that are really good at this stuff, and they need to be helped. I am not suggesting that we do not share this information with other states, the rest of the nation or the rest of the world—far from it, we would want the opposite—but we want to support and incentivise South Australian companies to contribute to the development of large, grid-scale storage options that unlock all that renewable energy so that it can be generated when the wind and the sun allow it, but it can be stored and then dispatched on demand. We have been right there, right from the beginning of this debate, suggesting that that is what has to happen.

Another thing we have suggested very positively is that we must utilise the spare generation capacity we already have in our state. We already have surplus capacity. We do not need to go off and dream up new ways of creating electricity: we need to start to use the generation capacity we have at the moment, not because—and this is very important—we are opposed to new ways of doing it (that can come), but if we can utilise the spare capacity we have in our state at the moment we can help solve the problem immediately. The capacity is already here, so let us enable it, let us start using it straight away.

Let us not wait for new technology, let us not wait for new generators, let us solve the problem today and use the capacity that we already have in our state. We have been contributing constructively and positively to this debate for a very long time and we will continue to do so. We have regularly released policies in the energy space. We will continue to do so. After the next state budget, we will release a fully comprehensive policy. That will be much closer to the next state

election, but we will not stop contributing in many ways to positive, constructive debate on this topic between now and then.

The government's suggestion, which they announced two weeks ago to the day, includes large-scale batteries. We have been supportive of that all along. Whether the government is going to do it exactly right, we will just wait and see what comes back from their tender, but we have been constructively and positively supportive of large-scale batteries for a very long time.

We will see what the government actually decides to do in that space. The government has also announced a peaking gas power plant. As I was saying just a few minutes ago, we have five open-cycle gas turbine peaking plants in South Australia already—one at Hallett, one at Mintaro, one at Penola and two in metropolitan Adelaide—and they operate under capacity. We should be doing what we can to get them engaged before contemplating building anything else.

One great concern about the government's suggestion to spend \$360 million of taxpayers' money on building a new peaking plant is that the government cannot tell South Australians whether they have included in that the operating cost. Is that all capital and some other operating costs are still to come, or is that partly capital and a certain time frame's worth of operating money is included in that? They do not know. They cannot tell South Australians. Does that include the gas pipeline to get to the plant? They have not thought about it; they do not know that.

The government, of course, will say, 'We'll wait and see what tenders we get back.' They have thrown out that they want to have 250 megawatts and they want to have \$360 million spent on it, but they do not know exactly how it is going to work. That flies in the face of statements made by the Premier and the energy minister many times in this place when we asked for some of the detail. We ask, 'What is it you are actually going to get for the money you've said you are going to spend?' or 'How much are you actually going to spend to get the product that you've outlined you want?' They say, 'We can't tell you that. That could disrupt the market. We're going out to tender.'

I have heard the energy minister say many times, 'We don't want to signal how much we're willing to spend on this project.' Guess what? That is exactly what they have done this time. They have said that they want to spend \$360 million of taxpayers' money for a 250-megawatt gas peaking plant. It is extraordinary that the government would so often say that they cannot provide those details because it might thwart their efficient expenditure, but apparently on this occasion it actually does not matter.

The own-use contract is another component of the government's program. They are offering their 480 gigawatt hours of electricity (I think it is; I need to check this number) for the government's own-use contract to a private generator—75 per cent for a new generator, 25 per cent for a renewable generator. The government's own-use is approximately 4 per cent of the market, so I am not sure how they think that, by offering 4 per cent of the market, they are going to change the whole generation market in South Australia.

Let them have a go, but this is not new. This is something the government announced last September. Last September, they said they were going to do this, but then two weeks ago they tried to reintroduce it as part of their grand new plan to solve the energy crisis they created. Let's see how that goes, and I hope it works, but it is definitely not new.

Another component of the government's plan announced last week is \$24 million of taxpayer money to subsidise the exploration and development of new gas resources. That is not new either. That was announced in October last year, I think. What they have done is decide that they are going to have another component. That was new two weeks ago. So, they are now going to spend another \$24 million of taxpayers' money to help solve the problem that the government actually created.

Another component of the government's plan, announced two weeks ago, is an energy security target. That is not new: that is just the government wrapping up a price on carbon with a different set of words. I heard one of the government speakers talk about it as if it were a fault of the opposition for not wanting another tax from the South Australian government on the people of South Australia. Guess what? Whichever member of the government said that is absolutely right: we do not want another tax on the people of South Australia, not at all.

We are completely in support of reducing pollution. We are completely in support of a well-planned, well-managed transition away from fossil fuels towards renewable energy in a sensible time frame, to get there as quickly as we can without making every South Australian household and business pay a completely unsatisfactory price, as is happening at the moment. We are fully in favour of supporting our environment the best way we possibly can, but not through a tax.

Those last three components—the government's own-use contract, subsidy for new gas production and a tax on carbon—half of the things announced two weeks ago by the government, which it says are part of that solution to solve the energy crisis that the government created, are not new. Half of them were already out there.

The last component, the sixth component, is the one the government has put on the table today—the Emergency Management (Electricity Supply Emergencies) Amendment Bill 2017. As I said before, that is a plan for failure. That is exactly what it is. This is the government saying, 'We know we've created this problem, we know we can't fix it any time soon, so we want to have emergency powers to deal with these issues when they occur, as we know they will.'

In the last two weeks, since this government's plan was announced, the Australian Stock Exchange forward base contract prices have gone up by, I think, 7.65 per cent. We have heard the energy minister say, here in this house, that the very best indicator of future electricity prices is the ASX forward base futures market, the prices that the ASX actually publishes. There are other deals done, but nobody other than the buyer and the seller have access to that information. The only information publicly available is this ASX information, and the energy minister has said that is the best indicator of where electricity prices are going.

Guess what? Comparing the most recent information available at the moment with the information available immediately before the government announced its plan two weeks ago, prices have gone up. So the market, buyers and sellers, have looked at the plan—these are capable, smart, intelligent and well-resourced organisations, that have their electricity trades listed on the ASX—and have said, 'Oh, we'd better start buying at higher prices now than we were offered before the plan was announced, because we don't think it's going to work.' That is what the information tells us. That is the market saying that the market does not think the plan is going to work.

To be really fair about this, if you look at the increases—I think one month was a 25 per cent increase over two weeks and one month was a 30 per cent increase over two weeks—they are in the next few months, and nobody could expect the government's plan would have an impact in the next few months. Those are trades that have been done based on the failures of government policy up until the plan was announced. Those were deals that were done where consumers willingly bought electricity at 25 per cent and 30 per cent higher than the prices available in the market two weeks ago. They willingly did that. That is all based on the failures of government policy before the plan was announced.

Let me take you to prices released by the ASX for March 2020. I need to check this number because I was not prepared for this debate, because the government brought it on, but for March 2020 I think there was an 18 per cent increase. I think there is at least one consumer—a large consumer—who, since the government's plan to solve the electricity crisis, which the government created, was released two weeks ago, has said, 'To purchase electricity three years from now, I will pay 17 or 18 per cent more than I would have before the plan was released.'

What does that tell you about the market's response to the plan? The market does not think that this plan is going to reduce electricity prices. When the Premier is asked in press conferences or anywhere else, 'When is this plan of yours going to start to take effect? When will South Australians see lower electricity prices or fewer blackouts?' he cannot say. He is not really sure. He says some aspects of it might be in place by next summer and some will not be in place by next summer. Guess what? The market thinks that in three years' time this still will not help. The market now thinks that electricity will be more expensive in three years' time than it did two weeks ago, just before the plan was released.

Another interesting component of the plan is hidden pretty deep. It is not one of the six headline components of the plan that the government put out in the main, easy to access part of

the documentation, which is the only information the vast majority of people would read. This component of the plan is diesel generators.

How absolutely ridiculous is this? We have a government that says it is putting South Australians through all this pain so it can be clean and green and save the environment. It says that it wants to reject the warnings it gets from its external consultants that say, 'If you do all this, you are going to create a lot of pain for South Australians.' 'It doesn't matter. We don't care. We are going to do it anyway because we want to save the environment,' says the government.

The government then releases its six-point plan because things are going so catastrophically badly. After costing the economy well in excess of half a billion dollars, it says it is going to spend another half a billion dollars trying to fix it all and then, deep down in the plan, it actually says, 'Since we are not really sure if or when this is going to fix it, we are going to import diesel generators so that we can help South Australians in the meantime.'

How ridiculous is that? It is absolutely preposterous. This government has created a problem. It has cost the economy well in excess of half a billion dollars. All South Australians, from the smallest households to the largest employers, are paying an outrageously high price. The government says it wants to do this to save the environment and be clean and green, but now it is going to import diesel generators because the plan may not work at any time and certainly will not be working anytime soon. This is ridiculous.

The government coming in here with this bill, giving absolutely no notice to the opposition that it is going to debate it, is a sign that it has absolutely no faith in itself. The government was not willing to go through the standard procedure and table a bill and give everybody the opportunity to read it and look at it. The media would know about it. The opposition would know about it. We could ask for government briefings in good faith. We could go to external advisers and get advice. The government did not want any of that to happen. It does not want anybody to know about it.

Either the government is ashamed of this bill or there is another option: it expects these powers to be necessary. It expects to have to use these powers before the normal time that would have elapsed—a few weeks or a month—to go through the normal consultation and debate process. I guarantee you, Deputy Speaker, we would have said to the government, 'We understand how important this is; we will go through it quickly. We will get advice quickly. We will deal with it quickly.'

The government must think it needs these powers tomorrow or the day after for it to have tried to rush this through, giving the opposition, the public and the media absolutely no opportunity to deal with this bill properly. Not even the whip was consulted. Not even the Opposition Whip was told, 'This is the plan for today. This is what we are going to do. We are going to throw the schedule that we have on the *Notice Paper* out, and we are going to do this.' The government has tried to hide this and the government should be ashamed of itself.

The opposition takes this issue so seriously that we will not oppose the bill in this house. We will do all our due diligence and we will get advice. We will do everything that we possibly can on behalf of South Australia to go through this bill appropriately, thoroughly and diligently. We will not oppose it today, but the government should be ashamed of itself.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (12:45): Fancy that, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Mr Duluk: Fancy what?

The Hon. P. CAICA: Fancy having to follow that diatribe.

Mr Duluk: I like to hear it.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I know you like to hear what he said. I know that, and I understand that.

I rise to support this bill, and I think it is a very important component of the plan that we have for South Australia. We have a plan for South Australia to make sure that our energy is available at all times when it is needed. That is what this plan is about. Why has this plan been developed? Because it is needed in the absence of anything else that exists at both a national level and throughout the rest of Australia. There is a vacuum, and that vacuum is the lack of policy, the lack of

direction and the lack of security with our energy market. Despite what has been said by the opposition, it is not of South Australia's making that we find ourselves in the position we are today.

I am sick of all the people who say that we have invested too much in renewables and that that, as a result, has created a problem with the marketplace. That is nonsense. Without being too rude—and I know we are not supposed to use the word 'lie', but mistruths and untruths are being perpetuated in regard to the impact of renewable energy in South Australia. This very—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: Deception.

The Hon. P. CAICA: 'Deception' is a very good word, and I will continue to take some advice on the powers of the English language from my good friend the member for Wright.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There should not be any interjections or response to them, should there?

The Hon. P. CAICA: No, there shouldn't be, but on this occasion there was, and for that I apologise. This is a very important component of our plan, and it will give South Australia greater local powers over national market operators and privately owned energy generators.

To date, we have found that the way the national system operates is that, as we recently witnessed in February this year, power is shed. It was unnecessary, and it did not have to be shed. Not only was it shed but, to rub salt in the wounds, it was extended to another 60,000 people for some mystifying reason. Then again, we have the nerve of those opposite, perpetuated by our media and the Prime Minister, claiming that the reason for this is renewable energy. It is a bloody nonsense. It is a nonsense, and people are not going to buy that out in my electorate or in other electorates. But what they will buy is a government that is standing up to do something about ensuring that we have security of electricity supply.

For the information of those opposite, this plan has been very well received in my electorate, and I am sure that it has been received well in other electorates, for two very good reasons: first, it is a plan that will ensure that we do have reliable electricity, and, secondly, it is a government that is standing up to make sure that we are going to ensure that there are electricity suppliers for all South Australians, that the lights stay on. It has been received very well within my electorate, and I am sure that is the case in other electorates.

It has also been very well received by businesses. The opposition has said that businesses have not supported this. Well, they have. I have not heard too many people who know their stuff in this area suggest that this is a plan that will not work. The plan will obviously work a lot better if there was some leadership at the federal level. The bill we are debating today is a very important component of securing our energy future, and it is a very important component of what I think is a very good plan.

As I said, my electorate supports renewable energy, and it will continue to support renewable energy. Indeed, I am very proud to be a member of a government when, in 2007, South Australia was the first Australian state to legislate a specific target to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. I was very pleased that South Australia was the first Australian state to sign an international agreement to limit global warming to under 2° Celsius. I am very pleased that in 2015 the state government and Adelaide City Council committed to Adelaide becoming the world's first carbon neutral city.

It was not that long ago when Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull was holding up South Australia to the rest of Australia—indeed the rest of the world—to see how well it had done in reducing its carbon emissions through the introduction of renewable energy initiatives. Now, of course, he is deriding that and saying that this is the problem that has been created with respect to the intermittency of these renewable energy sources, which, of course, is a nonsense. He has changed his tack absolutely, utterly and completely.

We saw a reinforcement of that when Mr Frydenberg, the federal energy minister, came out and straightaway talked about an intensity emissions scheme, which is a price on carbon, and was thrown directly and immediately under the bus by the Prime Minister. Finkel, of course, was then

required to adjust his interim report in such a way that that is removed from it. You can be deadset that it is not going to be included in the final report that is coming out in either late May or early June.

What I can say is that Frydenberg was right, and previous to Malcolm Turnbull changing his opinion he was right, that we need, for the sake of the security of our marketplace and the security of our investors, a price on carbon, in whatever form that might be, that provides security to investors and certainty to investors. Last time, I remember Malcolm Turnbull also signed the Paris Agreement, didn't he?

An honourable member: Yes, I think you're right.

The Hon. P. CAICA: He did, that's right. I notice that my friends down there are nodding in agreement, so it is Malcolm Turnbull who signed the Paris Agreement, which of course puts a significant obligation on Australia to reduce its carbon emissions. How are we going to do that? Has Malcolm come up with any idea, other than the fact that into the federal chamber they bring in great big pieces of coal and say, 'This is the future'? It ain't going to occur in the absence of some price on carbon, some policy by the federal government about how it is going to—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Clean coal—there is no such thing as clean coal.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Yes, that's right: they wash it with soap and that's how it becomes clean coal. It is just a nonsense and, because of the policy vacuum that exists at the federal level, and because of the policy vacuum that has existed with respect to being able to get any form of bipartisanship with the opposition here, the state government is intervening. Earlier, I heard the very good contribution by the Deputy Premier about governments in the marketplace. Like everyone, I believe in the marketplace, but when the marketplace fails the government has no choice but to intervene in that marketplace. There have been a heap of examples where that has occurred.

The opposition says that we should be hanging our head in shame. Well, in this chamber, the only person who is probably hanging their head in shame, in the afterlife, is this chappy up here—Sir Thomas Playford.

An honourable member: His party.

The Hon. P. CAICA: His party not showing any leadership on energy at all and blaming other things, like renewable energy, for the position we find ourselves in. I will tell you how we find ourselves in this position today. We find ourselves in this position because those opposite, back when they first took government, sold and privatised ETSA. Not only did they sell what ought be in the hands of the people of this state but, by increasing the price that they were able to get for that public asset, they did not agree to what should have been an important component, an additional interconnector.

They did not agree to that because, of course, they wanted to maximise the price of that public asset that should have stayed and still be in the hands of the public. What are the most important things in our lives? Water and electricity, the fundamentals of life, and they should be in the hands of the state. They are not, and they are not because you over there sold them and now we have to deal with what we have and not with what we wish we had. Part of that is making sure that we have a plan in place that, in turn, is going to ensure that we have safe, secure and reliable electricity and power generation for this state.

This is to give, as I mentioned earlier, powers to the energy minister. It is a bit rich for the lead spokesperson over there to say that the reason this is coming in is that we expect to use these powers in the next couple of weeks. I do not think that will be the case, but I will tell you right now that they will be there when it is required that they be used. We have a prime example of when we could have used that, and that was when the unnecessary load shedding occurred in February this year.

The National Electricity Market is broken, I believe, and needs to be fixed. We alone cannot fix it, but what we can do is have a plan to ensure that we can fix our component of it. The national

market needs to operate nationally, but it does not. The opposition spokesperson talked about different states being at different levels with respect to renewable energy. That is going to occur because some states have started earlier than others, but they are at different levels because there does not appear to be any clear direction from the commonwealth government about how the marketplace ought to operate, how it can manage it and the role it should play in managing that marketplace.

We have talked about the Finkel report and minister Frydenberg getting tossed under the bus, and the opposition leader is waiting for that report. The opposition is always waiting for something. I have heard consistently through this debate that both he and the shadow spokesperson are saying, 'We have constructively and positively contributed to debate in and on this issue.' I say they are kidding themselves.

You have not contributed in a positive way whatsoever. You have a plan called '2036'. The people of South Australia do not care what is going to happen in 2036 and, if they do, they want to see the road map by which you get there. There is no road map from the opposition's perspective about how we are going to get to what they say in that flimsy document of theirs, '2036', about what South Australia is going to look like. What they care about is the here and now. They care about the here and now, and what they care about is making sure they have reliable electricity supply, and that is what we are going to deliver through this plan.

The opposition also talked about wanting to work with this side of the chamber on these issues. I have not ever really seen that. I will give two examples. The Murray-Darling Basin Plan was one where this state stood up and fought for South Australia, but in fighting for South Australia we fought in turn for the health and wellbeing of a system which is the lifeblood of Australia.

Mr Pederick: You forgot about \$25 million for the Diversification Fund. It's true.

The Hon. P. CAICA: What is actually true is that when we were fighting the commonwealth government, both the Labor federal government and the state government, to get the best deal for South Australia in the system, what was the opposition saying? We would be satisfied with a Mazda. We are the Mazda, and that is how they like to work with us, caving in to their federal colleagues and not to fight for what is in the best interests of South Australia.

Marine parks: could we get any agreement from the opposition on marine parks? The whole world was going to cave in. We were going to ruin recreational fishing, we were going to ruin commercial fishing. That was not the case, but what did we see from the opposition? No intent or no ability to work with the government on what was an outcome that was important to South Australia—just the same as the Murray-Darling Basin Plan, just the same as the development of a proper electricity plan for this state.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: Boats.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Boats was another one. I know that oppositions live for whingeing and carping and all this type of thing, but the reality is that what the opposition wants more than anything else in the world is to get over here. I am going to leave this parliament having had one day of opposition. How on earth can they say how bad we are when they have not been able to get anywhere near being on this side?

I will tell you right now that the next election is going to be tough. It is probably going to be tougher than any we have fought in the last 16 years, but they are not giving anyone in this state reason to vote for them. That has always been the case. They have been assisted this time around as well. I will not go there for too long. But if you whinge and carp hard enough, then you might get some outcome that says this boundary redistribution might help you. I am not sure it is going to help because I still think that the people of South Australia are going to see through how shallow and hopeless the opposition is. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (SURROGACY ELIGIBILITY) BILL*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

STATUTES AMENDMENT AND REPEAL (SIMPLIFY) BILL*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

INTERVENTION ORDERS (PREVENTION OF ABUSE) (RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE ORDERS) AMENDMENT BILL*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

SUPPLY BILL 2017*Message from Governor*

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the house the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the bill.

*Parliamentary Procedure***ANSWERS TABLED**

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

*Ministerial Statement***STATE ENERGY PLAN**

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:06): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: On Tuesday 14 March, I announced a plan for South Australia to take charge of its own energy future. It is a plan that protects people. It is a plan that is about sourcing, generating and using more South Australian power in South Australia and we are putting that plan into action.

Today, we are opening expressions of interest from companies seeking to build South Australia's state-owned gas-fired power station. With a capacity of up to 250 megawatts, it will mean South Australians will have their own stand-by power available for emergencies and will operate at all times to provide system stability. The expression of interest is open from today and will run until Tuesday 11 April.

Another key element of the plan is to build Australia's largest battery here in South Australia. This large-scale battery will store renewable energy from the wind and sun, adding further stability to our network. It is the first project in our new \$150 million renewable technology fund. An expression of interest to build Australia's largest battery was opened on Wednesday 15 March and will close this Friday, 31 March. I look forward to updating the house on the results of this process; however, I can say that it has already had more than 200 downloads on the EOI documentation, with interest from Australia, North America, Europe and Asia.

The state government is also using its bulk-buying power to attract new electricity generation to increase competition and put downward pressure on prices. This procurement has been split into two parts: 25 per cent of our contract to secure energy from dispatchable renewable sources for up to a 20-year term and 75 per cent to attract a new competitor into the market. We have had strong interest in these contracts and aim to have them finalised by the middle of the year.

The state government is also offering incentives to source more gas for use in South Australia. On Friday 17 March, we announced a further \$24 million in PACE grants to help accelerate gas exploration. These grants will create around 100 jobs for South Australians. That same day, we also announced an offer of a petroleum exploration licence in the Otway Basin, offering 10 per cent royalties to landowners to help unlock the gate.

Our new energy security target will increase South Australia's energy self-reliance by requiring more locally generated, cleaner, secure energy to be used here in South Australia. This will come into effect on 1 July this year and we will soon have more details about its operation.

Lastly, today we have introduced legislation into this parliament—

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order: the Premier has spoken on this bill. The bill is before the parliament and he has already spoken on it. It is out of order for him to speak further and to do anything in relation to the contents of that bill. He ought to know better.

The SPEAKER: It would be entirely out of order if the Premier were canvassing the merits of the bill, which is still in its second reading before the house, but the Premier may refer to the bill's existence.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Thank you. Today, we have introduced legislation into this parliament to give the energy minister powers of direction over the market so that South Australia's interests come first.

Mr Marshall: The Premier is completely ignoring your ruling.

The SPEAKER: May I listen to just a little bit more of the Premier before I am asked to rule on whether he has breached the convention. Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Thank you.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: No, I won't be doing that; I have listened very carefully to the Speaker. South Australia will become more self-reliant for its power supply, as we take charge to source, generate and control more of our power right here in South Australia. Our work on delivering this plan has now begun.

AUSTRALIAN ENERGY MARKET OPERTAOR FINAL REPORT UPDATE

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:12): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I rise to inform the house on the fourth and final report of the Australian Energy Market Operator's review into the black system event in South Australia on 28 September 2016. The report consolidates the information previously published in AEMO's three preliminary reports as well as outlining the learnings and actions taken since the incident.

The report states that, on the afternoon of 28 September 2016, tornadoes with wind speeds between 190 and 260 km/h struck South Australia. Two of them almost simultaneously damaged a single circuit 275 kV transmission line and a double circuit 275 kV line some 170 kilometres apart. The damage to these three transmission lines caused them to trip and begin a series of faults occurring in quick succession, which led to six voltage shocks to the state's grid in the space of two minutes.

The report states all online wind farms successfully rode through faults until a preset limit, which allows a maximum number of successful ride-through events, was reached or exceeded. This resulted in sustained power reduction that led to an overload of power being imported through the Heywood interconnector which, in turn, switched off. The system then became separated from the rest of the national energy market. The remaining generation was much less than the connected load and was unable to maintain the islanded system frequency. As a result, all supply to SA was lost

at 3.48pm. AEMO's analysis shows that, following system separation, frequency collapse and the resultant system black was inevitable. Page 47 of the report clearly states:

The most well-known characteristic of wind power, variation of output with wind strength (often termed 'intermittency'), was not a material factor in the events immediately prior to the Black System.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I will repeat it:

The most well-known characteristic of wind power...(often termed 'intermittency'), was not a material factor in the events immediately prior to the Black System.

AEMO has outlined a number of factors they say must be addressed to increase the prospects of forming a stable South Australian island and avoiding a system black. They include sufficient inertia in the system to slow down the rate of change of frequency, sufficient frequency control services to stabilise frequency of an islanded system in South Australia and sufficient system strength to control voltage issues and ensure inverter-connected generators operate correctly.

I am pleased to inform the house that our energy plan explicitly addresses the issues identified by the national market operator. Our backup gas-fired generator will provide constant inertia in the system as well as emergency generation. Our increased powers will also assist in circumstances where demand is predicted to outstrip supply and direct alternative options to load shedding as well as reducing flows on the interconnector where necessary. Frequency and voltage stabilisation will be addressed by our battery project, providing up to 100 megawatts of storage.

We are already imposing extra conditions on generators in South Australia to ensure they can ride through these kinds of disturbances in the future. I can inform the house that in the hours following the release of this report, the Chairman of the Australian Energy Market Operator, Dr Tony Marxsen, was in Adelaide today addressing the Committee for Economic Development of Australia. He had this to say about the review into the events on 28 September:

I stress again, the black system had very little to do with the type of generation that reduced its output. This is not about renewables. On that day it was wind farms that cut output. On the 3rd of March when we had a near miss—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer will be seated. The member for Mount Gambier is warned for the second and final time and the member for Newland is called to order. Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Dr Marxsen stated:

On the 3rd of March when we had a near miss, it was gas generators. Back in 2003 and 2004 it was a mix of coal generators and gas generators. With the single exception of the 3rd of March near-miss, all of these events caused massive disruption to South Australia's electricity supply. The single common element was failure of generators to ride through grid voltage disturbances because of complex software control systems.

They are direct quotes from the head of the national market operator. I must say that I am encouraged by AEMO's learnings of the event and confident that our energy plan is well on track to curtail issues of stability and system security identified in this final report.

AEMO has now completed its investigations into the 28 September 2016 event. They have pledged to work closely with industry to implement all recommendations outlined in this report. There are 19 recommendations in total, all in various stages of implementation. AEMO's intention is to complete the remaining recommendations by December 2017. I am also looking forward to working constructively with AEMO into the future. Yesterday, I had the honour to meet with their new CEO, Ms Audrey Zibelman, who is a thoroughly impressive individual and is absolutely aligned with this government on improving the current state of the national energy market.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I am informed by the member for Davenport that we have guests today from the Concordia College year 11 legal studies class. Welcome to parliament.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Social Housing (Hon. Z.L. Bettison)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
 Housing Improvement—
 Fees
 General

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

Adelaide and Mounty Lofty Ranges Natural Resources Management Board—
 Annual Report 2015-16
 Alinytjara Wilurara Natural Resources Management Board—Annual Report 2015-16
 Eyre Peninsula Natural Resources Management Board—Annual Report 2015-16
 Kangaroo Island Natural Resources Management Board—Annual Report 2015-16
 Northern and Yorke Natural Resources Management Board—Annual Report 2015-16
 South Australian Arid Lands Natural Resources Management Board—
 Annual Report 2015-16
 South Australian Murray-Darling Basin Natural Resources Management Board—
 Annual Report 2015-16
 South East Natural Resources Management Board—Annual Report 2015-16
 Regulations made under the following Acts—
 Education and Early Childhood Services (Registration and Standards)—
 Education and Care Services National Law

By the Minister for Higher Education and Skills (Hon. S.E. Close)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
 Construction Industry Training Fund—Exemptions

By the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure (Hon. S.C. Mullighan)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
 Motor Vehicles—Lane Filtering
 Road Traffic—Lane Filtering
 Road Traffic—Road Rules—Lane Filtering

*Ministerial Statement***ADELAIDE CROWS AFL WOMEN'S TEAM**

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) (14:19): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: On behalf of all South Australians, I congratulate each and every member of South Australia's Crows AFL Women's team in winning the 2017 inaugural AFL Women's premiership in front of more than 15,000 fans at the Gold Coast. On Saturday, in a historic grand final, Australians witnessed a landmark victory for the Crows and for the many generations of women who have dreamed of playing AFL.

The first co-captains of the Crows' inaugural AFL Women's winning team both proved they are exceptional leaders. Chelsea Randall is a two-time winner of the Western Australian Women's Football League's best and fairest and Erin Phillips is a basketball Olympic silver medallist, world champion, WNBA champion—twice she has won that title—grand final best on ground, the AFL Women's Players Association most valuable player and she is a favourite to win tonight's AFL Women's individual award.

I think it is time that we saw female names on the grandstands at the Adelaide Oval, the home of the code in South Australia, next to the greats already commemorated there.

Mr Whetstone: What, eight games? Eight games and they're up there?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: The member for Chaffey doesn't think that women should be commemorated, by his interjections.

Mr Whetstone: Stick to the script, tool of the week.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: I will pass it on to Erin Phillips that the member for Chaffey doesn't think she's up to being honoured in South Australia.

The SPEAKER: The minister will be seated. I heard the remark of the member for Chaffey. Does he propose to do something about it?

Mr WHETSTONE: It was on radio yesterday, sir.

The SPEAKER: No, I was referring to the member for Chaffey's unparliamentary remark and I am asking him to withdraw it and apologise to the house for the use of such language in question time.

Mr WHETSTONE: I withdraw and apologise for calling the minister 'tool of the week'.

The SPEAKER: If any member apologises and withdraws on those terms again in my time as Speaker, I will name them. Minister, are you finished?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Thank you, Mr Speaker. It is also not possible to overstate the extent of Bec Goddard's extraordinary achievement as coach, leading the team to claim the inaugural AFL Women's premiership. To the rest of the team, many of whom switched sporting codes to achieve the premiership, it's nothing short of remarkable.

Before the inaugural season started, we heard many naysayers talking down the league, stating it would not work and it would not last. I think those people can now reflect on what has been a remarkable season with massive crowds and a loyal following around the nation, which can only grow from here.

The state government is a keen supporter of women achieving equality in South Australian sport. We want to raise the participation and profile of women and girls in sport in South Australia and ensure there is a place and space for them. We fund and support sports programs to increase women's participation and have also committed \$10 million in the latest budget to build new or upgrade existing women's change room facilities. I want to put on the record my thanks to the Treasurer for all the work that he has done in that area.

Women and girls who play sport should have access to exactly the same level of facilities as boys and men. Having female change rooms at sporting clubs sends an important message to women and girls: they are welcome and they are wanted. We also committed \$500,000 to the Crows to support what will be continued growth of grassroots female participation.

Since the inaugural AFL Women's league was launched, many women have come forward through the media to share their experience as young girls whose dreams of playing AFL were thwarted in their early teens. They have also told of how overjoyed they felt to finally watch professional women's AFL. Their greatest joy is knowing younger generations will follow in the footsteps of this inaugural league of players. We are incredibly proud of the Crows' outstanding performance in the first AFL Women's league, and are delighted with the way our state got behind this great team of pioneering female athletes. I even saw the Premier in a Crows scarf, and I heard the Treasurer utter those words I never thought he would utter, 'Go Crows.'

On behalf of all South Australians, Port supporters included, it is with the greatest pleasure that I again congratulate the premiership-winning Crows, their exceptional coach, Bec Goddard, and all the fans who got behind this great team on a truly stunning and well deserved win.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:26): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS: I rise to update the house about the Oakden Older Persons Mental Health Services facility. In late February 2017, the Australian Aged Care Quality Agency made an announced visit to Oakden. This involved a return on Monday 6 March 2017 for an unannounced review audit, and six days were spent assessing the facility against 44 standards of accreditation.

I am advised that the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network was informed on 17 March 2017 that 15 of the 44 standards relating to education and staff development, regulatory compliance and continuous improvements in care were deemed not met in two wards, Makk and McLeay, despite the Oakden campus previously achieving full accreditation against those 44 standards in February 2016 and being accredited through to 30 April 2019. As result of the most recent advice, the commonwealth Department of Health has now imposed three sanctions on the Makk and McLeay aged-care facility relating to financial payments to the facility and aged-care provider status.

I am advised that the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network was taking, and continues to take, immediate steps to ensure that the quality of care at Oakden is of the highest standard and that all residents are safe. I am also advised that the steps taken include employing a new clinical practice coordinator with extensive experience in aged care and dementia care to provide clinical and operational oversight at Oakden, that the consultant psychiatrist position has been increased, and that three after-hours registered nurses have been engaged to provide additional clinical leadership after hours and on weekends.

Oakden also now employs a part-time social worker and occupational therapist to ensure residents receive comprehensive services. A nurse adviser has also commenced at Oakden to provide high-level regulatory independent advice to management. A senior clinical pharmacist has commenced, and a part-time clinical pharmacist has been employed. The director of pharmacy is also providing face-to-face orientation on the online training modules for medication management. Medication education plans have also been developed and implemented for both medical and nursing staff.

I am further advised that the chief executive is looking closely at the practices of all staff employed at the Oakden facility and that some staff have been stood down from their duties. As these staffing matters are subject to ongoing investigation, I do not intend to make further comments at this time.

I want to make it very clear that the South Australian government takes a zero tolerance approach to any allegations of substandard care toward some of our most frail and vulnerable South Australians, and I reiterate that the Chief Psychiatrist is undertaking a systemic independent review of the Oakden facility. I am advised that while the Chief Psychiatrist has decided to focus his review on 2016, he will, in his review, look at the historical practices at the Oakden facility and the circumstances that may have led to substandard care.

I also want to make it absolutely clear that the Chief Psychiatrist is an independent statutory officer and has powers under the Mental Health Act 2009 to investigate matters of concern about safety and quality as he sees fit and can also recommend, as part of his review, further investigations. I am awaiting the findings of the Chief Psychiatrist's review at the end of this month, and we will share the findings and the recommendations as well as the state government's response with the care recipients' families and staff.

Parliamentary Committees

ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (14:31): I bring up the 78th report of the committee, entitled Biodiversity.

Report received and ordered to be published.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (14:31): I bring up the 562nd report of the committee, entitled Annual Report 2015-16.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Ms DIGANCE: I bring up the 563rd report of the committee, entitled Hope Valley EL170 Tank Structural Renewal Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Ms DIGANCE: I bring up the 564th report of the committee, entitled Morgan Water Treatment Plant Balancing Storage Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Question Time

ELECTRICITY GENERATION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:33): My question is to the Premier. Did the government undertake any modelling to determine whether 250 megawatts of reserve generation could be contracted from existing providers at a lower price and sooner than the government's proposed \$360 million gas generator?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:33): It's an important question because it has to clear up a lot of confusion from the opposition on this issue. Contracting with existing generation is not extra generation—

Mr Marshall: We're aware of that.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —you would hope so—because currently those generators are already in the market and available. They have visibility through the market, and it still means we are going to have shortfalls. The only way we can get through without load shedding is to have additional generation. Contracting with existing generators doesn't give us extra capacity. I thought it would have been self-evident.

ELECTRICITY GENERATION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:34): Nevertheless, can the Treasurer answer the question: did the government do any modelling?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:34): Again, I find that a stunning line of questioning. If we are going to be short with the generation we have in place already, what benefit does it do us to model getting that generation in—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The question contemplates—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —contracting with generation that is already available to meet a shortfall it can't meet. It is a ridiculous proposition.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Stuart is called to order.

ELECTRICITY GENERATION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:35): Supplementary: what will be the expected annual cost of operating this new piece of plant?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:35): We're out to the market, and the market will tell us the cost of the operation. I understand the Australian Energy Market Commission is establishing a new ancillary market for inertia. They have put out their release and their papers contemplating that. This government is contemplating an inertia market. The problem with inertia markets is that some states have an overabundance of inertia, so why would you have a market in those states, when other states require inertia.

As we transition to renewable energies, this market will become more and more lucrative, so what we are attempting to do is offer those stabilisation services through our new generator and, of course, funding from that will be provided through this ancillary market. We won't know what the benefits of that are until the market is established, and we won't know the operational costs of the generator until the tender process is completed.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Before the next question, I call to order the member for Kavel. I warn the members for Hammond and Morialta and the deputy leader, and I warn for the second and final time the member for Morialta.

ELECTRICITY GENERATION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:36): Supplementary to that earlier answer provided by the minister: given that we are spending \$360 million of capital, what is the likely income and expenditure cost to the state in terms of interest on the \$360 million expenditure, the depreciation charge on that \$360 million worth of expenditure and the ongoing annual operating costs for the new plant?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:37): As we said on the day we launched this, the Premier and I announced that we will be making public all those costs that are available to us on budget day, as we would with all other expenditure. I also point out that Business SA put out its own work saying that the statewide blackout cost South Australian industry \$360 million or so for that four-hour blackout. If we avoid one system black through our generator, it has paid for itself.

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call to order the member for Hartley.

STATE ENERGY PLAN

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:37): My question is directed to the Premier. How are South Australian companies seeking to create jobs through the government's energy plan?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:37): Our energy plan is about more than just creating affordable reliable and clean energy for South Australia. It is also about creating the jobs of the future. Last Monday, the Minister for Energy and I, together with the local member, visited 1414 Degrees at Tonsley, where Executive Chairman, Kevin Moriarty, gave us a tour of this great South Australian business. We saw a company that is focusing on creating clean storage solutions for the 21st century, using silicon technology as opposed to lithium.

His technology stores electricity energy by using it to heat a block of pure silicon to the melting point, 1414° Celsius—hence, the name of the company. 1414 Degrees has positive things to say about the state energy plan, in particular the energy security target. Using 1414 Degrees' South Australian technology, wind and solar farms could be eligible for subsidies, making them more viable and supporting 1414 Degrees to expand their business. Mr Moriarty says:

The Energy Reform Plan sets a strong foundation for our technology to solve the major energy supply and security issues being faced in South Australia today. The know how behind our groundbreaking technology is South Australian and we will keep it here even though its applications are global.

Our energy plan is about more than just South Australian power for South Australians. It is also about the renewable technologies that can create hundreds of jobs for South Australians but, for us to

realise those ambitions, we need certainty in national energy policy. Unfortunately, at a national level what we have seen is a renewable energy policy which could be described as dithering, particularly from the former prime minister and now the current Prime Minister, who has very much sold out to coal interests.

The reason why that is important is that, unless companies have a very clear signal about what they are going to get by way of financial returns for their investments, it will chill investment. People aren't even investing in tried and proven technologies so they certainly won't invest in new technologies. People need to understand the rules of the game. That's why we need national certainty at a national level. That's why we have seen a coming off in jobs in the renewable energy sector across this country. We need to return to being on the front foot in investing in this most important sector of the South Australian economy.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Hartley for persistent interjection. Leader.

ELECTRICITY GENERATION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:40): My question is to the Premier. Did Alinta's offer to the government, to keep the Northern power station open in 2015, provide sufficient synchronous generation capacity to maintain grid stability in the event of the Heywood interconnector becoming disconnected?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:40): I thank the honourable member for his question. Of course, the Northern power station is in private hands. It would still be in public hands if it had not been sold under the privatisation in 2000 under the Electricity Corporations (Restructuring and Disposal Act) 1999. This particular asset is being spoken about by those opposite, and I think those opposite were citing with approval some proposal that was floating around that we pick it up for a dollar.

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order: the question was in respect of the events of an offer in 2015, not 1991.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: So, we wouldn't be having this discussion but for that, but we are, sadly. The reality is that Alinta was never making an offer that would meet either our long-term needs or our short-term needs. We had specific requirements about South Australia's energy future and Alinta was unable to meet them and so there was never any offer that met South Australia's needs.

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Mitchell for an earlier interjection.

ALINTA ENERGY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:42): My question is to the Premier. What generation capacity, frequency control and system restart services did Alinta offer to provide and at what price?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:42): I think the best person to answer these questions is Jeff Dimery himself. I have to say that there has been a lot of romanticising about the Northern power station and its capabilities. There has been a lot of romanticising and myth making about the services offered to us by Northern. The facts are that Mr Dimery could not operate that power station and coalmine profitably. The reason he could not do that he outlined in an interview with Ross Greenwood. Ross Greenwood is no friend of the Australian Labor Party, but in an interview just recently on 15 March he asked Mr Dimery this question:

These coal-fired power stations have effectively reached their use-by date because while the economies on electricity in South Australia were as they were it really wasn't viable to continue losing money generating electricity from them.

That was the question. This is Mr Dimery's response:

That's correct. In fact, we're running out of coal supplies. The quality of the coal done in the mining towards the end was very substandard and in fact it was a very sophisticated operation where we were required to blend the coal from different parts of the mine in order to have a quality of coal we could actually burn through the power station.

Mr MARSHALL: Mr Speaker, I ask that you direct the minister to answer the substance of the question, which is clearly about the offer and the capacity of the plant and the offer.

The SPEAKER: I think the Treasurer's remarks are an appropriate prelude to his answering the substance of the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The capacity of that plant to operate long term to give us stability, control, inertia and the services that we needed required coal. The aeroderivative generator that we want to procure could offer these services without burning gas, but offer it with a battery. The mechanisms that are required of the Northern power station to decouple—

Mr Marshall: Just answer the question: what generation capacity frequency control of system restarts—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I'm answering all these questions. It is not my fault that the Leader of the Opposition does not understand that I'm answering these questions. Alinta could not offer us these services because to offer us these services, unlike new generation, they needed to burn coal. Mr Dimery himself points out that it was uneconomic to operate in the market. They were losing money. Their coal was running out. To offer us these services you need to have coal because their generators were not able to operate without the thermal energy, whereas the new generators that we are procuring can operate from batteries and offer us these services. It is fundamentally different.

The Leader of the Opposition is looking confused and dazed, not understanding what this means, and I've got to say it's really concerning. It really concerns me that a year out from the election, not only are the—

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer will cease debating the answer. He may wish to address the question of what were the terms of the offer or he may not.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Mr Dimery has made it very clear to me that he would prefer not to reveal the terms of the offer. I have said this a number of times in this house. If we had accepted this offer, it would be perfectly legitimate for the taxpayer to know exactly how we were spending their money, but I have to say that the idea of us revealing sensitive commercial information when people reproach the Treasurer publicly simply because the opposition want it is flawed.

ALINTA ENERGY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:46): Supplementary: what was the capacity of the Northern power station when the government refused Alinta's solution?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:46): First of all, they weren't offering a solution: they were losing money and wanted us to subsidise them. The question then is: if you subsidise one power station, in effect offering them a capacity payment, what do you do when a larger generator turns up and says, 'If you're offering capacity to the Port Augusta power station, why don't you offer it to Torrens Island? Why don't you offer it to Pelican Point? Why don't you offer it to Origin?' and then you are paying a capacity payment to everyone.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order: standing order 98. The question was very simple and direct and the Treasurer is refusing to answer; instead, he is debating.

The SPEAKER: Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Northern power station could not offer us the services we needed and, indeed, what Northern was seeking to do was to see the taxpayer socialise their losses. If the Northern power station was so critical to the function of this state, why did members opposite sell it? If it was so critical that the taxpayers pay to run it, why did they sell it? If it was so important to be in state hands and state-run and to be funded by the taxpayer, why did they sell it?

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is now debating the matter. Does he care to address the question of capacity?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I did, sir, thoroughly.

ELECTRICITY GENERATION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:48): My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. What amount of generation was required to prevent the tripping of the Heywood interconnector and subsequent statewide blackout?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:48): From memory, from the report, I understand we lost over 500 megawatts from wind farms and we lost another 800 megawatts from the interconnector, so that's 1,300 megawatts. I will get—

Mr Marshall: Don't add them together.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Don't add them together. There is a fundamental problem—
Mr Marshall interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: There is a fundamental problem with what the Leader of the Opposition is saying. If you look at the report, AEMO itself says that it is hard to say what would have occurred in the system—what other trips would have occurred—had that wind farm software been in place to allow them to ride through completely.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Stuart is warned.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It's in the report in black and white, but perhaps the person writing the questions for the Leader of the Opposition might want to remind him of what the report says so that he doesn't embarrass himself in question time again.

RENEWABLE ENERGY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:49): My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Now that the minister has had more than a month with this question in the house, can he advise us today what the full penetration of intermittent renewable energy was in South Australia for the December quarter?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:49): I don't have that in front of me, but I can get it.

The SPEAKER: The member for Giles.

GAS INDUSTRY

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (14:50): Thank you, Mr Speaker.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is called to order.

Mr HUGHES: My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Can the minister outline to the house any incentives available to encourage exploration and production of new sources of natural gas in South Australia and what has been the reaction to these incentives?

The SPEAKER: Can the Treasurer help the house?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:50): I will do my very best, sir. I thank the member for this question and his continued support for locally produced natural gas as an important transitional fuel as we advance this state towards its inevitable low carbon future.

Sourcing natural gas that then travels shorter distances and therefore more cheaply through pipelines to our industries, to our residential customers, is an important part of this state's economic success.

Support for natural gas is a central element of our energy plan. If you want to keep downward pressure on energy prices for industry and homes, you need to remove, not create, obstacles to gas production. If you want to create investment certainty for the companies spending millions of dollars in their search for new discoveries in the state, you need to support their endeavours, not threaten them with bans.

Our energy plan included \$24 million for the first round of PACE gas and a further \$24 million to fund a second round. Five projects, four in the Cooper Basin and one in the Otway, were successful in the first round that would generate up to \$174 million in new investment in local production. By accepting these grants, gas sourced from these projects will first have to be offered to local electricity generators, then industrial customers and, thirdly, South Australian domestic customers, but we did not stop there.

Our energy plan also includes an Australian first—PACE Royalty Return, which allows eligible landowners to share 10 per cent of the state's royalties to create new revenue streams to supplement their incomes. That is because we wanted landowners to regard discoveries of gas on their property as a reason to celebrate. To kick off PACE Royalty Return, new acreage in the Otway Basin is being offered to explorers.

I was asked about the reaction to the gas incentives in our energy plan. Firstly, Matt Doman, the local voice of APPEA in South Australia, and I understand a former candidate for preselection in the Liberal Party, says, and I quote:

The State Government has taken decisive action [and APPEA] encourages other states to consider the measures South Australia has embraced to secure affordable and cleaner energy from natural gas.

Rebecca Knol, the Chief Executive of SACOME, says:

The importance of these grants cannot be underestimated.

In relation to the PACE Royalty Return, Ms Knoll says SACOME is supportive of the collaboration. The National Farmers' Federation's president, Fiona Simson, welcomed South Australia's plan to 'adequately compensate farmers'. Deputy Prime Minister Barnaby Joyce, no less, said that our royalty sharing arrangements should be rolled out nationally. Finally, business commentator Matthew Stevens, writing in the *Australian Financial Review*, says PACE Royalty Return 'should resound nationally as the most important single initiative in a new energy plan that is otherwise rational and generally positive'. He continues:

When it comes to the extractive industries, there are few states that get the regulatory and fiscal regimes as right as South Australia.

That is from the *Australian Financial Review*. I also welcome the support from an unexpected quarter, the member for Bragg.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes. I quote her from 20 March 2017:

A gas-fired operator to the government have proposed with a back-up battery storage proposal, the \$550 million proposal, may be one of the best options that can be looked at.

Thank you, deputy leader. We appreciate your support and your endorsement of our energy plan.

ELECTRICITY PRICES

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:54): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier agree with economist Danny Price, from Frontier Economics, who said on radio on 25 January 2016, 'It's fine if people want more renewable generation, that's all okay, it's just that it costs a lot more. It's unreliable and it costs a lot more'?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:54): One of the authors of our plan, one of the many parents of our plan, is the honourable—not honourable, sorry—

Mr Danny Price. He may be honourable one day; who knows? What Danny Price obviously is talking about is that the country has chosen, rather than a market mechanism to decarbonise, the bipartisan approach through renewable energy targets that the Prime Minister and the opposition and the commonwealth parliament have chosen. It is an expensive path.

We prefer an energy intensity scheme. We prefer a market mechanism. That's why our energy security target, and the measures in our plan to reduce energy prices to decarbonise our grid to offer secure, reliable energy, has been co-authored by Danny Price. I would like to compare and contrast that with the opposition's, but they have no plan.

ELECTRICITY PRICES

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:55): Supplementary: given the minister's answer, does the minister also agree with Danny Price who said on 25 January 2016:

The options that South Australia have are very limited now...simply because the Government keeps on driving towards a greater quantity of more expensive generation as part of their policy. The...South Australian Government is to blame for electricity prices, not things that are outside their control.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:56): I haven't seen the entire context of that quote. I would like to have a look at the context of that quote in its entirety, but I think it is fair to say that the plan we have released, which is co-authored by Danny Price of Frontier Economics, the same person who co-authored the Prime Minister's then energy intensity scheme when he was leader of the opposition, has said in absolute terms that our plan will lower prices.

Our plan will increase competition. Our plan will stabilise the grid. Our plan will incentivise more South Australian generation and less reliance on Victorian interconnection. Our plan is a plan that has captured the imagination of South Australians. I would like to compare and contrast it with members opposite, but they only have one plan—and that plan is to ban gas.

The Hon. P. Caica interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Colton is called to order.

ELECTRICITY PRICES

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:57): Supplementary: does the minister then agree that Danny Price is saying that the government's plan is fixing a problem that the government created?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:57): Defeats have many parents, not just orphans. Victories also have many parents. I am happy to share in the support for our plan from Danny Price, from the Australian Energy Market Commission, from BHP Billiton to leading experts including, as I just quoted, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who I thank again for her endorsement of our well considered plan.

Danny Price is someone who has fought long and hard for a market mechanism. This government has argued for an intensity scheme. This government wants less reliance on Victorian interconnection. This government wants more gas, more sun and more wind so we have locally generated South Australian energy so we can take control of our own future. What we don't want is to be reliant on the eastern seaboard for our energy needs, which is obviously the plan the opposition has for the state.

ELECTRICITY GENERATION

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:58): My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Does the minister stand by his advice to the house that the closure of the Hazelwood power station in Victoria will be 'good for South Australia' and, if so, will he advise the house of the source of the advice he has received?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:58): I can advise the house that, as of today, a great thing has occurred. The second unit at Pelican Point is for the first

time, other than being directed, dispatching voluntarily into the South Australian market. When I suggested that, with the planned closure of the Hazelwood power station, this would occur, with more generation in South Australia, members opposite ridiculed us, but here we are today with proof in the pudding.

There are now more electrons being made in South Australia, more electrons being produced in South Australia. More South Australian gas is being burnt to make South Australian power in South Australia, rather than being reliant on interconnection from across the border. The more we produce in South Australia is absolutely a good thing.

STATE ENERGY PLAN

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:59): My question is to the Premier. Premier, what response have we seen from South Australian and international energy companies to the government's energy plan?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:00): I thank the honourable member for his question. Yesterday, I attended the Tonsley innovation district once again to discuss preparations for the delivery of South Australia's big battery project, with representatives from a South Australian-based renewable energy company, ZEN Energy, and US-based energy storage software and integration company, Greensmith.

ZEN Energy is one of many companies that have publicly expressed an interest in bidding for the big battery project and, if they are successful, they will partner with Greensmith to develop it. The state government has opened a two-week expression of interest process, which will allow national and international companies to express an interest in building Australia's largest grid-level battery storage. That EOI, as I said, closes on 31 March.

The documentation has been incredibly popular. It's an unprecedented level of downloads for a procurement in South Australia, showing the enormous interest in this project. Greensmith installed 40 per cent of the American battery capacity last year and recently completed a 90 megawatt hour project in California, which is comparable with what will be delivered here in South Australia. The grid-connected battery will help store energy from the wind and sun and provide us with the storage capacity necessary to meet peak demand. It will also increase stability in our electricity grid.

The presence of the battery, which will be the largest grid-scale battery in Australia, will also increase competition in the market by allowing the private operator to store renewable energy and supply it to the market at strategic times. Grid-level battery storage is at the cutting edge of renewable technology, with falling costs and capabilities increasing.

The fact that we have global companies like Greensmith willing to partner with local companies like ZEN shows that our \$550 million energy plan has hit the mark. Not only will it improve reliability, put downward pressure on prices and create jobs but it will also mean that we will become recognised internationally as the leaders in providing innovative solutions to a problem that is facing not just South Australia and the nation but the world.

YEEND, MR S.

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:02): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier accept that his behaviour towards Mr Shane Yeend last December contravenes his own ministerial code of conduct when he allegedly told Mr Yeend, and I quote, 'How dare you effin' embarrass me. You can shove your business up your a-r-s-e'?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:02): I am curious. Who discussed this in shadow cabinet? Who thought it was a good idea to tie yourself to Shane Yeend? Come on, which one?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: No, it's not Schubert.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: No, it's not Davenport.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: No, they're too clever. Criminon is looking down. Don't tell me, please.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order: standing order 98. The Premier is debating the question and avoiding the substance of the question.

The SPEAKER: No, I think the Premier is just getting warm.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Obviously, when businesses come to us with propositions we try to make sense of them. I must say that some of the ways in which—

Mr Marshall: This is about the way you behave in a public place.

The SPEAKER: The leader is on two warnings. This is a public place also.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Some of the ways in which this particular gentleman conducted himself were, to say the least, bizarre. We try, though, to make sense of propositions and we are working very carefully with this company, the Cannabis Corporation, to see whether there is—

Ms Sanderson interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —a business proposition concerning which we can support. The minister in the other place, the Hon. Kyam Maher, has been working effectively and constructively with other members of this team—of course, not with Mr Yeend but with other members of the team—and will continue to do so.

MEDICAL CANNABIS

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:04): A supplementary question: why are people from this industry who are wanting to establish this industry in South Australia being shuffled from the health minister to the Minister for Substance Abuse to the Minister for Manufacturing? Who is in charge here?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:04): It's a fair question. The Hon. Kyam Maher is the lead minister for this because, frankly, it does cross all those domains. This is an area that covers both the harvesting of cannabis sometimes for the purposes of clothing and other non-medicinal uses and, of course, it covers the question of medicinal uses, so the Minister for Health is involved. It does represent a particular manufacturing opportunity, so the minister for manufacturing is also involved. I have asked him to take the lead on pulling all these things together, and he has already conducted a number of round tables that have been very constructive.

It is somewhat confusing to understand why the criticism has been directed at the South Australian government because most of the regulatory barriers in this area are actually controlled by the commonwealth. Nevertheless, that's not a reason for us not to continue to work with the company, because we often advocate with companies to assist them in overcoming regulatory barriers that exist at the commonwealth level.

We need to work through each of those issues. There are issues of not insubstantial risk here that also have to be managed. Care needs to be taken that we don't expose people to risk of harm, so all those things will be addressed in due course.

VICTIM SUPPORT SERVICE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:06): My question is to the Attorney-General as Minister for Industrial Relations. How many workers compensation or industrial tribunal claims are pending by managers of the Victim Support Service that include allegations of bullying by the chief executive, Julian Roffe? Has the chair of the board, Jayne Stinson, briefed you on any of these outstanding claims?

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) (15:06): First of all, how many of these claims there are? The answer is I don't have that information at my fingertips. I can make such inquiries as might be necessary and try to find that out. As to the second question, I have had no conversation with Ms Stinson, or indeed anybody else to the best of my recollection, about work-related injuries in that particular part of government.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No, Jayne Stinson is the person. I did see her briefly the other day at a terrific event in Ashford, actually, where I was inveigled into wearing a high-vis jacket and a hard hat in order to dig a hole to commence the building of what I am sure is going to be a fantastic project. She was there—

The Hon. J.W. Weatherill interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: We didn't discuss this matter. However, we did discuss how terrific that project was going to be and the employment opportunities that were going to come out of that project, and the fact that for some—

The SPEAKER: The Premier has diverged from the substance of the question.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

MCLAREN VALE DISTILLERY

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:08): My question is to the Minister for Regional Development. Given the McLaren Vale Distillery refused to accept the Regional Development Grant, can the minister explain why the report showing job creation and economic contribution to McLaren Vale due to this grant remains on PIRSA's website over one year since that date and why a media event was held when no grant was ever handed out?

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) (15:08): I will take the question on notice for the Minister for Regional Development and bring an answer to the house.

HOUSING TRUST PROPERTIES

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:09): My question is to the minister—

Members interjecting:

Ms BEDFORD: High-vis.

Members interjecting:

Ms BEDFORD: Protection, sir—just for in here I mean. My question is to the Minister for Housing and Urban Development. Can the minister update the house on the number of solar photovoltaic panels installed on public housing to date and provide an update on the government's public housing build?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:09): While there is a great deal of excitement and enthusiasm about the government's energy plan, including the installation of a 100-megawatt battery storage facility, there are of course other ongoing ways in which the government is supporting the renewable energy industry here in South Australia. Members would be aware that this government has committed to a pilot program involving South Australian Housing Trust homes to install 400 solar energy systems on public housing properties throughout both metropolitan and regional areas of South Australia.

This program has been organised through Renewal SA, and three local companies have won the tender to install these solar energy systems. They are: Cool or Cosy, based in Torrensville;

Suntrix, based in Newton; and ZEN Energy, based in Tonsley. All three businesses are continuing their installations in Adelaide and, after that phase of the project is complete, we look forward to announcing where the next lot of installations will occur.

Systems will be installed in homes, as I said, in both metropolitan and regional areas, with more than 40 suburbs and regional towns being targeted to receive the systems on public housing. I can inform the house that, as of the end of last week, more than 100 solar energy systems have been fully installed and that the program is on track to meet its scheduled completion date by the end of this year.

Mr Speaker, 1.5-kilowatt and three-kilowatt systems are being installed and are tailored to suit the conditions of the home as well as the tenant. They are looking at installation parameters including, for example, light and shade and the energy usage and habits of the tenants. This program has been funded through the \$65 million public housing package announced as part of the 2015-16 budget.

As the Renewing Our Streets and Suburbs program, also being superintended by Renewal SA, continues to supply new housing stock and new homes, we are continuing to build the 1000 Homes in 1000 Days program as well. More homes are being built to better suit the modern needs of tenants in particular, including being more energy efficient and cheaper to run for those tenants living in those homes. They are certainly cheaper to run than the homes that they replace. With the addition of this solar energy pilot program, more homes can be considered for these energy systems in the future.

The benefits of this program are many. Public Housing Trust tenants receive the benefits of reduced electricity bills. The solar energy companies involved in installing the PV systems are able to expand their businesses and, through this program, they are collectively employing an extra 75 people to do this work. Of course, with more renewable energy being generated and used in these houses, there are environmental benefits as well.

Recently, I had the pleasure of meeting a recipient of one of these solar energy systems in North Adelaide. The tenant, Bryan, had said to me that he had been thinking about whether a solar system would be within his reach but, alas, to date it hadn't been. With the solar energy system now installed on his property, he is saving money off his energy bill, and he is using that money to contribute towards further studies. This is just one example of how this program is helping public Housing Trust tenants by reducing the cost of living. It's supporting the renewable energy industry here in South Australia and it's supporting jobs in the South Australian economy.

COUNTRY HEALTH SERVICES

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:13): My question is to the Minister for Health. Does the minister accept that Dr George Kokar, a long-serving general practitioner at Yorketown, has never given his support for the removal of a general surgery or urology services from Yorketown Hospital, which is contrary to the public claims of the Chief Executive of SA Health? Why is it that it is only the wide level of community concerns expressed, and my declaration of holding a public meeting on 20 April, that has forced Country Health SA into holding community consultation on these plans?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:14): Certainly, my understanding, and what I had been briefed, was that he was supportive of the changes and that the health advisory council had also been consulted about these changes and were broadly supportive. If that has changed, and we accept that they now have a different view, then obviously we are revisiting the issue, but there are still challenges to continuing to provide that service at Yorketown Hospital that need to be resolved.

A lot of those issues do revolve around the availability of that particular doctor to be able to continue to provide the service. I'm not going to get into a 'he said, she said' type squabble about these issues, but we certainly accept that he has a different point of view now, and we will work with him as constructively as we can to try to resolve this issue.

COUNTRY HEALTH SERVICES

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:15): Supplementary, sir: I understand that the 1 April date originally set for the removal of the services has now been removed. Is there an indication of when the community consultation will start, what form it will take and if another date has been set when that is?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:15): No other date has been set, but we do have an issue with our ability to continue to provide that service at that hospital revolving around the availability of that doctor continuing to provide the service. That is going to come to a head at some stage, but I certainly hope we can have this issue resolved.

Providing any service at any of our hospitals—country or metropolitan—revolves around two critical issues; one is the availability of clinicians who have the requisite skills to be able to provide that service which you can't do if you don't have them and the second is that you are able to do it in sufficient numbers, whatever the procedure might be, so as to meet the various clinical guidelines about the requisite number for a particular service to be safe. I think they are two pretty critical issues that you can't get around at Yorketown Hospital.

The bottom line for me is, unless I can be reassured that a service is safe in one of our country hospitals, we won't be doing it because I won't be having the Coroner coming after me saying that I intervened and insisted that a service continue to be provided when the clinical advice I had was that it couldn't be done in sufficient numbers to be safe, but we will continue to work with the Yorketown community and see if we can find a solution to this issue.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:17): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse. Did the minister attend a 2015 meeting at which the Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists raised concerns with the then minister for mental health and substance abuse about medical staffing and patient care at the Oakden older persons' mental health facility?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (15:17): I meet with the psychiatrists and many other professional associations quite regularly. I do recollect a meeting that was interrupted by several divisions that day, and I will be meeting with the psychiatrists' association again shortly.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:17): During that meeting in 2015 that you attended, what was the nature of those concerns and what action did you take as then parliamentary secretary to address them?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (15:18): Could I just seek clarity about that? Are you talking about 2016 or 2015?

Mr Duluk: 2015, minister.

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS: The then minister, the current Minister for Health, had a number of meetings when I was parliamentary secretary with the psychiatrists' association, not all of which I was present in. They raised a number of issues, broad ranging, and I visited a number of psychiatric facilities and mental health wards across the state and undertook to visit as many as I could.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:18): But at those 2015 meetings that you did attend, what were the concerns and what actions did you take as then parliamentary secretary?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (15:18): They are too numerous to go through. It's a very—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS: Considering the inexperience of those opposite about ministerial matters and their lack of depth in that space, they would have no idea of the amount of information—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned.

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS: —that a Minister for Health or the numerous psychiatrists who were at those meetings provided in that space at any one time—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS: —and I am not going to sit here and be intimidated by their implausible questioning.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:19): My question is again to the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse. Have any incidents at Oakden been referred to police for investigation since you became Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse in January 2016?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (15:20): As I said in my ministerial statement, the Chief Psychiatrist is undertaking a full and proper review into this space currently and I have made a statement about that in the chamber.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:20): Asking that same question again, have any been referred to police for investigation? You would know the answer if they have or haven't been.

Mr Pengilly: Phone a friend!

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (15:20): Yes, I was going to say that's exactly right; you haven't got any, Mr Pengilly. As to the review, I have made a ministerial statement today. I have visited the facility. The Chief Executive of SA Health is undertaking all employment matters relevant, and if the Chief Psychiatrist makes recommendations to me in this space—the Chief Psychiatrist makes comments to me and recommendations at the end of this month about that report—I will act on them very quickly.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:21): Have any of the alleged incidents at Oakden been committed by staff?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (15:21): As I said previously, and I repeat again, there has been a ministerial statement on this matter put before the house today and I will act on the recommendations of the report, which are due in a few days' time at the end of this month.

HOUSING TRUST PROPERTIES

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:21): My question is to the Minister for Social Housing. What progress has been undertaken by the state government to reduce energy costs for Housing SA tenants?

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) (15:22): I thank the member for Torrens. Housing SA properties are allocated to customers based on their demonstrated needs and are prioritised to those people and families who are either homeless or at risk of homelessness. These are people who are particularly vulnerable to cost of living pressures. The state government is aware of this and is committed to improving the lives of our most disadvantaged citizens.

Previous studies have shown that hot-water accounts for approximately 40 per cent of the total energy use in public housing dwellings. Further to this, the replacement of electric hot-water systems with solar hot-water systems has been found to reduce total household electricity use by approximately 30 per cent and, in turn, also reduces carbon dioxide emissions by approximately two tonnes per annum.

With a view to extending the benefits of lower utility costs to people living in social housing, the state government has replaced 1,000 LPG gas and electric hot-water systems on larger family homes with solar hot-water systems. This assists tenants to reduce their energy bills and greenhouse gas emissions and, importantly, will provide a means of reducing the cost of living. Tenants also have the opportunity to install solar panels on the roof of their rental property should they wish to pay for it themselves. Housing SA provides a deed of agreement between all parties involved in the process so that tenants can help themselves to save on energy costs.

There are more than 300 Housing SA tenancies that have taken advantage of this arrangement. This is not an arrangement to which those in the private rental market currently have access and can provide significant cost of living savings to those with the capital for the installation of their own solar panels. Housing SA also teams up with providers and support agencies to conduct energy audits of their properties to ensure that existing tenants can maximise the energy efficiency of their properties. This was an election commitment made by the state government during the 2014 election campaign, and I am delighted to stand before members today to confirm that this promise has been delivered.

Like the Minister for Housing and Urban Development, I had the opportunity to visit a tenant who had this solar hot-water system installed. She had twin boys in their teenage years and obviously had to use extra hot water as they were growing up, and she was very pleased to be able to access this new system. We continue to support our Housing SA tenants and looking at how we can help them with affordable living.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (15:24): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Are the three children, who were living in the home where a Craigmare woman was recently attacked by a group of men armed with hammers, known to the Department for Child Protection and, if so, what supports or interventions had they received prior to the incident?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (15:25): I won't comment on that specific case now. What I will do is take advice on what is appropriate to provide information on, given the sensitive nature of children's information, and provide that to the house after that advice.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (15:25): My question again is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. How many of the approximately 3,300 children under the guardianship of the minister were relinquished by their parents?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (15:25): I will have to get advice. I don't know that figure.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (15:25): Supplementary: while you are getting that advice, could you also please find out how many of these were relinquished due to a lack of support given to the family?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (15:25): I think it's unlikely that that will be available. The reasons for people relinquishing their children tend to vary and I would be surprised if that data is collected in a form in which I could provide it to the chamber.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:26): My question is again to the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse. Have you been briefed on the medication errors at the Oakden facility which contributed to the recent imposition of commonwealth sanctions against the facility?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (15:26): There has been media on the Spriggs case that was put before the ABC. Late last year, I became aware of that case from NALHN that involved medication errors. At that time, I triggered, as I have said in a ministerial statement in the past, in February, and again today, an independent review into the Oakden site. That review is ongoing, and I am expecting the report later this month, in a few days' time, and at that point of time I will address those concerns.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:27): Supplementary: how many patient lives have been put at risk as a result of the government's failures to address longstanding and systematic problems in this facility?

The SPEAKER: The question is out of order.

ARMSTRONG, MR LANCE

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:27): My question is to the Minister for Sport, Recreation and Racing. Will the minister be following the lead of the United States Postal Service and take steps to reclaim the millions of dollars of state taxpayer money that have gone to convicted drug cheat, Lance Armstrong, while he was participating in the Tour Down Under?

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) (15:27): If I wanted to waste a whole lot of time, I would. We sent a letter to Lance Armstrong back in 2013, I think it was, after all this stuff came out that he was a drug cheat. Let's remember that, when we signed him up, he was celebrated as one of the greatest athletes in the history of sport. As a sports journalist, I was there in 1999 when he came back from a near-death experience with cancer and won his very first Tour de France—one of seven. So, this is the background in which we had him come to Adelaide. What he did for the Tour Down Under was to take it to another level and we have kept it at that level and taken it—

Mr Wingard interjecting:

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

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: —onward and upward since then. We contracted—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is warned for the second and final time.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: We contracted Mr Armstrong to come to South Australia to take part in the Santos Tour Down Under to boost visitor numbers, to boost TV ratings, to boost visitors to South Australia and to grow the race, and he did all four of those things. It was later exposed that, during his professional career, he was a drug cheat, and no-one condones drug cheating.

We did write to him four years ago and asked politely for the money back, and we haven't received a response. We can spend a lot more money on stamps, keep the US Postal Service in business, but sometimes you look at it and ask, 'Would we really go after him?' Yes, he is a cheat. We paid him to do a job, which was to boost visitors to South Australia, which was to boost the standing of this race on a global scale.

Let's make no mistake: the Santos Tour Down Under is the biggest bike race outside of Europe. Next January, we will celebrate its 20th anniversary. If you look back at the trajectory of those 20 years, the first year that Lance Armstrong came he took it from a medium-level race to a top-level race, and no-one can take that away. I know there were plenty of people on that side of the chamber who were pretty excited that Lance Armstrong was coming here.

I think the slogan that some genius came up with was: if you didn't see Bradman bat, if you didn't see Ali fight, make sure you get to the Tour Down Under to watch Lance ride. I think that was it. I think a lot of South Australians came out to see that. A lot of people from interstate and overseas came here. He made the announcement that he was coming to South Australia with Bill Clinton. There were some big guns out there in Lance's corner.

While the US Postal Service owns the team and had some reputational damage done to its brand, which is what it is probably going after, Lance Armstrong did our event no reputational damage. He built the numbers and he did everything that we contracted him to do. I am not a lawyer, but I would say that if you went after him to say 'breach of contract', they would ask, 'On what grounds?' He is a cheat, we hate cheats and we don't like Lance. His name has been erased from the history of cycling, and so it should have.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: That was in the paper four years ago. Yes, breaking news—we sent a letter.

ARMSTRONG, MR LANCE

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:32): Supplementary: will you remove all drug cheats from any records of the Tour Down Under?

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) (15:32): Lance Armstrong didn't win the Tour Down Under. He came down here and did a lot of things around—

Mr Wingard interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: We didn't have to.

Mr Wingard interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Well, it's not a supplementary question, then, because you are talking about Lance Armstrong.

Mr Wingard interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Mitchell is on two warnings. If he makes another utterance, I will name him.

Mr Wingard interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: I think he made some unparliamentary remarks there.

The SPEAKER: Would the member for Mitchell share with the house the remarks he just made?

Mr WINGARD: Absolutely. I asked the minister not to be soft in his answer.

PORT ADELAIDE FOOTBALL CLUB

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:32): My question is to the Premier. Has the state government committed funding to assist Port Adelaide with preparations for its AFL match in China in May and, if so, how much? I redirect the question to the Minister for Sport.

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) (15:33): I will answer the question. Although it strictly doesn't fit within my portfolio, it will be occurring within the context of a trade mission that will be held to Shandong, Shanghai and the remainder of China in May.

My understanding is that Port Adelaide are pretty much running their own event. The state government has been extremely supportive. We are in discussions with Port Adelaide about what support we can provide, but essentially we give credit to Port Adelaide for the initiative they have shown and the leadership both within the AFL and the state. They will make an important contribution

to the trade mission, and it will be an outstanding and historic occasion. It will be well viewed—it has already sold out—and it will be a wonderful complement to our trade mission and the growth in activities with China that are going from strength to strength.

Grievance Debate

RENEWABLE ENERGY

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:34): The Liberal opposition has always been strongly and firmly in favour of a well planned, well managed transition away from fossil fuels towards renewable energy, and that remains our position. Let me just tell you, Mr Speaker, that the government, unfortunately, has completely stuffed up this transition. What is worse about this is they have stuffed it up against advice—advice they actually sought.

When they had a 20 per cent renewable energy target, they sought advice on whether they should increase it to 33 per cent and, if they did, what the impact would be. In May 2009, they were told by two independent consultants under no uncertain circumstances not to do it. They were told very clearly that if they increased the renewable energy target, if they allowed more wind farms to come into South Australia, they would destabilise the grid. That is exactly what has happened.

These problems we are dealing with now are not just parliamentary problems. They are not just academic problems. These are real problems affecting real South Australians. Every single household in South Australia, every employer, from the smallest through to the largest, is facing the highest electricity prices in the nation. They are facing the most unreliable electricity supply in the nation. They are also wrestling with the highest unemployment rate in the nation. This is a tragedy that goes to the heart of every South Australian household and every South Australian workplace.

This problem could have been avoided. This problem could have been avoided if the government had even looked to Danny Price from Frontier Economics, whom the government now lauds as a great ambassador for the program they announced two weeks ago. In January 2016, Danny Price made it very clear that renewable energy is terrific in many ways but that it is more expensive and more unreliable. Danny Price said that the problems the government in South Australia is dealing with in regard to energy pricing and energy security are of the government's own making.

Danny Price, a respected economist, is now supporting the government's program to fix the problem the government created. This problem has cost South Australia well in excess of half a billion dollars just in the last 18 months alone, but the South Australian Labor government now wants all South Australians to pay another half a billion dollars plus to fix the problem it created. This is an absolutely disgraceful situation because it could have been avoided.

The government pursued an unrealistically high renewable energy target, against advice, knowing it would destabilise the grid, knowing it would push electricity prices up, knowing it would make electricity supply unreliable and also knowing it would most likely lead to unacceptably high unemployment in South Australia. What is the government's response now? The government says that it is going to provide \$24 million to the industry so that the gas industry can find more gas. That is not new news; that was announced last September. The government says it is going to offer its own use of electricity for a tender to be applied for. That is not new news; that was advised last October.

The government says it is going to have an energy security target. That energy security target is just a tax. It is a tax on carbon, and the government knows it. It is not something that South Australians can bear. We cannot have any more taxes in South Australia. Guess what? There is nothing new in that either because the government has been pushing that bandwagon for a very long time. The fourth component of the government's plan is batteries. Well, guess what? The Liberal opposition has actually been saying for a long time that the government should use battery storage, should incentivise and support the development of a grid-scale battery.

As to a gas peaking plant, we have five of them in South Australia already that operate under capacity. The government wants to build another one. It is absolutely a waste of \$360 million of taxpayers' money. The government should allow the existing operators to operate more efficiently because then South Australians would get relief far more quickly. The last component is the

government's plan to give additional ministerial powers to the Minister for Energy, the minister who has been here for 5½ years and who has created the problem. The government now wants to give him more say in this issue and it is completely unacceptable.

LIGHT ELECTORATE SCHOOLS

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:39): Today, I would like to speak about some schools in my electorate and servicing my electorate and acknowledge the important role that schools play in our community. You can tell the sort of community you have by the school. Equally, the school also impacts on those communities around it. I took the opportunity in the last few weeks to meet some of the new principals in the schools in my electorate.

I met with Tricia Joseph, who is the new principal at Wasleys Primary School. Tricia has won a five-year contract at the primary school, which is a small school in the country township of Wasleys. In fact, it has under 30 students and they actually fit in two classrooms. Putting that aside, the school is much loved by its community, and the new principal has a great vision to grow the school. She is looking at different ways of ensuring that people who live in the community see Wasleys Primary School as their first choice.

One of the challenges the school has is that it lacks an after-hours school care program. As a result, a lot of parents who work in the community often have their children attend other schools in the region that provide that service. So, Tricia, her staff and her governing council are exploring ways to provide that additional service and therefore have some additional students. Even though it is a small school, it does some wonderful things. One of the things it does every year is showcase science and STEM subjects. They have a special science fair, which is also attended by other schools in the region, and I am planning to attend this year.

The other new principal I met was Alec Tibbitts, who is the new principal at Gawler East Primary School. Gawler East is probably at the other end of the spectrum in terms of size. It is effectively an urban school and has over 300 students. It is quite a large school. When I met Alec, he was very excited in his new role, having come from smaller country schools. Again, he has used his first weeks at that school to understand that community and address some of the challenges facing that school community, like every other school in our society today.

What impressed me about both those principals in these public schools was their strong commitment not only to public education but also to say that, because you go to a public school, your expectations of a student should not be any less than of any other student. They are both strongly committed to achieving great outcomes for their students at those two schools.

Another school I visited recently is not geographically in my electorate but certainly there are students who come from and live in my electorate. I took the opportunity to visit Blakes Crossing Christian College for the first time, which is just outside my boundary, along with my colleague the member for Little Para (after the next election, the member for Elizabeth). This is a newish school, a Christian school and a non-government school that has grown very quickly. It has some very impressive facilities and is well supported by the Blakes Crossing community.

The college started with six students in a room within the offices of Lendlease, which was the developer of the area, and then moved very quickly to the school it has now, which caters for hundreds of students. It is now an R-8 school and they are progressively adding a new year level each year. Like most schools that grow quite quickly, they are in the process of building some new classrooms and new science facilities, etc.

I met with the principal, Warren Hall, who has a great vision and great ambition for his school and the school community. It is a very impressive school and the staff are very committed. I would certainly encourage parents to consider that school as one of the choices available to them, amongst many other good schools in the area.

I would like to mention another school I visited that is not in my electorate, St Patrick's Technical College at Elizabeth, which celebrated its 10th anniversary. Given the time, I might elaborate a bit further on the history of St Patrick's at another time, but I would like to congratulate them on 10 years of successful education in vocational education.

MORIALTA CITIZENSHIP AWARDS

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:44): It is my pleasure every year to present awards to students in my electorate who are worthy of citizenship awards. The Morialta Citizenship Award is a prize to the value of \$100, a certificate and an acknowledgement of the student's work in a speech that I give every year in the parliament.

I am very pleased that this year, 2017, for the first time I will be able to offer these citizenship awards to students at schools in Birdwood, Gumeracha, Mount Torrens, Lobethal, Lenswood and Uraidla with the redistribution of electorates. As sad as I am to be losing the areas around Paracombe Primary School, Paradise Primary School, Charles Campbell College, St Francis of Assisi School and Sunrise Christian School, Paradise Campus, I make it clear to those schools that if they wish to continue receiving these awards I am very happy to continue sponsoring them, as the student population is still drawn from areas within the Morialta area despite the redistribution.

However, today I wish to acknowledge the 2016 winners of the Morialta Citizenship Awards. We have 17 students from 11 schools who received awards. From Athelstone School, congratulations to Liana Pennino and Malachi Ashby, who both competently and responsibly carried out extracurricular duties, whether through leadership, sport or organisational roles, which assisted staff in the general day-to-day running of the school. Both suggested ways they could help and independently saw what needed to be done. They are role models for the rest of the school community.

From Basket Range Primary School, congratulations to Oliver Cramond. Oliver is Basket Range Primary School's go-to man. He is the first one called upon to set up equipment for special events, to move furniture, to clean up the yard. He accepts responsibility without complaint and, importantly, can be relied upon to complete tasks to meet the school's high standards. He also keeps an eye out for the chickens and guinea pigs at the school.

From the Charles Campbell College Junior School, congratulations to Chelsea Curtis, vice-captain of the junior years. She has consistently worked to define leadership through altruism and collaboration. She has organised numerous assemblies and presentation events, and coordinated a public awareness campaign addressing the issue of rubbish on a local and global scale. She also mentors younger students.

From the Charles Campbell College Middle School, congratulations to Iman Zehra for her commitment to fundraising, for promoting Amnesty International across the student body and for her positive peer support to international students. From the Charles Campbell College Senior School, congratulations to Madison Thiel. Madison is an example to younger students in terms of academic excellence through her involvement in year 12 committees and for her outstanding service to the community in a wide range of areas, including after the Cyclone Pam disaster that devastated Vanuatu.

From the Norwood Morialta High School Senior School, congratulations to Lana Morro, a passionate advocate for human rights, equality and for the humane treatment of animals and the preservation of endangered species. Lana's extracurricular and outside activities most notably include a longstanding relationship with The Orangutan Project.

From the Norwood Morialta High School Middle School, congratulations to Hayley Brewer, a very responsible and reliable young woman who is always prepared to help other students. She has been a member of the SRC since year 8 and was its president in 2016. She represented the school on the Campbelltown City Council Youth Advisory Committee and also represented the middle school student voice on the governing council and other school committees.

From Norton Summit Primary School, congratulations to Cathryn Williams, an extremely self-motivated student who always strives to achieve her personal best in everything she does. She willingly accepts challenges and goes the extra mile to demonstrate her deep understanding in innovative paths forward.

From Paradise Primary School, congratulations to Jayden Strudwick, a class representative on the SRC. He played a role in community projects, including the nature play area and the new school sign. He also often helps with the school's audio-visual system. From Rostrevor College,

congratulations to Samuel Draper. During his time at the college Samuel has volunteered in the learning centres, assisting with Smart Work Sessions. He has also been involved in a Special Olympics program for students with disabilities.

From Saint Ignatius' College, congratulations to Ashlee Leach, who is very deeply involved with and committed to both the college and the local community. She regularly volunteers for Rotary charities, supporting victims of domestic abuse, the eradication of polio, supporting Shoeboxes of Love and the ShelterBox programs. She also contributed to the youth science forum at the University of South Australia and the Rotary Youth Program for Enrichment.

Stradbroke School split their award between three students. The first was Caitlyn Hamann, who brings her compassion to caring for younger students and who has volunteered her time for many leadership roles, including as traffic monitor, canteen monitor, library monitor and in many other areas. Keeley Smith, also from Stradbroke School, is a highly motivated student who inspires her fellow students with her willingness to lead, organise and encourage others, which shows that she is a wonderful role model and mentor to younger students as well as being a monitor. Jack Liu, also from Stradbroke, is a UNICEF ambassador as well as a monitor with a special talent for working with younger students.

From Sunrise Christian School, congratulations to Mary d'Assumpcao, who has contributed specifically to the St Vincent de Paul Appeal. Finally, from Thorndon Park Primary School, congratulations to Domenico Sacca, a wonderful young man who strives for excellence. He continually supports classroom discussions, supports his peers and works as an ambassador.

AFL NATIONAL WOMEN'S LEAGUE

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:49): I rise to pay tribute to a group of women who are part of a growing movement for change, who are very close to my heart and who I am sure all members of this chamber will join me in celebrating. I speak of the remarkable rise of women's Australian Rules football through the AFL Women's competition and of course of our Adelaide Crows women, who made history on Saturday as the inaugural winners of the AFL Women's grand final.

From the announcement of the AFL women's licences, coaches and players all the way through to Saturday's incredible game, the league has captured our imagination. I have met many, many people whose interest and fervour have grown as the season has progressed. I know we have many new fans of AFL and growing legions of girls playing as a result of this league.

I have been privileged to be able to work alongside the Crows to support the growth of women's football in this premiersip-winning side. It has brought me great joy to cheer on the sidelines at each of their home games and last weekend as they secured the premiersip on the Gold Coast. It has been an incredible ride, and I am deeply proud to support these skilful, courageous and generous women who are leading the way towards seizing the moment that we have before us to finally achieve gender equality in sport.

Getting to meet with the legendary coach of the team, Bec Goddard, extraordinary co-captains, Erin Phillips and Chelsea Randall, and a number of other players and administrators over the past year has been a wonderful experience. These women have smashed a sporting glass ceiling, and they are ambassadors for a new generation of coaches and athletes who we will celebrate as the AFL National Women's League grows and as many other leagues and teams grow.

Last weekend, we saw history made: the end of the first season of the AFL national women's league and the first and I am sure not the last time the Adelaide Crows women brought home the cup. I was privileged enough to be there as these women were presented with their medals and sang their club song together. It is a moment I will not forget.

The advent of this women's league is of course about women being empowered to play football and indeed any other sport at the highest level, but it is about so much more. Each of these Crows women is determined, as am I, to support the growing ranks of girls who are embracing the game as they are inspired by their sporting heroes. Every time I have asked one of these women to speak with a group of girls or attend an event focused on advancing girls and women in sport, they have agreed and been extraordinarily generous with their time and energy, spending hours encouraging those who one day hope to step into their boots.

The advent of the women's league has also hastened the addressing of some of the social issues that the AFL tackles by bringing them to the forefront of our minds. Sexism and homophobia have long been part of our community, but these problems are challenged daily by these women, every one of whom is rightly proud of who they are and determined, like myself and many others are, to ensure that, no matter whether a girl or woman wants to play sport at the highest level, coach it, administer it, write about it or commentate it, they can.

It is heartening to see our female athletes command the respect they deserve on the oval and to see them rightly expect respect for every girl and woman on any playing field, court, pool or anywhere else. Many who once doubted have come around since seeing the skill level of these women, since hearing their personal stories of determination, sometimes in the face of adversity, to live their sporting dreams, and since hearing about the revolution that these women are creating in local clubs and leagues across our state. Here's looking at you, Graham Cornes!

I wait with excitement to see the generations of girls and young women come through who have never been told they have to stop playing once they reach a certain age, who were never told that perhaps netball would be a better sport, and who were never told that playing footy was for their brothers and not them. As this occurs, as the SANFL, the SAWFL and local leagues continue to grow and, as the participation of girls in every sport builds as a result of girls now being able to see what they want to be, this and so many other women's sporting competitions will grow. I cannot wait for what is next.

Thank you very much to our Premier, our Treasurer and our sports minister for backing in women's football. Their support and their deep passion for this league and for many other leagues have played a part in young girls and women believing that they can and have also helped position South Australia as a hub for women's sport—a place where we can truly achieve gender equality in every aspect of every sport.

My huge congratulations again to our Adelaide Football Club AFL Women's team. Their courage and their skill have inspired so many on the oval, and their legacy will continue to inspire girls and women to participate in whichever sport they choose, however and whenever they choose to do so.

HARTLEY ELECTORATE

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (15:54): On the weekend, I had the pleasure of attending the 2017 Indian Mela held by the Indian Australian Association of South Australia. All who attended—the many thousands who were there—would agree that it was a wonderful and auspicious occasion.

I would like to especially thank the IAASA committee for 2017-18, beginning with Mr Adireddy Yara, the president; Mr Amarjit Grewal, the secretary; Mr Gagan Sharma, the vice president; Mr Sam Dahm, the treasurer; Mr Mandeep Rikhi, the assistant secretary; Mrs Monika Bhasin, women wing and youth coordinator; Mr Alok Alora, the public relations coordinator; Dr Rajni Madan, the grants coordinator; Mr Gurdeep Singh, cultural coordinator; Mr Pankaj Dumra, the event and sports coordinator; and Mr Harvinder Garcha, the media coordinator. I would also like to thank the Indian Mela 2017 committee for the fantastic job that they did. I look forward to attending the 2018 Mela in my Nehru jacket.

I also pay tribute to the Hectorville Sports and Community Club. I recently attended their annual gala dinner. Many people attended from a variety of sports, including the football club, the netball club and the local cricket club. I would especially like to mention the nominees and winners of the various awards that were awarded that night to acknowledge the outstanding contribution to the club which has done a fantastic job in our community for many years.

I will begin with the Don Grandison Award (formerly the Keith Vincent Memorial Shield) for outstanding non-playing service to the overall club in any one year or for voluntary unpaid service during the prior club year. The sole nominee and winner was Mr Neil Smith. I thank Neil, who has served as an oval boundary marker for football games which, as you know, is a thankless task on many cold, windy mornings. He also cleans the change rooms during the football season, which is also a thankless task after herds of mud-clad footballers have passed through, and has participated in hours of voluntary service behind the club bar. Thank you to him.

The Margaret Morden Proficiency Award 2017 was awarded to Stewie Fincher, who has become an institution at the club for services to junior and senior football. He has been the coach of the under-18's football team, coordinator for social events for the football section, including the steak and wine night and also the football end-of-year presentation. He has also worked tirelessly to bridge the junior and senior football sections of the club. I also pay tribute to the other nominees for that award including Richard Thomm, Dean Evans, Graham 'Doc' Broadbent and Sam McGrath.

Next was the Kym Keogh Most Improved Sportsperson Award. I pay particular attention to Mr Vishal Singh, who was the winner of this award, for his work in junior cricket, but I also acknowledge Paige McGrath, who was a nominee from the netball area. Vishal certainly earned respect from the opposition and also teammates for his positive interaction at the club. He was actually part of the leadership group as vice-captain, emphasising fair play and enjoyment of the game. He had an outstanding record in 2015-16. He opened the batting, scoring 377 runs in 10 innings with a top score of 95 and he also has a strong arm. He is a great and strong bowler, sending down 40 economical overs for four wickets.

The Craig Green Memorial Shield is awarded for outstanding performance in either a single sport or a number of sports during the prior club year. The recipient was to be selected by the HSCC President and can only be awarded to a person once. I pay special attention to Maditha Maduwantha in cricket, a wonderful person who played cricket at almost the very highest level across the world in Sri Lanka.

He is a fantastic cricketer and we are so fortunate to have him at the Hectorville Cricket Club. I thank Madu for all his good work. He has been and continues to be an A grade player, as a batsman and bowler, as well as being the Hectorville Cricket Club coach. I thank Madu for his contribution to the game of cricket. I also acknowledge the other nominees for that award: Hayley Whittington in netball, Danny Forde in football and Jake Mazzone also in football.

I also wish to make mention of St Joseph's in Tranmere. I read in the local Messenger this week that they are celebrating their 90th anniversary. I congratulate the school on reaching that milestone. I thank the board, parents, teachers and students and especially Frank Colagrossi, who is celebrating 25 years at the school.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:59): I am confident that most South Australians will have had some experience with the Royal Adelaide Hospital, whether as a patient receiving care or as a family member visiting loved ones who were being treated, perhaps at a late-night visit to the emergency department. Given that it is the hospital that deals with the most complex cases in our state, it is of importance to people not just in Adelaide but right across the state.

The recollection of patient experiences often involves extreme thanks for the excellent care provided by doctors and nurses but concern about the far less than ideal conditions in the hospital: patients sharing rooms with up to seven other patients, the risk of cross-infection, sharing bathrooms, ageing infrastructure and inefficient design. That is why in June 2007 this government announced that it would invest in the future of South Australia's health care by rebuilding the Royal Adelaide Hospital on a new site.

This decision was arrived at following many months of planning and deliberation, focusing on the inability to rebuild the hospital on its current very cramped site, the efficiencies that could be delivered by a completely new and modern hospital design, and rebuilding on a new site rather than having a decade of disruption for patients and families on the current site.

At the time, I was lucky enough to be one of a large number of people working on the project planning, led by my predecessor the member for Kaurna, John Hill, excellent public servants, including Jim Birch, Dr Tony Sherbon, Dr David Panter, Jenny Richter and Derek Exton and supported by the then premier, treasurer and the whole cabinet. Their vision, planning and foresight will pay dividends for the health of South Australians for decades to come.

Just last week I had the honour of visiting the new hospital now that it has reached the technical completion stage. I was there with you, Deputy Speaker, along with the Speaker, the member for Wright and the member for Fisher and others, visiting the hospital and seeing it now that

it is at the technical completion. Never have I been prouder of that work a decade ago than when we toured the hospital and saw the site where health care will be transformed in this state forever and the benefits of that meticulous planning that will be delivered for patients very shortly.

All are single-patient rooms that will increase the comfort for patients, help recovery, reduce patient falls, reduce patient infections and include all natural light, with opening windows and room for family members to sleep over with their loved ones. There are massive new operating theatres, all bigger than the current biggest operating theatre at the old RAH, with room for new technology that will progress over time.

There is modern design at the hospital designed around the patient pathways and needs, ensuring that patients can get access to the services they need in a timely manner. When you arrive at the emergency department, there will be access to diagnostics, imaging, pathology and all the things you need in a timely manner. Everywhere through the building is an environment that is welcoming, easy to navigate with lots of natural light and internal gardens. There is lots of parking and lots of food options.

As more and more people get the chance to see the hospital in the lead-up to it opening later this year, they too will see how beneficial all these planned-out elements will be. Just like we have experienced, sadly, with the tram, the new Adelaide Oval, the footbridge and the super schools, the new hospital has been subjected to sustained opposition from the Liberal Party and from all the Adelaide 'do nothing brigade' over the last decade.

Patients who receive that world-class care in world-class facilities will not be worrying about the lies and misinformation that has been spread about this project for so long. They will be focused on the fantastic care that has been provided to them in the best hospital in Australia, if not the world.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

Mr PICTON: The deputy leader interjects—she is certainly one who has been leading the campaign against this hospital for the last decade and people will remember all those quotes when it opens.

I congratulate all the builders, the planners, the architects and contractors involved in the new hospital and thank the hundreds of doctors and nurses who have been involved in the detailed planning, the clinical spaces and the patient pathways. I now look forward to the massive project underway for the establishment and transfer of patients to the new hospital, and thank everyone who will be involved in that massive effort.

What will be left will be a legacy for South Australian health care for at least the next 50 years: the best hospital in Australia, the best care for patients. People will remember that it is this government that delivered it against huge opposition from those opposite who tried to stop it at every step of the way, yet we persisted because we knew that this would be in the best interests of South Australians and in the best interests of the health care of everybody in this state.

Members

MEMBER FOR FLOREY, ALP RESIGNATION

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (16:04): On Wednesday 15 March, the Minister for Health secured endorsement as the ALP candidate for the seat of Florey in the 2018 election. Until next March, I will continue to energetically represent the interests of the electors of Florey and promote their values and rights to a fair go and the policy issues of importance to them—fundamental things like jobs; affordable, reliable energy; access to health and education services; and bold new initiatives such as universal ambulance cover.

I have had the honour to represent the Florey electorate through many boundary changes since 1997. As someone who has chosen to remain factionally unaligned, any influence on the centrally controlled preselection decision is taken from me, and I say to the faceless men who have taken this course of action that it is the voters and not you who will choose the next member for Florey.

This hostile takeover, under the guise and cover of the boundary redistribution, removes an acknowledged, hardworking, local sitting MP, primarily because the seat is no longer marginal. Therefore, in all conscience and on matters of principle, I advise the house that I will be resigning from the ALP today.

Bills

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT (ELECTRICITY SUPPLY EMERGENCIES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (16:05): I am wondering where I was at. If I become a little bit repetitive, I apologise in advance. I do recall that I mentioned about the vacuum of policy and direction at the federal level. I also mentioned Mr Frydenberg being thrown under the bus by the Prime Minister when Dr Finkel released his interim report and recommended a national emissions intensity scheme and we also are aware of the PM's earlier position on this and how today his position has altered dramatically.

We also know that those opposite are opposed to such a scheme and why wouldn't they be? They blindly follow their federal masters. However, the position of the commonwealth and that of the opposition in South Australia is, indeed, at odds with a growing group of individuals and organisations that are calling for a national EIS that includes, amongst others: the National Farmers' Federation; the CSIRO; the Chief Scientist, as I mentioned earlier, Dr Alan Finkel; BHP; the Australian Industry Group; AGL; Origin; the Australian Energy Market; and the Clean Energy Council.

You know what? They are right to be calling for such a thing. How do we actually expect the market to be incentivised and be able to invest with security? Those opposite talk about being supporters of the marketplace and the free market. We say that, when the marketplace fails, a government must intervene. It is quite simple. As if the marketplace will indeed regulate itself for an emissions intensity scheme—it will not do that. To this end, we, on this side, will continue to push for a national EIS. We would welcome those opposite joining us in advocating for a national EIS. I live in hope of that being the case.

I would make this point. In my discussions with my good friend and good-looking colleague, the member for Giles, when we are talking about a price on carbon or an EIS, we have to make sure that the price is set correctly and that it actually changes the marketplace and provides the security that is required for others and the marketplace to invest in alternative means of energy production.

Those opposite say a lot about their faith in the marketplace. They talk about their commitment and how they have, in their words and the words of the member for Stuart, constructively and positively contributed to the debate on energy and how their policy is to have battery storage rolled out. Guess what? How do you actually do this without intervening in the marketplace? That is my point. You cannot rely on the marketplace to do it without intervention.

You sit there with an ideological bent to say the marketplace will work, but the reality is that the marketplace fails and it fails in many areas and that is when government has to intervene. How do those opposite expect to do this in the absence of federal policy? How do they expect to do this without incentivising the marketplace? They cannot and they ought to stop deluding themselves.

I will finish off now, which will make people happy, I suspect. Like many South Australians and my colleagues on this side of the house, I remain somewhat shocked by the lack of leadership on energy issues at the commonwealth level and equally frustrated by the opposition blindly following the federal government. To this extent, this government has had no choice other than to develop and adopt an energy plan for our state, a plan that has at its core South Australian power for South Australians. The only policy of any substance I have heard articulated from those opposite, and so succinctly said by the Leader of the Opposition 24 hours before the 2014 election, is that if you want things to be done in this state and be done properly, vote Labor at the next election, and that remains.

I heard the member for Kurna talk about the legacy that will be left to the people of South Australia as a result of the construction of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. I hope that that legacy will not be a legacy after the next election because we will still be in power. What will remain are things

like the Royal Adelaide Hospital, the Murray-Darling Basin Plan and, importantly, the energy plan that we have for this state. I commend this bill to the house.

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (16:11): I, too, rise to make a contribution to the Emergency Management (Electricity Supply Emergencies) Amendment Bill 2017. The government wanted to make it seem so urgent that there was no time to allow any decent study of the bill through this house before we are asked to make a decision. Before I get to the bill itself, and I will get to the bill itself—unlike many of the members opposite to seem to be using this as an opportunity to rewrite history in a way that makes them not look like complicit failures when it comes to the South Australian electricity market—I have been proud of our response on this side of the house to this energy situation because we have been clear, moderated and consistent in what we continue to say.

I know that this government would like this debate to be about renewables versus non-renewables, but it is not; it is much more sophisticated than that. The fact that members opposite try to have this reductionist argument, that somehow this is as simple as it is, does not do this cause justice. Months ago, when we debated a similar topic in this place, I made the point that there is broad support in South Australia for renewable energy; if that is to continue, the worst thing to do, and ruin the broad-based support for renewable energy, is to go too hard, go too fast and stuff up the electricity market in South Australia, and that is exactly what has happened—exactly what has happened.

This government has failed to deal with a transitioning electricity market and has pushed and created an environment in which this change has been accelerated beyond the market's capacity to deal with it. We now have some fairly drastic measures and a fairly decent sum of money being used to fix up a problem that did not need to happen in the first place. We all agree that renewable energy is part of our energy mix at present and in the future, but we also realise that we are now asking for a solution to make renewables much more synchronous and able to provide a more stable supply of power into the grid.

We are asking renewables to do that before they are ready. It would have been much more sensible to have some better transitional arrangements before we asked renewable energy to make that change, which will become more expensive and much more difficult to implement had we taken a much more cautious approach. That cautious approach should be underpinned by the fundamental fact that we need to provide cheap, reliable energy in South Australia.

There are two very simple solutions to making sure that the market remains much more stable. People ask me, 'Stefan, what is the answer?' The first thing I say to them is, 'The best solution would be to build a time machine and go back to before the 2012 interim DPA that basically made it impossible to stop wind farm development in South Australia, to build a time machine so that we can go back and change the decision that was made in relation to the Northern power station.' It would have needed to stay open for only a few years in order for this transition to be made much smoother and much simpler. But those things did not happen.

Unfortunately, we cannot go back in time and we have to deal with the realities as they sit in front of us. I wondered why this bill was introduced today and about this urgency that requires us to make a decision on this legislation today. I think it has absolutely nothing to do with this bill. I think it has to do with the fact that this morning the Australian Energy Market Operator released into the public realm a report that identified fairly clearly—and again in a moderated and sophisticated way—the issues facing the South Australian electricity market. The executive summary states:

The generation mix now includes increased amounts of non-synchronous and inverter-connected plant. This generation has different characteristics to conventional plant, and uses active control systems, or complex software, to ride through disturbances. With less synchronous generation online, the system is experiencing more periods with low inertia and low available fault levels—

It goes on to say:

The technical challenges of the changing generation mix must be managed with the support of efficient and effective regulatory and market mechanisms, to ensure the most cost-effective measures are used in the long-term interest of consumers.

What they are trying to say here is the fact that we have gone gung-ho on our unreliable wind energy sources has created problems for the market and that the mechanisms to fix this were not put in

place before wind generation was brought online. That is essentially what it is saying, and it is something we have been saying since the September blackout and, indeed, before the September blackout. It is something we have been saying for years.

That is not to say that renewable energy has no place in South Australia. What it does say is that renewable energy, at this stage of technological evolution, has a place—a reasonably sized place—within our electricity generation system, but it has a limit. The reason we know it has a limit is that the government has been warned many times about where that limit sits and what the consequences of exceeding that limit are. The first of those was on 9 September 2003, when a submission made to the Environment, Resources and Development Committee stated, 'To set a state-based renewable energy target may result in higher energy costs for South Australia compared to other states.'

That same year, on 24 November 2003 evidence given by Lew Owens, who at that stage was the chair of ESCOSA, said, 'There are technical problems and limits with having large amounts of wind power in our distribution and transmission system.' In that evidence, Lew Owens said very clearly that there is an upper limit to the amount of wind generation we can safely put into the system before it starts to create problems of stability and reliability within our grid. He was right then and he is right now.

In April 2005, advice to ESCOSA from the Electricity Supply Industry Planning Council stated, 'Wind developments in South Australia at the 800 megawatt and 1,000 megawatt cases pose significant risks to the reliability and security of the South Australian power system.' But we do not have only 800 to 1,000 megawatts of wind energy in South Australia. I think we have around 1,700 megawatts, which is far beyond evidence given in 2005. This evidence was given 12 years ago, yet the government did not take heed.

In 2005 again, it was the view of ESCOSA that 'the reliability and security of the South Australian power system was at significant risk in the absence of upgraded conditions for network connections, high quality wind forecasting and proper market arrangements to integrate wind generators more successfully into the NEM'. In May 2009, the National Institute of Economic and Industry Research gave advice to DPC that said that 'limitations on wind power output to ensure South Australian grid stability is estimated to be associated with about a 20 per cent limit on wind capacity'.

But that is not what we have in South Australia. We have in excess of 40 per cent wind generation capacity, and some are suggesting that it is closer to 50 per cent. In 2009 again, it was the view of ESCOSA that 'the commission remains concerned with the long-term safety and reliability of the electricity system in South Australia with 867 megawatts of wind generation'. In 2011, a ministerial statement by then premier Mike Rann stated, 'We face a number of challenges. Some of these relate to managing the intermittent nature of wind generation.'

It is great that he made that statement, but he certainly did not take heed because soon after that he introduced a DPA that would send us well beyond what anybody was suggesting was a safe level of intermittent energy generation that our system could handle. In October 2014, a joint AEMO and ElectraNet study stated:

...having a high proportion of wind and PV generation can present a risk for SA if the Heywood Interconnector link to Victoria is disconnected at a time when all local conventional synchronous generators are offline.

In 2015, AEMO said in a South Australian wind study report that the intermittency of wind generation leading to sudden changes in the supply and demand balance makes managing the power grid more challenging. In February 2016, in an update to the renewable energy integration in South Australia, a joint AEMO and ElectraNet report again stated:

The withdrawal...of synchronous generation and the growth in wind and rooftop PV generation in SA is:

- Making the power system more susceptible to rapid changes in frequency, and to larger frequency deviations following a separation event.

I do not know how many times you have to be told something before you believe it, but it seems that this government went on its merry way, and it was only when the entire state went black last year

that it actually woke up to the fact that we have a crisis. I do not know how many times somebody needs to be told before it sinks in.

It is extremely frustrating, and it will be frustrating to all South Australians, that in the face of consistent and unrelenting advice the government chose to ignore everybody that it considers to be an expert in this area and instead went down a path that put into jeopardy jobs, put into jeopardy the cost of living of many low income South Australians and put into jeopardy the very image that people have of our state. Members opposite can try to point the finger at everyone else. It does not matter which day of the week, it seems to be that somebody else gets the blame, but the blame rests solely and squarely with this government.

We come back to this bill before us today. There are urgent things that go through this place on a fairly regular basis and oftentimes the Liberal opposition cooperates fully with the government to ensure that important legislation goes through and that it goes through in a timely manner. Without reflecting on another piece of legislation in the house, there are times when the government have put a bill before this place, basically enforced debate on the second reading in this chamber straightaway, only to have to put it off because they botched the bill so badly in the first place that I think amendments to that bill numbered in the hundreds.

We have this piece of legislation before us now and we are being asked to jam it through this place, but I am given to ask the question: what is the government hiding? Is there legal advice the government has that suggests that some of the things in this bill may not pass muster when it comes to interacting with federal regulation and federal law? Are there powers that are being sought in this bill that are not appropriate? We do not know. We will try to tease out those questions, but the government has something to hide. That is the only reason one can fathom that they want us to jam this bill through this place as quickly as possible.

It is interesting that the Minister for Energy was not the one who introduced this bill. The Premier came in and introduced this bill and the next speaker was not the Minister for Energy: it was the member for Kaurana. It seems quite interesting that the Minister for Energy has been benched on this one. Obviously, those opposite feel that he cannot be trusted to ensure the passage of this legislation through the house, so they have given it to the apprentice to try to get this thing through.

It is interesting that, even though the Premier spoke and then the member for Kaurana spoke on a piece of legislation that the opposition had not been privy to, the member for Kaurana had the gall to get up and say, 'Oh, well, the Liberal Party probably won't support it. We want bipartisanship on this issue.' It is pretty hard to get bipartisanship when you do not even show us the piece of paper before you bring it in here.

It is pretty hard and pretty disingenuous to start pointing the finger at the other side of the chamber when you abuse all convention that exists in parliamentary procedure but expect everybody to play nice. It is absolutely disgusting. I can assure you that we will do the right thing when it comes to dealing with the problems in our energy market in South Australia. We will be cooperative actors because the people of South Australia deserve a government and a parliament that are going to do those things.

What galls me is this fake urgency. It was urgent in 2003 when the government first got advice, it was urgent all the way through the 2000s, it was urgent as the wind farms were going up in the early part of this decade. To come in here today and suggest that there is some sort of fake urgency that means that today has to be the day is absolutely disgusting. As I said earlier, it is much more important for us to get this right than it is for us to necessarily get it done today. It was right when it came to making sure that the renewable energy generation fed into the market system properly, and did so seamlessly and without issues, and it is important for us to get this right today as well.

The truth is that this confected urgency, this confected outrage, is doing nothing more than trying to divert us from the fact that AEMO confirmed exactly what we have been saying all along on this issue. To bring this in here today to try to create some sort of understanding that, 'Here we are, we've solved the problem,' is a little bit like putting the inmates in charge of the asylum. Those who created the problem now want to give themselves more power to fix their own problem. The truth is that if we could have confidence that this government could fix the problem, they would not have

created it in the first place. If calmer heads had prevailed around the cabinet table, we would not be in the situation we are in today. Unfortunately, that is not the case.

Basically, this bill creates an entire new section within the Emergency Management Act. The Emergency Management Act creates states of emergency for natural disasters—things like bushfires and floods—and, through the State Emergency Management Committee, there is a series of steps the government normally has to go through to declare a state of emergency. This bill creates an ability for the minister to declare an electricity supply emergency. Clause 27B(1) provides:

If it appears to the minister, on reasonable grounds, that the supply of electricity to all or part of the South Australian community is disrupted to a significant degree, or there is a real risk that it may be disrupted to a significant degree, the minister may declare an electricity supply emergency.

The operative words here are 'on reasonable grounds'. If a bushfire happens, I think we can understand what that is; coming from the area that I do and in the electorate I represent we understand what a bushfire looks like. From this last year, we also understand what a flood looks like. However, 'on reasonable grounds' is the term used to define when the minister can intervene in the market.

This is a bill that seeks to create an emergency situation when we are in crisis. I think that crisis is fairly clear: the continuing election of the South Australian Labor Party here in South Australia. Those are the 'reasonable grounds' on which we need to declare an electricity supply emergency because if we had a different situation we would not need this piece of legislation in the first place. So 'on reasonable grounds' is certainly a term we would love to explore, and I dare say that the 2014 election result was probably where the 'reasonable grounds' started. Obviously, this crisis is of the Labor Party's own making, and now they are basically asking for as much power as can be given to solve their own issues.

Within the committee stage we will certainly be exploring many, many issues around the legality of this, around what advice the government has sought and received in relation to this bill. We will be asking questions around why it is that today is the day, why we need to butcher parliamentary convention in order to get this through. We will also be asking why the government continues to ignore the advice it is being given on a consistent basis.

With my last remaining minutes I would like to plagiarise from a TV show I am sure many of us in this place have watched—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: *Peppa Pig?* That is what you usually quote.

Mr KNOLL: No, actually *Peppa Pig* is strangely silent on this topic. The TV show essentially says this: there is a man who is caught sitting on a floating piece of plywood in a flood. He looks up to the heavens and he says, 'God, please come down and save me. I have been a good Christian all my life. I want you to come down and save me in my hour of need.'

He happens to come across a man in a boat. The man in the boat says, 'Quick, get in. I will save you from the rising waters.' The man says, 'It's okay, I don't need your help. I know what I am doing. God is going to save me. Just continue on your merry way.' The man floats on his piece of wood past a man sitting on the roof of a house, who says, 'Grab my hand. I will pull you off your piece of plywood and bring you up onto the roof where you will be safe.' The man says, 'It's okay. God is going to save me. I have been a good Christian all my life, and I know he will come down and help me.'

The man continues to float on through the flood and a helicopter comes along and puts down a rope. The pilot says, 'Grab on to the rope. I will pull you up and save you from where you are.' The man says, 'It's okay. God will save me. I have been a good Christian all my life, and he will save me.' So, the man continues to float on the piece of plywood. The man drowns. As he floats up into heaven, at the gates of St Peter, he says, 'God, I have been a good Christian all my life. Why didn't you save me?' God says, 'I sent you a man in a boat, I sent you a man sitting on a roof and I sent you a helicopter. Why did you not take the advice and the help that I have given you?'

This is exactly the same case. The government has received consistent advice from people putting out their hand and saying, 'Please, let me help you. I know how to help you,' and the

government has consistently and repeatedly ignored that advice. Now South Australia is drowning, and the only people to blame are the South Australian Labor Party.

Mr GEE (Napier) (16:31): I rise to support the amendment bill introduced by the Premier to amend the Emergency Management Act 2004. I want to tell you a story of action, denial and desperation, action by a progressive and visionary Premier, denial by a Liberal leader who has no policies, and desperation by a Prime Minister who is trying everything and anything to be popular.

On this side, we have a comprehensive plan to take control of South Australia's energy future and, over on the other side, we have a party that sold South Australia's electricity and is now blaming everyone else for the problems. We have a Prime Minister who is happy to stand up in the federal parliament and criticise South Australia and then take action when the power goes out in Sydney.

South Australia has a really good mix of electricity generation that, prior to the election, was praised by the Prime Minister but is now criticised for short-term political gain. We have a mix of gas and renewables with a backup of coal via the interconnector. We are the leader in renewables, and that is a positive because coal is not the future: the future is renewables.

South Australia is being failed by the Australian Electricity Market Operator, which is why the Minister for Energy needs to be given additional powers to intervene in the market to guarantee supply for all South Australians. South Australia can never have a repeat of 8 February 2017 when the Australian Electricity Market Operator knew there would likely be insufficient capacity in the system and failed to direct the second generator at Pelican Point to turn on. It caused South Australia to lose its power.

This bill is about the future of energy supply in South Australia. This government is taking charge of our energy future. We will build a new state-owned, gas-fired power plant that will not only provide energy security for South Australians but jobs for South Australian workers as well. These jobs will come online over the next 12 months as the state embraces the concept of owning their own power generation again.

Will people listen to the opposition desperately telling everyone what a terrible idea this is? No-one will be listening to the Leader of the Opposition or the Liberals when it comes to energy. They still remember what they did to the state's power assets last time they were in government. Once our energy plan is fully implemented, there must be legislation in place that prevents the Liberal Party from ever selling the state's power generation again.

I am just reminding myself of the story from the member for Schubert. The Liberal Party is like the fox who tells the gingerbread man, 'Jump on my back. I won't eat you.' As he gets deeper and deeper out into the water and the gingerbread man gets higher and higher on his head, what happens? The gingerbread man—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I don't want the member for Napier heckled.

Mr GEE: —gets eaten by the fox. Why does the fox eat him? Because it is in his nature. Just like that, it is in the Liberals' nature to sell everything.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I'm on my feet.

Mr GEE: Why do we have to take charge of our energy security here in South Australia?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Napier, sit down. It is very late in the day. There is no need to heckle the member for Napier. You are all well aware of the standing orders. The bases appear to be loaded. Did you leave us at question time, deputy leader?

Ms Chapman: No.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, you will be very close to going out the door in that case, so I would be careful. Member for Napier.

Mr GEE: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. Why do we have to take charge of our energy security here in South Australia? Because the Liberal Party sold it. That was nearly 20 years ago. That single piece of legislation increases the cost burden for electricity every year for South Australians. No matter how much those opposite trivialise the sale of our power assets, repeating the line, 'It's nearly 20 years ago. Let's move on,' the public have not forgotten. It is the most talked about reason for the power prices people are forced to pay. In retrospect, it really was a shocking act of sabotage by the Liberal government. Our government really has no other choice than to take charge of our power supply.

The people of South Australia expect it and the people are right behind it. So, what specific action is the South Australian government planning? A new gas-fired power station owned by South Australians, not the private sector, which will provide backup power during emergencies. It can be turned on as required without waiting for action from the AEMO. The plan will also deliver the largest battery in the Southern Hemisphere, which will be a great step forward and will see us leading the nation once again. The battery will be able to store renewable energy from our wind, solar and hydro generators.

A renewable technology fund will also generate more investment in South Australia which in turn will create even more jobs. This plan will see a reduction in electricity prices for South Australians by incentivising the exploration and production of more gas. Our government is promoting gas development in South Australia while the opposition is looking to ban gas exploration. The Liberals' plan, or lack of any plan, will deliver more instability and higher electricity prices. Under a Labor government, South Australia will not be following other states to ban gas exploration while at the same time coal power generators close.

The South Australian energy plan is supported by SACOSS, it is supported by SACOME and it is supported by South Australia. It is time that the South Australian Liberal opposition got on board. The opposition offers no solutions for the control of energy in South Australia. It appears that the opposition is simply not interested in the future of South Australia. The South Australian public see through all of their political grandstanding and they are learning pretty quickly that, when it comes to power, there is simply nothing there. The leader talks about a utopian existence and socialism. The leader is living with the Prime Minister in a parallel universe where there is no climate change, where coal will go on forever, and they are interested in lobby groups, not the men, women and children in South Australia.

This bill will deliver more energy security for South Australians. It will allow South Australia to deliver South Australian power for South Australians so that we can increase our self-reliance and provide reliable, competitive and clean power for all South Australians into the future. It is a very impressive and comprehensive plan. An important objective of the state government's plan is South Australian power for South Australians. It will deliver for South Australians and it is supported by local residents in Napier. How would I know what they are thinking, you might ask? Because I have been asking the good people in our northern suburbs.

Over the past three weeks, I have talked to workers travelling to the city by train on the Gawler line. I have doorknocked the residents of Davoren Park and Smithfield areas and completed shopping centre visits during this past weekend. I can advise the parliament that not one person I spoke to was supportive of the sale of the state's electricity generation by the Liberal Party—surprise!—and every person I spoke to felt positive about the state Labor government's plan to take charge of the state's energy, whether they were students and workers heading to the city, to university or work on early morning trains, or mums and dads in local shopping centres buying the groceries on the weekend, or seniors in their homes struggling with bills and blackouts. They just want action and they know that only Labor has a plan.

This amendment will complement and add to the advances that have already been made towards achieving our renewable energy target. South Australians overwhelmingly support renewable energy. Currently, all power generation in South Australia except for PV is in the hands of private operators. Our government does not own or control the generation, transmission or distribution of South Australia's electricity. We are going to fix it. We are going to take charge of our energy future and we are going to drive down the price of electricity in South Australia. We are going to provide energy security for South Australians. I commend the amended bill to the house.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (16:40): What an interesting day it has been. The Premier came in here and sought leave to introduce a bill to the house without notice and suggested that it was very urgent and that we should get it through parliament and pass through all stages immediately. I am not sure how many government members have spoken now. The Premier was followed by a backbencher and then we had the Attorney-General, who I expected would give us some legal background to this—and I will come back to that in a minute—and then we had a few other backbenchers. We have not heard from the minister.

If this was so important, I have to tell the house, to this stage nobody has shed any light on the bill. It is very hard to shed light in South Australia under the circumstances. We all know that. Did the last speaker ask those good citizens at Davoren Park what they thought about the Labor government selling the South Australian Gas Company? Did he ask any of them about that?

What a fiasco we have here in South Australia. Over recent times, I have witnessed a number of people saying, 'Let's stop the blame game and get on with fixing it.' I have spent most of my life as a farmer and as a farmer I reckon I am a reasonably practical person and I can turn my hand to most things. However, I have never seen a man or woman tackle the task of resolving a problem without identifying the problem and without identifying what caused it. I have never seen that occur. If somebody did resolve a problem without identifying the cause, I suggest that it would be called an accident. You have to understand what caused the problem before you set yourself to fix it.

The Premier and the minister know what caused the problem, but they do not have the guts to come out and admit it because they know that they are most of the problem. What they do instead is deny the cause of the problem, which has been their policy for the last 15 years, and more recently they have sought to blame the federal government. May I remind members of the house under whose jurisdiction the supply of power is: the last time I looked at the constitution it did not have much to do with the federal government. It is a state function.

You can talk about carbon taxes and carbon prices, and we have had a federal election on that—we have had several. The people of Australia have rejected it: that big, fat tax of the last Labor government federally was rejected by the people of Australia. We have already identified that problem, the people of Australia did not want a tax. Let's move on from there. What has caused the problem in South Australia? Anybody and everybody who has looked at this seriously knows what has caused it.

It has been caused by huge investment in South Australia in intermittent electricity supply—renewables—largely rooftop solar, which only produces electricity for a few hours in the middle of the day or the early afternoon and only produces electricity when the sun is shining but will not run at capacity on a hot day when the sun is shining its brightest. Those who have looked at them know that the efficiency of that technology drops off as the temperature increases. The other thing we have invested huge amounts of money in is wind farms. Again, history has taught us that on the hottest day, when our electricity consumption is at its maximum, they do not damn well work. They shut themselves down when it gets hot.

I was really interested the other day when the energy minister told the house that we have invested about \$7 billion in South Australia in renewables—\$7 billion—and now we have a system that does not work. If only former premier Rann in 2002, instead of saying, 'I'm going to build another interconnector to New South Wales and lower the price of electricity,' had said, 'I'm going to spend \$7 billion and build us a nuclear power plant,' where would we be today? We would be a lot better off than we are. But he did not say that.

This government is arguing that it is the federal government that has caused the problem. In fact, the minister has tried to intimate that it is the federal government that has caused the growth in wind farms in South Australia. Nothing could be further from the truth. Indeed, back on 16 December 2009 (that is a fair while ago), the then premier of this government put out a press release and granted a payroll tax exemption to any company that was building wind farms—a payroll tax incentive, yet now we have the minister and the Premier saying, 'It's not our fault. It's those dirty rotten federals. It's that dirty rotten Coalition government in Canberra that has caused all those wind farms to be built.'

This Labor government gave a payroll tax exemption to people who were building wind farms, yet they say, 'No, it's not our fault.' They have incentivised people to come and build the wind farms in South Australia. A document prepared a few years ago by RenewablesSA, 'A low carbon investment plan for South Australia', states on page 7:

South Australia's success in drawing low carbon energy investment is not just the product of its natural resources. The State Government moved early to gain an advantage in the development of renewable energy sources by leading the nation in setting policy frameworks and regulatory processes to provide greater consistency, transparency and the certainty that investors need to capitalise on these outstanding resources.

This was when the government announced that they wanted to meet a 50 per cent target of renewables by 2025. There is plenty of evidence on the record about this government and its encouragement of renewables in South Australia. That is why they remain in denial. They know what has caused the problem. When you read the AEMO report that was released this morning, what caused the problem? There were a number of steps.

The blackout actually occurred when the Heywood interconnector dropped out—that is when it occurred—but it dropped out because the wind farms switched off because they could not handle the sudden changes in frequency on the grid. If the wind farms could have handled that, we would not have had the blackout, but they could not. If we did not have the wind farms and we were still relying on, for instance, the Port Augusta coal-fired power station, I doubt very much whether we would have had the blackout because we would not have had all those wind farms drop out. That triggered the interconnector to drop out and we had the blackout. We can huff and puff, but the wind farms are causing the problems.

They are also causing problems because they have made it uneconomic for the traditional thermal-type power stations, like Port Augusta, to keep operating. Why do they make it uneconomic? I do not know whether members realise this, but generators bid in five-minute segments, 24/7, 365 days a year. They bid in five-minute segments that they will supply a certain amount of power at a certain price and AEMO adds them up until it has enough to meet the demand that they expect in each five-minute interval. It starts at the lower price and gets up to somebody who has bid in when they fill their order book to meet the demand for that five-minute interval. They rule the line there and say, 'That's the last generator that we will dispatch.'

I have heard the minister and the Premier talk about coal-fired generators gaming the system. Where the gaming in the system occurs is when the wind farms bid in extremely low; in fact, they often bid in at a negative price. But guess what? That is not the price they supply at. They supply at the cut-off price when the last generator is dispatched, whatever that price is, because the wind farms always know that that will be a thermal generator or a gas generator and they know that it will be a substantial price. They bid in very low so that they are always dispatched, whereas the thermal generator keeps pouring coal or gas into their boiler, bids in at a price to cover their costs and quite often gets knocked off. The wind generator is not paid at their bid price. They are paid something substantially above it.

It gets worse. They are paid for a renewable energy certificate, and for every megawatt hour they produce in today's market that certificate is worth about \$85 to them. The Port Augusta power plant used to supply energy into our grid at about \$30 a megawatt hour. The wind farms that have driven that generator out of business get at least that \$30 (and it is a hell of a lot more now) and another \$85 on top, and we sit around and wonder why the system is falling over.

The rules our market system operates under were developed in the late 1990s before there was any comprehension that we would have such a penetration of wind farms and rooftop solar panels. This government has sat with its hands on the wheel but its brain in neutral. I have heard no argument and no debate about changing the rules to meet the energy mix we have now—none whatsoever, yet we have this stupid piece of legislation stating, 'We are going to take back control.' That is what this is saying, 'We are going to take back control.' Well, hello!

On 3 June 2009, in this house I argued: why are we giving away control? Why are we giving away control when we got rid of the energy supply industry planning council, which was a South Australian organisation giving the best advice possible to the government in South Australia. This government got rid of it. I argued—and it is in the *Hansard* of 3 June 2009—that it was a retrograde step. Eight years later, the Premier is running around saying, 'We need to take back control.'

He and his government actually got rid of the control and handed it over. This government has little or no understanding of what it is doing. But it gets worse. We saw the Premier hijack Josh Frydenberg's press conference the other week. I thought Frydenberg handled himself fairly poorly, actually. I am damn sure I would not have stood there and taken that.

As Samuel Johnson said in 1775, 'Patriotism is the last refuge of the scoundrel.' He was talking about our Premier. The Premier can stand up and say that he is fighting for South Australia as often and as loudly as he likes, but he is a fraud. He is not fighting for South Australia: he is fighting for himself. He is fighting for his own political life. For this government to argue the patriot line, that anybody who makes adverse comments about South Australia is anti South Australian, is a nonsense. They are arguing anti the current government.

Thank God, we all know that for the last eight years at the last two general elections the people of South Australia have been trying to get rid of this government. At last, we will face an election in just under 12 months' time when I would argue that for the first time since 1975 the people will have an even chance—just an even chance—of getting rid of a government they want to get rid of because they have not had that ability in all that time.

The Premier, who is here only as a result of the worst gerrymander that has ever occurred within this nation and endured for such a long time and who ran up the flag of South Australia saying, 'I am the true patriot and anybody who has a crack at me and my policies is anti South Australian,' will see next year just how the people of South Australia regard him when they have a reasonable and fair opportunity send him an accurate message—because he will get it.

This piece of legislation is a nonsense. When we had the load shedding back in February, imagine what the minister would have done. He will think to himself, 'I have the power now to prevent this from happening.' He gets notification that there is going to be a requirement to load shed in South Australia because we have this mess of a system that he has helped develop. He says, 'I'll fix that.' What does he do? He gets on the phone, rings up Pelican Point and says, 'You've got to start your generator.' 'Okay,' they say, 'Yes, we'll go and press the button, turn the switch and light the gas burner and away we go.'

The load shedding would have occurred well before that plant started producing energy to prevent it. This is the nonsense that this minister and this Premier and this government try to put forward to the people of South Australia. Do they really think that we believe that the people of South Australia believe that the market operator sits in Victoria and plots against South Australia? Do they think that the market operator sits there and tries to devise an outcome that makes the lights go out in South Australia? Do they really think that?

Does anybody on the government benches think that their minister is more adept at keeping the lights on than the national market operator? Does anybody over there think that? I doubt it. I am absolutely convinced that he is not, and there is plenty of evidence to back me up. This government has presided over a lot of messes in the last 15 years—a lot of messes—but none as great as this.

As the member for Schubert pointed out, they have been warned over and over and over and over again, yet to this day they still remain in denial. Good on them, I say. Keep going down that path because the more of you who are given your marching orders by the electorate in March next year the better because none of you deserves to be in here with what you have done to this state.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (16:59): I rise today to speak very positively in support of this important piece of legislation, legislation that responds to our South Australian community's desire for our government to develop and deliver a strong plan that will secure South Australia's long-term energy future. It is legislation and a plan that provide a balance between taking control of sourcing, generating, controlling and securing our own energy, being environmentally responsible, moving away from the federal Liberal government's penchant for dirty coal, putting downward pressure on energy prices and creating South Australian jobs.

This is legislation that demonstrates leadership and vision and speaks to our government's passion for ensuring South Australia is self-reliant and strong. It is no secret that we have faced difficulties in South Australia in terms of our energy security and affordability. This is based on a number of critical factors, with the largest being the incredibly short-sighted decision by the

predecessors of those opposite to sell off ETSA, to take control away from South Australians over their energy future.

Over the past couple of weeks, I have spoken with many, many people in our southern community about our plan. I will speak more about this in a moment, but at this point it is very clear from those conversations that people know exactly who sold ETSA, exactly who took a crucial state asset out of the hands of South Australians. They know exactly what the consequences of that have been, as do those workers whom I have had the privilege of representing and advocating for over many years and who also bore the brunt of the selling off of ETSA.

Conversely, our South Australian Labor government is tackling the problem head-on, with a suite of solutions which cleverly contemplates and moves us forward through the context of a difficult National Electricity Market in a way which ensures that all South Australians can access safe, affordable and clean energy now and into the future. As has been said, our plan sets out a multifaceted approach, which as a package will assist South Australians across every community.

Firstly, we are implementing a new energy security target that will increase South Australia's energy self-reliance by requiring more locally generated, cleaner and secure energy to be used in our state. Secondly, Australia's largest battery will be built here to store renewable energy and to add stability to supply as part of a new \$150 million renewable technology fund. Thirdly, we are building a new emergency gas power plant to ensure government-owned emergency power is available in South Australia so that we have energy security and reliability in whatever circumstances arise.

Importantly, this will be a significant source of job creation in South Australia, a matter which is of paramount importance to our government. Initial estimates are that this plan will create 520 full-time equivalent jobs through the initiatives I have described and another 100 full-time equivalent jobs in increased gas exploration. These long-term investments are good for our economy, good for our state and, most importantly, good for our community members, who want jobs created for their children and grandchildren right here in South Australia.

Fourthly, today we are legislating for local power over the national market, to give our energy minister direction over the market so that the needs of South Australians always come first. These changes will allow a more rapid response to security and reliability problems, which will bring back some government control to a volatile energy market. We must ensure that we do not have another situation where a private power company has the capacity to turn on a generator in an emergency and does not. This should be a basic responsibility of those who provide an essential service.

The plan of course involves other components, but it is these that I address today. I direct honourable members who are struggling with some of the concepts to our comprehensive website at energyplan.sa.gov.au, a website that thousands and thousands of South Australians are accessing for clear information about our clear and visionary plan. It will come as no surprise to members of this chamber that people have differences of opinion over energy issues, as they are well entitled to do, but whilst talking to members of my own community about this plan I have found widespread support for the positive action outlined within it.

People are particularly supportive of the fact that we are taking the initiative, taking control and ensuring our ongoing energy security and reliability. From telephoning and doorknocking community members, doing shopping centre visits and attending community meetings, I have had the great privilege of getting a broad picture of just how our community feels about our plan.

Firstly, there is a general feeling of relief from people that our government has listened to their concerns, deeply listened, and is taking decisive action. Many have said to me, when I have asked them their thoughts on the plan, that we just had to do something. I believe that these people would not have supported the move to adjourn this debate today. As many people have said in support of our plan, 'Yes, this is great. Just get on with it.'

Coupled with that is an almost unanimous sentiment that we have to find a way to be more self-reliant, that we cannot simply rely on a broken National Electricity Market, nor on other states, as they fear that we will be second-class citizens to those on the eastern seaboard. They are heartened by the sentiments of our Premier, so eloquently expressed to minister Josh Frydenberg, and they are confident that we, and sadly we alone, will stand up to Canberra and ensure energy reliability for all South Australians.

I had person after person at Coles at Christies Beach, at Southgate shopping plaza, at doors, at community meetings and on the telephone saying, 'Please tell Jay "good on you".' At the closure of a very well attended community meeting two weeks ago about another local community issue, at the packed-out Christies Beach Surf Life Saving Club (my wonderful surf lifesaving club) a woman approached me and said, 'Katrine, I wish you had asked for a show of hands about Jay's energy stuff at the end of the meeting. I reckon you would have got 100 per cent support.' Whether we would have got 100 per cent support I am not sure, but from every conversation since that moment I reckon we would have been pretty close.

While worry over power bills is certainly of note, people are clear that this plan may give us a pathway forward in terms of stemming future price hikes. Our plan finally answers a range of pressing concerns for community members. What also came up over and over again was that, despite the scare campaign from those opposite, community members actually understand why renewable energy is important to our future and the future of our planet. It is not news for them that the age of dirty coal is over and that we must be more strategic about our energy choices. We on this side of the chamber understand that a carefully considered move away from high carbon-emitting unsustainable fuels is the way of the future.

People are tired of being fed oversimplified lines about power. They are ready to hear and reflect on our detailed plan, and they have shown this through an overwhelmingly positive response. They want a government that stands up and takes real action to answer some of the pressing questions for our state. Our action and service to the South Australian people in these matters are apparent, as is our desire to put South Australians first in every aspect of this plan to ensure the security of South Australian power for South Australians.

What do we have in response to our carefully costed, well developed and economically and socially responsible plan? We have an opposition that still talks about coal and allows Canberra to announce, in the words of our Premier, Jay Weatherill, 'a \$2 billion insult' to South Australia designed to keep the lights on in Sydney ahead of those in Adelaide when the federal energy minister came to Adelaide to talk about the Snowy River hydro plant.

Mr Bell: No, he didn't. He came to open a \$20 million AGL project.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Mount Gambier, you will be leaving the room.

Ms HILDYARD: As our Premier also said, this commonwealth Liberal government is 'the most anti SA government we have seen from a commonwealth government in living memory'. This begs the question of those opposite, in the long-sung words of extraordinary singers Florence Reece, Pete Seeger and Billy Bragg: 'Which side are you on?' We on this side of the chamber are firmly on the side of South Australia, on the side of South Australians. We stand up for our own energy, for our own jobs and for our future.

Mr Bell interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is lucky you are still here, isn't it, member for Mount Gambier?

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (17:08): Thank you, Deputy Speaker, for your indulgence. I want to put a couple of thoughts on the record and then explain in a bit of detail why assertions by members opposite are false and misleading. This plan will do nothing to reduce the price of electricity. If you understand anything about the market, you will notice that nothing in Labor's plan addresses price. I will give some credit that it will try to address the reliability of the grid and the way that intermittent energy and renewables play into that grid. Instead of looking backwards, the last thing I will say on that is that Labor conveniently forgets that the reason ETSA was sold was a little thing called the State Bank disaster, which technically bankrupted South Australia, but let's not concentrate on that little aspect. Let's talk about other facts relevant to moving forward.

I want to place on the record that I wholeheartedly support renewable energy. There is no doubt that is the planet's way forward and that we need to make sure that renewables play an ever-increasing part of electricity generation. There is no doubt at all. However, what we have here is a disorderly retreat from the market of base load power, in particular coal. It is quite interesting that the Labor government will stand up here to talk about that disorderly withdrawal but make no mention of

the fact that setting a renewable energy target at 40 per cent actually has a fair bit to do with that disorderly withdrawal from the market.

When I talk to people, they have an issue with and have trouble getting their head around the \$350 million build of a gas-fired power plant that is just going to sit there. It is going to sit there to provide inertia. The Minister for Energy will say, 'It is operating.' What he is failing to tell people is that it is not generating electricity into the market to keep the price down. In fact, the question I have for the minister is: at what price point would the power station come into the market? Would it be \$500 per megawatt hour? Would it be \$1,000 per megawatt hour? Would it be \$14,000 per megawatt hour, which is the cap under AEMO?

At no point does this bill mention at what price that power station would generate into the market. I could understand if the Premier or the minister sat there and said, 'We are going to put a ceiling on this at \$500, \$1,000, \$14,000, or just under that, to provide a ceiling for electricity generation.' But, no, it is going to sit there in case we have load shedding and we need to turn it on. That means that you and I will be paying for this and that it will not be bringing costs down. Not only are we paying for the install price but there is no ceiling price at which this state-owned generator is going to enter the market—\$10,000, \$5,000, at no point will this state-owned generator actually enter the market. It will be only to provide security.

That is why I make the initial point that nothing in this bill addresses the price of power. Ministers and backbenchers who stand up and say, 'This is a wonderful plan. This is going to address the price of power in my electorate,' clearly have no idea what they are talking about. The 100 megawatt battery, for the price tag, if the estimates are correct, will provide 2.5 minutes of backup if we have a statewide blackout. Of course, we can argue that it is not designed for an entire statewide blackout. It will be to provide for parts of the market that may close down, and of course it will then be able to supply backup for a longer period of time.

But it really does worry me that the Labor government does not understand the market. There is no gas reserve for domestic supply, so we are now heading headlong into gas providing the transitional fuel but with no guarantee that there will actually be enough gas there. The minister is quite elusive around that topic. I wonder what forward gas contracts have been committed by some of the major players in the market to what would be available for a domestic supply. Of course, Hazelwood is closing down, and then outrageous statements are being made by the Treasurer that this is good for South Australia.

He says that Hazelwood closing down is going to be fantastic for South Australians and South Australian residents. Today, in question time, when asked on that exact point, he said, 'Well, we're going to have more generation here in South Australia, isn't that good?' Again, no mention that the price is going to be higher than we currently pay because of that base load power generated, yes, by coal, providing cheap supply into the grid.

What disturbed me most was our so-called Premier's treatment of federal colleagues in a very public way. If this is the standard that a premier sets for us in South Australia, then I am deeply concerned. Some people will praise that as, 'Good on you for standing up for South Australians,' but what it really means—and I will not use some analogies I have used around other sections—is that we are alienating the exact people and states that we have to work with to be part of the solution. COAG, believe it or not, is not the enemy: it is part of the solution going forward.

I thought I would do some research and give some notes to the Treasurer because often we are accused of coming into this house and contributing nothing to the debate in a constructive way. I certainly do not want to be accused of that. I have done a National Electricity Market 101 and I have noted some points. The National Electricity Market is not a national market but a series of five interconnected regions, with each region based on state boundaries. This means, to understand the operation of the NEM, it is better to think of how a single region operates.

On an interconnector, the electricity flowing from one region to another is bought in the exporting region at the price in the exporting region but paid for at the price in the importing region, which means that there can be different prices. The size of this mismatch and its timing and duration are all unknown, so this imposes a risk on retailers. Because of the risk, retailers develop their offers to consumers based on prices offered only by generators within the region where the consumer is

based. This means that consumers in, let's say, South Australia, will only have prices offered to them based on prices offered by the generators operating in South Australia. Even though there might be some 600 to 800 megawatts of power entering South Australia from Victoria being paid for at Victorian prices, the value of this low-cost import has little impact on the prices paid to retailers by consumers.

There is also an assumption that interconnectors operate at their rated capacity all the time, but this is not the case. The actual flows on an interconnector are dependent on the networks in both the importing and exporting regions to operate at the rated capacity. For example, Murraylink is rated for 220 megawatts, but for much of the time when Murraylink is needed to operate at maximum capacity, network constraints in Victoria seriously limit its flow to South Australia. Interconnector capacity is also dependent on where in a region generators are dispatching from. For example, flows between Victoria and New South Wales are dependent on which of the Snowy generators are operating.

To increase the ability to trade between regions requires increased interconnection. The National Electricity Rules require any augmentation of interconnection to be assessed on a market benefit test. The impact of a market benefit test does not include the benefit consumers would gain from increased interconnection, even though consumers pay the cost of any increased interconnection. For example, if increased interconnection between South Australia and Victoria reduced the price of electricity for South Australian consumers by, say, \$20 a megawatt hour, the value to consumers of this price reduction is not included in the assessment of whether the interconnector will provide a net benefit.

The NEM operates as an energy-only market, where generators are paid according to the amount of electricity they actually provide. In a capacity market, such as is used in most other world competitive electricity markets, generators are paid for being available to generate when needed—i.e., they are paid to be on stand-by—and for the amount they generate on top of that.

While the energy-only market has operated successfully in the NEM to now, it did so because there was little intermittent generation and a rising consumption. Now, with falling or flat consumption and increasing amounts of intermittent generation, the sales by intermittent generators are displacing sales from base load generators, which reduces their cash flow. Base load generators have low operating costs but high capital costs, so they need to have a high sales volumes to offset their fixed costs. Essentially, that is why Port Augusta power station went out of business.

Failing to get these high sales volumes, these base load generators to close or require a payment to be available. As I said before, a case in point is the closure of SA's Northern power station which, prior to its closing, had lost nearly 50 per cent of its sales and had insufficient sales to warrant the capital required to keep the plant in operation.

The NEM operates as a marginal price market where the price for all electricity sold is set at the price offered by the last generator dispatched. The alternative to this is the 'pay as bid' approach where generators get paid the price they offer to the market. If there is one take-home point from this entire speech I would like the Treasurer to look at, it is a pay as bid approach.

At the moment, the NEM operates on a bidding system where generators provide bids to the market offering a certain amount of energy for a set price for each five minutes of the day. The market operator (AEMO) matches all the volumes and prices offered and, depending on the forecast of demand for that five-minute period, sets the price for electricity for each five minutes. A generator might and often does—nearly always does—have multiple bids for each five minutes, with different amounts of energy for different prices.

A generator can change its bid at any time up to the start of each five-minute period. Specifically—and this is the important part—it can withdraw offers at a lower price and replace them with higher prices and so increase prices for the same energy it delivers. If a generator knows it has to be dispatched regardless of the price it offers to meet the regional demand, it can set its price for all the electricity it provides at the market price cap of \$14,000 per megawatt hour.

For example, AGL's Torrens Island power station has nominally 1,260 megawatts of capacity. When the wind is not blowing and demand exceeds 2,000 megawatts, some of the units at

Torrens Island power station must be dispatched regardless of the price it offers, so guess which price it offers. The rules of the market allow Torrens Island power station to withdraw offers it has previously made at lower prices and rebid them at higher prices.

Marginal pricing means that generators like intermittent wind generators, which bid into the market to be dispatched ahead of all other generators, rely on there being some thermal generation being dispatched to drive the market price up. This means that the benefit of high prices goes to all generators that are dispatched, making those wind farms even more profitable, as they also get renewable energy certificates.

For example, wind generation was profitable with a spot price of about \$40 to \$50 per megawatt hour when the value of the renewable energy certificates was added. With a spot price plus the now very high price for renewable energy certificates, wind farms have benefited massively from the closure of base load generation. In the early years of the NEM, most generators were independent of retailers—another very important point. This has changed dramatically and now most generation is owned by retailers.

The impact of this change is that the big three retailers—AGL, Origin and Energy Australia—along with Inergy, effectively control either directly or indirectly all retail activities. To provide pricing to the mass market, that is, small businesses and residential consumers, retailers build up a book based on various forms of generated contracts, including the buying and selling of their generation rights from the spot market.

There is a view that batteries or pumped hydro will solve the problem of intermittent generation. What is missing from this assessment is that batteries and pumped hydro do not generate new electricity: they merely store electricity generated elsewhere for use at a later time, so there has to be sufficient generation capacity to provide for the needs of the moment, plus additional generation to store generation for later use.

Currently in SA wind farms generate about 30 per cent of the total electricity injected into the grid. This means that for the grid supplies to be fully supplied by wind will require more than three times the number of wind farms to provide the electricity needed at any moment, plus for electricity to be stored for when the wind does not blow. The amount of storage will require batteries and pumped storage to be sized to store the surplus electricity needed for when the wind does not blow.

Records in South Australia show that there are times when there is little wind generation for periods of two to three days. This would mean that for South Australian average demand of about 15,000 megawatts and two days of no wind, and the interconnectors with Victoria providing, say, 600 megawatts, there would have to be over 40,000 megawatt hours of storage, or three million Tesla Powerwall 2 batteries.

The NEM has become more peaky in recent years, with the frequency of very high demands becoming less frequent. This raises the issue as to whether more generation should be provided to operate less often, whether there should be greater interconnection between regions so that electricity can be imported for those few occurrences, or whether consumers should lose supply when these peaks occur—something that I certainly would not support.

In closing, it is clear to me that some of the issues I have raised have never been discussed in this parliament, and if the Treasurer is serious about the price of power, not just the reliability, he will address some of these issues.

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) (17:27): Last September, when we had the statewide blackout caused by a storm of the proportions we have not seen before in terms of seven tornadoes hitting our state at the same time, including a twin tornado that the Bureau of Meteorology told us that they had never seen before, within hours we had the Prime Minister of our country out there blaming renewable energy. The following morning we had the Deputy Prime Minister of Australia out there blaming renewable energy and attacking South Australia as a state.

When the big floods hit Brisbane a few years ago, when Cyclone Tracey hit Darwin back in 1974, could we imagine our prime ministers of the day going into a state that is facing incredible

challenges to get back on its feet after a big storm event, and criticising and kicking those people while they are down? The Prime Minister and Deputy Prime Minister of this country are a disgrace for the way they carried on after that storm in September last year.

I was in question time in Canberra last Wednesday, and still the Prime Minister and the federal energy minister were making jokes about South Australia, about 'can't keep the lights on'. We need better leadership in this country, and thank goodness we have good leadership at a state level, because there are a lot of things to blame for the situation we are in at the moment.

A lot of it has to go back to the then Liberal government selling off ETSA. Let us remember that under this Liberal government of the time the private sector all around the world looked to see what South Australia was selling because they got such great deals. Remember, they sold the TAB for two thirds of what it used to make us each year. They did a really bad deal on the sale of ETSA, an asset that belonged to the people of South Australia and should never ever have been sold.

We just heard the member for Mount Gambier say that he did not believe the way the Premier of South Australia spoke to the federal energy minister in Adelaide a couple of weeks ago. Well, this kowtowing to Canberra by the opposition in this state needs to stop. South Australians want South Australians to stick up for themselves, to stick up for their state and to make sure we have a bright future here, one where we are not faced with ridicule from our federal leaders, which is absolutely disgraceful behaviour. We do not want to be described as a state that cannot keep the lights on when it was because of things outside of our control. Instead of giving a hand, the federal government wants to blame us, and the state Liberal opposition wants to join them in that blame.

I was in Kingscote the day after the Premier had his words, quite publicly, with the federal energy minister. A man came up to me and said, 'Look, I don't always agree with Jay, but what he did yesterday was fantastic. It's about time people started sticking up for South Australia.' Then I went doorknocking, and it was the same sort of response in Kingscote.

The following Monday, the plan had come out, our state plan had come out. We were out there saying all these things that had happened, the national energy market, the faults with that are not our doing. We did not sell off ETSA, but we could not be out there blaming others because the people of South Australia looked to us as the elected government and they wanted us to take responsibility for what was happening. So our Premier, with the energy minister and the rest of cabinet, spent several weeks working on a way to address the issues our state faced.

On the following Monday, I walked into a cafe in Willunga and a woman called Ruth came up to me. She said, 'I think this is a great thing that the Premier has done, I like this energy plan, but we have only seen what we have seen on the television. Could you please send us some brochures, some information so that we can work our way through it?' I said, 'That's really funny, because I just got out of the car where I had been listening to the ABC news, and the member for Bragg was on there saying that the people of South Australia don't want another brochure.' Well, I reckon we might be more in tune with what the public of South Australia wants than those opposite.

I have mentioned the ridicule and the jokes and everything else that has been thrust upon our state by the federal leaders, something we have never seen before. No state has ever been bagged to the extent that our state has been by the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister of the nation, never in the history of Federation. No-one has ever come out like that, at a time of need in a time when the lights are out because of a storm no-one has ever seen before, when we were out there with emergency crews trying to get people back on their feet.

How no-one died in that storm is a miracle, one that we are extremely grateful for, but to have the Prime Minister and Deputy Prime Minister come out as they did upset a lot of South Australians. Those South Australians are angry, but they are also looking for someone to fix the problem, and I am proud to be a member of a cabinet that has addressed these issues. We have gone out there with a plan. There are many more months of work to be done to make sure that we fix this problem, but we will.

Today, the opposition lost the motion to adjourn the debate on this very significant subject. Then the Leader of the Opposition stood up and joined in with the jocularly of his Prime Minister and his Deputy Prime Minister, who he will never, ever stand up to because he kowtows to Canberra. He

stood in here and said, 'Oh, I go interstate and people give me torches, because the lights might go out when I get home.' Well, Leader of the Opposition, it is no time for jokes. This is a very serious subject. Maybe the reason they give you a torch is because your nickname is 'hurricane lamp': you are dim and you need to be carried.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:34): I rise to speak on the Emergency Management (Electricity Supply Emergencies) Amendment Bill 2017, which was introduced by the Premier and which follows an announcement two weeks ago in respect of an energy plan, one plank of which was, and I quote from the material published:

Local Powers Over National Market.

Goal: Give South Australia greater local powers over national market operators and privately owned generators.

The State Government will legislate to ensure that South Australian energy users are not held hostage to unwarranted market behaviour.

The Minister for Energy will be given strong new powers to direct the national market in the case of an electricity supply shortfall.

Ministerial direction includes the ability to direct generators to operate and direct the Australian Energy Market Operator to control flow on the interconnector.

This will ensure every available option is activated to maintain the state's electricity supply in an emergency situation or when market forces fail.

Drafting of new legislation will begin immediately. The Minister's power will be used as a last-resort measure if the national market does not act in South Australia's best interests.

Two weeks later, we have presented to the parliament a bill which purports to introduce this brave, bold, new initiative, which has been described as standing up to the national market, standing up to Canberra, to provide powers to the Minister for Energy to protect us in certain circumstances.

The question I ask, and which I think the Minister for Energy must answer to the parliament, is: why has he not acted on the powers he already has? At the time of the four incidents—events, as they have been described—which relate to the failure in September last year and the consequential blackout, and the load-shedding events since, why has he not acted to do just that in respect of the powers that he already has? He does not want to answer that question—he does not want to tell us.

The government's answer is, to protect him from explaining to the people of South Australia why he has failed to act under the powers he already has, that there is no answer. In reality, I suggest this whole bill is a complete subterfuge to divert from the fact that the minister did not do anything, and he certainly did not act within the powers that he has. So, I raise the question of whether we need this bill, given that we already have the Essential Services Act 1981, which gives the minister power to do a number of things, and it has a ringing similarity to the bill that is currently before you.

The Essential Services Act 1981, which is an act to protect the community against interruption and dislocation of essential services, makes provision for essential services, which are defined to mean:

...a service (whether provided by a public or private undertaking) without which the safety, health or welfare of the community or a section of the community would be endangered or seriously prejudiced;

The proclaimed essential services are as defined, and they are conveniently listed in the Essential Services Commission Act 2002 as being: electricity services, gas services, water and sewerage services, maritime services, rail services, or any other services prescribed for the purposes of this definition.

The act gives the minister, via the state, the power to proclaim a declaration of a period which is defined in the opinion of the government where circumstances have arisen or are likely to arise that have caused or are likely to cause interruption or dislocation of essential services in the state, and it gives the power to issue that proclamation for a period of up to 14 days. After that, it essentially requires the concurrence of two houses of parliament, 14 days, and the declaration—the same that is currently being asked for in the bill. It gives the power for directions to be issued, and I quote from the act:

If, during a period of emergency, it is, in the opinion of the Minister, in the public interest to do so, the Minister may give directions in relation to the provision or use of proclaimed essential services.

It gives very severe penalties to anyone who fails to obey those directions, both to corporates and to an individual person. It gives the minister the power to take over the provision of the essential service. Indeed, it gives extra very specific powers to the minister to require any person who is, in the minister's opinion, in a position to do so or to furnish information as specified in the notice. Again, there is the obligation to provide information. It gives the minister the power to fix prices, to stop profiteering under the act, and it authorises a number of officers to be able to carry out the terms of implementing those directions. It gives a delegation power, and it gives very considerable powers to deal with the continuation of an offence in breach of that.

The only thing which is not in this act, which currently gives the minister the power to act, is the clause in the bill that is before us which gives an exemption of liability. If the government wants to do that, if it wants to hide behind the protection in those circumstances, then of course they could have come in and amended the Essential Services Act which has been amended on a number of occasions since I have been here in the parliament—2004, 2005, 2009, 2011 and 2013. It has been contemporary to deal with exactly those circumstances.

Not once since September last year have I heard the Minister for Energy, or indeed the Premier, explain to the people of South Australia why they have not acted on this legislation. I will come to the briefing that was provided at 1 o'clock today on this bill. Not only are we in the absence of there being any explanation given to the people of South Australia, the only logical reason for the government to come in and say, 'We have to deal with this bill because it is part of our platform of our plan to deal with energy security in the state,' would be to pretend to South Australians that they actually need this legislation to be able to act.

It is their defence to the obvious question of why they failed to act over the past 12 months. I think we need to have those answers from the government. We need some explanation from the government about why they have failed to act. In the briefing that was provided on this bill, which incidentally did not show in the summary of bills to be debated this week by the government when it was transmitted to the opposition at 1.31pm on Friday. Some time in the last 48 hours or so the government decided that they would throw this bill in, given that on their published material they had only started to draft the bill at that time. It may be that it has taken two weeks to draft it and they had to finish it off over the weekend.

As has been clearly pointed out today, when they finally got it off the printer, not even a copy of it was conveyed to the opposition to say, 'For these reasons, we need to deal with it urgently.' I do not know that we are about to have a hot weather spell that would require us to have to deal with these powers. I say to the parliament that the minister has these powers already and he has not acted on them. He has not explained to you or anyone else in South Australia why he did not act.

Let's fast-forward to lunchtime today. We were given a briefing. We were going through the bill. I asked the question, 'Why is it that we need to have an amendment to the Emergency Management Act, which is a 2004 act, to deal with emergencies and what is to take place in a formula to deal with state emergencies? Why is it necessary for us to amend that act when we already have an Essential Services Act which gives very extensive powers to the government to act to protect South Australia?' The answer to the question was, 'We have subsequently introduced national laws in relation to a market for the provision of electricity services and, therefore, we need to amend an act, dated 2004, which comes after 1996, and we need to amend that act. Yes, possibly, we could have amended the Essential Services Act, but that predated the implementation of the national market.'

I do not know what school they went to, but if members look around they will see volumes of blue folders which incorporate the statutes of this parliament which we are bound by in South Australia. It does not matter whether it is the Constitution Act 1934 or whether it is the Education Act 1972 or the Essential Services Act 1981. They are valid laws. They operate, they are enforceable and they are accessible for the protection of citizens in South Australia when required. They set the statutory regime which is there until this parliament removes them or repeals them or they are struck down in a court.

I say to the Minister for Energy that it is about time he entered this debate and answered that valid question as to why he did not act back in September if he felt that either the AEMO or a generator had failed to act in the interests of South Australians, or had refused to do or not do a certain thing to ensure a continued supply of energy in South Australia. He has not done that to date, and he needs to do that.

Why has he not said to the Premier, 'I don't want to muck up your beautiful new blue plan. I don't want to make it look a bit weak. You have gone out there with this mantra of standing up to Canberra and so on, so we need this legislation. We need to get this through the parliament because we are paralysed with incapacity until this occurs'?

I say: what utter rot! These statutes are valid. They are there for good reason. They could have been acted on. I have reread these again today, and if there is a weakness in them in some way, then bring them back into the parliament and let's look at them. You could have stood up to these people, if that was your mantra. You could have done what you now say is necessary for you to do to stand up to these disorderly people who are holding you 'hostage to unwarranted market behaviour', to use the Premier's language.

The truth is they do not need this legislation. It is a complete subterfuge from the reality of the situation. They have utterly failed South Australians. The Minister for Energy has utterly failed South Australians. We can talk about all the debates that have gone on in here as the precursors to the disaster that we now have in South Australia—the critical situation we now have with an unreliable supply and a massive cost for an essential service in this state—but the real question that needs to be asked is: why are we even here debating this bill at all?

Why are we amending the Emergency Management Act when we already have the Essential Services Act, which is a valid piece of law? Why are we adding another model into the Emergency Management Act which, quite frankly, apart from adding in a few years ago a provision for a health emergency, is an act to establish strategies and systems for the management of emergencies in the state and for other purposes?

If we go back and read the reason we have the Emergency Management Act, it is to deal with emergencies like natural disasters and acts of terrorism. They are all listed in the act: explosions, fires, accidents, epidemics, pandemics, emissions of poisons, radiation or other hazardous agents, hijacks, sieges, riots, acts of terrorism and hostilities directed by an enemy against Australia. It is pretty clear what that act is supposed to be about.

The Essential Services Act is making sure that we have the powers vested in the government to act in a manner, in exceptional circumstances, to protect South Australians and to ensure that they continue to have a reliable essential service. It could not be clearer. Do not be fooled by this absolute smokescreen of required demand just because it fits in with the mantra of the Premier, who is trying to convince us as legislators that we need to act in legislation to be able to stand up to these parties who will hold us 'hostage to unwarranted market behaviour'. That power is there.

We need the Minister for Energy to come in here and explain why he did not act on it and what directions he would have issued if he had had that power which, for some reason, he is now telling the South Australian parliament he does not have. I suggest that the next aspect he needs to explain to us before we give him this power again is how he is going to implement it. How is he going to inform himself so that he will be more knowledgeable and more capable of making an assessment to essentially intervene in the marketplace, more than AEMO, more than the Essential Services Commission, which is also another agency of experts that we look to to protect us against the carnivorous conduct of profiteering private enterprises?

We have a whole structure of protection and we have a whole structure of experts, so how is the minister going to inform himself above those, or outside of those, to make a decision to direct AEMO or one of these scurrilous generators to do or not do a certain thing in an anticipated load-shedding moment? I hate to think. Is he just going to ring up the department and say, 'Well, what do you guys think? How am I going to avert this problem? I have asked AEMO to do something. Personally, I think they're on the wrong track and they're not going to do what I have asked them to do.'

I really am concerned that anybody in the Minister for Energy's role—not just the incumbent, but any individual—would be able to act in a manner, in such general terms, purportedly to protect South Australians having an energy supply at all. I would not be happy with the current one implementing it under the Essential Services Act, but my point is that it is already there. I think he needs to explain to South Australians what are the triggers, what are the consequences and who is going to mop up the mess if he errs, because at the moment, he is asking for your blessing in passing this statute to completely exonerate himself and all the other people who sit in cabinet who might support him in making a decision which he thinks is in your interest—but remember under this act he will have that power himself, not the cabinet.

I would not trust him as far as I could kick him. I am not prepared to accept that we even need to go down this line, to allow the Premier to give some chest-beating presentation to South Australia because he needs to do this to be able to stand up to those in the industry. We will have a lot of questions in committee and we will expect some answers.

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (17:52): I would like to talk for a moment about my electorate of Taylor. We have seen a very positive response to the state's energy plan. People have been walking past the office at Paralowie and they have been stopping to read the posters in the windows and having conversations with my electorate office staff. The comments in these settings, as well as on social media with my Facebook posts, show that people see clean energy as the way forward.

People want to see us move away from coal. When I travelled interstate recently, people from other states congratulated South Australia on its commitment to renewables. One constituent told us that he sent an email to the Premier to congratulate him on the plan (which in my electorate is not something that people normally do), saying that this is what the state needs. They are proud that someone is standing up for us against the federal government and understand that South Australia should come first for a change. Like many people commenting on social media, he was glad to see we had a strong Premier.

The Premier's decision to take charge of our own energy future has clearly been applauded by many. Of course, people in the northern suburbs are concerned about power prices and their household bills. They are the things that people in the north care about: the basics that affect their lives and that of their families every day. They understand that as part of the government's new energy plan we will see more competition in the electricity market, putting downward pressure on prices. As Minister for Disabilities and Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, I am principally concerned about the welfare of some of our state's most vulnerable people.

I am committed to ensuring that people are safe if the national energy operator does fail the people of South Australia again, and we suffer from further power outages before our new energy plan is fully implemented. The Department for Health and Ageing is currently developing an emergency plan for vulnerable persons across our community including those dependent upon equipment. Disability SA has reviewed backup power arrangements across disability service providers, both government and non-government. All providers are obliged to have backup plans in place and individual plans for clients relating to their individual needs.

A number of clients in Highgate are particularly dependent on equipment. Highgate has a number of systems in place to respond to unexpected emergencies, and this includes a backup generator that was installed in July 2016. This generator is tested each month. There are also backup batteries for ventilators. Other disability DCSI sites have business continuity plans in place that include arrangements for electrical outages.

No clients in a DCSI supported accommodation service or at Northgate are life-dependent on backup equipment. Disability SA clients living independently in the community who are dependent on equipment are supported to develop personalised emergency plans. The Glenside Health Service, James Nash House and mental health facilities located on hospital campuses are also well supported by backup emergency diesel generator systems. All public and commercial buildings are required to have a proportion of their lighting backed up by battery backup power providing luminance for a minimum of 90 minutes.

All exit lights have to have an extra 90 minutes of battery power backup. Batteries, as we know, are the way of the future; our plan talks about them extensively. Business continuity plans and contingency plans are in place to ensure continuity of residential and 24/7 drug and alcohol services across the state, both metro and country. These continuity plans will be reviewed and updated if necessary as part of the ongoing modernisation of the Department for Health emergency plans.

I am confident that South Australians living with a disability or suffering from mental health or drug and alcohol problems are properly protected as we move forward towards this cleaner energy future that our state wishes to, and strongly wants to, embrace, despite opposition from a noisy minority.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (17:57): We have had a rather historic day here today, but I rise to speak to the Emergency Management (Electricity Supply Emergencies) Amendment Bill 2017. I want to go into a little bit of the history of why we find ourselves here today: it is because of the state Labor government's headlong rush into renewables and not having a transition plan in place. It is just ridiculous that the 540-megawatt Northern power station—and in question time today the minister could not tell us how many megawatts it used to generate—was shut down last May, and it is only since then that we have had utter chaos inflicted on this state.

It was inflicted on businesses, households, the health system and the education system. Chaos was inflicted across this state because of a headlong rush by this state Labor Premier and his party into renewables. That is why we are here today, six months to the day after 28 September 2016. That was another historic day. We were sitting in the parliament, but it was an historic day for this state. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ELECTRICITY AND GAS) 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 11, page 7, lines 10 to 32—Delete the clause and substitute:

11—Amendment of section 48—Entry for purposes related to infrastructure

(1) Section 48—after subsection (2) insert:

(2a) Despite subsection (2), an electricity officer may exercise a power of entry referred to in that subsection without giving notice in accordance with subsection (2) in relation to electricity infrastructure situated on land that is in the area of a council and in the bushfire risk area if—

(a) the purpose of the entry is to conduct an inspection of the infrastructure; and

(b) at least 2 months before the inspection, the electricity entity published a prescribed notice—

(i) in a newspaper circulating throughout the State; and

(ii) in a newspaper circulating within the area of the council; and

(iii) on public radio broadcast services operated by at least 2 radio broadcast service providers who broadcast within the area of the council; and

(c) the inspection is conducted during the period specified in the prescribed notice.

(2) Section 48—after subsection (7) insert:

(8) In this section—

prescribed notice, in relation to an inspection of electricity infrastructure by an electricity entity in the area of a council, means a notice that specifies the period (of up to 2 weeks) during which the entity proposes to inspect its infrastructure in the area.

- No. 2. Clause 28, page 18, lines 33 to 35—Delete the clause
- No. 3. Clause 29, page 19, line 4 [clause 29, inserted section 69(1)]—Delete 'or vehicle'
- No. 4. Clause 29, page 19, line 23 [clause 29, inserted section 69(1)(h)]—Delete 'or vehicle'
- No. 5. Clause 29, page 19, line 24 [clause 29, inserted section 69(1)(h)]—Delete 'or vehicle'
- No. 6. Clause 29, page 19, lines 25 and 26 [clause 29, inserted section 69(1)(i)]—Delete paragraph (i)
- No. 7. Clause 29, page 20, lines 3 to 5 [clause 29, inserted section 69(3)(a)]—
Delete 'or person apparently in charge of the vehicle (as the case requires)'
- No. 8. Clause 29, page 20, line 29 [clause 29, inserted section 69(6)(c)]—Delete 'or vehicle'
- No. 9. Clause 63, page 37, lines 24 to 26—Delete the clause
- No. 10. Clause 64, page 37, line 30 [clause 64, inserted section 67(1)]—Delete 'or vehicle'
- No. 11. Clause 64, page 38, line 8 [clause 64, inserted section 67(1)(h)]—Delete 'or vehicle'
- No. 12. Clause 64, page 38, line 9 [clause 64, inserted section 67(1)(h)]—Delete 'or vehicle'
- No. 13. Clause 64, page 38, lines 10 and 11 [clause 64, inserted section 67(1)(i)]—Delete paragraph (i)
- No. 14. Clause 64, page 38, lines 26 to 28 [clause 64, inserted section 67(3)(a)]—
Delete 'or person apparently in charge of the vehicle (as the case requires)'
- No. 15. Clause 64, page 39, line 9 [clause 64, inserted section 67(6)(c)]—Delete 'or vehicle'

ELECTRONIC TRANSACTIONS (LEGAL PROCEEDINGS) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 18:00 the house adjourned until Wednesday 29 March 2017 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***NATIONAL WATER INITIATIVE**

In reply to **Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop)** (2 December 2015).

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy): The Minister for Water and the River Murray has provided the following advice:

To ensure sustainable, good quality water is available for all South Australians, the South Australian government contributes around \$43 million a year for water planning and management. The state government, through the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources and SA Water, provides 84 per cent of the total costs for water planning and management.

The South Australian government first indicated that it would seek partial water planning and management cost recovery in its 2010-11 State Budget, and the government's intention to recover water planning and management costs from natural resources management (NRM) levies is set out in the 2015-16 State Budget.

NRM levies are a primary source of funding for the management of natural resources in the State's regions, and a way of equitably sharing the cost of managing our natural resources.

The government's partial cost recovery for water planning and management is consistent with the 2004 Intergovernmental Agreement on a National Water Initiative—an agreement between the Australian, state and territory governments to bring into effect consistent approaches to pricing and water planning and management costs.

When all water-related charges are taken into account, the NRM levies paid by water users in our major food and wine producing areas, like the South East and South Australian Murray-Darling Basin, are low when compared to interstate water users.

As the government has chosen only to implement partial cost recovery and will continue to subsidise costs to provide some protection to water users, an independent cost effectiveness study will not be undertaken.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (23 February 2016).

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries): The dedicated ambulance service commenced 15 March, 2016. The dedicated Ambulance Service will be in addition to the existing patient transfer protocols. Patients requiring urgent transfer will continue to be transferred as priority 1 or medSTAR as appropriate.

Prior to the first phase of the intra-NALHN service moves, there were approximately 6 patients transferred from Modbury Hospital to the Lyell McEwin Hospital each day.

Since the service moves, patient transfers have increased by an average of 4 per day and are expected to increase by a further 4 per day following transfer of emergency and multi-day surgery activity. The service is capable of supporting up to 20 patient transfers per 24 hours if required.

CHILD PROTECTION SCREENING

In reply to **Mr GARDNER (Morialta)** (26 July 2016).

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills): I have been advised:

The Department for Education and Child Development has a clear screening and suitability child safety policy and procedure that outlines, amongst other things, what is required before any person may be permitted to participate in a school as a volunteer, including parents.

The screening and suitability child safety policy is supported by additional child safe policies and procedures that support volunteer participation and aim to ensure their safety and the safety of children and young people. Additional requirements include participation in 'Responding to Abuse and Neglect' training, induction, adherence to the public sector code of conduct and supervision.

The screening and suitability child safety policy and procedure aims to support the department in meeting its paramount responsibility for the safety of children and young people and to limit the possibility that unsuitable people are engaged with our children and young people involved with its sites and services.

A screening through the government authorised screening unit, located in the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion, is required for all parent volunteers, unless their child is in direct receipt of the services being provided. For example, screening is required for parent volunteers who are working with children with a disability and/or attending overnight camps, school sleepovers, billets, homestays and sport coaching (where the volunteers are not a parent of a child in the sports team).

Undergoing a screening is only one aspect of assessing a volunteer's suitability to work with children. Site leaders, such as school principals, must ensure a suitability assessment has been undertaken before a parent or

guardian can volunteer in a school. This suitability assessment enables site leaders to consider a person's screening, along with any other relevant information including but not limited to character references, interviews and assessments in accordance with the department's policy and procedure. Where a suitability assessment has deemed a person unsuitable to work with children and young people, site leaders have the right to decline their application to volunteer.

The recently enacted *Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016* was drafted to strengthen the background checking of people who want to work or volunteer with children in line with the recommendations of the Nyland royal commission.

The legislation removes the current 'two tiered' approach to screening and prohibits people who pose an unacceptable risk to children from working or volunteering with them.

The government is now preparing regulations for public consultation, including making it clear when parental exemption provisions will apply. The Department for Education and Child Development will have ongoing input into this process.

WILLIAM LIGHT SCHOOL

In reply to **Mr GARDNER (Morialta)** (4 August 2016).

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills): I have been advised:

(a) Curriculum development is focused on teaching 50% of the curriculum (Australian Curriculum) in Chinese and looking at which areas are best taught in Chinese rather than dividing the day into Chinese or English, with fixed hours for lessons. It is important to design an approach that best supports student learning.

Given the focus will be on implementing a strong biliteracy program into the bilingual program, Chinese and English will be used at different times and or in parallel to each other. This will ensure students have understood new concepts as well as support students to make cross-linguistic connections supporting proficiency from one language to another.

(b) One Chinese speaking teacher has already been employed and is working (along with other staff at the school) in collaboration with the Research Centre for Languages and Culture at the University of South Australia and DECD officers to develop a personalised Chinese bilingual program that meets the specific learning needs of students at the school.

(c) Plympton International College, formerly William Light R-12 School, will be looking to employ more teachers as the Chinese bilingual program expands. The number of teachers required to be employed is dependent on the number of students in the program.

(d) As Plympton International College transforms into a bilingual school they are receiving support through a broad range of activities which include:

- Staffing support including:
 - Extra Chinese speaking teachers to work alongside the classroom teachers in the bilingual program.
 - A coordinator to oversee the programs at the school.
 - Release time for teachers to prepare for the bilingual and daily lesson programs.
 - Professional learning activities to further develop pedagogies, including bilingual pedagogies that support better student engagement and improve outcomes for students.
 - Additional administration support.
- Additional funding for classroom refurbishments, ICT upgrades and the purchase of extra classroom resources to support the program.
- The department has contracted the Research Centre for Languages and Culture at the University of South Australia for the development of the bilingual and daily lessons of curriculum materials referenced to the Australian Curriculum.

The support commenced in the 2016-17 financial year will continue until 2026 to assist Plympton International College in becoming a centre of excellence in teaching and learning and in particular of Chinese language and culture.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (4 August 2016).

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries): The Modbury Hospital Emergency Department has not been downgraded. It is open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week and it continues to assess, triage and treat all patients presenting to the Emergency Department.

The number of Safety Learning System notifications (SLS) varies according to many factors including overall activity, patient acuity, types of patients presenting and their presenting problem.

The number of SLS reports made about the Modbury Hospital Emergency Department has remained fairly stable. There was only one extra SLS report for the first six months of 2016 compared to last year (104 to 103 respectively).

MODBURY HOSPITAL

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (4 August 2016).

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries): I am told that this incident was reported on 10 June, 2016.

LYELL MCEWIN HOSPITAL

In reply to **Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (4 August 2016).

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

1. The Northern Adelaide Local Health Network (NALHN) has dedicated beds per speciality and, irrespective of where the beds are physically located; the patients continue to be seen by the specialist team. To improve patient outcomes, NALHN has established 'home wards' where patients are co-located with other patients who have similar requirements. This allows team based care and decision-making. Patients who are accommodated in other areas of the hospital are not disadvantaged and will continue to be seen by their home team.

The Lyell McEwin Hospital is increasing the number of specialist beds as part of the Central Adelaide Local Health Network (CALHN) to NALHN Transforming Health moves, enabling NALHN to meet the growing needs of the northern community.

2. The number of patients that meet the National Emergency Access Targets (NEAT) fluctuates from day to day, week to week and month to month. I confirm that advice provided to my office on 7 June 2016 included data analysis that showed since the establishment of the Modbury Hospital Short Stay General Medical Unit under the Transforming Health, there had been a 30% increase in the number of patients being transferred from the Emergency Department to a medical bed within the 4 hour target.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

In reply to **Mr DULUK (Davenport)** (4 August 2016).

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries): The syringe vending machine located on North Terrace outside the Royal Adelaide Hospital will be decommissioned and will not be relocated to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital. In anticipation of the Royal Adelaide Hospital moving, SA Health has established two additional syringe vending machine locations at services close to the central business district at Hindmarsh and Stepney.

COMMUNITY SUPPORT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (27 September 2016).

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): I have been advised:

The following organisations have received and/or will receive the following amounts of funding related to the Affordable Living Program and Community Support Services Programs in the Financial Years 2015-16 and 2016-17. It should be noted the Community Support Services Program is a sub-program of the broader Family and Community Development Program.

Furthermore, as this information was compiled during the 2016-17 financial year, it should be noted the figures for this financial year cannot be considered final and are likely to change.

Organisation Name	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
Anglican Community Care	\$917,358*	\$919,948
Anglicare SA	\$1,162,268	\$1,040,346
Centacare	\$173,433	\$179,642
Catholic Diocese Pt. Pirie	\$78,898*	\$91,083
City of Onkaparinga	\$516,483	\$534,973
City of Salisbury	\$198,167	\$205,261
City of Tea Tree Gully	\$172,143	\$178,3063
City of Victor Harbor	\$39,204	\$40,6083

Organisation Name	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17
Vietnamese Community in Australia/ SA Inc	\$93,169	\$89,294
Community Food SA	\$90,570	\$114,024
City of Marion	\$223,873	\$231,888
Corporation of the City of Unley	\$42,354	\$43,8746
Eastwood Community Centre	\$73,231	\$75,853
Foodbank of SA Inc	\$250,000	\$250,000
Gawler Neighbourhood House Inc	\$62,604	\$64,845
Good Shepherd Microfinance	\$1,113,000	\$1,441,000
Junction Australia Ltd	\$120,401	\$124,711
Lifeline South East (SA)	\$153,855	\$151,180
Lutheran Community Care	\$517,040*	\$467,135
Marra Murrangga Kumangka Inc	\$81,776	\$84,704
Milang & District Community Association	\$78,405	\$81,212
Money Mob Talkabout	\$0	\$58,000
Multicultural Youth SA	\$53,674	\$55,596
North East Community House Inc	\$104,678	\$108,425
Northern Area community	\$420,621	\$435,679
Plaza Youth Centre	\$191,980	\$198,853
Port Augusta Youth Centre	\$97,036	\$100,510
Re-Engage Youth Services Inc	\$115,282	\$119,409
SPARK Resource Centre	\$92,988	\$0**
Survivors of Torture, Trauma and Rehabilitation Services	\$70,028	\$72,535
The Hut Community Centre	\$213,663*	\$213,765
The Junction Community Centre	\$120,622	\$124,940
The Salvation Army SA	\$659,500	\$269,704
UnitingCare Wesley Bowden	\$1,204,259*	\$1,204,259
UnitingCare Wesley Country SA	\$1,073,413*	\$1,070,053
UnitingCare Wesley Port Adelaide	\$1,069,279	\$1,107,559
Uniting Communities	\$1,097,490	\$908,685
West Coast Youth and Community Support	\$90,254	\$93,485

* Figures include recoveries

** SPARK Resource Centre has wound up their operations— funding is now provided to Centacare Catholic Family Services

AMBUS

In reply to **Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (18 October 2016).

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries): I am advised:

The AmBus has been off the road with broken windscreens three times.

57 FILMS

In reply to **Mr SPEIRS (Bright)** (1 November 2016).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier): I am advised:

The total value of the procurements is \$446,465.18 (including GST). The \$465.18 (including GST) did not represent a separate procurement.

The contracts were awarded and expended over the 2014-15, 2015-16 and 2016-17 financial years.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **Mr DULUK (Davenport)** (2 November 2016).

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries): I am advised:

The Chief Executive of Health Consumers Alliance of SA (HCA) is not a government employee, but SA Health does have a contract with the HCA for the provision of services.

The HCA may seek remuneration to cover the cost of time spent on government committees in line with the SA Health Sitting Fees and Reimbursement and for External Individual Policy Directive.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (3 November 2016).

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills): I have been advised:

The 90 cases referred to by the Auditor General occurred in the following qualifications:

Certificate I in Education and Skills Development
Certificate I in Spoken and Written English
Certificate II in Agriculture
Certificate II in Animal Studies
Certificate II in Applied Fashion Design and Technology
Certificate II in Data and Voice Communications
Certificate II in Education and Skills Development
Certificate II in Engineering
Certificate II in English Proficiency
Certificate II in Food Processing
Certificate II in Hairdressing
Certificate II in Hospitality
Certificate II in Information, Digital Media and Technology
Certificate II in Meat Processing (Meat Retailing)
Certificate II in Retail Make-up and Skin Care
Certificate II in Security Assembly and Setup
Certificate III in Air-conditioning and Refrigeration
Certificate III in Cabinet Making
Certificate III in Computer Systems Equipment
Certificate III in Disability
Certificate III in English Proficiency
Certificate III in Financial Services
Certificate III in Furniture Making
Certificate III in Glass and Glazing
Certificate III in Health Services Assistance
Certificate III in Landscape Construction
Certificate III in Nutrition and Dietetic Assistance
Certificate III in Pathology
Certificate III in Patisserie

Certificate III in Police Studies
Certificate III in Sports Turf Management
Certificate III in Timber and Composites Machining
Certificate III in Visual Arts
Certificate III in Women's Education
Certificate IV in Commercial Cookery
Certificate IV in Community Services Work
Certificate IV in Electrical—Instrumentation
Certificate IV in English Proficiency
Certificate IV in Mental Health
Certificate IV in Visual Arts
Certificate IV in Women's Education
Diploma of Building Design
Diploma of Community Services (Alcohol, other drugs and mental health)
Diploma of Community Services (Case Management)
Diploma of Community Services (Financial Counselling)
Diploma of Community Services Work
Diploma of Early Childhood Education and Care
Diploma of Engineering—Technical
Diploma of English Proficiency
Diploma of Graphic Design
Diploma of Information Technology Networking
Diploma of Laboratory Technology
Diploma of Library and Information Services
Diploma of Marketing
Diploma of Nursing (Enrolled/Division 2 Nursing)
Diploma of Project Management
Advanced Diploma of Applied Fashion Design and Technology
Advanced Diploma of Arts (Professional Writing)
Advanced Diploma of Business
Advanced Diploma of Policing
Advanced Diploma of Translating.

CHILD PROTECTION SCREENING

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (3 November 2016).

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills): I have been advised:

Of the staff without a current Child-related Employment Screening Check (CRESC) at the time of the Auditor-General's report:

- no Hourly Paid Instructors (HPIs) or permanent staff worked with students under the age of 18
- no HPIs or permanent staff were involved in delivery of school-based apprenticeships.

Staff working in school-based apprenticeship programs require a CRESC clearance by both TAFE SA and the Department for Education and Child Development.

TAFE SA

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (3 November 2016).

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills): I have been advised:

The assessment of Mr Murt's performance and hence the salary 'at risk' Performance Allowance is entirely a matter for the TAFE SA Board.

TAFE SA

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (3 November 2016).

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills): I have been advised:

As at 3 November 2016, there were 602 cards in use by TAFE SA. The breakdown of the limits that apply to these purchase cards and the number of holders of purchase cards at 3 November 2016 was as follows:

Credit (transaction limit)	Number of cards/cardholders
\$10,000	2
\$5,500	2
\$5,000	8
\$3,500	1
\$3,000	1
\$2,500	1
\$2,200	542
\$2,000	30
\$1,500	2
\$1,100	1
\$1,000	6
\$550	1
\$500	2
\$1 (card holder on extended leave)	3
Total	602

The total purchase card spend on purchase cards for 2015-16 was \$6,998,232 (GST exclusive) although it should be noted that this was for 698 card holders.

EDUCATION AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder)** (15 November 2016).

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills): I have been advised:

The Department for Education and Child Development will be making the necessary system changes to allow for the accrual of long service leave for teachers who perform emergency relief work. This is in line with the legislative requirements pertaining to long service leave accrual for South Australian government employees.

As a result of the changes a teacher who performs an emergency relief day will now accrue long service leave entitlement rather than the 2.5 per cent loading.

Estimates Replies

57 FILMS

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (28 July 2016). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier): I have been advised:

The total expenditure with 57 Films in the 2015-16 financial year was \$323,101.03 (excluding GST).

SCHOOL ABSENTEEISM

In reply to **Mr GARDNER (Morialta)** (29 July 2016). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills): I have been advised of the following:

This information is now publicly available on the My School website.

TAFE SA

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (29 July 2016). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills): I have been advised of the following:

By contractual agreement, the TAFE SA Chief Executive is eligible to receive a Performance Allowance.

The review of the Chief Executive's performance against KPIs is coordinated by the TAFE SA Board Chair and approved by the TAFE SA Board.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL SITE REDEVELOPMENT

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (23 February 2016). (Estimates Committee A)

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

1. The report was produced by the new Royal Adelaide Hospital project team and Central Adelaide Local Health Network to better understand the specifics of the requirements for each individual clinical trials unit.

2. The report was requested as part of ongoing consultation with the staff group, consultation with this group has been ongoing as part of the planning for the new hospital.

The new Royal Adelaide Hospital will continue to be a centre for excellence in medical research, with all current clinical trials at the RAH set to move to the new site or within the Health and Biomedical Precinct on North Terrace.

Face to face patient consultations will continue to occur within the outpatient, inpatient or day treatment areas, as they do at the current RAH. The majority of researchers undertaking both existing clinical trials activity and new trials already being planned will be housed within the new RAH.

Additionally, SAHMRI has agreed to house some cancer and cardiology researchers, whose work aligns with the existing SAHMRI research pillars, further strengthening the clinical and research partnership.

This follows substantial planning discussions with research and administration staff about the requirements for their particular trials and the suitability of the new hospital.

Having all our current clinical trials based in the heart of the Health and Biomedical Precinct, with the majority at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, is an excellent outcome.

These important trials will deliver potentially lifesaving medical breakthroughs for many years to come.

TARGETED VOLUNTARY SEPARATION PACKAGES

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (29 July 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development): I have been advised of the following:

In 2015-16, \$728,000 (excluding leave payments) or \$1,253,000 (including leave payments) was spent on targeted voluntary separation packages (TVSPs).

These nine TVSPs were funded by Renewal SA and the South Australian Housing Trust, with Renewal SA providing \$594,000 and the South Australian Housing Trust \$659,000.

There is no budget for targeted voluntary separation packages for financial years included in the forward estimates.