

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 30 March 2017

The **SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)** took the chair at 10:30 and read prayers.

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

Bills

CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES (YOUTH TREATMENT ORDERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 November 2016.)

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (10:31): I am very pleased to speak on the Controlled Substances (Youth Treatment Orders) Amendment Bill. On a number of occasions, I have identified to this house my utter abhorrence at the scourge that drugs wreak on our young people. We have seen in recent months reams of evidence about the particular impact of ice in so many of our communities.

Crystal methamphetamine, base, speed, amphetamines—all these stimulants are taken by so many of our young people in recreational situations, thinking they will have no effect on their long-term wellbeing when the reality is it destroys lives. People get addicted to these drugs without even realising what is going on.

People under the age of 18 in particular are at a stage where their brains have not developed and so are at a point where, even without the introduction of amphetamines, their risk-taking behaviours are higher and their understanding of consequences is lower. Introducing drugs like ice into the situation puts them at enormous risk. It destroys long-term cognitive function. It enormously impacts on their lives and physiology in the long term and, in the immediate term, on their families.

Parents come to a situation where they do not even understand the child in front of them because they are so changed by the stimulants and drugs they are on. There is the impact of course on communities where people are so often led to engage in crimes or other risk-taking behaviours with disastrous impacts on those communities.

Undertaking every action we can to ensure that our young people are not under the sway of the drugs that are destroying their lives is an absolute priority for this parliament and a priority that this party, the Liberal Party, has identified for a great many years because ice is not that new a phenomenon. I remember working with the Australian National Council on Drugs when I was working with the federal government and going to meetings with the Ministerial Council on Drug Strategy in 2006 and 2007, as we were identifying a national ice strategy.

This is something that the Howard government, in its Tough on Drugs campaign, took very seriously, occasionally possibly even with support from some wise attorneys-general around the country. However, that has not always been the case. I will be appalled if the Labor Party votes against this bill, which will go so far towards ensuring that young people are not left behind and left to the control of these drugs.

There has been some suggestion that youth treatment orders are inappropriate, but the fact is that we have research. The Australian National Council on Drugs published research in 2006, so there is long-established research that identifies that mandatory treatment orders can be as effective as voluntary treatment orders. It is a fallacy to suggest otherwise, particularly for a young person. We must take every opportunity to get them off drugs.

Some people have said this bill is harsh on young people. I say that sometimes you have to provide tough love and sometimes you have to do what is in the best interests of the child. If this

measure is what it is going to take to get that young person off drugs, then that is absolutely to be commended. I commend the shadow attorney-general for introducing it to the parliament. I think the Liberal Party is on the right track as we seek to get our young people off drugs.

It is up to the Labor Party—the government—to show it is not a soft touch on drugs to ensure that our young people have the best opportunities in life and that our communities are safe from the harm that these drugs wreak.

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (10:36): I rise to support the bill. In my time as member for Mount Gambier, the second biggest issue I have faced is ice in regional communities. Ice in the South-East is a gateway between Victoria, Melbourne and Adelaide—a thoroughfare, for want of a better word. We have seen a rise in the use of the ice methamphetamine. What is deeply concerning to me is the prevalence of this hideous drug in our sporting community.

Most people who have grown up in the country realise that sporting clubs are the backbone of country communities. Ice has infiltrated many sporting clubs. The latest research reports also indicate the number of tradies who are using ice on a regular basis. From a country perspective, that is a potent combination because many of our sporting players are also tradespeople, and this drug is certainly having an effect there.

I would be absolutely dismayed if the government did not support this bill because, although this certainly is not the answer in its entirety, it is a small step towards doing everything we can as a parliament to put our partisan issues aside and focus on the people of South Australia. A mandatory detention order does have a place and can be used effectively as part of a suite of ways of tackling this issue. The Minister for Police and Correctional Services was in Mount Gambier just last week and held a round table. For some reason, the Minister for Health and Substance Abuse was not there, but I wish she had been because she would have heard stories of how this drug is affecting my community.

The forum was very well chaired and people were very respectful, and I think the minister did an outstanding job in drawing out the issues from the participants in that round table. It came out loud and clear that the issues faced by regional areas around addressing the ice epidemic are around lack of coordination. People do not know what services are actually available. Services between themselves do not know what other services are providing and are often competing for funding or allocation of funding from different buckets of money, so there is a lack of collaboration.

For parents coming in, they do not know who to go to, who to turn to or which services can help them, so it was loud and clear that we need a one-stop shop, an area where people can go to and either have those services in that physical building or certainly an early contact point. But what also came out was the need for rehabilitation services, both detox and rehabilitation. It is not just rehabilitation of the person who is using ice. This drug affects families, friends and work colleagues and the rehabilitation centre really needs to take into consideration those support networks that wrap around the person affected by ice intake.

If you watched ABC last night—it was a little bit late, probably about 11 o'clock at night—*Ice Wars* was on TV and it showed a young man who ran away from the police who were staking out a known drug dealer's place of residence. When they tracked that young person down, they had got out of prison only the day before, but the powerful part for me was talking to the mother. The mother said, 'I feel helpless.'

They showed photos of a young boy you would not recognise as the person using ice now. He was a young boy, who at the age of five would take \$5 down to the police station if he found it because he did not want the person who had lost the money to be out of pocket, now turning into a person unrecognisable to his mother who had lost all hope in getting her son off this insidious drug.

It reminds me of Karen and Maurie Judd, who came into my office when I had only been a member for probably three or four months. They had lost their son, Jay, to drugs and one of the powerful statements that she said to me was that his spiral out of control was known for a long time and that the one thing she wished was that the authorities were tougher at the start. Had there been a mandatory treatment order in place, it may have—we obviously cannot know the outcome by going back in time—saved his life. They were very powerful words for somebody who has lived through the living hell of ice addiction through someone they love—their son.

One of the things that came out very clearly from their experiences was that they thought early intervention was the best idea going forward in terms of early treatment. I am hoping the government does support this youth treatment order because it needs to be one of the tools available to support our young people, and the word 'youth' being in there is paramount to this bill. It has to be one of the tools available to help people who are addicted to ice whose lives are spinning out of control and, without a mandatory detention order, possibly would not recognise that they even have an issue at an early stage.

Why do we let it go through to crimes being committed, normally escalating in scale, as they become more and more desperate for the drug before we take some intervention into the root cause, which is the drug ice? I commend the shadow attorney-general for bringing this bill to our party room. I cannot see how we need to be playing politics on this issue. This is about the youth of South Australia. This is one of the tools that our authorities need. I am hoping, with all sincerity, that people on the other side, who have not made up their minds, will support this bill.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (10:45): I support and congratulate the shadow minister. In the absence of the shadow minister, I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The house divided on the second reading:

Ayes 19
Noes 24
Majority 5

AYES

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

NOES

Bedford, F.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Caica, P.	Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.
Digance, A.F.C.	Gee, J.P.	Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.
Hildyard, K.	Hughes, E.J.	Kenyon, T.R. (teller)
Key, S.W.	Koutsantonis, A.	Mullighan, S.C.
Odenwalder, L.K.	Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.
Rankine, J.M.	Rau, J.R.	Snelling, J.J.
Vlahos, L.A.	Weatherill, J.W.	Wortley, D.

PAIRS

Brock, G.G.	Marshall, S.S.
-------------	----------------

Second reading thus negated.

POLICE COMPLAINTS BILL

Second Reading

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (10:51): I move:

That this order of the day be discharged.

Motion carried; bill withdrawn.

LIMITATION OF ACTIONS (INSTITUTIONAL CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 29 September 2016.)

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (10:54): I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes	24
Noes	20
Majority.....	4

AYES

Bedford, F.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Caica, P.	Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.
Digance, A.F.C.	Gee, J.P.	Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.
Hildyard, K.	Hughes, E.J.	Kenyon, T.R. (teller)
Key, S.W.	Koutsantonis, A.	Mullighan, S.C.
Odenwalder, L.K.	Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.
Rankine, J.M.	Rau, J.R.	Snelling, J.J.
Vlahos, L.A.	Weatherill, J.W.	Wortley, D.

NOES

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

PAIRS

Brock, G.G.	Marshall, S.S.
-------------	----------------

Motion thus carried; debate adjourned.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (11:00): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I rise today to speak to the Freedom of Information (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill tabled by the Hon. Mark Parnell in the other place. The Liberal Party supports this bill and strongly agrees that there is an urgent need, as there has been for some time, for a more transparent government in this state. This bill aims, through the polishing of the Freedom of Information Act, to achieve that.

In the past, I have introduced a bill similar but not identical to the one before us today. Since that time, I note that the level of secrecy within this government has gone far beyond what anyone

could imagine, reaching levels of absurdity. There has been secrecy discussed in governments throughout history.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am on my feet; sit down. I am on my feet, member for Chaffey. It is pesky, I know, but that means you have to listen. It is Thursday, and it is only 11 o'clock. The member for Hartley has a bill before the house, and he is entitled to the respect that all members enjoy when they bring a private member's bill to the house. I would be horrified if anybody really meant to disrupt his speech, which no-one can hear with the amount of noise that has been going on in the chamber. Member for Hartley.

Mr TARZIA: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. As I was alluding to, secrecy has been a topic amongst governments and they have protected many things over time for fear of embarrassment. Let's go through some examples and then relate it to the present era. There was Churchill and UFOs, the CIA with mind-control experiments, Area 51, UFOs in the USSR, the Loch Ness monster, the CIA schemes to kill Castro, Julia Child's intelligence, the Grand Central Terminal secret rooms, listening in on Lenin and, of course, some might even remember Potemkin villages. Then, of course, you have Alinta this week. That letter from Alinta was very interesting.

Let's turn back now to early 2014 in the wake of the state election, when the then CEO of the Essential Services Commission of South Australia wrote a scathing letter to the chairman of ESCOSA. We remember what that said, and it was clear from those remarks and other remarks around that subject that there is an ongoing level of political interference where there should be neutrality and a hidden agenda by certain senior bureaucrats and ministers who govern the state. The public deserves more than this and deserves to know what is going on.

Another example of the Weatherill Labor government's secrecy is its handling of the infamous Gillman land deal. A multimillion dollar land deal involving the government and private developers was approved by cabinet against the advice that it should go to public tender. The ICAC has made a ruling since then involving serious maladministration, and this has been mired in controversy since the government ignored the advice in 2013 to sell the site under an open tender process.

The state government has, we know, now banned ICAC access to government documents, various documents, and that, too, has been in the media recently. A recent report by *Today Tonight* also highlighted the secrecy of the Labor government.

There being a disturbance in the gallery:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The gentleman in the gallery needs to sit down, please.

Mr TARZIA: It actually revealed to viewers that ICAC's access to cabinet documents has been banned in some instances. To reiterate, the government has banned the ICAC from accessing certain documents. I think it is pretty clear that this policy could open the door to corruption moving forward. We go on: just a few months ago, Monash University's study into the *Australian Journalism Review* acknowledged that our freedom of information laws were the worst in the country and found that the system was designed to block, delay and obfuscate.

In an audit of state government agencies' implementation of the FOI Act by the Ombudsman in 2014, an analysis of the practices of 12 government agencies took place assessing the implementation of the act for financial year 2012-13. In his executive summary of the report, the Ombudsman described the state government's recent policy initiatives on proactive release of information as 'timely and relevant to the digital age'.

However, he actually pointed out a disconnect between those initiatives and the act, describing the agencies' approach to the information disclosure under the act as outdated and its processes belonging to pre-electronic times, which is a long time ago. He goes on to add that:

...the agencies' implementation of the act is wanting and demonstrates a lack of understanding or commitment to the democratic principles which underpin the act...

The bill before the chamber today seeks to implement various recommendations in the Ombudsman's report and allow for a transition to a more transparent government.

I would like to expand on these recommendations and the main features of the bill in taking these into account. The first change relates to the Ombudsman's first recommendation. The amendment that this bill seeks to introduce is to include a reference to the principles of representative democracy in the objects section of the act and to acknowledge that documents held by government are a public resource to be held on behalf of the public and managed for public purposes. The second amendment relates to the Ombudsman's recommendation No. 24, which states:

Following Commonwealth and interstate FOI legislation, the Act should give express guidance on what factors should and should not be taken into account in determining whether disclosure of documents would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest.

This amendment aims to guide FOI officers in assessing what the public interest is, through description of what factors should and should not be considered when determining the public interest. Another amendment in the bill relates to recommendation No. 8 of the Ombudsman's audit, which states:

The Act should require agencies to promptly acknowledge receipt of an access application and an application for internal review. Both acknowledgements should inform the applicant of the relevant review and appeal rights and timelines, particularly in the event of the agency failing to make an active determination within the statutory time frames.

The Ombudsman goes on to add: 'In the meantime, the agencies should adopt this practice as a matter of policy.' By putting this acknowledgement process into legislation, it is hoped that applicants will be better informed about their review and appeal rights from the outset. The Ombudsman takes aim at government tardiness in recommendation No. 10, which states:

Agencies must refund the fees to an applicant if they exceed the initial determination or internal review time limitations under the Act.

I believe that this measure would go a long way to bringing the agencies to deal with the FOI applications in a timely manner. The Ombudsman's 10th recommendation further states:

Agencies have a discretion to impose a ceiling of 40 hours for processing access applications following consultation with the applicant.

Unfortunately, as we know, it is all too common for agencies to claim in their responses that it would involve too many resources, and that these would be used up by the agency to have a look for documents that applicants are attempting to have officially released.

Additionally, responses such as, 'We can't find the document,' or 'It doesn't exist,' are commonly received. What the Ombudsman said about documents that cannot be found or do not exist, under recommendation 13, is also stipulated. At present, the act does not mention what is required when agencies are unable to locate documents. The Ombudsman notes:

Agencies appear to struggle with offering adequate explanations to applicants when they cannot locate documents.

In other jurisdictions—the commonwealth, for example—legislation exists that points out that, should documents not be found or not exist, then this is interpreted as a determination to refuse access. Reasonably, the Ombudsman recommends that South Australia include similar provisions, both reviewable and appealable, in the act.

Recommendation 19 also relates to the refusal of access. In a list of 19 clauses and 50 subclauses and paragraphs of exemptions in the act, the Ombudsman found that these were unclear and open to misuse, with a tendency to overwhelm the purpose of the act. The Ombudsman suggested that this list encouraged FOI officers to take the easy road and pick the exemption route.

With relation to notices of determination, the next amendment based on the Ombudsman's 25th recommendation strongly relates to the key problem of the executive arm of government's role in the freedom of information system, with evidence in the Ombudsman's audit strongly suggesting that ministerial or political influence is brought to bear on agencies' FOI officers and that FOI officers have been pressured, in many instances, to change the determination instances. The amendment relating to this recommendation would seek to eliminate political interference—because we know that it does occur—and reduce the delays that are incurred when FOI officers await ministerial direction regarding applications. The Ombudsman actually noted:

I have come across an instance in an external review in which an agency released information the subject of an access application to a media outlet, prior to releasing the information to the applicant, an Opposition Member Of Parliament. Evidence given to the audit suggests that this is not uncommon.

Why would they go to a member of the media before a member of the opposition? That is assuming, of course, that the member of the opposition lodged the FOI. A member of the government might FOI themselves; I know that that has been done many times in the past. Unfortunately, as currently would seem to be the case, if something embarrassing is about to be lawfully provided to the opposition or to a crossbench party under the Freedom of Information Act, ministers are directed to give it to the media first. This is not clearly not the intention of the act and the FOI process.

In other jurisdictions such as Tasmania, for example, the freedom of information legislation ensures the independence of agency decision-makers and that they are free from inappropriate influence. It is the Ombudsman's view that, if an agency's determination is directed by its minister, it should be clearly stated in the determination. This amendment goes some way to address this issue by requiring that, if a determination was at the direction of another person including a minister, the determination must include the name of that person and the extent of the direction given to the FOI officer.

Moving on to one of the final legislation policy measures of the bill, I refer to the Ombudsman's 11th recommendation relating to external review:

The act should allow an external review authority to remit deemed or inadequate determinations back to the agency for consideration.

The final amendment I would like to touch on relates to the improper direction or influence over FOI officers by others. The Ombudsman's recommendation No. 26 states:

The Act should create offences of improperly directing or influencing a decision or determination made under the Act.

A uniform protocol should be created for use across all agencies which codifies the requirements for accountable and transparent communication between ministerial offices and agency FOI officers in relation to access applications under the Act.

This amendment makes improper direction or influence—which we have seen does occur—an offence with a penalty of a fine of up to \$5,000. It is a modest fine, but I think that that would make an impact. As it stands, the act does not contain any prohibition about improper direction of, or influence on, an accredited FOI officer or other FOI staff.

It is important that we remember that, in considering these changes, as the Ombudsman points out in the executive summary of his report, government-held information is a public resource, just like that letter from Alinta was a public resource. The public's right to access the information is central to the functioning of a democracy. The opposition welcomes these reforms and this bill and will continue to support the measures to increase the transparency of government and keep it accountable and honest, and free of political and ministerial interference. I commend this bill to the house.

Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (11:13): Well, well, well, here we have another bill being presented to the parliament from the member for Hartley regarding the Freedom of Information Act.

An honourable member: Come on, Brains.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PICTON: This is, of course, a bill that he is bringing to the house on behalf of the Hon. Mark Parnell from the other place. I think it is important that we take the time to mark this in the calendar so that, should the member for Hartley ever be in government (and I hope that that is a very long time in the future), we can go back and have a look at all these speeches he has given about how the Freedom of Information Act should be reformed to give people access to anything they want, anytime they want, with no fees and no repercussions, irrespective of the impact upon agencies because, if he were to be in government, he might no longer support the propositions that he has put forward to the house today.

We have seen this in the federal government recently. A Liberal opposition in Canberra gave similar speeches to those of the member for Hartley, in which people such as Senator the Hon. George Brandis would say that freedom of information needs to be opened up and supported and 'Let a thousand flowers bloom in freedom of information.' Then he comes into government and becomes the minister responsible for freedom of information, and suddenly the shutters go down. They abolish the freedom of information officers who worked to provide independent reviews of government decisions through the information commissioner, they started refusing things that had previously been granted for many years.

We saw Attorney-General Brandis recently losing a case in the Federal Court where he refused access to his diary. A two-year court process had to be gone through because he refused to provide access, and I think that inevitably revealed that he did not meet with any of the community legal providers that he said he did before he slashed their funding. He fought for two years to stop that from happening.

If the Liberal Party in South Australia were ever to form government, let us actually see them put their policies up. I want to see their commitment that they would introduce this bill if they were in government, but I do not think we will see that. However, this is a government that does support open and transparent access to information, and we have done that right from the beginning of when we came into government.

We reformed this act quite significantly. People in South Australia might remember that under the Olsen-Brown government it was very hard to get access to any information in South Australia. The Freedom of Information Act was a complete logjam, everything was deemed refused. We reformed it quite significantly upon coming into government, and there is now a lot more access to information. In fact, access for members of parliament is improved; they get fee waivers for their applications, and we know that members opposite use them very regularly.

We know that because—and they like to talk about how there are too many public servants—we have a whole hunk of the Public Service just dealing with their freedom of information requests, just dealing with the paperwork, particularly from people like the Hon. Rob Lucas and the member for Schubert. Pile after pile of fishing expeditions from the opposition, fee free, are being sent in trying to find things. Although we would like them to be doing other things, they are there just dealing with Liberal Party freedom of information requests, so I think there is a fair degree of context that needs to be provided to this bill being brought before the house today.

There is some detail I would like to go through. Some of the facts being provided from the department as well as the Attorney need to be looked at, this bill, in particular, and some of the reasons why we do not believe it should be supported. As was mentioned, it was introduced by the Hon. Mark Parnell in March 2015 and it makes a number of miscellaneous amendments to the Freedom of Information Act. It is also identical to a bill he introduced in November 2014. The government's advice is that this bill would have adverse impacts on agency operations and staff, the commissioner and other elements of the government. There are numerous issues with how the bill would operate in practice as well as legal issues with some provisions. Some of the government's main concerns with the bill follow.

In regard to clause 4, apart from supposedly offering guidance to agencies, it is not clear what clause 4 of the bill would actually achieve. The changes would not have much practical effect, given that participation already covers activities such as commenting on and reviewing the making of laws and policies. It is uncertain whether the changes would enhance the openness any more than the current objects do. In addition, some documents held by the government are not necessarily a public resource that should be made available to the public.

For instance, medical records held by hospitals are not primarily a public resource, although they may be used for public policy purposes. Victim impact statements are not a public resource, and so on. Documents held by the government may be used for public purposes, but this does not mean that the documents themselves are always made available to the public for very good privacy, confidentiality and public good reasoning. Clause 5 of the bill inserts factors that should and should not be taken into account when determining whether the disclosure of documents would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest.

The bill lists 21 factors that must be taken into account when making an assessment about the public interest and then lists four factors that must not be taken into account. I think this is something that those opposite and the Hon. Mark Parnell should be very careful about, because our advice is that the list of what should be taken into account is very long and unwieldy and is likely to cause confusion about how each fact is to be interpreted. The list would create an exhaustive set of circumstances that would act to redefine the term 'public interest' and prevent the holistic common law definition from being applied.

It may in fact be that the list achieves the exact opposite of what the honourable member wishes to do, in that it would restrict the definition of public interest rather than allow a broader view under the common law. Determining whether the disclosure is contrary to the public interest could become nothing more than a tick the box exercise, so we need to be very careful about the clauses that are being put by those opposite.

Regarding clause 7, it is important to note that agencies must manage their FOI responsibilities within a tight fiscal budgetary climate. Requiring agencies to refund fees will impose a budgetary burden that will most likely exacerbate the delay in terms of people getting access to the information they need. These clauses could be in fact impossible to operate in practice. It would not be possible to separate out what part of the fee was attributable to the granting of access to the document. For example, if there are eight documents and all are refused but the Ombudsman determines that access be granted to one document, it would be very difficult to ascertain how much to remit, not to mention the huge administrative burden that this would place on the agencies.

Currently, the FOI Act allows an agency to refuse to deal with an application if it appears to the agency that the nature of the application is such that the work involved would substantially and unreasonably divert the agency's resources from their use by the agency in the exercise of their functions. Clause 8 of the bill inserts a new threshold in terms of what is to be considered substantial and unreasonable diversion of the agency resources. The threshold imposed is that the application is dealt with by one person and is likely to take more than 40 hours.

Imposing such a threshold is very arbitrary. It does not take into account the circumstances of a particular agency at the time. Also, it is not clear how the limit of 40 hours was determined. The clause takes no account of the size of the agency and, as such, our advice is that it is very poor public policy. It is simply not possible to have a blanket threshold on what constitutes substantial and unreasonable diversion of an agency's resources.

If you look at clause 10 of the bill, which directs an agency to act consistently with the objects of the FOI Act and the principles of the administration of the act when considering whether to refuse access to a document, our advice is that the proposed subclause is ineffectual, because it is already a requirement of the principles of the act that they be observed and adhered to.

If you look at clause 11 regarding determinations that would be made, our advice is that those determinations under direction are extremely rare. Where a principal officer turns his or her mind to an application at its initial stage, he or she is more likely to simply make the determination personally than to direct the FOI officer. Section 29(6) of the act clearly contemplates that a principal officer is permitted to make a determination. The government considers reform in this area to be unnecessary given the rarity of this issue.

A lot of these details of the act will make substantial difficulties in terms of the administration of the act, and in some cases our advice would be that it would in fact deliver the opposite of what is intended. The government agrees that public access to information is an important bedrock of democracy, and we have done a lot in our time to increase the access to public information, however, our advice is that the bill does little to enhance public access and, as such, the government opposes it.

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (11:23): I rise to support the bill and commend the member for Hartley for bringing it to our joint party room. What we have seen, going back five or six years, is a newly elected premier espousing the virtues of transparency and wanting to run a government in a different way to the previous premier. Yet, fast-forward to where we are now, and we have one of the most secretive state governments in this country, where the Public Service has been politicised

to a point that it is frightened to give frank and fearless advice, to the point where local members are having family members come and talk to them about issues in our Public Service.

I will give you the example of the Mount Gambier hospital. Family members were coming to me and talking about severe understaffing and severe lack of supervision, because their daughter or their son was reporting these issues to them, but as soon as they had come and spoken to me they feared being victimised or at worst sacked. We have a situation at the moment where freedom of information is vitally important to the running of this state, yet there can be onerous financial penalties for an individual wanting to access information.

I will give the example of Nick O'Connor, who is very interested in jumps racing. It cost him \$5,000 out of his own pocket to gain the submissions, after nine months of FOI-ing the minister's office, on what submissions had led to the minister wanting to ban jumps racing. Again, he was a victim of circumstance. Had Nick known how to navigate the system a little better, it would not have cost him that \$5,000. It took nine months and \$5,000, and what he found was a pile of generic emails, predominantly sent from New South Wales, informing the minister's opinion.

I do believe that these reforms are needed. I specifically draw the house's attention to improper influence from ministers and that a \$5,000 penalty is insignificant in today's world. I would support the penalty being raised to \$20,000 for improper interference so that we can have a freedom of information system that is transparent and of value to the people of South Australia. With those words, I will conclude.

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (11:26): I once again thank the Hon. Mr Parnell from the other place. It is disappointing to see that the government will not be supporting this bill, but I think it is a very overdue bill. We have seen time and time again how, no matter what independent commission report makes these remarks, the government, in its absolute arrogance, is not willing to listen. I have no doubt that the people of South Australia will judge them on this issue, as well as many others into the future. I commend the bill to the house.

The house divided on the second reading:

Ayes	19
Noes	23
Majority	4

AYES

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

NOES

Bedford, F.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Caica, P.	Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.
Digance, A.F.C.	Gee, J.P.	Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.
Hildyard, K.	Hughes, E.J.	Kenyon, T.R. (teller)
Key, S.W.	Koutsantonis, A.	Mullighan, S.C.
Odenwalder, L.K.	Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.
Rankine, J.M.	Rau, J.R.	Snelling, J.J.
Vlahos, L.A.	Wortley, D.	

PAIRS

Brock, G.G.	Weatherill, J.W.
-------------	------------------

Second reading thus negatived.

Motions

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (11:32): I move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises the extraordinary care provided to veterans and other South Australians by the Repatriation General Hospital at Daw Park over the past 75 years;
- (b) notes the Labor government's promise to 'never, ever close the Repat';
- (c) condemns the Weatherill Labor government for its plan to break its promise and close the hospital; and
- (d) calls on the government to renew the Repatriation General Hospital as a health and medical precinct for veterans and residents of the southern suburbs.

To begin:

'The Repat', as it is affectionately known, remains a vital community asset and a valued symbol of past achievement.

Let me just say that again:

'The Repat', as it is affectionately known, remains a vital community asset and a valued symbol of past achievement.

They are not my own words, although they are words I do agree with. They are not the words of the Save the Repat Alliance or Professor Warren Jones, although I am sure they would also agree with that statement. They are not the words of more than 120,000 South Australian residents who have signed the petition opposing the closure of the Repat. These words are in fact posted on the state government's own SA Health website. Let me repeat:

'The Repat', as it is affectionately known, remains a vital community asset and a valued symbol of past achievement.

Never has a truer word been spoken. Let us be clear: the Weatherill Labor government itself acknowledges the uniqueness, symbolism and value of the Repatriation General Hospital to our state, yet despite this acknowledgement it continues to ignore the wishes of South Australians, ignore the wishes of southern Adelaide residents and ignore the wishes of healthcare professionals. Instead, the government is intent on ripping out the heart of the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network and continuing its plan to close the Repat. The SA Health website also notes, and I quote:

For more than seventy years the Repatriation General Hospital at Daw Park has delivered a very special kind of care to South Australian veterans and war widows.

It certainly has a very special place. Thousands upon thousands of South Australians from all walks of life are grateful for the treatment they have received at the Repat, including my own dad, who spent seven weeks in the Repat in the early 1970s as a young Army cadet. I am constantly reminded of the importance of the Repat to southern Adelaide residents, whether it is by phone calls, emails or letters to my office, or a street-corner meeting and at public events. I hear stories of the very special care the Repat has provided personally to a loved one or to a friend.

The clear message is that there is something incredibly special about the Repat, the people, the camaraderie and its culture. Its character and uniqueness are the sum of these parts, something that simply cannot be replicated anywhere else. As you break apart the Repat, moving each piece, shifting hospital wards to other facilities, carving out key clinical services and redistributing staff across the statewide hospital network, the removal of each piece will slowly erode the Repat's identity and, sadly, destroy the essence of what makes the Repat so special.

A letter was published in the compliments corner of the Southern Health News December 2016 edition. The author wanted to thank Ward 5 staff at the Repat for the wonderful care they provided to her father, her thanks extending not just to the medical staff but to the administrators

and cleaners of the hospital as well, all of whom had demonstrated, to quote from that letter, 'empathy, respect and dignity', as well as a 'friendly attitude'.

Again, the Principal Community Visitor Annual Report, Mental Health Services 2015-16, noted that Ward 18 at the Repat 'was identified to have a model of best practice in place' in relation to treatment and care plans and that Ward 18 'demonstrated the ability to go above and beyond'. It should be noted that it was the only ward in South Australia to be singled out for praise by the Principal Community Visitor Annual Report in this regard. The compliments, recognition and appreciation for the Repat are endless.

The Southern Adelaide Local Health Network provides care for around 350,000 living in the southern metropolitan area, including those in my own electorate, as well as providing a number of statewide services and services to those in key regional areas. The key pillars of the network responsible for providing services within SALHN are the Flinders Medical Centre, Noarlunga Hospital and of course the Repat.

Closing the Repat and removing an entire hospital from the network will destabilise the very foundation of the health network in southern Adelaide. The impact of this closure will be felt far beyond our veterans; it will affect every South Australian, especially those in Adelaide's south. As SA Health's own website says, the Repat is a vital community asset; it plays a critical role in our state's health system.

There are approximately 170,000 visitations to the Repat each year. Specialist services are provided in urology, vascular surgery, respiratory medicine, cardiology, ophthalmology, diabetes and rheumatology, just to name a few. Each year, there around 2,000 transfers from the Flinders Medical Centre for overflow and convalescent patients, and it also provides more than 200 beds for general medicine, surgery, palliative care, mental health and rehabilitation services.

Closing the Repat will have a significant and longstanding impact on our community. It will be felt for generations, especially amongst our current armed forces personnel, who are our future veterans. Once these beds are removed, once the services are lost, they will never be regained. The closure of the Repat and the broader changes underway as part of Transforming Health have generated deep-seated community concern. What began as a ripple has fast become a tidal wave, as the full implications of Transforming Health are felt across our hospital network by South Australians not only in metropolitan Adelaide but in our regional areas as well.

The mayor of Onkaparinga council, Lorraine Rosenberg, wrote to me recently to voice her community's 'grave concerns about the impact of Transforming Health on their future access to hospital services'. The fast-growing southern region of Adelaide is worried: they are worried about access to essential health services, they are worried about the closure of Noarlunga Hospital's 29-bed medical ward, they are worried about the closure of Noarlunga's private hospital and they are worried about the severe downgrade of the Noarlunga Hospital emergency department.

They should be worried because closing the Repat will put more pressure on existing services at the Flinders Medical Centre and at Noarlunga, and reducing services at Noarlunga will drive more patients to Flinders. It will be a fast-gathering snowball, a snowball that is heading directly for the Flinders Medical Centre. People down south will be travelling further for medical treatment, they will be waiting longer, the staff will be under enormous pressure to meet the daily demand and good luck trying to find a car park at the Flinders Medical Centre.

On Tuesday 28 March, the Noarlunga Hospital ED was overcapacity for 12 hours straight, six straight hours of which were in Code White, which means that all treatment areas are occupied. For this entire 12-hour period, the Flinders Medical Centre ED was also overcapacity and in Code White for 11 hours straight. Unfortunately, this is the norm rather than the exception. During the 12-hour period from 1pm on Monday 27 March until 1am on Tuesday 28 March, Noarlunga Hospital's ED was also overcapacity for 12 hours straight, eight of which were Code White. Again, for this entire 12-hour period the Flinders ED was also overcapacity and in a Code White status for nine hours straight.

Right now, we have a health system that is clearly not working. What is the capacity of the system going to be to cope with the closure of the Repat? The access blocking occurring in the emergency departments at Noarlunga Hospital and Flinders is symptomatic of a network that is not

coping with current demand. Transforming Health is simply not working. If all things are bad now, how much worse will they be, as I said before, when the Repat closes? It is not just immediate patient care and services that will suffer.

Opportunities will be lost, opportunities to maximise health outcomes for residents of southern Adelaide, opportunities to continue to foster a strong government partnership with Flinders in respect to training and research, training that is critical to preparing our next generation of healthcare professionals, training that is critical to attracting and retaining students, and research that is essential to creating job opportunities that our state so desperately needs. At Flinders, there is an opportunity for hospital and university staff to work together to ensure that patients benefit from the latest developments in research. An overworked and under-resourced Flinders Medical Centre threatens to erode this incredibly valuable collaboration.

Deputy Speaker, as you are well aware, in 2010 then premier Mike Rann said, 'The Repat Hospital is here to stay. The Repat Hospital will never, ever be closed by a Labor government.' Former minister for health John Hill, and now ACH board member, was also clear in his statements at the time. He said, 'It's not something that's going to be done by the government.' Before the last election, the current Minister for Health, the Hon. Jack Snelling, was adamant when he said:

SA Health is dedicated to maintaining the same high level of care that Veterans and the local community have come to expect from the Repatriation General Hospital, both now and into the future.

Despite these repeated promises from the Labor government under current administrations and former administrations to never, ever close the Repat, the health minister confirmed earlier this month in question time that he 'expects to be off the Repat site before the end of the year'. Before the end of the year, the government is planning to close the Repat facility that it said repeatedly, as recently as 2010 and then again in 2014, that it would never, ever close.

On 19 February this year, I attended the commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the bombing of Darwin held in the Repat chapel. While sitting in the chapel, I started to reflect on the Repat and what it means both to me and the community. The Repat means 75 years of outstanding service to our veterans, to southern Adelaide and to all South Australians. Yet, sadly, in a year of what should be celebration, we are instead left in shock and despair at the Weatherill Labor government's intent to break its promise and bring to an end 75 years of history and service by closing this much-loved and treasured community asset. It is absurd and we will rue the day that the government took this decision, an incredibly short-sighted decision.

After 75 years, the state Labor government considers the Repat too old and too tired to invest in, yet this is a government that has just committed more than half a billion dollars of your taxpayer money for a patch-up job on South Australia's fragile electricity system when it could have spent \$24 million to keep Alinta open. That \$24 million would have helped ensure base load supply, provided a more reliable energy market and saved South Australians from further increases in their electricity bills.

The proposed half a billion dollar spend on this so-called energy crisis, much of which is the fault of this current government, is twice what the government is spending on capital works under the entire Transforming Health regime that they are trying to implement. The government could have totally rebuilt the Repat for that amount of money and still had a very healthy pocket of change left over.

So, today, I call on the government to stop its plan to sell the Repat. It is not too late. The Repat has not yet been sold. A contract with ACH has not yet been finalised. There is still time for the Weatherill Labor government to make the right decision to commit to its original promise to never, ever close the Repat. I call on the government to instead renew the Repat.

There being a disturbance in the strangers' gallery:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member must be heard in silence.

Mr DULUK: I call on the Independent member for Florey and Labor cabinet ministers the member for Frome and the member for Waite to stand up for South Australia's health network and stand up for the residents of southern Adelaide, and I call on the Minister for Veterans' Affairs to

stand up for his constituents and demand that the government put to an end the appalling decision to close the Repat and, instead, commit to renewing it.

The government does not know how it is going to integrate the Repat services into the broader hospital network. It still cannot say where it will be able to shift the Repat's outpatient services, sleep unit, orthopaedic services or radiology services to. It does not know where it will shift the services to without crippling other parts of the network, and it does not know how the transition will be completed. Unless these questions can be answered, at the very least the government should suspend its negotiations with ACH and halt its plans to sell the Repat. Finally, I would like to acknowledge the Save the Repat campaigners and Augustinus Krikke for all your hard work, commitment and dedication to saving the Repat. From this side of the house, we thank you very much for your support.

There being a disturbance in the strangers' gallery:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Elder.

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:46): Firstly, can I acknowledge all those in the gallery who are here on behalf of Save the Repat. I feel pretty sure I have met most of you along the way, and I acknowledge you for your commitment and passion on this particular issue. I share your passion as well.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Treloar: She is supposed to be talking to us.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I beg your pardon?

Mr Treloar: Isn't she speaking to the house?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: If you have a point of order, you need to stand up and tell me what it is.

Ms DIGANCE: We on this side are not in agreeance with the motion the member for Davenport has put forward, and that will come as no surprise. In particular, we are not in support of this motion, given it is very hollow and fearmongering with little positive aspect or glimmer of hope presented in it. We do accept though the premise of recognition—

There being a disturbance in the strangers' gallery:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Sit down. Each member of the house is entitled to the right to speak in silence. I ask the members of the gallery to observe the standing orders as well. If there is any further comment, I will have to ask you to leave, and I do not want that to happen, so can we please listen to the members in silence. Member for Elder.

Ms DIGANCE: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. We do acknowledge the premise of recognition put forward here, however, that the Repat General Hospital at Daw Park for the past 75 years has provided extraordinary care to veterans and other South Australians. I am sure all of us would have a story to tell in relation to the history of care and kindness that this institution has shown towards South Australians.

My grandfather, post World War II, spent time at the Repat, along with uncles, friends, family and peers and nursing professionals who are actually still there at the Repat. I have a long connection with and memories of the Repat, so I, too, have sadness along with all of you. As the local member, I have spent time talking with you and fronting what have often been very angry, animated and, naturally enough, dismayed groups as we work through together the next chapters of health care in our state.

I think you would all agree that I have always been honest with you. I have always taken your views with the greatest respect. I have written letters to the minister on your behalf seeking answers and guidance. I understand that while as human beings we naturally gain comfort from things staying the same, we are of an intelligence that drives us to seek new and better ways through progress.

We see a flicker of agreeance in the member for Davenport's call to renew the Repat General Hospital as a health and medical precinct for veterans and residents of the southern suburbs. This plan will commence its journey in late 2017 with the ACH Group taking the lead to redevelop and open up the site. As has been widely reported, the submission of the South Australian-based, not-for-profit ACH Group consortium, Open Daws, proposes to develop an integrated health and housing precinct with a focus on ageing and teaching. Open Daws will invest \$200 million into the redevelopment of the site over the next seven years, to be completed in 2024, with:

- a strong community focus through providing health and aged-care services, including transition care and day hospital services;
- rehabilitation services such as ambulatory care and inpatient and outpatient rehabilitation;
- facilities for education and training as well as an innovation hub;
- residential accommodation for different community groups; and
- a childcare facility. The master plan includes allied health services, residential aged care, affordable housing, medical imaging, pathology and pharmacy services.

There will be a strong veterans presence, including health and community services for veterans on site. The chapel and remembrance gardens will be enhanced, and the veteran community will be engaged in a co-creation process for the future of the site. The ACH Group has a long history of working with and for the veteran community, with the foundations of the organisation lying in the development of affordable housing for war widows.

I know that those opposite have arrested vision and limited ability to predict a dynamic future for South Australians. They may be surprised to know—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Chaffey.

Ms DIGANCE: —that in fact this plan is being welcomed and talked about in a positive light by many.

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Finniss, order! Stop. Member for Finniss, I believe you want to speak next.

Mr Pengilly: I do.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, you won't be if you keep shouting over the top of the member for Elder. Member for Elder.

Ms DIGANCE: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. The Repat was established in 1942 to care for veterans after the Second World War. I heard Mr Bill Denny recently reference this as he addressed a memorial service at the Repat chapel I attended, commemorating the bombing of Darwin. He made the point that we must ensure that we maintain for the small number of those who remain from World War II the care that they have come to know, but that a new model of care is expected by those coming after them. What we heard that day was the acknowledgement that the delivery of health care has changed since 1942 and that it must change.

We know that only around one in five veterans who go to our public hospitals as inpatients go to the Repat and that veterans account for less than 10 per cent of the Repat's inpatients. We also know that the Repat is hard for some veterans to access, including those who live and work near the Edinburgh Defence Precinct in northern Adelaide. Historically, veterans have been understood to be older men who served during World War I and World War II or, more recently, Korea or Vietnam.

However, over the past 10 to 15 years a contemporary group of veterans has emerged. Not surprisingly, these younger veterans, who have been involved in peacekeeping activities or served in recent conflicts in the Middle East and who also include a higher proportion of women than in

previous generations, have vastly different preferences and needs from those of our older veterans. These differences mean we have to rethink our traditional approach to providing health care for our veterans and their families, as well as the broader veteran community.

Upon discharge and transition to the civilian community, veterans are faced with an unfamiliar and complex health system. Veterans' health services and priorities must be accessible to all veterans, regardless of locality, and therefore beyond the grounds of the Repat. Every service currently provided to veterans and other users of the Repat will continue at different locations across metropolitan Adelaide—in many instances, in brand-new, state-of-the-art health infrastructure. No service is ceasing.

The state Labor government is investing more than \$210 million at the Flinders Medical Centre, the Noarlunga Hospital and the Glenside health campus to build state-of-the-art, brand-new facilities as well as to improve and upgrade existing facilities. This significant investment will ensure these hospitals meet the future needs of people who live in the southern Adelaide area and, indeed, are able to cater for our patients who have previously gone to the Repat.

The upgrades included at Flinders will be a brand-new rehabilitation centre with 55 rehabilitation beds, new gyms and a hydrotherapy pool; a new 15-bed palliative care unit offering shared spaces and a large rooftop garden; more car parking, with a new 1,780-space multideck car park; a dedicated orthogeriatric service; and a new centre for the Older Persons Mental Health Service. While I know that some of the local constituents are sad that their hospital is closing, as am I, I know the interest is growing in the new and unfolding chapters of this precinct.

Flinders Medical Centre, with its upgrades and new additions, will give the care we all expect. To overcome the fear of parking, I have championed car parks for older and disabled patients as near to the entrances as possible, a concierge to assist their ease of passage around the hospital and one free car park per palliative care patient to assist in the stress of parking to visit someone in such need. Included in the plan is also the \$12 million upgrade at Noarlunga Hospital, which will change it into an elective surgery centre for South Australia.

Significantly for our veterans, there will be a brand-new \$15 million veterans' mental health precinct, named the Jamie Larcombe Centre, at the Glenside health campus. The new facility, which includes a post-traumatic stress disorder service, is being purpose built. It will have 24 single rooms with ensuites, outpatient rooms, a gymnasium, research spaces, gardens and areas for reflection, family-friendly spaces, including a children's playground, research spaces to advance veterans' mental health care, and car parking facilities.

The state-of-the-art facility, due for completion later this year, is named after Sapper Jamie Ronald Larcombe, who was born in Kingston, Kangaroo Island, and was deployed to Afghanistan in 2010. The name is a tribute to the service and sacrifice of Sapper Larcombe, who was killed in action on 19 February 2011. The service of all our veterans will be recognised in many ways throughout this precinct.

This project came to the Public Works Committee, which I chair, and received bipartisan support. On that day, we had present Save the Repat supporters—and I was grateful you were there—most of whom I had met previously. When I spoke to them post the plan having been presented at Public Works, they did agree that the plan looked to be appropriate and well designed and would be purpose built.

While I know change brings challenge, and fear for some, I look with hope and embrace the future of health care at the Repat site as it passes on to its next phase and continues to deliver health care and wellbeing services to South Australians. With that, I will say that we, on this side, oppose this motion.

An honourable member interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:56): I rise to support the member for Davenport's motion and I can scarcely believe what I am hearing from the other side of the chamber. The member for Florey has been a loud and vocal supporter of the Modbury Hospital for years and years and years.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Not that long.

Mr PENGILLY: You are interrupting me.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I'm sensitive about age.

Mr PENGILLY: The member for Florey has been slotted and the current Minister for Health, the one who has overseen this absolute debacle at the Repat, wants to be the next member for Florey, and then we have the member for Elder, who has just spoken, who has been slotted by the Labor Party. She is speaking on behalf of the government and putting up their weights on what they have done. I have never heard so much spin in all my born days.

This government is all about spin and not about substance. You have stuffed up the health system. You are stuffing up the Repat by closing it. You have stuffed up the power industry. You have water bills that nobody in South Australia can pay. You have power bills that no-one can pay. You have emergency services levies that you have ramped up, and that is only just the start of it. How you can come in here and try to defend the closure of the Repat is indefensible. You are a disgrace of a government.

I had a couple of comments noted that I was going to mention, but I do not think I will do that. It is not your hospital. It is not my hospital. It is no member of this house's hospital. It is no member of the other place's hospital. It is the veterans' hospital and it has been for a very long time. If you think this is going to go away, it is not. It is going to come back and bite the government severely because there is a group of people who have been out the front for months and months on end for extended periods—every Monday they are out there—and they are reminding South Australians what a disgraceful thing is happening to the Repat.

They do not want it to close. It is the veterans' hospital. It does not matter whether they are Second World War veterans who are still alive and in there or those currently serving overseas. It is their hospital. On that note, I am a personal friend of the Larcombe family on Kangaroo Island. I am very close to them and I knew Jamie. I know the girls really well. I am happy to have the facility named after Jamie, who was killed in Afghanistan, but I think it should not be used in this place. I do not think it is appropriate.

Going back to the loyal group of protesters who are out here every week, these are people, many of whom have served overseas or have family members who have, who are adamant that this facility is being closed when it should not be. It is just wrong. It is wrong, wrong, wrong. It was mentioned that it was about 1942 when it was first established. It does not matter whether it was 1942 or 1992, or whatever. The facilities inside and the medical care have been upgraded. It is a place they value and it is a place they know. A number of my constituents have served time in Ward 17 and that is where they feel comfortable. They do not want to go anywhere else, they want to stay there. That is their facility. That is how they see it.

The member for Davenport spoke with some clarity about this government saying that it would never, ever close the Repat. Well, hello, what is happening? You are closing it. You are making a complete mockery of your own government's decision to never, ever close it by going about it. All the spin in the world from Labor will not fix this debacle.

You can rest assured that not only this side of the house but those thousands of veterans out there will remind the people of South Australia, next March, just what they have done in relation to the Repat. They will not be allowed to forget what has happened. They will be given every opportunity to cast their votes on that, and a number of other issues, at the state election. All this government wants to do is to flog it off, flog off the land to try to fix up some of the financial disasters they have impinged on South Australia. They could not care less about people. They cannot even care about their own members, the member for Florey or the member for Elder. They have slotted them both. Where are you coming from?

I think the member for Davenport has said so much in his excellent contribution on his own motion that I do not think there is any real need for me to go over all of that again, and I do not intend to. I want to remind the house and remind the Weatherill Labor government of what they are doing and what they have done to South Australia, in this particular case, by closing the Repat. They have

unleashed a firestorm on themselves electorally that will not be forgotten. I believe it is an absolute disgrace. With those few words, I will resume my seat.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Treloar.

INTERNATIONAL DAY OF THE MIDWIFE

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (12:02): I move:

That this house recognise—

- (a) the key role of professional midwives in provision of accessible, affordable midwifery-led care for women and babies;
- (b) the evidence that demonstrates midwifery-led care provided by educated, experienced, professional midwives promotes improved quality of care and wellbeing of women and babies;
- (c) that the role of the midwife is key to forming positive foundations critical to the first years of a child's life; and
- (d) that on 5 May, as we recognise International Day of the Midwife, we pay tribute and acknowledge the valued and valuable work of all midwives, and their vital role as we all commit to champion and promote this pivotal model of care.

To say I am honoured is an understatement, as I welcome today to Parliament House around 60 midwives and mothers with their babies. Welcome to all of you. Why are we all here today? You are here and I am here because we know the value of midwifery-led care and the value of the profession of midwifery. You are here to pledge your commitment to this profession that is key to building healthy communities. You are here to demonstrate that every woman deserves choice, the right to midwifery-led care, with its validated health and wellbeing outcomes.

Annually, since I have been the member for Elder, we have gathered in this house to recognise and champion the profession of midwifery and its critical importance to our society's development and progress. To reaffirm and reinforce a cohort of passionate, dedicated and highly educated people with university degrees, highly experienced professionals, as many of you here are, is incredible. I am a midwife, I am also a registered nurse, and I have worked for a long time with at-risk families. I have taught midwives at the University of South Australia and more recently I was appointed adjunct associate professor with the Faculty of Medicine, Nursing and Health Sciences at Flinders University.

This house knows my commitment to the profession of midwifery, as every year I invite my fellow parliamentarians to give real recognition to your value. Present today is a very rich mix of clinicians, professors, associate professors, doctors, ANMF leaders, chief executives, university academics, students, mothers and a few babies—which is great—and also some of my fellow midwifery students from The Queen Elizabeth Hospital days. Collectively, I estimate that here today we would have well over 1,000 years of experience.

All of you here are representative of what is of critical importance to our society, for you are the builders and the building blocks of our society. You enable and empower new mothers, fathers and families to ensure the best possible start to family life. You create foundations on which our social capital grows and progresses, ensuring the development of a robust and dynamic economy and society. Today, I address the motion I laid on the table earlier this year in acknowledging that this house recognises:

- (a) the key role of the professional midwife in the provision of accessible, affordable midwifery-led care for women and babies;
- (b) the evidence that demonstrates midwifery-led care provided by educated, experienced, professional midwives promotes improved quality of care and wellbeing outcomes;
- (c) the role of the midwife is key to forming positive foundations critical to the first year of a child's life; and
- (d) that on 5 May, as we recognise International Day of the Midwife, we pay tribute and acknowledge the valued and valuable work of all midwives and their vital role as we all commit to champion and promote this pivotal model of care and professional practice.

This year we acknowledge the theme: Midwives—Making a Difference in the World, and while we gather early for International Day of the Midwife, which is celebrated on 5 May, this theme is highly appropriate for what I will talk about today.

Transition to parenthood begins during pregnancy, when the guiding hand of a midwife has been demonstrated to enable better health and wellbeing outcomes. Midwifery's complexities see its ethos and practice based in both science and art, coupled with expertise, professionalism, intuition and caring, in one of the most intimate of relationships on this planet: a relationship to be revered, honoured and respected.

Many of you know that I spend much time advocating, talking, raising issues, holding forums and discussions, writing letters and arranging meetings to present our case to decision-makers, including the minister. I put to you all here that, while the conversation continues, the time for change and action has arrived and that this change and action be harnessed through the clarity of three main focal points: first, I propose a multimedia statewide campaign on what a midwife is; second, converting recognised wellbeing outcomes of midwifery-led care into care for all; and third, constructing a model of midwifery-led care that best facilitates safe and universally accessible services of choice and promotes good foundations for babies, mothers and families.

Firstly, the statewide multimedia campaign on what is a midwife and the importance of your role, with a promotional advertising campaign to expand the understanding of the role of a midwife. As a result of a robust forum of midwives and obstetricians that I hosted, you came up with what was really needed in this state to progress midwifery-led care. Unanimously, the campaign was identified as number one. I sent the letter to the minister and discussions are in progress, and I am sure we will see results soon.

Anecdotally, we know there is, generally, limited understanding of what a midwife is. Words used to describe a midwife could include: professional, science, trust, relationships, hands on, available, empowering, enabling, collaborative, university educated, experienced, accessible, affordable and safe. Midwives differ from nurses—I know because I am both. Like architects and interior designers, they are both different but have a thread of commonality. For nurses and midwives, there is this thread of commonality: it is the humanness, the connector of ultimate best possible outcomes.

When the first campaign is complete, all South Australians will know what a midwife is and does, why you are important to them, and why you are necessary to building the health and wellbeing of this state and how and where you can be accessed. Before I move on to the second point, I would like to set the scene with some words from Tessa, who is here today, as she reflects on her journey and the importance of a midwife overseeing her care. I would suggest that Tessa is representative, in many cases, of her peers. Tessa writes:

As a first-time pregnant woman, I had a rough idea of what I wanted for labour and birth, but I didn't know where to find it. I wanted to be nurtured, calm and well-attended during my labour by someone I trusted. I wanted my baby to be delivered safely and naturally into my arms. I wanted to be respected and heard as a woman in the midst of one of the most important rites of passage of [my] life.

When the time came for us to consider having another child, I knew what I didn't know last time and started researching. I discovered the midwifery model of care—I had not realised that the State offers very high quality Midwifery Group Practice programs which women can access for free. In discovering the midwifery model, I realised the absurdity of looking to the private obstetric model for this kind of responsive, one-to-one care.

Under the care of an inspiring, diligent and committed private midwife, I went on to have two more babies naturally—both were 'vaginal births after Caesarean'. These births healed my past trauma, gave me a new appreciation for the grand design of birth and left me with a lasting passion for midwifery care and maternity service reform.

Without midwives, women face increasing and unnecessary interventions which might be safe in the short-term but create longer-term morbidities physically and emotionally. Women need midwives.

Thank you, Tessa, for those words. My second point urges converting well recognised health and wellbeing outcomes of midwifery-led care into accessible care for all. The evidence clearly demonstrates that midwifery-led care gives results. After nearly 15 years of midwifery group practice in our state, the statistics are not publicly discoverable. It is time they were.

We know from studies and research that midwifery-led care produces better outcomes for mothers and babies and that this model of care promotes increased normal vaginal births, decreased use of epidurals, decreased use of drugs and their side effects, decreased post-delivery haemorrhage, and decreased physical injury to women by way of episiotomy or instrumental intervention. With this comes improved mother-baby attachment and a smooth return to life post delivery. Incidentally, this model of care gives cost savings of around \$900 per consumer for a woman under the care of a midwifery group practice, compared with standard hospital care models.

Only 15 per cent of child-bearing women in South Australia have access to a midwife-led continuity model of care. That translates into 60 to 80 women per month or around 700 to 1,000 per year who miss out and cannot access care of their choice. In fact, as we have heard from Tessa's account, many do not even know that they have this choice. We must make this well known and accessible.

Thirdly, collectively we must put on the table our ideal model of midwifery-led care. We must build it, own it and champion it. Our model must cover all aspects and be the continuum to facilitate and provide best accessible care of safe choice for every woman, baby and family. It must demand a policy focus and a designated budget line.

I will begin this section by acknowledging our shared disappointment as we witnessed a missed opportunity with the announcement of the strategy of Transforming Health, a strategy with perfect synergies for midwifery-led care. Last year, there were the associated ambassador announcements with not one midwife amongst the ambassadors. Midwives deserve better. In our model of care I propose:

- midwives are recognised for their expertise in general or specialist fields—antenatal, delivery, postnatal;
- midwives have ease of access to care for women at home and/or in midwifery group practices with admitting rights to hospitals (which is now starting to happen) to complete a delivery as needed;
- midwifery group practice has enough space so that every woman has access to the service;
- midwives are involved early as we know that the first five years of life are important as development and neural plasticity of the brain are crucial in these few years;
- midwives can detect and intervene on any issues, including child abuse, neglect and domestic violence;
- midwifery university graduates have access to hospital graduate places. We must increase this number not decrease it. Apparently at the moment, we have 50 places for around 120 students. This is not good enough and we need to encourage innovative ways to address this issue. We must halt the pending known midwifery shortage and the pressures of double shifts and excessive hours;
- midwives specialised in child health education, preventative and educative support to mothers, fathers and families;
- a specialised 24-hour parent helpline that is easily accessed;
- Torrens House live-in residential assistance and education for parents is once again open for business 24/7;
- mothercraft nurses work side by side with registered midwives offering a full complement of care and education and wellbeing assistance; and
- we value and grow innovation, as we saw last year with the University of South Australia's opening of their midwifery-driven clinic, where professional midwives practise alongside student midwives. This is very innovative and very proactive and needs to be encouraged.

The question has to be asked and decisions must be made: do we want to provide best care with choice to build our families, strengthen our communities and set the direction of our future? I say yes, and so we must insist on policy and a budget line to address this in a determined and strategic manner. We need to be deliberate and willing to move ourselves to where we know we can make the change. We must speak our truths to bring clarity and action. This may cause discomfort to others, but this can loosen the status quo, with the associated momentum bringing vision to reality.

Women, babies and families of South Australia deserve our best service, and we owe it to them. We must champion and provide this. I am really honoured that you are present here today so that I can speak with you and about you and so that I can thank you for all you have done, all you are doing and all you will do for South Australia and South Australians. Come 5 May, I wish you all a very happy International Day of the Midwife.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hear, hear!

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (12:16): I think this is the third or fourth time I have spoken on this motion or a similar motion in this place. I congratulate the member for Elder on bringing this motion to this place; it is very important. Why is a bloke standing up and talking about this? It is because I owe my life to a midwife. I was born at home in England. It was a January day, snowing hard outside. The midwife had come and sent my father off to get the doctor. He fell off his bike a couple of times in the snow going to get the doctor.

My aunts were outside digging up bricks from the backyard to jack up the bed because the midwife had said the bed needed to be higher. By the time the doctor arrived, the midwife had done what she had done so many times before with a huge amount of expertise, professionalism and care: she had delivered another baby, and that was me. I should mention that my brother Ian was also born with a midwife's care. I was 7lb 2oz; I was quite moderately sized. Ian was 11 pounds something. He was a big boy.

Now they would be in hospital with intensive care all around them, but at the time, the midwife took care of this, and why? It was not just because of the science behind her training, but because of that personal expert knowledge. There is nothing more important in medical care of any sort than that hands-on experience, particularly in such a personal and important episode in anybody's life as having a baby. Having somebody there who can give professional expertise with a massive amount of experience behind them and who knows what to do to calm the mother down and make sure everything goes well is so important. My aunts Anna and Jean were midwives out at the Queen Vic.

Everybody in this place would be strongly appreciative and very supportive of the role of midwives in South Australia. According to the information I have, there are 33,490 midwives and RN midwives registered in Australia. That is a huge number. They are backed up by a health system that is geared for in-hospital births but, as I have said, I was born at home and people are still choosing to give birth at home, out of hospital circumstances.

We know that midwives are there to support mothers, support families and support the whole process, not just at the birth but also with prenatal education and information, making sure that everybody knows what to expect. My son was 10lb 6oz, my daughter, Sahra, was 8lb 13oz, and I once said to my wife that it was like shelling peas. I cannot repeat in here what she said to me about shelling peas and giving birth; it was not quite like that.

Mr Pengilly: It's a wonder you're still alive.

Dr McFETRIDGE: I can't fight very well, but I can run fast. It is so important to make sure we have midwives there who know what they are doing. The most important thing we can do in this place is continue to recognise days like International Day of the Midwife because members are able to get up and give their own personal stories. I think that is an important part of not only recognising midwives as part of the medical profession as medical practitioners but also showing the real connection we have in this place with what is going in the real world.

The role of midwives is becoming more technical now. The expectations are getting higher. The requirements are getting higher, and having nurse practitioners, having Professor Dabars in the gallery with us today, shows the level of training that is available now so that we, as patients and recipients of medical care, are getting the best care. I emphasise again to all the people who are

here in the gallery today that if you added up the years of experience it would be thousands of years of collective experience. It is that experience, that bedside manner, that tender, loving care—and I do not think that is putting it too strongly—that makes our health system, particularly the obstetrics and gynaecology part of it where midwives are involved, very special.

Being a grandfather now, knowing that my grandchildren were born with the expert care of midwives—doctors were there helping, but the midwives were doing most of the work—is so important. This is an important motion. I will not say any more; I will let others speak on it. It is a very important day and I am very pleased to be able to lend my assistance to recognise the worth of midwives and the importance of this day.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hear, hear!

Ms COOK (Fisher) (12:21): I am very pleased to rise to support my colleague the member for Elder in this motion. The member for Elder is a tireless advocate and voice for all midwives in this place. The motion moves the recognition of midwives' leadership, the influence they have on wellbeing and health because of the contact they have in the first year of a child's life, and pays tribute not just to midwives but to the advancement of care in the model that midwives provide because of their advocacy for women across the decades.

The world of the professional midwife is as interesting as it is challenging, rewarding and inspiring. As a general nurse, I have the utmost respect, admiration, and maybe even a tinge of jealousy at times, for the way all midwives go about their loving and nurturing contact with mums, babies and families. I have to say my role as a level 3 nurse in a mixed general obstetric and gynaecology ward was one of the most rewarding and enjoyable roles that I have had during my 28 years of clinical nursing.

The chance to assist women in the birthing of their children at the most intimate time of life, the opportunity to provide love and reassurance to women with antenatal crises, and to undertake my work with very tiny babies watching on from their cots while newly anointed parents took a well deserved rest, were some of the most special times in nursing for me. The role is privileged, satisfying and held in the utmost regard.

In a world where there is constant pressure to improve efficiencies in patient care, achieve better patient outcomes and ensure that we clinicians deliver best practice patient-centred care, the leadership looks to midwives who lead the way in these forms of practice. Midwifery-led care models such as family birthing suites, discharge planning and follow-up models have led the way in this regard for many years. The member for Elder and I often refer to these models in our advocacy to the Minister for Health, particularly when describing ways in which clinical pathways are developed and best delivered.

General nurses have long understood the benefits of these models, and we look to midwives for leadership. I think we are getting there, albeit slowly. Trust me, the wheels turn very slowly, but with the acknowledgement that nurse-led care is what our community needs, and in fact what our community wants, I feel very happy to see that endoscopy scope-type care, nurse-led care, is coming. I am pushing very hard for nurse-led models around palliative care.

Thank you all for your care. Thank you for your kindness and love in the most intimate and challenging times of life. Thank you for helping families in our state. Thank you to all midwives working in the community, family homes, clinics, children's centres and GP practices. Thank you to midwives working in rural and remote settings, and of course, thank you to midwives working in acute settings, antenatal labour, postnatal and of course neonatal care. You are all awesome and we salute you. I look forward to celebrating International Day of the Midwife again on 5 May.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (12:24): I rise today to support this motion acknowledging the International Day of the Midwife and also to acknowledge midwives everywhere, particularly those who are gathered in the gallery today. This motion recognises the key role of professional midwives in provision of accessible, affordable midwifery-led care for women and babies, it recognises the evidence that demonstrates midwifery-led care promotes improved quality of care and that the role of the midwife is key to forming positive foundations critical to the first years of a child's life.

The member for Elder has identified the differences between a nurse and a midwife, and I suspect that these days there is even greater divergence occurring between those two professions. I am married to a nurse who, when you could, trained back in the day at the Tumbay Bay District Hospital. She went on to gain her degree and become a registered nurse. I can say in this place that, had it not been for four children in five years, I know for a fact that she would have gone on to pursue midwifery. That was not to be, and I am sure that there are lots of stories like that.

The International Day of the Midwife is held each year on 5 May and was launched in 1992 by the International Confederation of Midwives. The annual event highlights the work and role of midwives and midwifery. Midwives work in a range of environments that include hospitals, birthing centres, community centres and women's homes. Some midwives are employed by health services and organisations; others are self-employed as privately practising midwives. All midwives are providing vital services in birthing throughout our community.

The number of midwives registered in South Australia in 2016 was 522, an increase of almost 12 per cent on the previous year. I have no reason to believe that that increase in the profession will not continue. Midwives help to deliver many of the around 20,000 births in South Australia every year. For those who are sitting here today and who are unaware, I represent a distant and far-flung electorate that encompasses Port Lincoln, Cowell, Ceduna and all the way out to the Western Australian border.

In my electorate, hospital birthing is only possible now in Ceduna and Port Lincoln and also, for some, in Whyalla, which is in the member for Giles' seat. The reality is that there are only three hospital options for mothers-to-be on Eyre Peninsula. There are many reasons for this, but one, I am sure, is the difficulty in attracting health professionals, including midwives, to the more remote areas of South Australia. What it means, of course, is that mothers-to-be who live in these more remote areas must often travel many miles in order to have their babies in a hospital environment.

Last weekend, I was talking to a senior health professional, and there is no doubt that the demand for midwives in country areas is increasing and will continue to grow to support those country mothers who are giving birth in more remote areas. Aside from all that, we must continue to recognise the invaluable work and achievements of our health professionals. Midwives play an integral role in supporting the health of mothers and their babies through providing proper care before, during and after pregnancy, and acknowledging and supporting them in their work is of enduring importance. The International Day of the Midwife on 5 May provides that opportunity. I support the motion and I say a big thank you and congratulations to midwives everywhere.

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (12:28): I will be very quick because I know we are almost out of time, but as parliamentary secretary for regional services I think it is important to acknowledge good work when the government does do good work. I want to commend them for a new initiative that has just been rolled out, that is, the midwife manager for maternity and neonatal services across regional South Australia, an initiative that brings together the skills of midwives in country locations, who can feel isolated or disconnected. This initiative, this program, brings those midwives together, provides a lead role in working in partnerships amongst our country birthing hospitals and, of course, those midwives in country as well. It really is a great initiative and enables country midwives to feel connected, to share skills, and to tap into other skills located around our wonderful regional and rural areas.

It was a role that was previously under the director of nursing but, of course, that is just one of many roles the director of nursing needs to undertake. To have this type of special focus on midwives in country areas is to be commended. The only thing I would ask is that I believe the trial finishes in June this year, and there will be a need for funding. I encourage the government to look at this service very seriously. Representing a regional area, I know midwives are crucial to our country and regional services.

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (12:31): I would like to thank those who have spoken on this motion this morning: the member for Morphett for his really interesting recount, which was excellent; the member for Fisher for her insights as well; and the members for Flinders and Mount Gambier, both from rural settings, for their insights. I really appreciate that, as I know everyone here would also appreciate that.

What all of us gathering here in this house does is give affirmation to this amazing profession of midwifery. Midwives are vital and key to the success of our families, which in turn builds successful and strong communities. I thank them for what they do, I welcome them to the house, and I know that we are going to share lunch soon, which will be very good. I thank them for coming and I thank everyone who has supported this motion today. I commend the motion to the house.

Motion carried.

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

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

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (12:32): I rise to commend the motion and also the hard work of the member for Davenport and elected candidate for the seat of Waite—the member for 'Davenwaite', as we will acknowledge him here. Unfortunately, the member for Waite is not in the house—

The Hon. L.A. Vlahos interjecting:

Mr BELL: Pretty much. The Minister for Veterans' Affairs has not contributed to this debate here today, nor has the Minister for Health, and perhaps that is a reflection of their stance on this matter. Coming from Mount Gambier, people might wonder why I would be talking about the Repat. Before I got into parliament that probably would be a fair assessment, but when you come into this house you get to meet a number of wonderful people in your community and your electorate. I came across a veteran, Ansi Nitz, who took me aside and spoke to me about the Repat, what it means to him, how it has assisted his life and, in his words, 'saved his life' coming back from war.

Many times we have sat in an Indian restaurant not far from the Repat site, where he has spoken passionately not only about the hospital but also about the treatments he is undergoing there. He entrusted to me information that has made me want to fight to support this motion and congratulate those members of our community who have fought so hard to maintain the Repat: 120,000 signatures on a petition to save the Repat and people sleeping out in front of Parliament House for many nights show the passion and the meaning this hospital has for veterans, veterans of many wars, not just the Second World War.

It comes down to a matter of trust. It is pretty clear that many people in South Australia do not trust this government. Why would you? We have had premiers before say that never, ever would the Repat close, and here we are looking at closing the Repat. I congratulate those people who have maintained the fight. On behalf of Ansi and the South-East community, and many others at the RSL, I will stand up for their desire to have the Repat remain open.

I would say to people that your patience will be rewarded. In 12 months' time, you have a chance to make your voice, your desire, heard. It is not just yours; make sure that you talk to your friends and your families. Even if you have never voted Liberal before in your life, this is your chance to make a real difference and show this government that you will not be taken for granted and that people power can change a government. On 17 March 2018, make sure that not only you but your friends and families understand how important this issue is. With that, I conclude my remarks.

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (12:36): I put on the record my thanks to those who spoke—the member for Mount Gambier made an excellent contribution just then—and a very quick point that pretty much says that this is the people's opportunity to send a message to this tired and out of touch government that has for the last four years, or since the 2014 state election, cut and hacked health services in metropolitan Adelaide, and they are cutting and hacking health services in regional and country South Australia as well.

This is the people's opportunity to tell this government that you cannot play around with important health services, you cannot play around with the Repat, you cannot mess up health services and silo them, you cannot go on making terrible decisions as they have been in regard to health and you cannot ignore the wishes of the 120,000 petitioners who have petitioned this house in regard to the closure of the Repat. I thank the member for Finniss for his contribution as well. He has long been a supporter in this house of veterans' services and legacy.

I also thank the member for Elder for her contribution. I know that she is in a difficult position. I think that deep down she does not want to support Transforming Health. Deep down, she does not want to support the closure of the Repat, but she is bound by this machine that has put her second, a machine that has forced her to vote in this house against the best interests of her constituents. That is the most deplorable thing about what this government is doing. It is forcing its members to vote and support bad public health policy.

With those closing remarks, I would like to thank everyone who made a contribution. I would like to reassure those in the gallery and everyone who is following this debate that we on this side of the house will continue to fight for the Repat and continue to fight for the renewal of the Repat. We want to work with government, we want to work with the community and we want to see services maintained at the Repat, and that is something that I will be doing every day right up until election day and beyond.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 19
 Noes 23
 Majority 4

AYES

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

NOES

Bedford, F.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Caica, P.	Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.
Digance, A.F.C.	Gee, J.P.	Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.
Hildyard, K.	Hughes, E.J.	Kenyon, T.R. (teller)
Key, S.W.	Koutsantonis, A.	Mullighan, S.C.
Odenwalder, L.K.	Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.
Rankine, J.M.	Rau, J.R.	Snelling, J.J.
Vlahos, L.A.	Wortley, D.	

PAIRS

Marshall, S.S.	Weatherill, J.W.	Pisoni, D.G.
Brock, G.G.		

Motion thus negated.

COUNTRY HEALTH SERVICES

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (12:45): I move:

That this house—

- (a) notes the importance of providing adequate health care and facilities in country South Australia;
- (b) calls on the state government to address the \$150 million backlog of maintenance and noncompliance issues in country hospitals across South Australia; and
- (c) condemns the state government for failing to provide funding to correct compliance issues at the Loxton and Waikerie hospitals, instead leaving it to health advisory councils to fund.

I put forward this motion after I received correspondence from the Waikerie hospital's HAC that the operating theatre was facing closure. It was brought to my attention by the local health advisory council that several significant issues relating to occupational health and safety had been identified. This is a hospital run by Country Health SA, so you would assume that any noncompliance issues in an ageing hospital would be addressed by the state government. These issues included an air conditioner no longer working in the operating theatre and noncompliant doors. The cost of repairs and compliance was around \$140,000. I was further advised that Country Health SA would not pay for these upgrades and that the budget was not large enough to cover these issues.

The South Australian government's priority that Country Health could not shell out \$140,000 to keep an operating theatre open and workable is an absolute disgrace. The scenario the community faced meant that the Waikerie hospital's operating theatre would have to close in any circumstances where the air conditioner would normally be turned on to provide ventilation. Essentially, this would have left the hospital without minor surgery and no operation of the birthing suite over summer, including for emergency caesarean births.

After repeated requests to the state government to fund noncompliance repairs, the HAC decided it had no other choice but to use community-raised funds to fix the issues. Luckily for the state government, a crisis was avoided. This raised an even greater question: given the \$150 million backlog of maintenance and noncompliance issues in country hospitals across South Australia, how many HACs are being given no choice but to fund their own maintenance and compliance issues? The most recently tabled annual reports for the HAC in my electorate also showed further examples of what appear to be funds raised by the community used for basic fixes.

I note that the Loxton and Districts Health Advisory Council used money raised and donated by the community to upgrade bathrooms in the west wing of the Loxton Hospital to ensure that they have disability access as well as a new call-bell system. To me, providing disability access to the hospital toilet is a vital service, and the call-bell system should fall under the responsibility of the state government. However, it was good to see that these hospitals have been proactive in getting upgrade and compliance issues addressed and using local tradespeople.

Likewise, concerns were raised by the Renmark Paringa District HAC. At the time of the annual report being written, the HAC was still waiting for a response from the Minister for Health about a letter it sent out outlining concerns about acute services at the Renmark hospital. The letter, supported by the Flinders University rural clinical school and the GPs at the Renmark Medical Clinic raised serious issues. The importance of having adequate health care and facilities in country South Australia should not be understated.

Too often, we see a city-centric focus. We are spending billions of dollars on new metropolitan hospitals, priority projects to the city-centric government. I am sure that the new Royal Adelaide Hospital will be state-of-the-art, but in the overall scheme of health budgets, how can a state government not find a measly \$140,000 to keep an operating theatre open in Waikerie and potentially save lives? The closest hospital to Waikerie residents is a good 40 minutes away in either Berri or Loxton. The question I ask is: what value does the current government put on life? What value is there on a life in regional South Australia as opposed to a life in metropolitan South Australia? Interestingly, the government's South Australia's Health Care Plan states:

If you need to have elective surgery, you'll want to do so as soon as possible, and as close to home as possible...You may no longer have to travel long distances.

I note an opinion piece in today's *Advertiser* by Janice Fletcher, President of the AMA in South Australia, which starts with, 'Country doctors have had enough.' It reads:

The feeling outside of metropolitan Adelaide is of relentless and mindless cost-saving to finance the new RAH.

Dr Fletcher goes on:

We hear a distinct lack of trust in the government, firstly to have the will to step up on country issues and, secondly, to deliver.

Even when concerns may be groundless, the government simply is not believed. What we have seen for too long is a piecemeal approach that leaves regional communities and local doctors in doubt and

fear about their future. Adequate funding is of course the other big part of this picture, and that is up to the Premier and the Treasury.

Constant budget reductions can only be met by service cuts, and the community suffers. Whether it is Yorketown, Quorn, Port Augusta, Mount Gambier or the Riverland, health care in all these areas has had major issues. Some of the most isolated and disadvantaged people live in regional and rural South Australia and they need adequate health care.

A Marshall Liberal team recently released welcome health policy, which recognised the need for local communities to have stronger input into local health services' decision making, and Country Health SA has said to the HACs that there is \$150 million worth of noncompliance issues in country hospitals here in South Australia, yet the government allocated \$15 million towards those issues in the last financial year.

While the \$36 million upgrade to the Riverland General Hospital has been welcomed, there is continued community concern that the services at other hospitals in the region will be centralised. Reducing the need for patients to travel to Adelaide for specialist care is another area that requires ongoing improvement in the regions. While I acknowledge that more specialist care, such as chemotherapy, is now available, in many cases the demand well outstrips the number of treatment places that are available.

A large number of community groups have raised money towards the approximately \$26,000 needed for the four chemotherapy chairs after they were informed of a shortfall. It is disappointing that \$5 million was cut from the budget at the Riverland regional hospital and the government was then relying on the goodwill of Riverland people to raise enough money to purchase the chair. In 2015, the health advisory councils under the Weatherill government placed restrictions on the HACs to access millions of hard-earned dollars for local hospital maintenance and upgrades, fundraised by local communities in their goodwill gesture.

Local HACs were being told that only new money raised in the 2012-13 financial year could be spent, and previous money would remain in the Labor government's coffers. That was an absolute disgrace. These country hospitals are supported by their communities—fundraised by their communities, supported, bequeathed by their local communities—yet we have this arrogant state government that continues to say, 'We'll hold the money and you can raise more money.'

Dedicated and passionate volunteers on health advisory councils commit extensive time and effort raising money for their local hospitals, but the Weatherill Labor government took control of community-raised money and funds bequeathed to all those hospitals. Communities were angry that the government was dictating to country hospitals how they can spend their own money. The hospital auxiliary funds holding money raised by community must not be used as part of the health budget, and any restrictions on accessing this money should be removed. Local determination of the allocation of funds, especially those which have been locally raised, ensures money is spent in the area, spent on local tradespeople, and is in direct need of the greatest impact to services.

I note that many concerns have been raised in the past regarding the shortage of health professionals, such as nurses and front-line services in our hospitals; the need for more specialists visiting regional hospitals, particularly in the Riverland and Mallee; the lack of community and Aboriginal health services; and the lack of mental health services. These are all services that are taken for granted in metropolitan hospitals in South Australia, yet we see regional hospitals being denied these services that are critical for the continuation of our communities.

Emergency care in the Riverland—in particular, accident and emergency care—is undertaken by River Doc's ED. This is a fantastic organisation, but it is a private provider, so there is a fee, whereas across metropolitan South Australia the government provides accident and emergency free of charge. People in South Australia need to understand that we have a city-centric government that does not give any priority to regional healthcare services, particularly after-hours care.

In conclusion, I think it is extremely important to continually discuss the shortfalls in Country Health. It is abundantly clear where this government's priorities lie. Every South Australian deserves adequate health care and this is something that should never be forgotten.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (12:55): I move to amend the motion:

By deleting all words in (b) and (c) and inserting the following words in lieu thereof:

- (b) notes that the state government, through Country Health South Australia, is working with health advisory councils to address and prioritise maintenance and noncompliance issues in country hospitals across South Australia; and
- (c) extends its appreciation to all country health advisory councils for their dedication to supporting health care in regional South Australia.

I think one of the incredibly important roles of any member of parliament is to effectively represent their community, so bringing to the parliament the legitimate concerns of the constituents and the services in their community is important. The health system is an incredibly complex system. Health is by far the largest budget item for the state government. I think the allocation in the last budget was \$5.8 billion for 2016-17.

The argument has been used that there have been cutbacks in country South Australia to the health budget, but the facts are somewhat different. Recurrent funding has actually increased. There is always going to be a race between the increase in recurrent funding and the resources needed to meet those needs. Recurrent funding for Country Health back in 2013-14 was \$769 million. In the most recent budget, that was increased to \$819 million for recurrent expenditure in regional South Australia.

Capital funding over recent years has also been very significant in country South Australia. We have seen an expenditure in regional South Australia of \$213 million over the last six years. It has been acknowledged that there has been additional investment in regional South Australia. We should not lose sight of that because in many centres it has led to a very significant improvement in services, not least in Whyalla but also in a number of other major regional centres plus some of the smaller centres.

The member for Chaffey did refer to the expenditure in Berri, which was welcomed, where the state government spent \$36 million. In Whyalla, the state government invested \$15 million, which was part of a \$70 million upgrade. It was thanks to the former federal Labor government that an upgrade of that significance happened. It is worth reflecting that a number of those major upgrades in regional South Australia were all consistently opposed by the Liberal opposition in Canberra. If they had got their way, Whyalla would not have had the \$70 million investment.

In Port Lincoln, there was a \$12.2 million investment on the part of the state government and a \$40.5 million investment on the part of the then Labor government. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

Ministerial Statement

GRAIN HARVEST

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) (14:01): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: As farmers know, you cannot count the harvest until it is in the silos. The final results are in, and South Australia's grain growers are to be congratulated on delivering a record-breaking grain harvest. They have produced a whopping 11.1 million tonne crop

this 2016-17 season. The outstanding harvest beats the previous record of 10.3 million tonnes set five years ago.

It is incredible to see just how much grain our farmers have produced, particularly given the challenge of extreme weather conditions faced by our state last year with strong winds, hail and heavy rain hitting most of the agricultural districts. The grain industry is one of the largest export industries in South Australia and a major contributor to the state's food and agricultural exports, which generated \$4.6 billion in 2015-16.

Grains harvested are processed and packaged to produce a wide variety of consumer-ready items such as bread, noodles, pasta, breakfast cereals and biscuits, as well as alcoholic beverages, including beer and malt whiskey. This season's grain crop is worth around \$2.2 billion at the farm gate. We have officially broken the yield records for wheat, barley, lentils and hay. South Australia really is on the pulse. We are now the largest lentil producing and exporting state in the country, bringing in 448,000 tonnes of lentils this season worth an estimated \$260 million at the farm gate.

One in five working South Australians is employed in the agribusiness sector, and more than 12,000 people are employed in the grain industry directly in production as well as indirectly in supporting roles such as the storage and handling sector, farm advisers, chemical fertiliser resellers, agricultural aviation and fuel suppliers. This year, more than 2,500 casuals were employed to help manage the record harvest.

Our grain farmers are a vital part of the state's economy. In 2015-16, they generated \$4.4 billion in revenue, and around 85 per cent of their grain was exported to countries including Indonesia, China and Vietnam. I thank Viterra for doing such a fantastic job in working with the industry to prepare for this bumper harvest, boosting its storage, handling and shipping capacity, and taking on extra workers.

In addition to ideal rainfall and growing conditions through most of the year, our high crop yields are also the result of the investments farmers are making in innovation, new and emerging technologies and the adoption of smarter farm management practices. In 2016, the South Australian Research and Development Institute (SARDI) entered a \$50 million bilateral agreement with the Grains Research and Development Corporation to secure the future of grain industry research in South Australia, focusing on programs of state and national importance, including farming systems for low to medium rainfall areas, crop protection and crop improvement.

While seasonal conditions will always have an effect on yields, innovative cropping and pasture management are important to unlock productivity and help our industry build a stronger competitive advantage. Whether you live in the city or in the country, everyone in South Australia benefits when our farmers produce great crops. I send my sincere thanks and congratulations to all those people involved in the grain industries for their tremendous efforts this year.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Attorney-General (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Electronic Transactions—Exemption

By the Minister for Planning (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Planning, Development and Infrastructure—
General
Transitional

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Animal Welfare—Dehorning of Cattle

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
 Passenger Transport—
 Non-cash Payment Surcharges
 Taxi Fares No. 2

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:06): I move:

That standing orders and sessional orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice forthwith.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the house, and there being an absolute majority present I accept the motion.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:07): I move:

That the time allotted for the debate be one hour in lieu of question time.

Motion carried.

*No-confidence Motion***LABOR GOVERNMENT**

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:06): I move:

That this house has no confidence in the government because it has:

- (a) imposed on all South Australian families and businesses the highest cost and most unreliable electricity system in the nation;
- (b) ignored repeated warnings about the risks of forcing too much intermittent renewable energy into the electricity system too quickly;
- (c) continually denied responsibility for the energy crisis it has caused; and
- (d) compounded its maladministration by attempting to cover up a proposal from the owner to keep the Northern power station operating that would have maintained grid stability and avoided blackouts at less than one-twentieth the cost to taxpayers of the government's so-called energy plan.

The Premier, his energy minister and the rest of the cabinet can no longer hide. Because of the persistence of those on this side of the house, we have exposed the government for exactly what they are—guilty of incompetence, guilty of negligence and now guilty of a cover-up. Not since the State Bank collapse of 1991 has South Australia faced such an incredible crisis—a crisis in confidence—and all because of this grossly incompetent government.

This crisis has been caused by the chaotic energy policies that this government has put in place. The government's deliberate policy was to undermine the viability of base load power here in South Australia to drive that affordable, reliable power out of South Australia. Why did they do it? All because they were zealots to their ideologies, zealots to the cause for intermittent renewable energy and zealots to their cause over and above the interests of every single South Australian family, business and jobseeker. We now have the highest priced, least reliable grid in the entire nation, and this is something for which this government should hang its head in shame.

What has it delivered? What has this energy policy delivered for the people of South Australia? I will tell you—

There being a disturbance in the gallery:

The SPEAKER: Can we please have no flash photography.

Mr MARSHALL: —the highest unemployment rate in the entire nation and a crisis of confidence right across this entire state. This Premier and this energy minister have made South Australia the laughing stock of the entire nation with their failed experiment that has plunged South Australia into a competitive disadvantage with every single other state in the nation—highest price and least reliable energy, highest unemployment and an exodus of young people and capital across our borders. This has all happened despite the repeated warnings to this government repeated warnings which were all ignored by this government. Let's take a look at just some of them.

Back in 2003, when South Australia had just 1 per cent intermittent renewable energy penetration, the then minister for energy, the Hon. Patrick Conlon (former member for Elder), warned the government not to set its own targets because it would ensure that we had higher prices in South Australia. Were his warnings heeded? No. The government had better ideas than that. Again, in 2009 the government was warned by two separate independent reports that made it very clear that going beyond 20 per cent penetration of intermittent renewable energy risked stability of the grid. But just three weeks after this the state government increased its renewable energy target to a dangerous 33 per cent.

In 2014, AEMO and ElectraNet raised concerns, when they did an investigation into intermittent renewable energy here in South Australia, that this could lead to statewide power outages because of reduced systems security. Again, just a few weeks later where was the Premier? I will tell you where he was: he was burning fossil fuels and flying over to Paris to have his moment in the sun, with 57 Films in tow, to announce that South Australia was going to have a 50 per cent renewable energy target. There were numerous warnings, but this government ignored each and every one of them. This Premier and this Minister for Energy put their ideology ahead of the interests of every South Australian, and now this state is paying the price.

On 15 March this year, the Premier was asked at a press conference to explain the offer that was put to the people of South Australia, via the government, to keep the Northern power plant in Port Augusta open. He said there was no such deal. Two days later, in front of 650 witnesses he was asked the question: what was the offer that was put on the table from Alinta to keep affordable reliable base load power here in South Australia to manage the transition to renewable energy? He said there was no offer. The moderator said, 'Are you sure there was no offer?' His answer was, 'No offer, no offer.' This Premier was completely and utterly caught with his pants down, and 650 witnesses can attest that that was the response of this Premier.

This was the most serious of all cover-ups because now, of course, we have full visibility as to what that offer was. That was an offer to keep the lights on in South Australia. That was an offer to keep 450 people employed in Port Augusta and Leigh Creek. That was an offer, which was an affordable offer here in South Australia, of \$8 million—\$8 million to ensure that there was still payroll tax being paid in Port Augusta, still mining royalties being paid in Port Augusta—in fact, \$4.5 million. The net cost of this offer was just \$3.5 million per year, but no way, 'no way Jay'. He said he was not going to go near this offer: it was not in line with what he stood for.

This offer was going to ensure that we kept energy prices affordable here in South Australia. This offer was to ensure that we had stability of our grid here in South Australia, as we moved through to more intermittent renewable energy in South Australia in an orderly fashion, which did not make sure that South Australia could not remain viable on the national stage. Unfortunately, all the warnings were completely ignored. The government said that the offer that was put to the people of South Australia via the government was not a long-term offer.

Let me tell you that nobody said that it was a long-term solution. Alinta, in their offer, did not say this was a long-term solution. In fact, what they did was to give a guarantee for a three-year period to provide energy into our grid in South Australia to keep our prices low and to ensure the stability of our grid. But it was not to be for this Premier. He completely rejected it out of hand. We asked in parliament yesterday: what due diligence did the government actually do? I asked the Premier yesterday: did you do a cost-benefit analysis on the offer that was put forward? Not one shred of evidence was provided by the Premier.

So, we asked the energy minister: can you provide any evidence that the proper due diligence was done by this government to consider this offer to keep affordable base load power in

South Australia to manage the transition? None—there was no due diligence done by this government. This government is completely and utterly negligent, and they put every household, every business and every jobseeker in a perilous situation here in South Australia. They have blamed everybody else. They have blamed every person in this state and in this country other than themselves.

Just let me take a quick look at some of the people they think are responsible for the crisis we now have. Of course, they blame the Liberals. They blame the National Electricity Market. They blamed AEMO. They blamed bad weather. They blame coal—of course, coal is the big culprit. They have refused to accept any responsibility. They have even refused to apologise to the people of South Australia. The Premier and the energy minister in South Australia are dangerous ideologues. They will see no facts. They will speak no facts. All they can do is cover up, mislead and lie to the people of South Australia.

Now the government is saying, 'We've got ourselves into a big hole over here and we need somebody to dig us out. Who is going to dig us out?' The taxpayers of South Australia. Again, we see this repeated position of this government. They create a mess and now the taxpayers in South Australia—already burdened with the highest taxes, the highest regulation, the highest water prices and the highest electricity prices—have to pay for this government's gross incompetence. How much is it going to cost them? It will cost \$558 million to solve the crisis that Labor themselves have inflicted upon South Australia with the policy settings they have put in place.

As if it is not bad enough that businesses in South Australia have already had to foot a bill of more than half a billion dollars in lost business and cost of business because of the instability of our grid, as if it is not enough that businesses and households in South Australia have to wear the highest prices in the entire nation, now, given those two situations, the government says, 'That's not enough pain. That is not enough pain for you and you need to wear more of the pain in South Australia,' and that is going to come in the version of a \$558 million hit to the taxpayers of South Australia.

What are they going to get for this? Are they going to get some nice, clean, green energy in South Australia? I will tell you what they are going to get. One of the central points of the government's plan is diesel generators dotted right across the state. We ask the question: is this some sort of new, clean diesel? I do not think so. This is the irony of the situation that Labor has inflicted on the people of South Australia: we are now going to have diesel generators to ensure the stability of the grid in South Australia. What a disgrace.

Batteries, we are going to have batteries, but again when we asked questions in the parliament: how long are these going to last for? Maybe five years. How are they going to be disposed of? No idea. How much is it going to cost for the disposal? We have not gone out to the market yet. Herein lies the problem: a two-week expression of interest because we are in crisis. Why are we in crisis? Because that man and that man refuse to accept an offer along ideological lines, and they have plunged the state into a serious position of disadvantage because of it.

We have a new \$360 million emergency-only gas-fired generator in South Australia. We have no idea when it is going to be built. In fact, the Premier said that he thought it would be built by the end of this year. Of course, he has been back-peddalling at a rapid rate of knots. There is no possible way that this is going to be delivered by the end of this year. What we do know is that it is going to cost \$360 million to put this in place, possibly because it has not gone out to market yet. Again, we asked in the parliament yesterday: what is going to be the operating expense? What is the loss inflicted upon the people of South Australia each and every year? What do they say? No idea. What is the interest going to be on this project? No idea. What is going to be the depreciation on this asset? No idea.

This is a government without any idea and with no interest in the people of South Australia whatsoever. The \$360 million sounds like a marketing plan rather than a plan that is going to deliver energy security and lower prices for the people of South Australia and all because this government did not have a plan. They hated coal. They did not have a plan. They have never had a plan and nothing has actually changed here in South Australia.

Mr Speaker, remember when we last had a government as guilty and as gutless as this one? Remember the collapse of the State Bank that proved so costly to every single South Australian?

Remember when Labor did that? Well, let me tell you that they are doing it again. They are doing it again because it is in their DNA. Despite many warnings, they denied that there was a problem until it was far too late. They condemn Liberals for asking the pertinent questions.

See the parallels between what happened with the State Bank and what happened here? They refused to accept responsibility and then they tried to cover up the government failures, all the while costing every single household and every single business in South Australia dearly. The Liberals dug South Australia out of that hole by being willing to take decisions necessary to restore the state's finances. Now we are in another hole because Labor will not change their ways.

The refusal to keep the Northern power station operating is the worst government policy decision since the State Bank collapse in 1991. We now have a situation where we are going to have a billion dollar clean-up by this government, despite also having this uncompetitive situation of the highest cost and least reliable grid in the nation. It should not have happened. It was completely and utterly avoidable.

This parliament has set a standard for public administration in an attempt to avoid the incompetence and the negligence that have riddled this government's energy policy. I refer to the maladministration as it is identified in the ICAC Act. All South Australians are paying for the incompetence and the negligence of this government. With no apology, no acceptance of responsibility, only the naked arrogance of denying, misleading and lying to the people of South Australia, this government is no longer worthy of the confidence of this house.

The SPEAKER: The government benches heard the opposition's lead speaker in silence. I will be applying the sessional order without warning. Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:22): Thank you, Mr Speaker. The only reason that this motion is being brought to this house at this time is because of the growing confidence of the South Australian community in this government. I welcome the opportunity to invite this parliament to express their confidence in them through resolution today. The reason why there is this growing sense of confidence in the South Australian community in this government is because it has taken one of the most significant public policy issues confronting our state, something that affects the lives of every citizen, something that affects the basic safety of every citizen, the livelihood of every business, and has seen a threat to it and has responded assertively to remedy it.

It has done that in the face of a federal government that has offered no cooperation and, indeed, has been the architect of many of the challenges that we have sought to address. What it has decided to do is to take charge of its energy future. What this government mapped out on the day after the last completely avoidable blackout on 8 February was to announce that we are going to take charge of our energy future.

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morphett will depart under the sessional orders for an hour.

The honourable member for Morphett having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: We told the people of South Australia that we would take charge of our energy future. The people of South Australia want us to be self-reliant. They want us to stand on our own two feet and to actually have control of our energy future. We produced this plan, the plan that has been published and is receiving wide acclaim, not just from commentators, from people who understand the energy markets and how they operate, but also from ordinary everyday South Australians. There is not a place I can go in South Australia at the moment where I do not have someone coming up to me wanting to engage me on this energy plan and congratulating the government on the steps it has taken.

The reason we are here debating this motion is because those in opposition are in a panic. They realise they have offered no solution. The Leader of the Opposition also understands that his leadership is on the line, that questions are being asked of him. What we have seen over the course of the couple of months since that last event was the guffawing of the Leader of the Opposition, the national parliamentary Liberal Party's—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Heysen contralto will be quiet.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —attempts to ridicule South Australia from across the border. Those smiles very quickly turned to grimaces on the next day as we saw load shedding in New South Wales, and as word filtered through to the manufacturing bases of New South Wales and Victoria and they saw the electricity contracts being offered, the forward contract prices, now rivalling and exceeding South Australia's prices. What was a South Australian problem very quickly became a National Electricity Market crisis.

Of course, spectacularly, when the energy minister came to town and once again wanted to wag his finger at us and ask us to quietly participate in a process that he had already nobbled, he received an assertive response from me, and every South Australian who had any sense of self-respect and pride stood up and cheered. That is what happened. The reason we are here debating this motion today is because the Leader of the Opposition feels his grasp on this issue being lost.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition will depart for the next hour for breach of the sessional orders.

The honourable member for Dunstan having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: He is losing his grip on an issue that he was hoping would allow him to slide quietly into government in much the same way as he sought to do in the 2014 election—no policies, just hoping to point attention to some challenge or misfortune that might befall South Australia and try to shift blame, offering no positive solutions for the future, hoping to slide into government. But the people of South Australia are more intelligent. They are asking themselves the deeper questions.

I notice that the Leader of the Opposition could not even bring himself to actually assert one of the main points in this motion of no confidence. He said, 'When the state government plunged the state into.' He could not even get out the last words because he knows that that idea, that somehow the blackout was caused by renewable energy, was completely rebutted by AEMO in its final report concerning the blackout on 28 September. He could not even bring himself to use the words because this mess they have been peddling to the people of South Australia has never been—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The members for Adelaide and Hartley are warned. There will not be a further warning.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The people of South Australia understand that they have been spun a story by those opposite about the way in which renewable energy—

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond will depart under the sessional orders for flagrant breach of the standing orders for the next hour.

The honourable member for Hammond having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I have spoken about the motivations for this motion, which are entirely about the Leader of the Opposition feeling as though he has lost control of this debate. If you just look at the terms of the motion, you can understand that this is a leader who simply does not even understand that what he is talking about here represents a gross act of hypocrisy.

The Leader of the Opposition seeks to advance the idea that we were warned about some event that we should have responded to. The only warning we received from the Leader of the Opposition in relation to this matter was in 2012, when he warned us that we were not going hard enough on renewable energy. This is the warning we received from the Leader of the Opposition. If you look at the much vaunted 2036 plan, something that was actually announced after the announced closure of Northern, there is no reference to the word 'electricity' in that plan, and 'energy' is mentioned only in passing in relation to mining and energy.

If this was the signal moment, if this was the warning that should have been ringing in our ears, why does it find no representation in the key policy document of the Liberal Party of South Australia? The Leader of the Opposition advances a hypocritical proposition on this question. If you go to the Warburton review, the very review which was set up by former prime minister Tony Abbott, it was not set up to be kind to renewable energy. The Warburton review itself finds, on the basis of AEMO advice that, while there are some technical challenges, there is no difficulty with integrating renewable energy into the National Electricity Market. This is as late as 2015.

These are the so-called warnings that have been provided by the authorities who are entrusted with the responsibility of managing this market. The one, though, that is most galling is this suggestion that we have continually denied responsibility for the energy crisis that somehow we have caused in circumstances where those opposite have consistently—

Mr Bell: Yes, you have caused it.

The SPEAKER: The member for Mount Gambier will withdraw under the sessional order for an hour for flagrant breach of the standing orders.

The honourable member for Mount Gambier having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: We have consistently advocated for a price on carbon in this place since 2007—for 10 years, a decade. Imagine the changes that could have occurred to the South Australian and the national energy market if we had had a price on carbon in place: the investment opportunities, the stabilisation of the grid, the cleanliness of the grid, the downward pressure on prices. Those opposite are seeking to advance the proposition that we are at fault for their vandalism of the National Electricity Market, and this is also from the people who privatised this very South Australian electricity market and made sure it had fewer connections with other states that could have provided some modicum of protection.

They seek to drive up the price of these assets but leave us vulnerable at the end of this network. Those opposite are seeking to advance the proposition that we have not accepted responsibility. Indeed, we have. We have stepped up with an energy plan which is an intelligent, competent and effective way of dealing with the system. The reason why we are seeing this motion being promoted now is because they can see this plan is working.

Yesterday, we had the announcement of the reopening of the Pelican Point power station—an absolutely crucial element, an additional 240 megawatts of power being brought into the system which will assist us both in driving down prices and increasing stability. What we know is that Pelican Point would not have opened if Northern had been operating. It is as simple as that. That is what the owners say, that is what every sensible commentator says. Look at the time it has taken for Pelican Point to open from the time of Northern closing.

The markets do not respond when governments involve themselves and sterilise these markets. Just imagine if somehow we had been able to keep Northern open, even for any period. The period during which they would have been open would have sterilised the investment opportunities of other people coming in, the long-term solutions which we are now seeing put in place. Let's go to this so-called Northern deal, the dud deal.

The Northern deal was no deal at all. What it involved was the suggestion that they would pull up stumps at any time. It is illusory to say they would stay here for five years or three years or for any period of time. They simply could not guarantee us they could stay for even one week. We were meant to hand over taxpayers' dollars, sterilise the market in terms of future investment, on the basis that they could not simply give us any commitment at all.

As for the question of due diligence, our prudential advisers advised us against accepting this deal. Imagine the scandal if we had not accepted their advice. Imagine the scandal if we had applied scarce taxpayers' dollars to somehow kick the can down the road for some unspecified period of time, offering no certainty for the people of Port Augusta, offering no certainty for the people of South Australia in terms of their energy security needs.

What we have seen demonstrated here today through the moving of this motion is a Leader of the Opposition who is beginning to understand that people are questioning his leadership. They

are questioning the fact that we have an energy plan, one that he was demanding that we produce, and the moment we produced it he said we should wait for the Finkel report. This is a Leader of the Opposition who at the end of the day simply always bows down and pays homage to Canberra. This is the simple and only modus operandi for the Leader of the Opposition.

The reason that people cheered us when we stood up and asserted South Australia's interest is because they want somebody to stand up for South Australia. They do not want some dud deal that offers the illusion of coal as our future. They want an energy plan that secures their energy future.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:35): I stand here to support the Leader of the Opposition and the motion, as all members on this side of the house do. It is very clear that by any standard this government has failed with regard to energy policy and the delivery of electricity. We have the highest electricity prices in the nation. We have the least reliable electricity in the nation. By any definition, that is a failure. Unfortunately, what we have with that is the highest unemployment in the nation as well. It is not a coincidence because they go together. These things all come together after 15 years of this government in office. There is no-one else to blame. No other state has anything similar to this with regard to electricity.

This government has failed South Australians and failed the people of Port Augusta and Leigh Creek as well, people in my electorate. This government has failed South Australia in outcomes, failed South Australia in process and failed South Australia with secrecy and duplicity. Every household and every employer in South Australia has been failed by this government. If this government genuinely believed that what it was doing was right, it would not fight so hard to keep information secret from the public.

The public history that the government wants South Australians to know about is very simple. In June 2015, Alinta announced closure plans. In November 2015, Alinta clarified that closure would be in March 2016, and the power station and the mine actually closed in May 2016. The government would like it to be that simple. The government would like that to be all that anybody knows, apart from the fact that along with that went 438 direct jobs. You could probably double that number with regard to full-time jobs employed by other organisations where that employment is directly related to the existence of the mine and the power station.

This actual history is slowly becoming apparent. It takes FOIs, it takes the Ombudsman to step in and it takes all sorts of organisations and people to get information out, and there is more to come. We know that Alinta made offers to the government. Of course, now everybody in South Australia knows that Alinta offered that, if the government paid \$25 million, it would keep its power station operating for another three years. We also know that, from the moment Alinta announced its closure plans, base future prices for electricity in South Australia skyrocketed. From the moment that the power station actually closed, the spot market skyrocketed and all households and all South Australian employers and employees have suffered with that ever since.

But the government provides many excuses, many rubbish excuses. They blame privatisation—absolute nonsense. Victoria and South Australia were both privatised at approximately the same time 19 years ago, yet Victoria does not have these problems. Victoria has had the cheapest electricity in the nation for many years now. They blame the federal government. If that were true, all states would be affected the same. They blame the national market operator, they blame the generators and they blame the retailers. They say the other states hate us. It just goes on and on.

They say that there was not going to be enough coal. Alinta was getting close to running out of the coal that it had exposed, but in early 2015 Alinta publicly presented a plan to invest to access enough coal for the Port Augusta power station to see the power station through until 2032. However, they were not able to pursue that realistic, researched plan because government policy forced the closure of the Port Augusta power station. As well as shamelessly blaming everyone else, they shamelessly take credit that is not due to them. In question time yesterday and just now, we heard the Premier trying to take credit for the fact that the Pelican Point power station has come back on.

Anybody who knows anything about this industry knows that Pelican Point and ENGIE have been working towards that reopening for many months. In fact, it has actually been the plan and their

ambition for longer than that. Everybody knows that it has nothing to do with the government announcement that was made two weeks ago. They have been working on this for a long time, and it is nothing to do with the government, but the government will shamelessly try to take credit for it.

The government's \$550 million taxpayer-funded—so, electricity consumer-funded—package that it wants to embark upon to fix the problem that it created is so popular with the market that the ASX announced that base future prices have actually gone up 8 per cent on average over the next three years. In fact, there are consumers willing to pay 17 per cent more for their electricity in three years' time than they would have had to pay on the market the day before the plan was announced. That is how confident the market is of the success of this plan.

AEMO has said, since the plan was released, that they predict that there will be 125 days in the next two years when South Australia will have a reserve shortfall. AEMO announced that since the government's plan was announced. AEMO do not have any faith in the plan either. We must have a sensible, well-planned, well managed transition away from fossil fuels towards renewable energy, but we cannot have the overnight, ideologically driven, politically driven pursuit of renewables that are without storage immediately, as the government has pursued for many years. This is not something we are dealing with only at the moment.

The government was warned in 2009 by consultants it paid to give it advice that it should not increase its renewable energy target from 20 per cent to 33 per cent but did it anyway. In fact, the economist the government uses to help sell its plan, Mr Danny Price from Frontier Economics, who is well regarded, said in January last year that the problems South Australia is facing are actually the fault of the government. He said very clearly that government policy has created these problems. Good on him for trying to help the government get out of these problems that it created, but that is proof that the government wants to spend \$550 million of taxpayers' money to fix a problem that it created.

Keeping the Port Augusta power station open for a few more years would have and could have contributed to this transition. It would have meant that we would have had lower prices during the transition, we could have had fewer blackouts during the transition and we could have had fewer job losses during the transition. We also would have had an effective market with reasonable wholesale prices and reasonable retail prices, instead of the extreme volatility we are seeing.

I am sure that even ENGIE is looking at their situation at the moment, seeing the wildly low and high prices and thinking, 'Goodness, what have we done? Where are we going?' Everybody needs a degree of stability. I am not saying that they need certainty, but they need a degree of stability. We are seeing a range of extraordinary prices in South Australia due to government policy because we have too many wind farms installed. I never say that we should not have any, but there is a saturation point. Until that energy can be stored, there is a saturation point beyond which we cannot go.

We on this side of the house know that we have to move towards renewables. We actively promote the idea of trying to access pumped hydro, trying to access solar thermal at Port Augusta, trying to access biomass—a whole range of things that can contribute—but until we get there, we need stability and we need base load electricity in the market. This government had the opportunity to spend \$25 million of taxpayers' money.

That would have avoided a significant share of the estimated \$500 million that blackouts have cost our state, and that would have avoided a significant share of government investment to move forward towards a future with far more reliable renewables. We need renewable energy that can be stored, that can be dispatched on demand, not renewable energy that is only dispatchable when it is generated if it is windy, if it is sunny. That is the world we have to get to.

Taking the Alinta offer, paying \$25 million—a lot of money but nothing compared with the \$0.5 billion that has already been lost through blackouts, by independent assessment, and the \$0.5 billion that the government wants to pay for its policy—would have made the transition far more sensible and far more successful. By not taking that transition, the government has damaged Arrium, the government has damaged Nyrstar, the government has damaged every household and every employer, large and small, in our state, and the government has damaged the people of my electorate.

Figures released today by the ABS show that Australia, from 30 June 2015 until 30 June 2016, has had a 1.4 per cent population growth. South Australia has only had a 0.5 per cent population growth, but Port Augusta, the Flinders Ranges and the outback have had a negative 1.1 per cent population growth. We are also suffering in Port Augusta with a 9.7 per cent unemployment rate.

These are the things that the government have done. They have hurt every single South Australian along the way, but they have hurt the people of Port Augusta, Leigh Creek and the north of the state more than they have hurt others. If this government had had the opportunity to spend \$25 million to keep a significant employer and essential service provider going in Adelaide, they would have spent the money in a heartbeat. They refuse to do it in the north of the state.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:47): Those were moving words that would have had some credibility if he could have pointed to a policy to alleviate all the ails he was talking about in the Mid North if he only had a policy to incentivise more storage, if he only had a policy to talk about reinvesting in Port Augusta, or if he only had a policy to point to and say, 'Here is the Liberal Party's plan for 2036.' How about 2018?

If only we were less than a year away from the election and the shadow minister could stand up talking about what ails his community and point to the policy differences that he could say will solve these issues. Alas, all we have is talking about the past, bereft of any ideas—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —bereft of any policy—

The SPEAKER: Treasurer, just a minute. The member for Stuart was heard in silence, yet the member for Mitchell and the member for Adelaide are immediately heckling the next speaker for the government. I will not hesitate to act. Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —bereft of any intelligent idea opposite to alleviate what they claim is ailing our state. It is one thing to point out a problem; it is another thing to fix it. It is another thing entirely to fix it. We will not be lectured by people who have no policy on energy about what our plan is until they come up with an alternative. Until then, it is intellectually dishonest for the opposition to be talking about electricity given, I believe, they are the guilty party here.

We have, of course, letters being released into the public against the wishes of the private companies that have come to the government seeking assistance. The Leader of the Opposition believes that this letter will make him Premier. I can advise him that he needs a bit more than a report in *The Advertiser* to make him Premier. This letter is dated 6 May 2015, and I will give you a snapshot of the National Electricity Market at that time on 6 May 2015.

In April 2012, Alinta notified the market that it would only operate in the summer months, between October and March. Investment and productivity improvements enabled Alinta to bring the Northern power station to normal service again in September 2014, and the company told the market that the Port Augusta council and the South Australian community had a long-term commercial future ahead of it. In June 2014, Pelican Point station advised the market that in the April of the following year, 2015, the power station would only operate one unit in the market and that the other unit would be mothballed. I am giving you a snapshot of where we were when we received these letters.

Subsequently, the Australian market operator in 2015 put out a statement of opportunity updates for South Australia confirming the withdrawal of the remaining 231 megawatts of capacity at the Pelican Point power station in the winter of 2016. Also, on 10 December 2014, AGL announced that it would be withdrawing from service 480 megawatts from the Torrens Island power station from its A units in 2017. So, let's be clear. At the time, the Northern power station was not the only generator looking at withdrawing from the Australian energy market. It was not the only one. There were lots.

Let's go through the details of the supposed deal that those opposite are so enamoured by. Initially, consider what the Alinta letter says about site restoration costs. The initial estimate of restoration costs is \$126 million set independently by consultants Jacobs. Alinta then revised these

costs down to \$53 million thanks to a different consultant, McMahon Services, but admits that there were risks, and I quote: 'There will never be complete certainty until site restoration is undertaken.'

Secondly, how do we think every other business, in light of what I have just told you about withdrawing out of the market, would react to the government's subsidy for one of its competitors? This is not a game of draughts: this is a game of chess—you have to think more than one move ahead.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Stop. The first in the queue would have been AGL.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: They can laugh all they like. That is exactly how they behaved when they were in office. First, especially AGL and ENGIE had already notified the market that they were withdrawing capacity from the market. Quite rightly, they would have come to the government and said, 'You're subsidising Alinta, therefore you will subsidise us.' That was perfectly reasonable. What would that have cost? Ten million? Fifty million? A hundred million? Hundreds of millions? Of course, there would be no limit to the demands it would put on the public purse once the government showed a weakness and a propensity to invest in a private market. For obvious reasons Alinta, in its correspondence, does not raise these prospects.

Secondly, let's look at the economic conditions of the company and the reason this all actually began. Another piece of correspondence that the opposition do not like talking about, also released to the media against the company's wishes, details the financial difficulty that Alinta was being faced with of \$300 million in negative cash flow—\$300 million. Even those opposite surely would be able to understand that Alinta was running at a loss and increasingly becoming an uneconomic business. One of those reasons was because the resource the company relied on so heavily was coal.

The Department of State Development website indicates that the economic recovery of coal from Leigh Creek was only 20 per cent of the estimated coal resource. It was only 20 per cent, but you do not hear that in the questions and the statements of the opposition. Even the thermal value of the coal was about 15 megajoules per kilogram, or half the average thermal value of the Latrobe Valley coal, which has the added advantage that it does not have to be travelling 250 kilometres from the mine to the nearest power station. What that means is that Alinta had to burn twice as much coal as their competitors for the same amount of power, and that is why they were losing money.

Jeff Dimery is one of the most astute and smartest business leaders in this country. Make no mistake about it, this man is a powerhouse. He is clever, he is astute, he is charming and, most of all, he understands this market better than most. He pointed out in a radio interview that they were running out of coal and that the quality of the coal Alinta was mining towards the end was substandard and required a sophisticated blending process to raise the quality sufficient enough to burn through the station.

Let's get to the real crux of the argument. One of the main reasons that we could not accept a deal with Alinta was the quality of their resource. Finally, during all the long, complex and often changing negotiations involved with this company, there remained at the very end one clause the government could not accept—that the company reserves the right to give a month's notice to close no matter what we paid them. Keeping the plant operating for three years was always going to be difficult under this prospect, and the government did not believe, and none of our advisers believed, it was viable.

Let's discuss the hypothetical for a second. Let's say that we did pay Alinta this money, that we forked out the money to prolong what was going to happen to Port Augusta anyway. Let's pay the \$25 million and then on 1 December 2016, before summer, they say, 'We are issuing you a month's notice. We're closing in the peak of summer,' unless, of course, we revise the offer. There is no battery in place and no other plan in place. We had a deal for three years of operation. The member for Stuart is happy. We are prolonging what is going on in Port Augusta.

Then this very astute businessman says, 'You are about to be short if I turn my power station off. How about we revise the offer? Instead of \$25 million, let's make it \$100 million because we're friends, because we're close, because it's so important to the local community. You pay us \$100 million or I'm turning my 500 megawatts off, and if you don't like it the lights go out.' What would we do then? Could we get generators in time? Could Pelican Point source gas in time? Could we have other generation come in place? Would Torrens Island have mothballed their other 480 megawatts? What would Pelican Point have done?

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert will depart under the sessional order for the next hour.

The honourable member for Schubert having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Let's get to the real point. They were not offering us a solution at all: they were seeking to clear the decks. I will quote Mr Dimery again. He told *The West Australian* last year, 'Not being exposed to coal is a massive bonus for Alinta...we're unshackled and we have a growth platform.' Ultimately, this businessman confirmed that Flinders Power would be closing its operations on 31 March 2016, and Alinta was sold just last month, I think, for a price tag of \$4 billion.

They wanted out, they wanted another company to run this, they wanted us to pay for it so they could sell their assets, and they have convinced members opposite that it was nirvana. God help us if these people ever sit on this side. Talk about knocking on their door for a great deal—I have a bridge for sale, do you want one? It is unbelievable. They would have paid up, no questions asked. I have to say that the idea that we are going to pin South Australia's hope on a failing coalmine and an old power station is appalling.

What has happened since that second unit has come online at Pelican Point? We are a net exporter of energy. We are becoming more self-reliant. We have a plan to become more self-reliant, while members opposite reminisce about the glory days of coal. What a joke. If it was so important to you, why did you sell it?

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:58): As the rap sheet of this dysfunctional and deceitful pair is rolled out, it becomes abundantly clear why the people of South Australia have no confidence in this government. But it gets worse. By late 2014, as the future of the Northern power station was starting to crumble and the hopeless mismanagement of transfer to any alternative reliable and affordable power supply was rolled out by this government, like a tsunami the whole of the northern area was facing massive job losses and a fractured energy supply and market.

So, what does this government do? What does this dysfunctional duo do on your behalf? They batten down the hatches, they hide in the bunkers and they certainly try to hide the evidence. They implement a strategy which is to block and delay and obfuscate every opportunity for the people of South Australia to know what is really going on. In terms of the freedom of information applications lodged in May 2015, as we approach the announcement by the Northern power station that it will be closing, the government indicate that they will not be, via the Freedom of Information Act—

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Newland will depart for the next hour under the sessional order.

The honourable member for Newland having withdrawn from the chamber:

Ms CHAPMAN: The correspondence for the preceding 12 months is sought. The government do not produce that material. An application is made to the Ombudsman to consider the matter as to whether there is any just reason or exemption opportunity to have that material released.

Finally, after a number of processes, on 19 September 2016—that is, nearly a year and half later—the Ombudsman directs the government to produce the documents. A month later, they do not appeal and they still do not produce them. We have to write to remind them that they have to give us the documents. Eventually, we get the documents. That is the letter of January 2015. You

have all read it. South Australia has read it, I can tell you. Then we come to the 6 May 2015 letter—again, a hard-fought and kept secret. I want to tell South Australians, via you, that there are another 30 documents sitting there admitted to exist but refused to be released. They are being kept secret.

What has been going on over in the Rau ranch while all this has been going on? This is the Attorney-General, the most senior officer in this state. While the government is being sued in the Supreme Court by an aggrieved party in the Gillman deal, there is a Supreme Court order out there requiring the government to disclose documents. It is all familiar, isn't it? Renewal SA is refusing to release documents. Again, they had to be released under freedom of information application. The Auditor-General by this stage is crawling all over this action.

By October 2014, the government has said, 'It's all good. We are now going to publish some new guidelines in respect of the unsolicited bid guidelines'. It gets worse, I am sorry to say. By January 2015, about the time these letters are being written, the Attorney-General is dealing with, firstly, the Auditor-General's Report, which comes down criticising the process on Gillman, explaining the significance of what has to be done and what should be done in that regard, and also that month ICAC confirms that they are conducting an investigation into Gillman. By 13 January, the Supreme Court decision of Justice Malcolm Blue is released and handed down in respect of that particular activity—another damning indictment. All this is going on.

It must have been a shocking Christmas for the Attorney-General to have to read all this material. Nevertheless, it is all there. By 10 February 2015, he walks into this parliament, his government having been ordered by the Supreme Court to release documents, having been smashed by the decision of the Supreme Court, having been held up to ridicule, clearly by the processes operated by the Auditor-General and, ultimately, a few months later Mr Lander QC gives a complete smashing of his government, including two counts of maladministration. He walks into the parliament and dumps two folders of documents on his table in the disclosure of those documents. He is caught out, ordered by the courts to release them, and only under those circumstances does he listen to it and action it.

The SPEAKER: Alas, the member's time has expired.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (15:03): The Premier and the Treasurer have exposed the absolute naiveté of the leader's thinking on this matter. The lack of business acumen, the lack of an alternative plan and the poor understanding of the energy market and the business of government foreshadow the mistakes those opposite would make if in government. Theatrical accusation of lies and deceit under privilege does not help South Australia to face up to the challenges we now look at in the eye.

After 20 years in politics, and after listening to this motion, I have come to the conclusion that politicians generally fall into three categories. First, there are the movers, those motivated by vision, policy agendas and the desire to change the world, people who look for solutions rather than dwelling on the problems, action people who get things done.

Then there are the groovers, those motivated by the power, the position and the personal excitement of politics. They grandstand about the problems, seeking to pass blame for effect and for a personal political benefit. Rather than getting things done, they rip things down. Then there are the passengers, who just go along for the ride in politics, making little difference. As the state government's energy plan shows, on this issue the Premier is the mover and, sadly, the Leader of the Opposition, the mover of this motion, is a groover.

Policy for a better future seems to be a no-go zone for the leader. This motion is retrospective, it ruminates about the past but it fails to deal with the future. It offers no solution. Under the leader, the opposition's position is a set of contradictions. They claim to support renewables but oppose an emissions trading scheme or a price on carbon. The leader is wedded to brown coal for the future of South Australia but his energy spokesperson has told parliament—and he said it again today—that he supports solar farms and a renewable future. The leader opposed the debate on a nuclear future, yet laid a claim that he would support nuclear energy for South Australia as part of his plan.

Under this leader, members opposite claim to support gas generation, yet they argue for coal. They claim to be financially prudent and good business managers, yet their support of an Alinta subsidy, as the Treasurer has eloquently exposed, would put the taxpayers of South Australia at an unlimited financial risk and fatal damage to the budget, with nothing to back up the assertions we have just heard that it would fix the problem. The leader wants a fossil fuel future, but he locks the gate on gas exploration. He demands that South Australia keep an old, brown coal power station open, yet his Prime Minister refuses the same course of action at Victoria's Hazelwood power station. It is messy.

South Australia's political history is marked by significant policy decisions on supply of electricity to underpin its industry and to meet its domestic needs. These decisions required political courage. In the mid-1940s, when then Liberal state premier Tom Playford moved to nationalise the Australian Electricity Supply Company, his own party, the Liberal and Country League, split, and the legislation to create the Electricity Trust of South Australia passed in 1946, and only passed with the support of the ALP and Independent members in parliament.

Some 50 years later, in the 1990s, there were more changes afoot in the energy sector. State-run electricity companies were becoming inefficient, and leading economic reformers such as then treasurer Paul Keating were advocating for a national market and some states considered the option of privatising their utilities. Generally, those initiatives were supported by the then federal Liberal opposition. Again, the intensity of the debate caused a political divide. It saw the creation of a new national market hinged on a set of regulatory arrangements and rules that enabled the electricity market to work effectively and efficiently in the best interest of all Australians.

Here we are in 2017, 90 years after the Adelaide Electric Supply Company opened for business, and we are at another watershed moment. The national system has failed and is broken. It is so broken that a failure by the automated software systems of the market operator, AEMO, to properly manage wind energy and extreme weather events resulted in a statewide blackout. It simply is not up to date. Further market operator failures in February this year resulted in unnecessary load shedding events. That system was designed 20 years ago, and the rules that set out how that market would operate are now 20 years old.

While we wait for the national parliament and the national market operators to catch up with the new era, to move into the 21st century, South Australia has developed a plan to improve our position and to transform our market. Already that plan has resulted in new investment, with yesterday's announcement of a deal between Origin and ENGIE to make full use of the gas-fired generation from Pelican Point.

What is the alternative South Australian energy plan? The leader who has moved this motion has proposed paying money to an old coal-fired plant to maybe hang around for a few years, losing money every year and increasing the cost of remediation to South Australian taxpayers, with no guarantee it would have solved any of the issues we have faced. The Marshall option is the 1946 plan. He says his vision is that '2036' starts now. This week his vision looks more like '1946, let's go back there'; 1946 was a great time that was. It is the year that Tupperware was first sold in the USA. I am sure the deputy leader would have been there. That is the Marshall vision—brown coal and Tupperware containers to carry your lunch.

The voters of South Australia recognise that there is no going back to brown coal or black coal and that we need to move on to a new energy mix. Battery storage and renewable energy and a range of other prospects are included. That is all outlined in the government's sound and assertive policy, entitled 'It's time to take charge of our energy future'. The government has come up with a plan of action that will deal with them and this issue in the short term, the medium term and the long term.

I simply ask: what has happened to policy development on the other side? I have listened to the cabinet debates. I have listened to the evidence and the various options. I have seen the options considered and chosen, and I have seen the public testing of that information. I have seen the quality of the decision-making process, and I am also very aware of the quality of the decision-making process opposite.

An honourable member: No, you're not.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Yes, I am. I can see it has gone downhill even further, should that be possible. We have a plan. What is yours? This motion is based on a backward looking vision based on brown coal and previous eras from a world that has simply moved on. You need to get with it. What we should have been dealing with today was the opposition's alternative plan, a battle of ideas. Instead, all we have is a muddle.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 20
 Noes 24
 Majority 4

AYES

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

NOES

Bedford, F.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Caica, P.	Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.
Digance, A.F.C.	Gee, J.P.	Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.
Hildyard, K.	Hughes, E.J.	Kenyon, T.R. (teller)
Key, S.W.	Koutsantonis, A.	Mullighan, S.C.
Odenwalder, L.K.	Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.
Rankine, J.M.	Rau, J.R.	Snelling, J.J.
Vlahos, L.A.	Weatherill, J.W.	Wortley, D.

PAIRS

Pisoni, D.G.	Brock, G.G.
--------------	-------------

Motion thus negatived.

Ministerial Statement

LUCAS, HON. R.I.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:16): I table a copy of a ministerial statement made in the other place by the Hon. Kyam Maher.

SMALL BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE

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) (15:17): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Around 43 representatives from small business associations attended this week's Small Business Roundtable, the ninth since it was established by the Weatherill government in 2014. The round table is a great opportunity for associations that represent thousands of small businesses to have direct access to ministers on a range of topics.

Wednesday's forum received an overview of improvements to business costs through the successful reforms to the former WorkCover scheme. Under the guidance of new legislation and the good work of the Deputy Premier, the average levy on employers has dropped from 2.75 per cent in July 2015 to 1.95 per cent today. This is a fantastic achievement.

The impact of this reform is a return of \$180 million a year to small businesses across the state. Over a four-year period, that equates to well over half a billion dollars. That money can be used for expansion, wages or improved facilities. It is worth noting that if any other business costs were reduced by \$180 million there would be loud acclamation. This achievement has been very much the silent achievement of this government.

They would also welcome the recent Westpac national economic report that showed that South Australia's economy strengthened in 2016, with state final demand rising by 2.1 per cent in the December quarter. The same report shows employment was 1.1 per cent higher than a year earlier in the December quarter and there is an evident stabilisation in business investment in response to increased activity.

The Small Business Roundtable also discussed the energy plan developed by this government to ensure security of supply. I can advise the house that there was almost uniform recognition around the room that the national market rules had failed to keep pace with the evolution of the national market. Electricity costs are a serious concern to small business. We need to get them down and we are working very hard to do so.

Also on the agenda was a briefing from *beyondblue*'s general manager, Patrice O'Brien, on the programs that business can access to ensure mentally healthy workplaces. I congratulate *beyondblue* and their sponsors, which include ReturnToWorkSA, for the program called NewAccess, which is used in workplaces and community settings.

At the round table, I announced the expansion of the Export Partnership Program, which will now consider applications from small business associations. This broadening of the program will encourage associations to spread the message about the economic opportunities that exist in exports because that is a fabulous opportunity for small business. There was also an update on the series of one-on-one meetings between my agency and small business associations to hear from business how we can better support them through the new Small Business Statement, to be released in November each year.

I thank the member for Kaurna for his contributions on red tape reduction and the energy plan and the Deputy Premier for his very worthwhile contribution. I thank them for making themselves available for questions and a frank discussion with small business on a regular basis as always. I look forward to the 10th round table in early July when the Treasurer will be able to speak to the Small Business Roundtable about the budget, face questions and answer them bluntly and directly from the floor—a most important process of communication between government and small business which, after all, employs well over 90 per cent of South Australians.

HOUSING AND HOMELESSNESS FUNDING

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) (15:21): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: On Wednesday 29 March 2017, I met with chief executives of community sector agencies to discuss the future of social housing and homelessness funding in South Australia. I called this meeting with community sector partners as a result of recent media reports that the commonwealth government wanted to make significant changes to the current National Affordable Housing Agreement (NAHA). The future status of this funding is not only a state issue: its uncertainty impacts many vulnerable South Australians.

The NAHA brings \$94 million per annum to South Australia to fund private rental, social housing and homelessness services to South Australians. In addition to the National Partnership Agreement on Homelessness, which is due to expire on 30 June 2018, the NAHA provides

homelessness and housing services to around 22,000 homeless people each year and provides nearly 30,000 people with bond and rent assistance to afford renting in the private rental market.

South Australia should be very proud of the genuine collaboration that exists between our community sector agencies and the government. Chief executives recognised this collaboration as enabling us to deliver innovative and responsive services such as our most recent Code Blue and Code Red extreme weather responses to people sleeping rough. At the meeting, other South Australian reform and innovation was also recognised. That included the Safety First response to women and children experiencing domestic and family violence, the Ladder Foyer youth homelessness response connecting young people to education and jobs and the No Wrong Door access to services through homelessness gateways.

At our meeting, we also discussed openly the areas where we continue to strive to do better. They included our responses to Aboriginal people, a joined-up approach with mental health and drug and alcohol services, and improving our emergency accommodation response. In May, I will be chairing a national meeting with housing ministers here in Adelaide. At that meeting, I will call on the Turnbull Liberal government to rule out any changes to NAHA that will divert money from front-line homelessness services.

Grievance Debate

RIVERLAND STORM DAMAGE

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:24): I stand here, 138 days after a devastating hailstorm ripped through the Riverland and marginal Mallee country and decimated a huge amount of country and productive horticulture and agriculture, to put on record my disappointment, which cannot be overstated, at the process for assistance for these impacted growers. The sudden and unprecedented hailstorm left an estimated damage bill of somewhere in the vicinity of \$100 million to nearly 260 properties. The full effects of the storm are yet to be felt. Wine grapes, stone fruits, citrus, almonds, potatoes, onions and cereal crops and more were impacted.

While provisions for mental health support were established immediately, it took 42 days for any funding support to be announced by the state government under the Commonwealth-State Natural Disaster Relief and Recovery Arrangements. Three Riverland councils were given the funding agreements, but they forgot two council areas—the Mid Murray and the Karoonda East Murray areas—that were also damaged by these hailstorms. They were not put on that disaster relief arrangement—outrageous.

Finally, the state government, through PIRSA, have acknowledged that Mid Murray had significant damage, but they have decided that Karoonda East Murray did not have enough damage even though some crops were 100 per cent wiped out. 'Sorry,' is the response I got. The Riverland growers impacted by the storm were offered up to \$10,000 to help clean up and essentially minimise the risk of fruit fly outbreaks. As of this month, just 30 of the 145 contacted growers have made inquiries about storm assistance through the grants.

The problem is that many of the growers themselves had already undertaken clean-up of the damage on their properties weeks before any assistance was announced. We have to remember that growers and farmers are proactive and they cannot just wait. They cannot wait for the slow machine of government. They have to get on and do what they have to do. As far as financial assistance goes, that is it. Despite many concerns being raised time and time again through letters, local media and in this place, the growers have essentially been left with no further financial support and with insurance that nowhere near covers the extent of the damage.

Sunraysia growers, just across the border only 40 kilometres away, were hit by the same storm. They were given an option of concessional loans of up to \$25,000, and Riverland growers were not given that same option because PIRSA has stated that Sunraysia suffered greater damage, but how is the damage measured? The extent of the damage on the Riverland will continue through several seasons, so how was that damage assessed? How was that damage put into the context of a submission?

As I understand it, despite the current guidelines the state government has the option of requesting further assistance from the federal government. A state government-commissioned

independent report highlighted the lengthy delay in response as a deficiency in the storm response process and identified disparity between the Riverland hailstorm and the Virginia flood responses. A local recovery coordinator took 24 days to be appointed to the Riverland disaster compared to just one day in Virginia in northern Adelaide. This storm has impacted on the livelihoods of our food producers—the shining lights of our economy—and the state government appear to have shrugged their shoulders and said, 'You will just have to wear it.'

Take Riverland farmer Steve Brauer, for example. The storm wiped out his entire stone fruit crop, equating to a loss of around \$60,000. As he looks to repair his trees, which may delay crops for some years, and without any income, how will he pay his bills? How will he pay his children's school fees? What will happen to the people who he employed to pick and pack his fruit? I stand here today and call on all levels of government involved in the natural disaster support process to show some compassion and help these growers.

At a time of great need, these farmers have been left to fend for themselves without even a concessional loan to assist. I bet the government will continue to hit them with taxes and levies despite the fact they already and still have no income. I will continue to advocate on behalf of these growers in my electorate of Chaffey impacted by this storm. The South Australian Minister for Agriculture can refer to me in every which way he wants on radio, on TV or here in the chamber; I will not back down.

We must learn from the state government's response to the Riverland hailstorm. This cannot happen again. As Citrus Australia South Australia Region committee member Mark Doecke said, 'It's unfortunate that bureaucracy gets in the way of people who genuinely need help.' We need to support these growers and we need to support South Australia's economy.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (15:29): I rise to promote an important campaign to stop domestic violence. One Million Stars is a campaign focused on ending domestic violence. It is a peaceful, inclusive art project, bringing communities together to discuss and act against domestic violence. One Million Stars was started by talented weaver, Maryann Talia Pau, after the rape and murder of a young woman in her local community. Maryann attributes this quote by Dr Martin Luther King Jr as her inspiration:

Returning hate for hate multiplies hate, adding deeper darkness to a night already devoid of stars. Darkness cannot drive out darkness; only light can do that. Hate cannot drive out hate, only love can do that.

This project aims to have one million woven stars on display at the Gold Coast 2018 Commonwealth Games. Communities around the world are joining together to send stars to the games. These stars are symbolic and represent light, courage and solidarity to end all forms of violence, including violence against women, bullying and racism.

The stars remind us to shine light into the world by being our best and most courageous self, to stand against violent behaviour and to work together to create change. For Maryann, the star is a reminder of her ancestors' skill, courage and innovation to navigate the oceans using the light of the stars. It is a connection to her Samoan and Pacific island culture, her loved ones, her values as an artist, collaborator and sister. This is an important project with a vision for change, and the following facts give momentum to this important life-saving change. We know that:

- in Australia, at least one woman per week is killed by an intimate partner;
- one in four Australian women has experienced physical or sexual violence by an intimate partner;
- women are at least three times more likely than men to experience violence from an intimate partner and five times more likely to need medical attention or hospitalisation due to violence from an intimate partner;
- Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women are more likely to experience high rates and more severe forms of violence compared with other women, being 35 times more likely to experience domestic or family violence and 31 times more likely to need medical attention or hospitalisation with a higher incidence of death;

- intimate partner violence contributes to more deaths, disability and illness in women aged between 15 and 44 than any other preventable risk factor;
- domestic or family violence is the single largest driver of homelessness for women; and
- of the women who experience violence, more than half have children in their care.

This is shameful. We also know the children who have witnessed domestic violence are more likely to:

- show aggressive behaviour;
- develop phobias and insomnia;
- experience anxiety;
- show symptoms of depression;
- have diminished self-esteem;
- demonstrate poor academic performance and problem-solving skills;
- have reduced social competence skills, including low levels of empathy;
- show emotional distress; and
- have physical complaints.

These facts are shameful and must stop. It will be a happy day of celebration when not one woman's life is lost at the hands of a partner who supposedly loves her. We must maintain the outrage and be incensed to generate the momentum to stop this intimate partner terrorism.

Recently, I had an opportunity to view an exhibit of stars while visiting the Cook Islands, and I was inspired by the initiative of witnessing the joining together of the community against domestic violence. This motivated me to act and register my commitment to this project on behalf of South Australia. So, get involved and join me and the South Australian community as we make Stars for South Australia, the name I registered under.

We will send the stars to be displayed at the Gold Coast for the 2018 Commonwealth Games, with all those from other states and countries. Call my office on 8374 1939, or email elder@parliament.sa.gov.au for information on how to get involved and we certainly will assist. Step up and join us as we say no to domestic violence.

FISHING REGULATIONS

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:34): Let me support the member for Elder in saying no to domestic violence. Any effort whatsoever that can go towards doing that is incredibly important. The subject of my grievance speech today is the soon to be imposed new fishing regulations for coastal waters in South Australia and particularly the impact they will have on the Upper Spencer Gulf.

I am sure every member of parliament here would agree that we need to use all our natural resources very sensibly and very wisely and ensure that they are sustainable, but that does not mean that you cannot touch them and that does not mean that you cannot use them and that does not mean that you should not be innovative in the way that we access resources. I would like to talk particularly about recreational fishers in the Upper Spencer Gulf, understanding very well that commercial fishing is an incredibly important part of the broader fishing sector.

Recreational fishing in the Upper Spencer Gulf is actually under a fair bit of pressure at the moment. I would like to put on the record my thanks to Mr Robin Sharp, who for decades now has contributed to sensible debate and offered useful suggestions about how government regulations could be imposed without unnecessary burdens on the people of Port Augusta and the Upper Spencer Gulf. I would also like to thank Mr Josh Kirkham, who came with Robin Sharp and presented to the Legislative Review Committee several weeks ago. Robin has done so twice recently, Josh

accompanied him once, and they both made a valuable contribution. In fact, in around 1995 Robin presented to that community as well.

The issue we are dealing with at the moment in Port Augusta is the government's intention to increase the minimum size limit for King George Whiting from 30 centimetres to 31 centimetres for the entire Spencer Gulf. That might seem like a very small thing—one centimetre, one-thirtieth of a change in size—so what is the difference? If you know a bit about fishing, and I know a bit about fishing, or if you talk to people other than me who know a lot about fishing in this region, they will explain very well that it actually makes a huge difference. In fact, it is actually quite hard to catch a fish bigger than 31 centimetres.

Things have been like this for a very long time. This is not because the region has been fished out. This is not because there has been an overly great impact by fishers. It has actually always been that way. When the government and the department over many years have looked at fish stocks and thought that they were lower than they wanted them to be, they have changed the size limit. When they change the size limit, they say that will make a difference and then several years later they come back and say, 'Well, we still haven't got the result we want, so we'll change the size limit again. We still haven't got the result we want, so we'll change the size limit again.'

The reality is that history shows us changing the size limit is actually not working. There are things that could work, but the main objective of this very short opportunity to speak in parliament is to ask the government to consider a special zone in the very upper Spencer Gulf. I know that every MP thinks that his or her area is special and wants special consideration, but by world standards, the Upper Spencer Gulf is quite unique. There are other places like it around the world, but there are none other in Australia. It is a hypersaline inverse estuary, where the top of the gulf supports habitat that does not exist anywhere else south of it. Some species do exist in more tropical waters around the upper eastern and upper western coast of the nation. I would like the government to consider this very seriously.

I put on record my thanks to minister Leon Bignell, who met with Robin Sharp and me to discuss this issue. He was apparently told by his staff that people in the community meetings were all supportive of these changes to regulations. I can tell you that is not the case. It may well have been in meetings that I did not attend, but I attended a meeting in Port Augusta where that certainly was not the case. In fact, during a parliament week I also attended a meeting in Glenelg, just to get another viewpoint from a part of the state I am not so familiar with, and people there were not happy about these changes to regulations. I am not saying that the government should change everything to make people happy, but I am saying that the Upper Spencer Gulf is worthy of consideration of a special zone.

ROSEMARY BRYANT AO RESEARCH CENTRE

Ms COOK (Fisher) (15:39): I would like to use the opportunity today to raise awareness of a recently established research centre. I was fortunate enough and honoured enough to be invited to the launch of the Rosemary Bryant AO Research Centre. It is a demonstration of two significant organisations in this state partnering to address the challenges that nursing and midwifery face today as a modern and continually evolving profession.

The Rosemary Bryant AO Research Centre is a joint initiative between the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation of South Australia and the University of South Australia and is a first in this state. The centre will focus on research to advance the discipline of nursing and patient care related to population and public health, workforce reform, safety and quality, clinical practice, patient outcomes and the translation of evidence into education and practice.

As we are all aware, up-to-date evidence in health care is vital not only in clinical practice but also in policy, management and, critically, systems development and funding. This centre will play a key role in ensuring that this state has the evidence it needs to make informed healthcare decisions. The centre will utilise its networks to build innovative partnerships for healthcare research to inform strategies for (1) extending the capacity and capabilities of nurses and midwives to build a resilient, sustainable and collaborative workforce; (2) health system planning and resourcing; (3) clinical care outcomes; and (4) translation of evidence into practice and education.

The centre will also be strategically placed to develop strong national and international multidisciplinary partnerships so that South Australia can maximise the impact of its research in a variety of healthcare settings. The centre will pave the way for discoveries, advances and changes to better equip nurses and midwives to support not only South Australians but also the profession and health systems at national and international levels.

By establishing the Rosemary Bryant AO Research Centre in South Australia, today I am also recognising and acknowledging the foresight of two of this state's leading organisations—which are, as mentioned before, the South Australian branch of the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation and the School of Nursing and Midwifery at the University of South Australia—as champions of driving change and innovation through a partnership approach.

The ANMF South Australian branch, since it was first established as this, has played an important part in shaping the quality of our nursing profession in South Australia. Let's not forget it has the largest membership of any of the healthcare industrial organisations and perhaps organisations overall. In fact, it has just reached the milestone of 20,000 members in South Australia. It plays a very important role in the health of this community to ensure that we as a state stay true to the mission of delivering high quality patient-centred care. It is with this in mind that the ANMF has partnered with the university to establish the centre.

UniSA is currently ranked 25 in the world's top 50 universities under 50 years of age in the 2014-15 QS World University Rankings. It is an effort this state should be very proud of, but it is also one that we should continually look to support and build upon. The University of South Australia was established to be this state's university for the people and to address issues of access and equity and facilitate opportunities for all in South Australia to pursue a university education. The university has a long history of educating the future nurses, midwives and nursing leaders for this state. It is the third largest undergraduate teaching facility in Australia and the largest in South Australia. Each year, the School of Nursing and Midwifery at UniSA graduates around 700 undergraduate and postgraduate nurses and midwives.

This partnership has established what I hope will become the pre-eminent nursing and midwifery research centre in Australia and one that not only informs local action but also drives change in national and international arenas. Nurses and midwives work very hard to make a positive difference in people's lives. This centre will support them as they undertake that very important work and ultimately improve outcomes for those they care for. I have no doubt that by using Dr Rosemary Bryant AO's name, with her lending her time and the weight of that name to this research centre, that is exactly what will be achieved.

She was the first commonwealth Chief Nurse and Midwifery Officer and an Adelaide girl who was the Director of Nursing at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. She has held many senior nursing leadership roles, including the Branch President of the South Australian Nursing Federation (as it was called before the word 'midwifery' was introduced) and Vice President of the International Council of Nurses. She is a true trailblazer and a real inspiration. As the state member for Fisher, I look forward to supporting this research centre and watching it flourish as the state's pre-eminent nursing and midwifery research centre in the years to come.

EPILEPSY AWARENESS

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:44): I rise today to acknowledge national epilepsy Purple Day, held each year on 26 March. Purple Day is an important annual event, with people not only wearing purple, like your good self—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: In solidarity.

Mr DULUK: —in solidarity, like you are today, Deputy Speaker, but holding local community events, fundraising and working together to increase awareness and understanding of epilepsy and the need for increased funding to support individuals and families affected by epilepsy. Last Sunday, 26 March, the Epilepsy Centre hosted a family day at the Entertainment Centre. Whilst it was a fantastic and fun day, it is important that we remember the very serious and important motives that underlie the need for Purple Day.

Nine-year-old Cassidy Megan of Nova Scotia in Canada started Purple Day in 2008 because she wanted to raise awareness about epilepsy and she wanted other kids with epilepsy to know that they are not alone. That is why, as I have been saying, we celebrate world Purple Day on 26 March. It has become an important opportunity to draw attention to the prevalence of epilepsy within our community and what we can do as a government and as a society to help those living with epilepsy. Deputy Speaker, as you know, we can do a lot.

Around 61,000 South Australians are affected by epilepsy, suffering periodic fits or seizures. The severity and regularity varies from each patient, but for many it is debilitating not just for the individual but also for their family. I have been fortunate enough to get to know young Archer and his family, who live in my electorate. Archer featured on the ABC News last Sunday discussing how epilepsy affects him. Archer is just like any young boy. He likes to play basketball and watch *Star Wars* movies, but epilepsy makes life for him a lot harder. Unfortunately, Archer has a lot of seizures. He has spent a considerable amount of time in hospital and regularly travels to Melbourne to see a specialist and receive treatment. Some days, he cannot go to school, and on the worst days he has to go to hospital. Sadly, Archer is not alone.

In June last year, I moved a motion in the house calling on the government to adequately fund epilepsy services. The Epilepsy Centre, led by CEO Robyn Wakefield, another wonderful constituent of mine, does a superb job providing support for people living with epilepsy, their families and their carers. You do not need to scroll down too far on their Facebook page to appreciate the enormous level of gratitude felt for the Epilepsy Centre. However, they do this outstanding work with very limited funding and, indeed, without any state government funding at all—not a single dollar.

Their main source of funding is a call centre in Prospect, which telemarkets lotteries and donation campaigns. The Epilepsy Centre is staffed by only two registered nurses and three social workers, who all work part-time. These dedicated staff work out of some of the major hospitals, but they are paid by the centre. I cannot speak more highly of the work the centre does, especially with such limited resources.

Unfortunately, the Weatherill Labor government has continued to ignore the Epilepsy Centre's request for assistance. They have continued to ignore the community's request for assistance, and they have also ignored my requests for assistance for the centre, but we are not deterred. We will continue to fight the South Australian families living with epilepsy. Without funding and without a proactive government, these South Australian families will continue to miss out on much-needed assistance and access to innovative new practices and medication.

The Victorian Epilepsy Foundation receives about \$1.2 million annually in state government funding. Last year, dozens of Victorian children with severe epilepsy were recruited to participate in a medical marijuana trial. This followed a New South Wales government announcement that children with severe epilepsy could access a medical cannabis, called Epidiolex, that has shown positive results in US trials. In October 2016, a world-first trial of medical marijuana gel to reduce uncontrolled seizures for adults with epilepsy commenced in Melbourne.

South Australians living with epilepsy, like my friend Archer, already regularly visit Melbourne to receive specialist treatment that is either unavailable in our state or they face unacceptable waiting periods. If we are not careful, they will join the many thousands of South Australians who are turning their back on the state each year and decide to move to Victoria, leaving in search of better opportunities, fed up with a tired Labor government that lacks initiative and is slow to react and too arrogant to listen to those who they represent.

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:49): I rise today to speak about International Women's Day, which is observed worldwide on 8 March. This year's UN women's theme—Women in the Changing World of Work: Planet 50-50 by 2030—is particularly pertinent in Australia at this time, an issue I will return to in a moment. I take this opportunity to acknowledge some of the remarkable ways in which International Women's Day was observed around the world this year. Here in Australia there were many gatherings and celebrations, the largest of which continues to be the wonderful International Women's Day Breakfast in Adelaide supporting the UN Women's National Committee Australia.

I was among the nearly 3,000 people who attended this year's breakfast, along with students from across the state. The guest speaker, the Hon. Julia Gillard AC, the first woman to serve as Australia's Prime Minister or Deputy Prime Minister, spoke about her work through the Global Partnership for Education, supporting 65 developing countries to ensure that every girl receives a quality, basic education. Ms Gillard's work focuses on prioritising the poorest and most vulnerable people, often in conflict-affected areas. Ms Gillard said that the world was failing girls by not ensuring that enough of them were properly educated. She said about 130 million girls around the world were not attending through to secondary school, with most coming from the poorest countries.

She said only 26 per cent of low income countries had as many girls as boys in primary school, while that figure dropped to just 10 per cent at secondary level. By failing to ensure that girls get an education, Ms Gillard said, we are not only violating their human rights, we are denying our world its best possible future, because educating girls is so transformative. Girls' education is so important, not only for their empowerment but for the broader wellbeing of their families and their nations.

Further afield in India, over 30 women's groups came together to organise a march for the One Billion Rising campaign in New Delhi. Hundreds of thousands of women joined together to protest against gang violence that in recent times has been especially targeted towards women. In Iceland the government announced it would be the first in the world to compel companies to prove they offer equal pay regardless of gender, nationality or ethnicity. The government's plan, entitled the Equal Pay Standard, requires employers with more than 25 staff to ensure equal pay for work of equal value, and looks towards eradicating the gender pay gap by 2022.

In Poland, women protested outside the headquarters of the ruling right-wing nationalist Law and Justice Party, demonstrating against gender discrimination and demanding reproductive rights. Related rallies, demonstrations and gatherings took place in more than 80 towns and cities across the country. Marchers gathered in Tokyo to mark the day. Despite recent attempts to raise the profile of women in the workforce, cultural gender bias keeps women chronically underemployed. Interestingly, female representation in lower houses of parliament in Japan was recently ranked 163rd out of 193 countries. Many, many other countries marked and celebrated International Women's Day this month.

This UN day remains an important, vital catalyst and conduit for driving greater change for women and achieving gender parity. While celebrating our achievements, we must still acknowledge the challenges we face and renew our determination to work towards finding solutions that advance women's equality and full participation. While there are many gender issues that are close to my heart, there is one I would like to touch on briefly today, and that is the gender pay gap for women.

In Australia, this has fluctuated over the last 20 years between 15 and 18 per cent. In 2016, a gap of 16.2 per cent improved on the previous year's 17.9 per cent. It stunned me that in 2017 the gender pay gap still exists to this extent. On one level, we understand the gender pay gap in terms of women being paid less than men to do the same work but, when addressing the gender pay gap, we should also look at the gender work gap, which is not just confined to comparative pay. We need to continue to look at the reasons women are sometimes limited in accessing paid work and the disproportionate amount of unpaid work undertaken by women in a domestic context.

Bills

ANZAC DAY COMMEMORATION (VETERANS' ADVISORY COUNCIL) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

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) (15:54): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the ANZAC Day Commemoration Act 2005. Read a first time.

Second Reading

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) (15:55): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

In July 2014, Premier Weatherill announced that every government board and committee would be abolished unless it could demonstrate that it had an essential purpose. The scope of this review included 429 government boards and committees. The review recommended that the Veterans' Advisory Council be retained. The review further determined that in order to streamline services to veterans and improve process, the functions of the ANZAC Day Commemoration Council should transfer to the Veterans' Advisory Council, its appointment process be simplified and responsibility should be transferred to the Minister for Veterans' Affairs.

I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

In July 2014 Premier Weatherill announced that every government board and committee would be abolished unless it could demonstrate that it had an essential purpose. The scope of this review included 429 government boards and committees.

The review recommended that the Veterans' Advisory Council be retained. The review further determined that the functions of the ANZAC Day Commemoration Council are to transfer to the Veterans' Advisory Council, its appointment process simplified, and responsibility will transfer to the Minister for Veterans' Affairs.

Following the passing of the *Statutes Amendments (Boards and Committees – Abolition and Reform) Act 2015* in August 2015, responsibility for the ANZAC Day Commemoration Council was transferred to the Minister for Veterans' Affairs.

The ANZAC Day Commemoration Council has two functions:

- to keep and administer the Anzac Day Commemoration Fund; and
- to carry out such other functions as may be assigned to the Council by the Minister.

The functions relating to the Fund will transfer to the Minister for Veterans' Affairs. Each application made to the Minister for a payment out of the Fund must be referred to the Veterans' Advisory Council for its consideration. The Veterans' Advisory Council will make recommendations to the Minister in relation to such applications as the Council thinks fit.

The Veterans' Advisory Council, so ably chaired by Air Vice Marshal Brent Espeland AM (Retd) will continue to promote the wellbeing of the South Australian ex-service community, promote co-operation across ex-service organisations in South Australia and monitor and provide advice to the State Government about matters that concern the veteran community with a particular focus on contemporary veterans.

It is intended to enact the transfer of the functions of the ANZAC Day Commemoration Council to the Veterans' Advisory Council and the Minister for Veterans' Affairs with effect from 1 July 2017 to align with the expiry dates of the majority of current ANZAC Day Commemoration Council members.

I commend the Bill to honourable members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *ANZAC Day Commemoration Act 2005*

4—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause deletes the current definition of *Council* and substitutes a definition of the Veterans' Advisory Council.

5—Repeal of Part 2

This clause repeals Part 2 (which formerly established the Anzac Day Commemoration Council).

6—Amendment of section 15—Establishment of Fund

7—Amendment of section 16—Application of Fund

Clauses 6 and 7 transfer functions relating to the Fund from the Anzac Day Commemoration Council to the Minister but require consultation with the Veterans' Advisory Council.

8—Repeal of section 17

This clause repeals section 17 as it is no longer necessary.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Treloar.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT (ELECTRICITY SUPPLY EMERGENCIES) AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 29 March 2017.)

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:57): Yesterday, I started to speak in support of this bill and I left off talking about the importance of the resources, having a gas resource in this state, and that part of this plan is to increase the availability of gas for energy to make sure we have a valuable reserve there to make sure we can provide the electricity which our state requires.

It is interesting because there is a parallel to this situation we find ourselves in today, and that parallel goes back to something the Minister for Investment and Trade mentioned earlier today, back to 1946. It is a very important parallel because it exposes the difference between our party, which has a policy to make sure we protect and provide power for our state, and a party which has no policy whatsoever.

Back in 1945, the then government of Sir Thomas Playford was having an arm wrestle with the South Australian Electricity Supply Company. The South Australian Electricity Supply Company had a monopoly in terms of power generation and distribution in this state back in those days. One of the things that concerned Sir Thomas was the availability of the resource at that time which was coal. The company said, 'No, we will maintain our profits by buying coal from interstate and keeping minimal reserves in the state in terms of power generation,' and therefore our power security was at risk even then in this state.

Sir Thomas made it very clear that he saw industrialisation of the state as an important employer. He saw the transformation of our state from an agriculturally based state to one which had a growing element of industry and employment in a growing urban society. The problem with Sir Thomas, apart from being a member of the Liberal and Country League of the day, which was a result of the merger of the Liberal Federation and the Country Party, was that he could see that having control over power in this state was important for the state. He could see that. He could see something in 1946 that the Liberal Party cannot see today. The Liberal Party cannot see why it is important for our state to have control of our energy sources, which is a key element of our plan.

At the time, Sir Thomas spoke to the company and said, 'You guys have to do a better job than this.' In the same way that we have a monopoly because the Liberal Party sold off ETSA so that we basically have a monopoly in this state, the Adelaide Electric Supply Company essentially said, 'Bugger off, Sir Thomas. We're a private company. We'll do what we like.' I understand that Sir Thomas was not a person you say no to easily and that he sometimes used his huge frame to make sure that people understood what he was talking about.

There was a bit of brinkmanship, so what did Sir Thomas do? He called a royal commission. He called a royal commission into the supply of energy in this state. In 1945, he appointed the Royal Commission on the Adelaide Electric Supply Company, made up of Supreme Court justice Geoffrey Reed, Professor Arthur Lang Campbell and John William Wainwright, who I think was the auditor-general of the day or a retired auditor-general.

This royal commission looked into how we could maintain a supply of energy that we required to industrialise the state. In other words, how could we create those blue-collar jobs and those industrial jobs that have been the hallmark of our state for the last 50 or 60 years? The commission reported in March 1945 and it recommended that the industry be nationalised. Sir Thomas agreed. There was an uproar amongst most of the Liberal Party members though, and particularly those in

the upper house. You have to remember that in those days, to be a member of the upper house, you had to actually own some property.

Ms Cook: Wealthy.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: You had to be quite wealthy. You had to own some property. Therefore, the upper house was actually controlled by quite a conservative party. Our upper house now is quite liberal compared with the upper house of those days. Sir Thomas then went to the federal government of the day, which was the Chifley Labor government, and asked Chifley for some money to nationalise the industry.

What did Chifley say? Chifley said, 'Of course we'll help you out. We understand why it's important to have an energy source. We understand why it's important to industrialise your state and to create jobs,' so he did. But, unfortunately, while Sir Thomas got the bill through the lower house with 29 votes to six, with every Labor Party person supporting Sir Thomas—the six against were Liberal Party members—the bill did not get through the upper house. On 7 November, the bill failed to pass the house in 1945 and was not put into parliament until 1946.

On 6 April 1946, Sir Thomas was able to twist a few arms in the upper house, the bill passed and ETSA was created. ETSA has been the backbone to make sure that we have an energy supply in this country. That was a key decision by a government of the day being pragmatic enough to do what is right for the state. If we fast-forward some years, the same Liberal Party then privatised ETSA, and that is the genesis of the problems we have today. There is only one thing worse than a public monopoly and that is a private monopoly, which has certainly been proven to be the case here. The private monopoly has put profit before people and, in this case, we have been on the receiving end of it.

What does this energy plan do? This plan ensures that we retain control of the energy sources in this state. Unfortunately, the Liberal Party has not learnt the lesson that one of their greatest premiers, Sir Thomas Playford, did back in 1946. I am surprised because, when the Liberal Party has debated this policy matter over the last few days, they have been talking about the past, but they seem to have not gone far enough into the past to learn what Sir Thomas told them many decades ago.

The fourth item is a proposal for battery storage and a renewable technology fund. That is very important. It is interesting because part of the Liberal Party actually supports that. They do support it. They have talked about the importance of storage and batteries, etc. In fact, they have a mickey mouse version of this as a partial policy, I think, where you actually put a 12-volt battery in everybody's house and that should help us get by. They actually do support this, but unfortunately they lack the vision to do it on the scale that is required for the state. That is another important element of this plan.

Another important part of the plan is to do two things: to attract new players in the market and to increase competition. This plan does that firstly by our being a party to the new gas-fired plant and, secondly, by bringing in other parties through the solar, battery storage and renewable technology front. We have also set ourselves an energy security target, which means that more gas is generated locally and more gas is available locally, and that in itself will put more downward pressure on the price of power.

It was interesting to note yesterday that the Liberal Party actually complained that the spot price of power had gone down and that the companies were not making super profits. One day they are complaining that consumers are paying too much and the next day they are saying that the companies are not making enough profits. You can understand why people are unclear about what the Liberal Party policy is. We have a plan: the Liberal Party has no policy. Moreover, this policy is starting to pay dividends.

I do not think it is unfair to say that South Australia, albeit perhaps under some tough conditions, has actually led the debate across the country, and there are changes right across the country as a result of what happened in South Australia and, importantly, as a result of the lead that the South Australia government has taken in tackling those issues. I have no doubt that governments in Victoria and New South Wales will be reviewing their energy policies and plans to make sure that they do not end up in the hands of, and at the mercy of, the multinational companies, as we did.

An important aspect of this plan is that we have maintained our commitment to renewable energy. It would have been very easy to back off. I have spoken to many people in my community, including businesspeople, who said that that was an important element. We have to move forward, we need to plan for the future and it is important that we have done that. This policy is also very important because it sends a very clear signal to the marketplace about where they should invest.

One thing has been quite clear of recent times, and I recall hearing this on the radio recently when the National Farmers' Federation spokesperson—and I would not have thought the National Farmers' Federation was one of those left-wing organisations—said that our energy policy at a national level is in chaos because at the national level, what the policy is depends on what day it is, and business need some certainty and some clarity to be able to invest.

It is as simple as that. Even if they do not like the policy, they actually know where they stand. The policy of the national government changes every day. There is a lack of certainty and therefore businesses are not investing. We are doing our best as a state government to ensure that there is a clear policy in this state and that business knows where to invest. That is very important.

Compare the announcement of this policy, and the way this policy and plan were prepared, to Globe Link. With this plan, there is engagement with the key players in the sector, the people we need to deal with to make it work. There was engagement from day one. It is clear from the comments we have received from business and others and from the non-government sector that there was clear engagement with this plan. This plan was worked in tandem with the rest of the state, and that is why it has received such favourable treatment.

Compare that to Globe Link. The Liberal Party prepared that policy with no consultation—not even with the Freight Council of South Australia, who are the people in the sector—and that is why it has never taken off. It just sits there on the side of the road waiting for somebody to pick it up again. It is an appalling policy. Globe Link is an indication of how this Liberal Party would be in government—no consultation and half-baked ideas that never take off. That is how they would run government. Compare that with what we have done. We have engaged with this policy. We have a plan which is supported, and the Liberal Party is so disappointed that this plan has strong legs under it.

This plan talks about standing up for South Australia. This plan is about saying South Australia comes first. I was listening to Matt and Dave on the radio the other day—I know I should wash my mouth out with soap—and they were talking to the Leader of the Opposition. The question they put to him was: 'Isn't this plan essentially what the Prime Minister is trying to do at the national level now—renewable energy with the Snowy II scheme, if that takes off?'

They asked him, 'Why is this plan bad for South Australia but reflects what your national leader is doing?' He could not answer the question. He avoided the question because he could not stand up for South Australia. He could not stand up for South Australia and say what is right for South Australia. The Leader of the Opposition has time and time again not stood up for South Australia.

The comment was made that we should not make this about renewable energy. Renewable energy is an important part of this plan—we do not hide from that. Renewable energy is a plan for the future and a plan to secure clean air for our children, our grandchildren and future generations. We are a government for the future generations: the Liberal Party represent the past. One day they want to go back to coal, the next day they want to do something else, and the next day they want to do something else again.

It is a little bit unfair of me to say that the Liberal Party do not have any renewable policies; I am sure they do. I am sure the Leader of the Opposition supports wind power because every morning he gets up, sticks his finger in the air and works out which way the wind is blowing to work out what the policy of the day will be. The extent of their wind policy is to work out which way the wind is blowing that day to see which way they will move and which way their policy will go and that, unfortunately, is an indication of how they would be in government.

We as a government have been disciplined. We as a government have made it very clear that we will do what is right by this state. For those reasons, this bill should be supported. It is an

important part of this plan to make sure that we have secure energy, reliable energy, affordable energy and energy that is under the control of South Australians.

Ms COOK (Fisher) (16:12): At long last, I get to speak on the energy bill. I am supporting a raft of changes being made to our energy system. In the late nineties, the then Liberal government made the decision to privatise our energy market, exposing it to the bull and bear cycle of the free market which was more intent on delivering a profit to a few shareholders than on delivering a cheap, reliable and environmentally sustainable electricity supply to South Australians.

The plan that our government has put forward is the biggest redesign of the energy market that we have seen. It will see South Australian power for South Australians. At its core, the plan will improve reliability and push energy prices down by delivering on the following goals:

- building Australia's largest battery storage to help store the energy we get from the sun and wind to improve their reliability around environmental fluctuations. We should note that the announcement today around battery storage for the Riverland is fabulous and supports this;
- building our own gas plant, owned and operated by the state government, which can come on line quickly to bolster the state's energy production, increasing our supply;
- using the state government's electricity contract to attract new generation to South Australia, making more of our energy locally produced, keeping more jobs here in South Australia and of course putting pressure on the market;
- taking back powers from the national regulator which has failed to deliver reliable energy to South Australia; and
- incentivising local gas to provide more local jobs and ensure a necessary supply of this important transition fuel.

This is a balanced plan. Our energy security has been something that a number of members of my community have spoken to me about. Equally, my community wants us to focus on ensuring South Australia's target of net zero emissions by 2050 is achieved. Around the world, trillions of dollars have been invested in renewable energy. This is because renewable energy is fast becoming the cheapest way to invest in new electricity generation, and it does not create pollution that causes global warming.

By agreeing to the international agreement on climate change, known as the Paris Agreement, the Australian federal government has committed Australia to producing energy in ways that do not cause pollution. By the middle of the century, I want my children, my children's children, and so on, to live in a world that is clean and free of pollution and to see climate change stopped in its tracks. It is our future. It is the big picture. The opposition throws accusations at our government, at me, regarding us being ideologically obsessed with renewables as though this is some kind of insult. I will take that accusation ahead of being accused of living in the past and being ideologically obsessed with dirty coal. There is no such thing as clean coal.

With its abundant natural resources, South Australia has been leading Australia's efforts to clean up the electricity sector. The state's energy comes from a mix of renewable energy and gas, which produces much less pollution than electricity generated from coal. Renewable energy is good for jobs and the economy. Investment in renewable energy has seen more than \$7.1 billion invested in the state, with more than 40 per cent being in regional areas. These investments have helped create new industries and jobs for South Australians.

As South Australia nears the target of generating 50 per cent of its electricity from renewables, the challenge will be to generate even more in a national market that is old and outdated. This is where gas can play a role as a transitional fuel. Watching the generation and supply graphics on our apps, as everybody does now in parliament, it is interesting to note that we have suddenly this week become a net exporter of energy and highly competitive on the national market.

Gas also has a role nationally as coal-fired generators close. In the past decade, nine coal-fired power stations have closed in Australia, including the Port Augusta power plant in South Australia. Australia's most emissions intensive power station, Hazelwood, in Victoria, has now closed

its generators. This is occurring because most coal-fired generators are old, with two-thirds already being more than 30 years old and needing to be replaced.

As the preliminary report of a review into the National Electricity Market states, owner investors are exiting emissions intensive power stations as these reach the end of their designed lives. It has been clear from our consultations that no-one is contemplating investing in new ones, nor would financial institutions provide finance to do so. Given this uncertainty, the only way for new transitional generation to be built in South Australia is for the government to invest in building its new gas-fired power plant, as well as offering incentives for new operators to enter the market and supply the government's energy needs.

South Australia will continue to lead the way in the transformation of the next generation of renewable technologies. While the state government is working with the business community here to look to a financially viable alternative to coal production, with gas as a transition fuel being the most immediate and most available to South Australia, we have a Prime Minister who supports a price on carbon, then he does not, and whose only policy position now seems to be to bury his head in the sand and hope that it goes away.

But is that the position of the rest of the federal Liberal Party? No. Their Treasurer is obsessed with coal, brandishing it in parliament and extolling its virtues. They are the people the Leader of the Opposition would turn our energy policy to if he had his way. He thinks that they are the best people to handle our energy policy. It is hypocritical of the state opposition to call on us to reopen a coal generator in Port Augusta while the federal government brandishes coal in the parliament one week and then the next week the Prime Minister is refusing to supplement the operations of Hazelwood as it just is not a viable proposition.

It is not lost on the thousands of people who have been contacted by me and my team in the past few weeks through doorknocking, calling and talking to at shopping centres and parks, etc. In fact, the reception has been nothing short of incredible. I have not seen anything this positive in the two years I have been the local member, and even my experienced staff have been really surprised. When I sit in here and I listen to those opposite sometimes talking about this, I scratch my head and think that I must live in some parallel universe, where negativity constantly overtakes the positive and I completely misinterpret what I am being told because everything I hear from those opposite can be so negative.

But the message is so clear from my community. I have had people call out as they drive past me in the streets, 'Tell Jay to get them,' and, 'It's time we gave it back to them,' just to give a few lines that have been called out. Some of the other general input has included, 'At last, a positive move. Stop talking and just start doing it,' and, 'I love this plan. I'm so glad you're doing something about it. We can't wait for the federal government to act,' and, 'The worst thing about politics is the blame game, which transcends in privatised business, but what most people fail to understand is that governments and councils seek advice from experts and then decide what is the best solution for their residents.'

It is a 100-year sellout that the Olsen Liberal government has left us with. They have sold off not just for a generation but for more than the average lifetime. The Minister for Energy will be given strong new powers to direct the national market in 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 that 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 powers will be used as a last resort measure if the national market does not act in South Australia's best interests—and this has become highly evident. These are just some elements of our plan to help ensure our energy security and ensure that our energy sector is working in our interest. The message of support for this plan is clear from my electorate, and it was clear this morning at the railway station as I joined the Premier, ministers, other members of parliament and candidates who have already been selected to represent Labor at next year's state election. It was a very positive response. People were happy to see this being done and very supportive of our plan.

I am glad to hear that the opposition will be supporting this bill. I was thinking that it would be at their peril to ignore the need to support increased state control over our central services, and I was worried that they would not be able to bring themselves to put the opposing for opposing's sake mentality to one side and at least partly unscramble the Olsen government egg. This plan is for my family and your family, my community and your community. I commend the legislation and the plan put before us by the government. This will deliver a cleaner, more reliable and cheaper energy system.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (16:22): I rise today to speak on the government's energy bill, which they introduced yesterday without any notice to the opposition. As whip, I must say that I found that somewhat disconcerting. Tradition in this place, or protocol at least, dictates that bills be on the table and the opposition has the opportunity to consider them for at least two weeks. In this case, the government broke convention. It concerned me. It certainly concerned our shadow minister.

In the end, all in all it is poor form. The cynical amongst us might suggest that the government simply did not want to get to the next item on the agenda, and that was child protection. The other thing I will say on this is that my office spoke with the Manager of Government Business's office just 20 minutes before the beginning of the sitting day Tuesday. There was no indication whatsoever that the government was going to put this bill to the parliament.

The introduction of this bill coincided with the release of the AEMO report, the summary of the 28 September statewide blackout. Concurrently, or at least during the same week, there was the announcement by the government of half a billion dollars' worth of expenditure into a government-owned gas-fired power station. Also this week, out of the blue it would seem, came the ENGIE announcement regarding the refiring of Pelican Point. I actually have a bone to pick with ENGIE about another matter, but I will get back to that.

We have seen today a motion of no confidence in the Premier and his government essentially around the \$24 million that was asked for by the Northern power station to stay open. Really, more than anything, as the government well knows, it was about managing the transition away from coal-fired into renewables, which we have all said on this side we support. I suspect that the two were not related, but the irony was not lost on the people of Eyre Peninsula that the very day the stack came down at Port Augusta there was yet another outage in the Streaky Bay region. People did not blame that particularly, but the irony did not escape them.

The electricity supply problems began on Eyre Peninsula well before 28 September and still continue. In fact, I had a call left on my office phone overnight from a resident of Scale Bay, just south of Streaky Bay, who said that the power was out there yet again. By his calculations, that is the 13th outage in the last 12 months. It is particularly problematic in areas around Streaky Bay, Ceduna and Elliston as they are essentially on the end of the grid.

That 28 September power outage obviously hit the state, but it particularly hit the bottom end of Eyre Peninsula. Even though I have spoken about it before, I would like to talk about it again. The three generators—and the Treasurer is well aware of this—that were supposed to be operating and backing up the power supply for Port Lincoln and southern Eyre Peninsula failed. They were all brought online. Two failed and the other one was taken offline after that failure. It meant that Port Lincoln and the bottom part of Eyre Peninsula was left in a much worse situation than it otherwise would have been.

Those generators are operated by ENGIE. To this day, we still do not have a reasonable explanation as to what happened there, although my understanding is that the Treasurer has instructed ESCOSA—which I suspect through a lot of this has its head in the sand, given that it is required to monitor the provision of essential services—to provide a report. That is impending and the people of Eyre Peninsula are keen to see it.

It also gave me the opportunity to communicate with my electorate. I sent out a survey form and had an overwhelming response from the electorate of Flinders. I received over 600 returns in postal form, which is quite remarkable and just shows how much an outage can affect the people themselves. It becomes a very political debate, but ultimately it is the people who go through the experience. I was then able to communicate back to my constituents.

I discovered that about 50 per cent of respondents had applied for the government's loss of power grant. Of the remaining 50 per cent, the reasons they did not apply included lack of communication and knowledge, the exceptionally short time frame to lodge and, of course, there was no phone or internet access, which in some cases extended for weeks. The ad hoc implementation of the grants meant that my office was in regular contact with the government unit responsible in an attempt to clear up some of the inequities experienced across the electorate. Poor management was reflected in a number of applicants who were not successful in obtaining assistance due to various reasons beyond their control.

In conjunction with the Port Lincoln mayor, Bruce Green, I wrote to ENGIE regarding the generators. As I indicated earlier, we have not had a satisfactory answer about that as yet. My question today is: should the power go off again, right now, would those backup generators be capable of providing electricity today, tomorrow, next week or next month? We do not know that. In fact, the locals have become very cynical about the reliability of the power supply. I know for a fact that just a few weeks ago, for the Port Lincoln Cup, the Port Lincoln Racing Club hired a generator for the day at a cost of \$20,000 to the club. That is a lot of money to a sporting club. They hired a generator as a backup because they simply could not take the risk of a power outage on what is the biggest day of the year for them.

We were pleased to welcome the state Liberal leader, Steven Marshall, to Port Lincoln after the outage. We heard from community and business leaders, and the Leader of the Opposition was informed not only about the power outage but also about the ramifications that unreliability and high prices are having on future investments into Eyre Peninsula, a very important regional part of this state. I have also met with Telstra to discuss contingencies for extending our backup power supply for mobile and land lines, because once there is an extended outage communications go out as well. When you drill down, the loss of communication was just as distressing, if not more so, than losing the electricity for many people, particularly older people.

More recently, as our power supply problems have been experienced state and nationwide, remembering that our outages on Eyre Peninsula were being experienced for a period of time well before 28 September, we have seen the issue escalate onto the national agenda. In hindsight, I believe Eyre Peninsula was, to coin a phrase, 'the canary in the coalmine' for the rest of the state and the rest of the country.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: A canary in a coalmine?

Mr TRELOAR: I like it, a canary in a coalmine. Is that—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: This is the badge, the canary badge.

Mr TRELOAR: It is nice to make that connection, Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am simpatico.

Mr TRELOAR: Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull visited Port Lincoln in January—that actually coincided with the Tunarama—and consolidated our power problems, our very regional power problems, on the national stage. We are still hearing about Port Lincoln in the federal parliament, with stories from community members and business owners he met. As I said, his visit coincided with the Tunarama, which gave him the opportunity to meet many, many people. I also met with federal energy minister Josh Frydenberg this week, and that gave me the opportunity to put Eyre Peninsula's perilous energy case forward once again onto the national stage.

This week, the Premier conceded that 15 years of failed Labor policies would cost taxpayers more than half a billion dollars, having forced the closure of 540 megawatts of cheap base load power at Port Augusta. We all understand that it did not have a long-term future, and that has been put to the parliament today by the opposition, but it was a critical part of the transition period, rather than have it just chopped off and there be no transition period at all. We find ourselves in exactly the position we are in.

The Weatherill government is now proposing to spend \$360 million on 250 megawatts of stand-by power. Nowhere that I can see in this plan is the problem of South Australia's lack of cheap base load power addressed. It certainly does not deliver cheaper electricity to South Australia; in

fact, from my perspective it does not guarantee reliable services to Eyre Peninsula either. There is no one single solution to our energy security.

The state Liberal Party has proposed part of its energy policy, which we will take to the 2018 election. Power must be reliable and affordable with investment and return on investment. There must be a National Electricity Market with a broad generation mix, balancing demand and supply. I firmly believe that in South Australia, at present, we are out of sync with the rest of the country.

The AEMO report we have all been scouring for the last few days—all 277 pages of it; it is quite a read—has 19 recommendations. There is something in it for everyone but, ultimately, the AEMO report suggests that the blackout was inevitable because of the settings that were contained within the grid. As I said before, I can only suggest that somebody has been asleep at the wheel, particularly in relation to the management of the grid itself. The AEMO report talks about the grid stabilisation and, from my perspective, long-term it is not just about power generation but also about the security of the grid and the extremities of the grid—which I suspect have had minimal maintenance over the last few years.

The main transmission line into Eyre Peninsula remains an issue. ElectraNet runs a main line down from Port Augusta to Whyalla, down to Yadnarie near Cleve. It then branches out and goes west to Wudinna and on down south to Port Lincoln. In the short term, that is the most critical thing for the power supply onto Eyre Peninsula. I know that over the past few years ElectraNet has been working towards the duplication or replacement of that transmission line.

They have not had a business case put in front of them to justify it as yet, but obviously the energy situation in this state is a moving feast. It changes day by day, week by week. I am hopeful that ElectraNet will be provided with a case to improve the transmission line into Eyre Peninsula for future and impending markets, for the growth of the region, for increased population and possibly even for the export of electricity out of the region into the national grid.

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (16:35): I rise to support the Emergency Management (Electricity Supply Emergencies) Amendment Bill that gives the minister some power hitherto unavailable over the electricity market and the players in the electricity market. I know that this minister at least will use those powers wisely and judiciously, and I hope that other ministers will do so in the future. I understand also that the opposition will be supporting the bill; I certainly hope that is the case, but it means that I will be making a slightly amended version of my speech.

Over recent weeks as I have gone around to train stations and shopping centres, when I knock on doors and talk on the telephone to people in Elizabeth, I talk to them about the electricity system and the problems we have experienced in recent times. They are giving me one message loud and clear, and that is: stop talking about it and fix it. When they hear about the energy plan that the Premier and the energy minister have put together, the response is overwhelmingly positive. I have not been in this place as long as some, and I certainly was not around for the debates when the Liberal Party sold our power assets, but like the member for Fisher, I have never seen a response to a government policy initiative quite like this. As I said, it is overwhelmingly positive.

On the doorsteps, I hear nothing but praise for the way the Premier took the federal minister to task at that infamous press conference because—surprise, surprise—people expect their leaders to lead and they expect their leaders to put South Australia first. The response to our plan has been so positive, in fact, that part of me hopes the opposition continues to talk it down. There is a hope that they will continue to come into this place to talk down renewable energy because the more they talk it down, the more they kowtow to Canberra and to coal interests, and the more they talk down renewables, they demonstrate that they are on the wrong side of history.

Recent events have clearly shown us that the National Energy Market is not working for South Australia. It is a system that has shown itself to be very good at making money for large energy companies, which is fine and I support markets as a matter of principle, but when the operation of a market works in direct contradiction to the needs of its customers, as the National Energy Market has consistently shown to have done in recent times, it is up to political leaders to act. That is what the Premier and the energy minister have done. They have put the needs of South Australian energy consumers ahead of the profits of energy companies and ahead of a blind adherence to free-market ideology.

This is about seizing back control of our energy system. But more than that, we are unashamedly committed to renewable energy and we are also committed to jobs in South Australia, and I am personally committed to jobs in northern Adelaide. That is why the focus of this plan is not only to put downward pressure on prices, it is not only to stabilise the system, it is not only to make sure that the lights stay on so to speak, it is about creating jobs and business opportunities in the markets for emerging technologies.

A key element of this plan, aimed at least partly at creating investment opportunities and jobs in renewable energy, storage and other emerging technologies is the renewable technology fund and the commissioning of large-scale battery storage. The idea is first of all to provide the state obviously with large-scale storage for renewable energy so that power is available when it is needed, but importantly this is just part of a \$150 million fund—\$75 million in loans and \$75 million in grants to support renewable energy projects. I understand that there was an announcement today—or there will be an announcement forthcoming, so I will not speak too much about the battery.

But as well as modernising the grid and looking to the future, this is all about supporting private innovative companies and entrepreneurs and in turn supporting local jobs. In this context, I was really pleased to officially open the Polaris Centre Energy Speed Networking forum at the Fluid Solar House in Elizabeth Vale. Before I speak about this event, I might reflect a little on the Fluid Solar House itself because it is quite a remarkable place and I am really proud that its backers have chosen Elizabeth as the home for this world-class building. Fluid Solar House is a multiuse off-grid office building housing the innovation grid, which is a smart tech and renewable energy coworking space.

It is basically a solar thermal-powered building, completely off the grid, or it will be completely off the grid as of this week, I understand. Fluid Solar technology supplies about 70 per cent of demand for the building energy demand, using a 150 kilowatt rooftop concentrating solar thermal collector array and a 4,200 kilowatt hour thermal energy storage system. The remaining electricity demand is provided by rooftop PV and, interestingly, a battery pack, together with a wind turbine.

As I said, this building is completely off grid. It is proof that, given the right environment and, crucially, when it is coupled with storage, renewable energy works and is worth investing in. For governments, it is worth creating the conditions for this investment to take place. I could go on about this building and I will speak more about it at a later date, including the many design features that make it so efficient. So, I was really pleased to visit the house again and particularly to open this renewable energy business networking event organised by the Polaris Centre. It brought together many great businesses, including many from northern Adelaide, that are doing wonderful things in renewable energy, energy efficiency and energy solutions.

I will name some of the businesses that participated because it was really well attended. These included: Elwa; University of South Australia; Down to Earth Sustainable Solutions; Nexgen Energy Pty Ltd; Maximum Lighting and Energy Solutions; Redflow; Cminus; J Glazing; Dematec Automation; Redivivus; EEA Pty Ltd; Enpro Envirotech; CSS; Century Engineering; Mayfield Industries; Suntrix; Interception Design and Construct; 360 Evolve, which has an amazing virtual reality set-up that enables you to explore energy efficiencies in your own home or in your business; Seed Consulting; KT Projects; Just Glorious; SA Power Networks; Steven Zilm Solar and Electrical; Anbar Energy; Lauthier-Wendt; Schneider Electric; The Solar Project; and Accumulus Energy.

It was really well attended and all these people are contributing in one way or another to the future of renewable energy in this state. The main message I got from these businesses was that there is a future in renewable energy. In fact, it is the future of energy and they are very keen and willing to continue working on and investing in renewable energy technologies. The renewable energy fund, together with our energy security target, will create the environment where these businesses can flourish and make our state a centre for this type of technology and the advanced manufacturing jobs that will result from this investment.

This government, despite the efforts of some of those opposite and of other conservative voices, is not afraid of renewable energy. We have nothing to fear from renewables. It is my view that, along with storage technology and perhaps nuclear power, renewables are the future of energy

provision worldwide. It is my view that there is a particularly big future for advanced solar and solar thermal technology. We are seeing solar power in its various forms surging in Australia.

We heard the Minister for Transport yesterday, in his excellent contribution to this debate, talk about the success of our rooftop solar program, which has led to a huge take-up of PV solar technology: 130,000 households across the state, as well as businesses and public buildings. The Climate Council's recent report, *State of Solar 2016*, states:

In 2017 over 20 new large-scale solar projects will come online. A further 3,700 MW of largescale solar is in the development pipeline (roughly equivalent to three coal-fired power stations).

It goes on:

Australia is expected to reach over 20GW of solar PV in the next 20 years, equivalent to about a third of Australia's current total power generation capacity.

Solar and battery storage for households and businesses is already gaining traction in Australia—with more than 6,500 households installing the technology. Uptake is expected to triple in 2017.

Large-scale developments such as the Lakeland solar and battery storage project and the Kidston solar and pumped hydro project (both in North Queensland) are demonstrating the potential of combining large-scale solar and energy storage technologies.

Finally, they point out:

The Victorian Government is seeking expressions of interest to build a large-scale battery storage facility in western Victoria to improve grid stability.

We believe that this plan will mean real economic opportunities for businesses and entrepreneurs in this state. We want South Australia to lead the way in attracting investment in these new industries and, in turn, create new jobs to replace those of the old manufacturing sector. In particular, for those of us who live in the northern suburbs, we hope it will fill in some of the gaps left by the departure of the automotive sector.

I commend this bill as part of the government's broader energy plan, and I know that the people of South Australia support this plan, too, as well as the leadership shown by the Premier and the energy minister in responding to the failure of the energy market.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (16:44): I want to thank every member of the house for their contributions, and I pass on my thanks to the opposition. I know it is unorthodox to introduce legislation and demand its passage and debate immediately, but I can honestly say that I can think of no more urgent issue than making sure that we can avert the type of occurrences that have occurred in this state when we had generation sitting idle, no apparent emergency evident until that generation was not available and South Australians were load shed.

Our emergency powers contemplate an emergency unfolding. They contemplate a situation where the emergency has occurred, and there are examples in a complex electricity system that require judgement and, in the words of Matt Zema, being able to anticipate events before they occur and acting so that you do not need to declare emergencies. It is very difficult to know what would have occurred on the day of the September blackout if I had had the power before an emergency unfolded to constrain the interconnector.

Constraining the interconnector on the South Australian border would have led to more thermal generation being on our side of the border. The Australian Energy Market Operator claimed that there was no credible contingency that the interconnector would be lost, even though they set those contingencies. I had a different opinion. I contacted AEMO on the day of 28 September to ask them: is it prudent to constrain the interconnector? They felt that their hands were tied because there was no credible contingency. My view that day was very simple. They are the ones who decide the contingencies. They are the ones who decide whether they are credible. That can be changed.

The idea that the Australian Energy Market Commission must develop a cookbook-style set of rules with recipes for AEMO to follow according to every situation that might be foreseeable is ridiculous. We expect the market operator to be able to assess every single individual occurrence and make an assessment. There have been four times that South Australians have lost power since the September blackout. Each one of those occasions was different. It is very difficult, in a complex

electricity market, to build rules that can adapt and give you a set of criteria and write instructions on what to do depending on the situation.

I have to say this to the shadow minister: if you truly aspire to be the energy minister in a new Liberal government, these powers give the state more sovereignty. The idea that we cannot constrain interconnection from competitors interstate for our own security—not to give a competitive advantage to South Australian generators, but to secure our system—is ridiculous. Of course we should have that power, the same way we should have to close a road to avoid people driving through it so they do not get flooded, just as we would say it is important to change trading conditions to prevent certain events occurring that may risk life.

I have to say that I already have the powers I am seeking now if an emergency is declared. I can actually intervene, declare a state of emergency and, of course, have these powers. It only makes common sense, given what we have been through, to now say, 'Do we require these powers to avoid heading into a state of emergency?' It is not as simple as saying that the Governor must obey whatever the executive tells him in Executive Council. The Governor must be satisfied, and we, as his ministers, must be truthful in advising him. If there is no emergency as defined under the act, we cannot call a state of emergency. We need to be able to satisfy ourselves that an emergency has occurred.

There are nuances throughout the current legislation, but it is unacceptable that the state must operate under a continued state of emergency as called on by the federal energy minister, Mr Frydenberg, who said, 'Just declare a state of emergency.' You need to have the criteria in place under the act to do so. You cannot govern a state that is in a perpetual state of emergency just so you can have powers of direction over the National Electricity Market. That is absurd.

The most important point I want to make before we enter into committee, if the house is amenable to this debate, is this: I believe the threat of our intervention is just as powerful as an intervention. Companies knowing that there is a possibility that the state will exercise its sovereignty to secure its system despite the market signals, despite what the market may be attempting to do—whether it is gaming the market or whether it is taking advantage of rules and current operations—knowing that the state has the power to do this is enough of an incentive to ensure that this will not ever occur again. The idea of South Australians being load shed when there is sufficient capacity to meet needs and the market decides it is best not to, or intervenes too late, surely justifies this legislation.

I do not know what the opposition have planned in another place. The government is not up for compromising. This is a fundamental piece of our plan. If the opposition have amendments that improve the legislation, that improve our powers, that make it easier to operate, then we will consider them, but if they are there to stifle the government's ability to intervene, if they are there to try to make this policy fail, then we will oppose them.

We are wanting the opposition to act responsibly within the state's interests, and it is a big test for them. The test for them is this: if they truly believe that they are going to be the government within the next 12 months, they will support this legislation. If they think they might lose, they will vote against it or try to amend it in a way that makes it unworkable. We will soon find out. I commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

Sitting extended beyond 17:00 on motion of Hon. A. Koutsantonis.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Ms CHAPMAN: My questions relate to the establishment of the new regime which amends the Emergency Management Act 2004 and does not purport to deal with any other legislation. My question is: why has the government not, in introducing this regime, amended the Essential Services Act 1981?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that the government was advised that housing these powers in the Emergency Management Act has certain advantages over alternative options such as the Essential Services Act and Electricity Act, including definitional and consistency advantages as well as existing provisions which complement the policy objectives of these powers.

Ms CHAPMAN: Who provided that advice?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Crown Solicitor's Office.

Ms CHAPMAN: When was that advice sought?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Crown has been involved throughout the entire contemplation of the government's Our Energy Plan. They have been giving the government advice. I do not know the exact date on which we sought the particular advice. It has been developed organically as we have been going through this process. They have been providing advice to the government the whole way through. They are an integral part of government advice. We do not really generally make decisions without crown law advice.

Ms CHAPMAN: I am not suggesting that you would, minister. The reason I ask is that, according to the published material on the plan the Premier had provided on 14 March, there was an indication that the development and drafting of the bill was to then commence from that date. My simple question is: in going down this line, using this model, when did you receive the advice that any use of, or amendment to, the Essential Service Act 1982 was not going to be part of that, or was a less reliable process to go through?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I find the question confusing because it misunderstands the process the government goes through in developing policy. Fundamentally, it misses the point in that the government consults regularly with crown law. We make organic decisions and, until a final decision is made, that policy is still in contemplation mode. Finding the exact date when that advice was received, my guess is (but I have to check) that we would have received multiple pieces of advice about potential legislative forms.

It might have been: do we bring in completely new, independent legislation creating this power, or do we amend existing acts? Probably there would have been advice on the merits of both of those, and the cabinet would have formulated its decision. I do not have the exact date and I do not think it is really relevant for these proceedings.

Ms CHAPMAN: Is it the intention of the government to proceed to repeal the Essential Services Act of 1981 if it is of no use?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No.

Ms CHAPMAN: In respect of the Essential Services Act 1981, in the time that the minister has been the Minister for Energy, has he ever exercised the provisions of section 3 of the act and declared a period of emergency in circumstances that have arisen or are likely to arise that have caused or are likely to cause interruption or dislocation of an essential service in this state?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Under these currently, I am advised that under the Essential Services Act the last time this was proclaimed was on 29 September 2016, and it was the Governor who had the powers, not the minister.

Ms CHAPMAN: And what were the circumstances under which that declaration was used?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It was after the system black.

Ms CHAPMAN: For how long did the period of emergency continue?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I do not have that information at hand, but I understand it was extended. I do not know what was the minimum period that we had it in place, but there was an extension. I can get that information between the houses for the member.

Ms CHAPMAN: Can I just clarify this, because on the day of the blackout—I assume we are talking about September 2016, the day the statewide blackout went down—the Premier was seated where you are and came over to me to say, 'We've got a major problem. Do you agree to the parliament being closed down so that we can attend to it?' He needed to attend a state emergency

management meeting, which I understood to be under the Emergency Management Act 2004, not under the Essential Services Act 1981. I wish to be absolutely clear.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that we used the Essential Services Act to declare that electricity was an essential service to give powers of direction by the Governor over those essential services in South Australia.

Ms CHAPMAN: In relation to the latter then, was the direction in relation to the proclaimed essential service also applied under section 4 of the Essential Services Act at the time of the September 2016 outage?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Is the opposition asking if we issued directions under section 4 or if we—I am not quite sure what the question means.

Ms CHAPMAN: There was a declaration of a period of emergency—we have established that—and you used the Essential Services Act to do it for a time unspecified, which may or may not have been extended. Under section 4, a direction can be issued in relation to a proclaimed essential service. My question is: did you issue any directions in respect of that incident or at any other time?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I can advise the house that the Australian Energy Market Operator was issued two directions: (1) not to operate the spot market, and (2) to maintain the expected rate of change of frequency of the South Australian power system in response to the non-credible coincident trip of both circuits of the Heywood interconnector when the power system is in a secure operating state or at below three hertz per second.

The CHAIR: Are you referring to section 4 in this act or in another act?

Ms CHAPMAN: No, another act.

The CHAIR: We are really getting off clause 1.

Ms CHAPMAN: That is why we are getting to the decision of the government to proceed under the current—

The CHAIR: How many questions do you think you might have on clause 1?

Ms CHAPMAN: I am happy to do them on several, but probably half a dozen or so. Were the directions you just referred to of AEMO or of your government?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It was made of AEMO. The Attorney-General issued instructions to the Australian Energy Market Operator to suspend the spot market and to maintain a rate of change of frequency, as I described in my earlier answer.

Ms CHAPMAN: With regard to the entities that received notice of that direction, did they cooperate and ensure that they were undertaken?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, and they were required to do so.

Ms CHAPMAN: Regarding the three incidents since that time, which largely relate to load shedding occasions when there have been power outages, was there either an emergency declaration prepared or a direction issued?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: First, the other events were not all load shedding. I understand only one was. The others were events of tree limbs taking out power lines and causing transmission or distribution disruptions. There were no other instructions issued and I think no emergencies were declared.

Ms CHAPMAN: Is there any reason why not?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that the ability to use the Essential Services Act in advance of an interruption of essential services in the state is limited by the requirement for the Governor to form the opinion that circumstances have arisen that are likely to cause an interruption to electricity. This is a significant test to satisfy, hence the government is seeking the more general powers of direction.

Ms CHAPMAN: On the occasion of September 2016, was any request made to AEMO to undertake the decisions subsequently issued by the direction or were they just served with a direction?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We consulted with AEMO prior to giving the directions. They were well aware of them in advance, and then we issued them.

Ms CHAPMAN: In the consultation, did you ask them to do the things that were ultimately in the direction or not? Did you just tell them 'We are going to be issuing a direction and this is what the terms of those directions are going to be'?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Following the restoration of power on 28 and 29 September last year, AEMO felt that they could no longer suspend the market and wanted to return the market. That would have required a direction from us to suspend the market, which we issued to them. They felt that they did not have sufficient powers in place under the current regime to maintain a certain rate of frequency monitoring within the system, and we therefore issued them a direction.

Ms CHAPMAN: Were the directions you issued on the night of the blackout, the other two, also at their request?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that the directions were issued after the restoration of power.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sorry? There were only two instructions.

Ms Chapman: They were both after the restoration.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: They were both after the restoration of power because, if my memory serves me correctly—and I stand to be corrected—AEMO wanted to re-establish a spot market relatively quickly and felt that either they did not have either the power or that it was unnecessary to suspend it.

We felt the prudent thing to do after a system black was to suspend the market to reassure the public and stabilise markets very quickly. Then we were very concerned about stabilising the system given that, in my opinion, a non-credible contingency had occurred. I was very concerned about the operation of the system, given that something had occurred that should not have occurred. Through our advisers, we came up with a plan to make sure that AEMO, through our directions, would maintain the system in a certain way to stabilise the system to minimise the chances of another system black.

Ms CHAPMAN: The only directions that were issued were after the reconnection of the power and in a circumstance where AEMO was not going to be taking a direction or action that you thought was prudent or appropriate. Therefore, in this consultation you had with them they presumably made that clear, and in the government's opinion that was not appropriate and therefore you indicated you would issue the direction. Is that how it happened?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I think it is a relatively good characterisation of what occurred, other than to say that AEMO were very comfortable with the directions that we issued. Let's be clear about this. AEMO is not some independent market operator that is appointed by the government to act independently. They are a company with shareholders, I should explain to the committee. They are surrounded by lawyers—lawyers to defend their actions and lawyers ready to pounce on their actions.

The suspension of the spot market is a relatively serious market action to occur, as is the direction on the rate of frequency change to be stabilised and maintained. It is much easier for AEMO to have that direction imposed on them, rather than for them to formulate this opinion on their own. Because we are an external body, and if we have a state of emergency declared, then we are able to issue these directions. It protects AEMO as well as the other participants in the market.

Ms CHAPMAN: Because this is the only example that is being used, and I am happy to use this as the sum exploration as to how this operates, in that circumstance AEMO's judgement was a certain way forward, the government's judgement was a different way and, whilst AEMO were not

prepared to follow that route, they were happy for you to issue a direction in some way to protect them against any adverse retrospective assessment of whether or not they had done the right thing. In other words, they were happy to be enveloped by your direction, almost as a protection.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I suspect that is part of the answer. I think the other part is that they felt that whether or not they thought that suspending the spot market was a good idea, they also felt they did not have the power to do it under the circumstances. Power had been restored. Other than transmission lines being damaged, I think most of the generators in Adelaide, other than the Port Lincoln generators, were operational. They were not reporting large-scale damage through the lightning strikes. We were very concerned about what damage had occurred on our generation assets.

I think that there is a bit of the scenario you are contemplating, but I also think that the other part is that, whether or not it was a good idea, they felt they did not have the power to do it. We were able to step in and make the decision for them.

Ms CHAPMAN: I think you would understand that they would have the power to do it. If they did it, though, they might have been subject to some complaint by the shareholders or those whom the determination might adversely affect. Is that a better assessment?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I think the better explanation is that at the time, after power was restored, they felt they did not have the power under the current framework to suspend the market.

Ms CHAPMAN: In progressing with a suspension of the spot market, via your government's direction, that was able to be achieved. Were there any consequences from that? Has there been any action or claim for damages or anything of that nature as a result of that?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, not that I am aware of.

Ms CHAPMAN: Having done that, and having used the Essential Services Act to do it in the circumstances you describe, why is it necessary for you to produce this new model under a different piece of legislation when the one time you needed to use it you did that and it all worked?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: There are a couple of reasons. Firstly, I believe that we could have prevented or minimised the risk of a system black had there been an intervention earlier. I remember the day of 28 September very well because my father-in-law was in hospital. He is a strong smoker, member for Colton. He was doing it very tough and I went to see him. I was hearing the reports of the wind and the storm front moving through South Australia, and I was very concerned about powerlines and transmission lines being taken out because, when these lines are taken out quickly, the system seeks the energy that is being demanded of it and it can cause surges.

A system black had been at the top of my mind for a long time, especially during the bushfire season. I remember calling AEMO and asking them, 'Is it prudent to constrain the interconnector in South Australia in advance of this storm heading through the Mid North and coming to Adelaide?' to make sure that we had as much thermal generation on as possible. The response I had from AEMO was that they felt that the system was secure and that there were no credible contingencies for any loss of the interconnector or any other form of generation.

My mind at the time, before question time that day, was very clear. If I had had the power to constrain that interconnector, I would have constrained it before the storm hit, not draw power out of Melbourne but constrain the power coming in, which I have the power to do, despite the misunderstanding of some in the media about my ability to direct Victorian generation, which I cannot do and I do not seek to do. All I was attempting to do was send a larger market signal here to have more generation on.

Constrict the interconnector and you would immediately have seen more units at Torrens on and immediately more units at Osborne on and immediately more units at Pelican Point on. We could have directed maybe the second unit on and had a lot more inertia and synchronous power in the system to withstand those shocks if we did suddenly lose transmission lines through what was being touted as a very large storm. I note that some of the wind speeds we went through on that day were equivalent to some of the cyclonic winds in Queensland yesterday.

I was very concerned about it so, yes, I think that if I had had the power before the emergency was there I could have used that power to, at the very least, constrain the interconnector so that losing it would not be a credible contingency. I would have had more thermal generation on in the state and we could maybe have withstood the shocks to the system. We still would have lost power at Olympic Dam and we still would have lost power in Port Lincoln because transmission lines were damaged and so were those generators. Things still would have occurred, but we might have avoided a system black.

Ms CHAPMAN: Prior to 2 o'clock on the day, you asked AEMO to do certain things which, in your judgement, would have assisted the management of the event that was about to occur. They declined. You formed the view that that should have occurred and you would have exercised the powers if you had the power to do it. My question is: when did you form the view that AEMO's judgement on this issue was wrong and who informed you for the purposes of making that judgement?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: First of all, it was not in terms of me seeking them for instructions. I was asking them questions, things like: is it prudent to constrict the interconnector? I formed in my mind that it had not worked when the lights went out and that obviously the policies AEMO had put in place to avoid a system black had failed, evidently, because we were in a system black. I have worried about a system black.

In fact, all energy ministers worry about a system black. New South Wales nearly had a system black a few weeks ago during the heatwave. They ran their system insecurely for a period of time and that could have potentially spiralled out of control as well. My view on this at the time was that I was asking questions like, 'Is it prudent?' I was being reassured by AEMO, the market operator, that it was okay. Up until then, they had not let us down. Up until then, I had no reason to question their judgement. I accepted their judgement on this, but the subsequent action was a system black.

AEMO did not set out to cause a system black, but for the reasons they have set out in their four reports there were things that they did not know about that occurred; that is, the software settings alongside generation that did not allow for more ride-through events to be contemplated within that type of generation. They did not believe the loss of the interconnector was a credible contingency on the day. They claimed that it was not a credible contingency. We did lose the interconnector that day. All the measures they had in place that they thought could happen failed and the system went black.

Ms CHAPMAN: That is very different from what I understood you to say earlier, and that is that, if you had had the powers, you would have exercised them. It is one thing to say in hindsight that it seemed a number of their judgements or their views as to how they would get through this event were in error and that perhaps other decisions should have been made. Had you formed the view yourself before 2 o'clock on that day that AEMO should be acting in a different way or had you relied on them at that stage because there was nothing else you had and no other information? And, if you did have other information which caused you to form a judgement that the information you were given was wrong, who did you get it from and why did you not act on it?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I had no power to intervene, other than to call a state of emergency, but of course a state of emergency did not exist, so I could not have called it and used any of those powers as this was before the storms wreaked any havoc and before there was any damage done to property. It was just weather advice and nothing had actually happened. People were on stand-by. We had emergency crews on stand-by. We did the right thing and checked with the national market operator about the ability for our infrastructure to withstand such a belting and they said we were okay.

With hindsight, we would have acted. The learnings from a system black are very clear. Again, these are learnings. Systems evolve. You do not set rules at a point in time and then forget them. As matters occur, as in the United States after Hurricane Sandy, there have been learnings. There have been changes to legislation, changes to regulation and changes to practice. It is the same with a system black. We had the system black, hence the Our Energy Plan. The measures in here are to ensure that the system is secure, stable, affordable and reliable.

A cornerstone of this plan is to give me, or any energy minister, the ability to intervene early on the advice of the offices that will regulate it—my energy markets division, AEMO and others—on

what is prudent to do. AEMO can see the bus coming, but sometimes they just do not have the rules or the ability to act early enough. Neither do we. That is why this legislation is vital, to give us the ability to act earlier, in advance, with more prophylactic measures to make sure that if the state is about to enter a massive wind event or bushfire, we can act. With Hurricane Debbie in Queensland, thermal generation—

Ms Chapman: You will have to seek leave if you are going on.

The CHAIR: On that point, you did say six more questions. I am not sure if the member for Stuart has any questions.

Ms CHAPMAN: I am sure he has a lot, but we are getting speeches in response.

The CHAIR: This is nearly finished then?

Ms CHAPMAN: I hope so. With the benefit of hindsight, let's go to the September event. You say that if you had had these powers you would have acted. What would you have done and whose advice would you have obtained for the purposes of forming the judgement to act?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: If we were facing the same conditions, I would have constrained the interconnector and directed generation in South Australia on.

Ms CHAPMAN: Whose advice would you have drawn on or relied on for the purposes of forming that judgement, or is it just something you make a decision on yourself?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I would have drawn on the advice of my agency. My agency would have consulted with the market operator and any other relevant operator. For example, we would talk to ElectraNet, we would talk to SA Power Networks, we would talk to the generators, I imagine. We would talk to the entire industry in South Australia about the prudent path forward.

Ms CHAPMAN: In a weather event, you are going to talk to the entire industry of South Australia?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes.

Ms CHAPMAN: When you consulted with AEMO on the September occasion, is it your understanding that they had consulted with ElectraNet and others?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I do not know; you would have to ask them.

Ms CHAPMAN: Did you ask them?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No.

Ms CHAPMAN: That is what I thought.

The CHAIR: Member for Stuart. You are still on clause 1, I presume.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Yes. Minister, you said that if you had these powers you would consult with the entire industry about how to use them. When we were given a briefing by your advisers, we were told that nobody in the industry had been consulted about this bill. You have explained to the house that you have had crown law advice but that not one other player in the entire industry has been consulted about this bill in advance of bringing it to the parliament. Why is it that nobody has been consulted?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: First of all, this is the government's response. Secondly, private operators in a private market do not like any interference from anyone. Thirdly, we said there had been no formal advice. There has been plenty of informal consultation with the operators.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Regarding that informal consultation with the operators, are the operators comfortable with what you are proposing?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I do not care, and I will tell you why I do not care. Because when a market decides it is better for them to leave generation off and South Australians go without power, they are not treating electricity as an essential service. My responsibilities are to the people of South Australia, not to people headquartered in Sydney or anywhere else.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Why did you seek their advice then?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Because it is prudent to negotiate with people. It is prudent to talk to people. That is why I believe it is important to have these powers because, unless I have these powers, the market will continue to operate in the way in which it has operated, which means that if it is cheaper and more efficient for them to send South Australians without power to maintain system security, rather than doing everything they could to keep power on, including maintaining a certain 'spot price' in the market, then that is what they would want—no action. Of course, no private operator likes being told by the government what to do.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I understand that, but my question was: why did you seek their informal advice, given that you said you did not care what it was going to be, that you do not care what the advice is? If you were going to do what you wanted to do regardless, why did you seek the advice?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I get that you are trying to verbal me. That is not what I said. I said that I do not care what their views are on this because this is the most important thing that we are doing—

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: So why did you seek their advice?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Because it is how I work. I always talk to the industry. I talk to the gas industry, I talk to the mining industry, I talk to the energy industry, I talk to all of them. They all know me. They all know how I work.

Ms Chapman: But do you listen?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Well, I don't ban gas, so I do listen. Do you?

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Minister, you said that if you were to have these powers in a situation as described in the act, you would seek advice. You gave us a lot of information about your thoughts on 28 September. Information received under a freedom of information request shows a short series of emails. I do not have the whole context, but from what I have on paper in front of me it appears that you were advised (and I will not say by whom just to leave that off the record for now) that 'even with the current weather conditions, we don't expect this to be an issue'. This is at 11 o'clock in the morning on 28 September. I am trying to get to the bottom of where you would get the advice from.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I do not know the context of the question.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The context of the question is that you said that if you assumed the powers available under this act, if the act were there, you would seek advice from a whole range of people with regard to what decisions to make and how to use it. You have told us that you do not particularly care what the commercial side of the industry would want; that would not be most important in your mind. You have said that you would seek advice from your department, from a range of other people you could get. That is the context. The question is this. I have received under freedom of information a series of emails in which, late in the morning of 28 September, you were advised by one of your most senior advisers that 'even with the current weather conditions, we don't expect this to be an issue'.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I do not know who that email is from. It could have been someone reporting what AEMO had said. I do not know. I will have to wait and see.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I would be happy to say—

The CHAIR: Order! I do not even understand what 'this' means in 'we expect this'.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: If you are happy, I am happy; I would just prefer to leave other people out of it. There is an email here from your Chief of Staff, Jarrad Pilkington, at 11.06 on 28 September 2016 that says, 'Even with the weather conditions, we don't expect this to be an issue,' 'this' being concern about the electricity system.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: To who?

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I can go through it all: to Vince Duffy with a cc to Tom Koutsantonis, Rebecca Knights, Paul Heithersay and Don Russell.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I do not know what question he was answering, whether it was advice from AEMO. I do not know; I have to check. Again, as I said, hindsight is a wonderful thing. The energy plan is born out of the experiences of the system black. There are learnings and we are implementing those learnings. Quite frankly, this legislation is about ensuring that those learnings are implemented, and this is one of the most vital pieces of that implementation.

Ms CHAPMAN: Who else did the minister get advice from on that day to form his view that he would have acted if he had the power to act?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I suppose I have to say that after the system black it was pretty obvious that we should have intervened earlier, but we did not have the power. It is pretty obvious and self-evident. What the opposition is actually asking me is: if I had formed the opinion beforehand that the system was definitely going to go black, why did I not act? Even if I had thought that, I do not have powers to do anything about it. That is why we are here today.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: That is not the question.

The CHAIR: I am not sure how the question relates to the bill, if that is not the question.

Ms Chapman: He wants more powers, that's why.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The question was: if you had these powers, what advice would you access to use them? You are a human like all of us, you do not know everything and you will need advice. You have explained your view about industry advice. There is an example of your closer departmental and ministerial advice which on the day, it appears, would not have led to your taking up those powers. If you had those powers, what other advice is out there that you would access?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Taking an email and saying, 'This is our view of the day,' you do not know what informed that email. You do not know why Mr Pilkington had come to that view and you do not know what advice he had received, yet you are posing a question as if that was our thinking.

Ms Chapman: We are just asking you.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, and I am answering it. I sat quietly while you were asking me questions, so you can sit quietly while I answer them.

There are learnings. I take advice from Vince Duffy, who is my executive director, and from Rebecca Knights, who is in energy markets. These are two of the most talented and respected public servants in the government. They know the energy markets better than most. I would take advice from AEMO. I would take advice from the chair of AEMO and the CEO of AEMO. I would talk to the owners of the relevant power stations about their ability to start or not start, and I would talk to ElectraNet about the ability to constrain the interconnector and then we would act, and we would act in the interests of South Australians pure and simple.

What happened on 28 September should not ever happen again. System black is a complete failure of the electricity market. It is one of the darkest days in the history of AEMO, and I think they agree. System black should never be an option. Load shedding is the last resort, and we are implementing measures to make those even more remote.

The CHAIR: Before we go on, the table are looking through the bill and it does appear that you are already on clause 8 because you are asking about the minister's powers. I think we should be moving on from clause 1.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

The CHAIR: Well, and powers. If you want to have an argument with us that is okay, but what we are saying to you is that we think that we have moved off clause 1.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Can I ask one more question?

The CHAIR: On clause 1?

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Yes, ma'am.

The CHAIR: One more question and then we are moving to clause 8 because that is where we are up to.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: No, clause 2.

The CHAIR: What is on clause 2?

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I will ask that question in a minute. Minister, I have only a small amount of information to share with you about this communication because that is all I get under freedom of information, but you got the gist of it. Were you given any different advice by any of those other senior people, anybody else other than the advice I have here, which is that it all looks okay?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I have to say that trust and faith in the system work when the system works well. Leading up to system black, my faith in the market operator was almost completely undentable. Matt Zema, a South Australian from the Coonawarra, was a close friend and someone whose passing I mourned terribly. I felt very sad for him and his family, especially his son. Matt Zema was someone who had complete faith in the system. I trusted the people he had mentored and brought into the system, so when they said to me, 'All is okay,' I trusted them.

Now, after the awful experience of that trust, I have very different views about how the market operates and in whose interests it operates. I suppose the learning here for me is like that of any minister in any government, Labor, Liberal or any government around the world: you are continually learning and adapting to the situations in front of you. As people change and personalities change, so do modes of operation.

Now that Matt is gone, Audrey is there and she will make different decisions. She will run AEMO her way. As board members change, cultures change, things change. What we are doing is protecting the state because I cannot allow control rooms in Sydney or boards based in Melbourne to let South Australia go black ever again.

The CHAIR: We have finished with clause 1 and the next question was on clause 2.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: But the question was: did you receive any different advice from your advisers on the day?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Different advice from what? To what AEMO had told me? To how we were thinking?

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The advice that I read out to you before from one of your senior people saying, 'It will all be okay.'

An honourable member interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order! That has nothing to do with the title. Where does your question fit? The question you were asking was about—

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: A logical train of response to the minister's answers.

The CHAIR: Where is your question in this bill? Where does it fit? You tell me where you would like it to fit? It does not fit in clause 1.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The CHAIR: It does not fit in clause 1.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I am happy to go to clause 2 and come back to this under a different clause.

Clause passed.

Clause 2.

The CHAIR: This one is going to fit into the commencement; is that correct?

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Yes, ma'am. Minister, given the urgency with which the government has brought this bill to the house, if it were to pass in the other place how soon after that would you commence this bill by proclamation?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Immediately; that is how urgent it is. The moment it passes both houses of parliament it will be going immediately to the Governor to proclaim it.

Clause passed.

Clause 3 passed.

Clause 4.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Clause 4 is pretty straightforward. It provides that 'Objects and guiding principles' are for 'making provision for declarations relating to electricity supply emergencies'. The next clause makes it pretty clear what is an 'electricity supply emergency—see section 27B'. I am not hoping to jump ahead, but I am looking at that and there is nothing that I have picked up in the core parts of 27B about when this would be implemented that makes an emergency a necessity. The core bit of when you would adopt these powers is, for example, if a community is disrupted to a significant degree, or if there is a real risk that they may be disrupted to a significant degree, from lack of supply of electricity, but that does not talk about emergencies.

Can you explain for the committee your intentions with the bill with regard to emergencies? Keep in mind that there is significant disruption, probability and actuality, versus risks that result from that—the risk of it happening versus the risks that come from it happening. As I read this bill, you could assume those powers, with the risk of a supply shortfall being very real. There is nothing in the bill that says that that must lead to the likelihood or expectation of some sort of emergency as a result of the shortfall.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Again, this is a very different way of thinking. What I am trying to do here is be prophylactic. If there is a real risk that there will not be supply, if there is a real risk that there will be an interruption, I can act. Hopefully, there is not a disruption and there is not a break in supply because we have acted. What occurs now is that you get market signals to attempt to avoid these things.

The system has to try to guess whether winds will be sufficiently strong enough to take down power lines, whether or not we are heading to a very high hot peak demand day, whether or not we will reach that peak, and whether we have enough time to intervene. The power of this is for me to make an assessment that a disruption of a significant degree, or a risk that there will be a significant disruption, does not occur, so we can intervene early. That is why this clause is there.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I understand that, but as part of that assessment, would it be necessary to reasonably expect that some form of emergency would come from the electricity supply disruption, or is it all about only electricity supply disruption?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: As far as the purposes of this are concerned, for an emergency I assume what you are asking is: is it a significant degree of disruption? People going without power is a significant disruption. We want to avoid that. That is why I will have these powers. If you are saying that this is not just in the matter of there being a bushfire, strong wind events or floods, that it could just be that it is 45° and a generator has decided that a dropped spanner means that they cannot turn on and the price stays at \$14,000 rather than new generation coming on and dropping the price to \$180, what I will be doing is making sure that that significant disruption does not occur by using these powers to intervene early and making sure that South Australians do not go without power.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: This is really critical to the whole thing. I am not suggesting that it should be one way or the other, but it is important that everybody with an interest in this understands. When contemplating using this power, where would you draw the line about a significant emergency? You can imagine a town of 200 people that is going to be out of power for some reason. Presumably, that is not a significant emergency, as important and as much of a disruption as that might be for the people who live there. Obviously, at the other end of the scale, if

it was all of metro Adelaide, that goes without saying. As a minister potentially using these powers, where would you decide that the significant disruption kicks in?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Given what happened with the September blackout, I think South Australians are at the point now where they believe that there should never be an interruption to power under any circumstances. Whether or not we can guarantee that is very, very difficult. My personal view is that whether you are in a town of 200 people or whether you are in a city of 1.5 million people without power makes no real difference. It depends on the reason. If there is a raging bushfire that is cutting people off, that is one thing; that is a different scenario. You would not make them maintain power through scrub that could set a bushfire starting in another direction.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am not saying you are saying that; I am just giving you my thinking. However, if it is the market deciding that it is cheaper and more efficient to load shed these people, rather than to turn on other generation or constrain the interconnector to have more generation turned on, then we will act. Every scenario will be different. As I said earlier, with the four blackouts that we have had, including the September blackout, every scenario has been different.

There is not one unique event that occurs that causes blackouts. These things are fluid and they change. That is how difficult the job is for the Australian Energy Market Commission in setting rules, because if they are trying to find recipes to fit every single situation that occurs, life has a way of doing things that makes the scenarios that appear very hard to find a recipe to fit that scenario. So you need to have discretion. I am giving us another arm of discretion, so if AEMO cannot do it under their rules, we can.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Essentially, would it be fair to say that it is complete discretion and there really are no guidelines? It would be completely at the discretion of the minister any time there is a reasonable expectation of a supply disruption of any sort that might have any range of consequences. That is what this bill seeks: complete discretion under any circumstances where it could be reasonably forecast that a disruption would occur.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, it is not. I think we are both pushing on an open door here. There is a threshold that has to be reached, and the threshold is under 27B(1) of the act, which provides:

If it appears to the Minister, on reasonable grounds, [and there are definitions of 'reasonable'] 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.

That is the threshold. If it reaches that threshold, I can act.

Ms CHAPMAN: I have a question while we are on clause 4—Objects and guiding principles. Further down there is going to be a requirement to provide information which relates to what we are about to amend, and that is to add in a declaration relating to electricity supply emergencies under this clause. Have you ever exercised your power pursuant to section 6 of the Essential Services Act to require information on which you might then rely to make this declaration?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I will have to check whether or not we can exercise that discretion under the act, but my advice is that we have a relationship with most parties and they provide information voluntarily. Again, it is another example of having the powers under the act and not having to exercise them, but it being there garners a level of cooperation.

Ms CHAPMAN: Section 7—Profiteering, of the Essential Services Act, gives you the right to fix a maximum price in respect of an essential service. Have you ever exercised that?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am not aware of having done that but it sounds tempting.

Clause passed.

Clause 5 passed.

Clause 6.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Clause 6(1) provides:

It is the intention of the parliament that this act apply within the state and outside the state to the full extent of the extra-territorial legislative capacity of the parliament.

In the advice you have sought from crown law, or anywhere else, are there any situations or examples where the powers that this act envisages would not be able to be enforced, or directions that you might potentially like to give may not be enforceable? What I am asking is, given all the advice the minister would have received from crown law and others, are there any situations the minister is aware of where the objectives of the act may not be able to be fulfilled because organisations, potentially in other states or territories or somewhere like that, would not be obliged to comply?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised there will be some real life scenarios where we may have to direct people who are outside South Australia. For example, the AEMO control office is in Western Sydney, so we would have to direct people in regard to their operation in South Australia while they are based in Sydney. I am advised that we have the power to do that.

There are also some other real-life scenarios where the physical location of some poles and wires coming into South Australia are based in Victoria. In effect, we would never direct people to make a change to the energy mix in other jurisdictions, just South Australia, but those people may be physically based, when making those decisions and directions, somewhere else.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Thank you, minister, I have got that. Perhaps I can reword it more usefully. Have you been advised of any situations where the extraterritorial legislative capacity of this parliament would not be sufficient to give those types of directions?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised no, that the parliament does have that power to make extraterritorial laws to have an impact on individuals outside South Australia.

Ms CHAPMAN: My understanding is that because AEMO, and in fact a number of the generator companies, are headquartered outside of South Australia, the purpose of this section is to be able to capture them to the extent either of their operations here or the effect they may have in respect of the electricity network here. Is that the purpose of you introducing this?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes.

Ms CHAPMAN: The advice you have had on this is from the Crown Solicitor's Office?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes.

Ms CHAPMAN: And are you satisfied that the addition of this clause is sufficient to give you power to impose a binding direction in respect of the generators and/or AEMO because they are the ones who have been identified in the Premier's statement about who he wants to affect here?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes.

Sitting extended beyond 18:00 on motion of Hon. A. Koutsantonis.

Clause passed.

Clause 7.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I am probably exposing some lack of knowledge here, but clause 7, insertion of section 26AA reads:

Except as provided in section 26, if an electricity supply emergency has been declared under Division 6, no direction may be given under this Division of a kind that could be given under Division 6.

Could you tell me what that means?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: If the state has declared a state of emergency, I am advised, and the state controller is making directions, he cannot make directions of the kind I could make in that situation so there are not contradictory orders being given about the electricity supply.

Clause passed.

Clause 8.

Ms CHAPMAN: This is the provision that sets up the new model of who this is to apply to, how it is to work and generally when an electricity supply emergency is in operation. My first question is: apart from AEMO and an electricity generator and a retailer, is there any other party you propose that you would be issuing a direction against?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No.

Ms CHAPMAN: When you issued the direction in September 2016 against AEMO, albeit under another act, did you issue a direction against any other party?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised no.

Ms CHAPMAN: Is there any reason then, if you are proposing to manage the commercial market, and AEMO is part of that structure as a body relevant to its operation, why the terms of this emergency arrangement—that is, to intervene and require a spot price or some other anti-profiteering regime—are that we should not specify that that be the limit of whom you could direct in these circumstances, namely AEMO or a generator or a retailer?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: In division 6, under 27A, the bill is clear that I can only give directions to market participants, and the market participants are listed.

Ms CHAPMAN: Had you received any advice as to whether you should have any other party to direct?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I would like to direct you, but unfortunately I do not have that luxury.

Ms CHAPMAN: In relation to the declaration, I think you explained in an answer to another question about what you saw as the threshold, which is basically when you form the view that it is necessary, you can do it. There are not any qualifying criteria, there is just your determination if, on reasonable grounds, a risk exists. We have been through that section. Apart from the capacity to direct for the purposes of price during an emergency and to avoid making money that we have referred to already today which you would see as unreasonable, is there any other circumstance where you consider that you would be needing to direct either a generator or a retailer or AEMO?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is very hard to give these hypothetical scenarios the justice the house deserves because every scenario is different. In my mind, and I think in the agency's mind, the main powers would be to direct AEMO to direct generation on or to suspend the spot market in the case of something potentially occurring or to direct generation on. I also have powers under another act to move gas around the state to make sure there is sufficient pressure in pipes to start generators.

I really cannot give you the hypotheticals of where else we would use it. Something may occur that we have not contemplated, but if we have the powers in place, we can deal with it then, but it is certainly not me trying to usurp the market. I do not want to be issuing directions every single day. I want this to be the last resort; that is certainly where my mind is at with this. Given that we have pretty wideranging powers under the Gas Act, you do not see me sending that many directions around now. I think this act will be used more as a general conversation with a retailer or AEMO that will not require a direction.

Knowing that it is there I think will have sufficient force within the market to make sure that any behaviour that might not be advantageous to customers in terms of supply—not in terms of price but in terms of supply—should smooth out any of the wrinkles. I cannot give you the hypothetical scenarios you are looking for because I have not really contemplated any other ones, other than constricting the interconnector to make sure we have as much generation on as possible or directing generators on if they are mothballed, not participating in the market or sitting out of the market and waiting.

Ms CHAPMAN: So, essentially, to ensure that there is sufficient generation, you would want to have that power to say, 'I want you to turn this capacity on,' to cover an anticipated weather event or some other circumstance which, on your advice, could affect the supply itself—in other words, there would be an interruption to service—and/or that restricting of the power supply could cause a huge spike in the price, of which there might be another problem.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Restricting the interconnector is not about price.

Ms CHAPMAN: I did not say that. The generator.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I would see my powers as giving the system more redundancy. By constricting the interconnector, rather than it being on maximum importing to South Australia, you would obviously have more generation on in South Australia to meet demand and the interconnector would be reserve headroom to call into the system to stabilise it.

I am not trying to be anticompetitive here. I am not trying to crowd out Victorian or New South Wales generators. What I am attempting to do is to secure the system for continuity of supply because when we lose supply people can die. It is dangerous not having electricity, so it is important that we do everything we can. That is the way I am contemplating this act. That is the way we have drafted the act. It is not necessarily about trying to take out anticompetitive behaviour or market manipulation, although that might be a consequence of these powers. The intent of the act is to make sure that we have the ability to secure supply when necessary, when the market fails to do so.

Ms CHAPMAN: Have you contemplated that the directions will also be to the Technical Regulator or do you think you have enough power under his or her act to do that?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, there is no power to direct the Office of the Technical Regulator in this act.

Ms CHAPMAN: But he has a specific piece of legislation under which he has to give an annual report to the parliament and he has to take instruction from you. You have power to direct in any event.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes.

Ms CHAPMAN: In relation to liability, there is a protection from liability clause later on in the bill. I forgot to ask you, in relation to us accepting this new model under clause 8, whether you have received legal advice as to whether that protection is sufficient to protect the state against a claim by a generator and/or AEMO if they considered that there was some mala fides, negligence or recklessness in the direction.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes.

Ms CHAPMAN: Was that by the state Crown Solicitor's Office?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes.

Ms CHAPMAN: Have you conferred with any of your colleagues, ministers for energy, also in the system—that is, in New South Wales or Victoria—in respect of whether they would have any concerns about you progressing with a direction power of this nature?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I would like to keep my conversations with my colleagues between us. I think it is fair to say that they are watching with interest to see how this plays out. I know that the Minister for Energy in Victoria is watching very, very closely. I know that Mr Frydenberg has his views and I have discussed our plan with him. I think the sense amongst the COAG Energy Council is that they all agree that something needs to be done. I do not know their views or whether or not they agree with our package, but I get the sense that they all understand that we need to act, and we are. They act in their state's interest: I act in ours.

Ms CHAPMAN: Of those, you have discussed it with the energy minister of Victoria and Mr Frydenberg. Are they the only two?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: As I said to you earlier, I am not going to talk about who I have consulted with on this because it is fair to say that the COAG Energy Council, regardless of party affiliation, is a very collegiate group. We work very well together. Politics is left at the door and we work constructively, so I do not like revealing conversations that we have had, other than to say that I think they are all watching with interest to see how our reforms impact the market. But I am acting in the state's interest. I am not really interested in whether this is approved or not approved by New South Wales, Queensland, Victoria or Tasmania because I am the Treasurer and energy minister of this state, and I only care about this state.

Ms CHAPMAN: Well, I am the member for Bragg and I am a member of this parliament and you are asking us to approve this bill, so I think it is reasonable for us to know whether in fact the state is going to face litigation or objection at COAG or in relation to any challenge to the validity of legislation—hence, my question.

I am not asking for the details of conversation with colleagues around Australia who are involved in our system for electricity sharing in the national market, but I am interested to know: have any of them at this stage—and they may not have, with only two days' notice of even viewing this bill, because I am assuming they did not see the bill before we did—indicated any concern about your capacity to make a direction that may adversely impact on their supply or price?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: First, the advice from the Crown is very clear: this is a constitutionally valid piece of legislation that we have every right to introduce. Second, new section 27C provides:

- (4) The Minister must, to the extent that it is reasonably practicable to do so in all the circumstances (and having regard to the urgency of the situation) consult with a market participant the subject of the proposed direction under this section before giving the direction.
- (5) In giving a direction under this section, the Minister must, to the extent that it is reasonably practicable to do so, take reasonable steps to avoid unduly interfering with the operation of the national electricity market, the National Electricity Rules and the National Electricity Law.

We are a sovereign state, we are entitled to introduce this legislation and we are entitled to protect our citizens.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: With regard to giving notice if a declaration is made, 27B(3) provides that it must be published in a manner and form determined by the minister. What potentially would that be? What would your intention be? How would you let people know?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We are seeking as much discretion as possible depending on the situation. It could be quite urgent, so it might require less notice. Again, we want broad discretion here because things move very quickly. That is the answer I can give you.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Would it be your intention wherever possible to advise the public that those powers have been assumed?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We could make a gazettal, which is informing the public. We could publish it on a website, which is informing the public. I can put out a press release, which is informing the public. I could call some journalists or I could tweet it. I think getting the information out so that the public are aware is very important, but what is also important is speed, and speed in these situations can be quite urgent. There will be no secret directions that people will not be aware of, and the actual declaration will be in writing.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: This clause talks about the potential for the powers to be assumed for up to 14 days, or less if that seems appropriate. Would that just be for one incident or expected incident? Let's just say hypothetically that there is a reason why these powers would be assumed that satisfies everything in the bill, and you set a period of time. If within that period of time a different supply shortage or a different expectation of a supply shortage came up, would it require a different declaration or would it be covered in the same time period?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Which?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It would require a new declaration. I am not sure if it would be required, but we would make a new declaration because we would be assessing the new situation.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: These powers are quite broad-ranging and influence a whole range of people and organisations. I am thinking particularly about generators. Is there a third-party influencing power within this? In a situation where you would like to direct a generator to undertake activity—presumably generate—but that generator, to do that, requires participation and quite likely gas, do you have the power then to force that generator to purchase fuel, essentially, to fulfil your direction?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Again, it depends on who I am directing. If I am directing diesel generators—and there are diesel generators operating in the NEM—you would have to check to see the availability of fuel. There are no powers under this for me to get them that fuel. I could use other powers under other acts to get them that fuel. I could use direct procurement through the government to get them that fuel as Treasurer. The government can go out and procure fuel sources.

The key for us here is the ability for them to transfer that fuel source into energy, and that is the part I am interested in directing. The rest really is ancillary. I can use the Gas Act to maintain pressure, I assume. We will check that, but I assume I have powers under the Gas Act to direct gas. The Prime Minister has already talked about giving AEMO those powers through a national body, which we are considering, to make sure there is sufficient pressure in pipes to restart generators. Generators often fail to start. One of the reasons they fail is that there is insufficient pressure in the pipes leading into the generators. On average, gas-fired generators fail on one out of every four times they attempt to start.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Say that again, please.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Gas-fired generators, on average, sometimes fail to start. I think the industry average—I could be wrong here—is one in four attempts to start fail. So, 25 per cent of the time they fail to start, and they try again and again until they start. These things are not as efficient as our brand-new aeroderivative generator, which is like a jet engine, which I am looking forward to getting my hands on. I think it is an important power to have. I am interested more in the ability to turn that fuel source into generation but, if the fuel source is scarce, you may choose not to direct that generator. You might go somewhere else and find someone else who has a source. There are a number of options available to us.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: If the fuel were available, would this bill give the minister the power to direct the generator to purchase the fuel in what would normally be considered very unattractive commercial conditions, or would the government acquire the fuel and essentially give it to the generator to use?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I would just give them a direction to generate.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Regardless of the cost?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, electricity is an essential service.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Minister, new section 27C(5), which you referred to a little while ago, talks about 'avoid unduly interfering with the operation of the National Electricity Market'. You have said in your other comments that, with a focus on what is best for South Australia, if you need to interfere with the market you will interfere with the market, that you will do whatever is necessary. How does that sit with this requirement to avoid unduly interfering with the market? What does it really mean by 'unduly'? If you or I potentially just wanted whatever is best for South Australia, we might say that that's not undue at all. Somebody else might say that you are interfering with the market unduly. How would you go about trying to do what is the very best for South Australia in the way you have described you would before, and simultaneously comply with this requirement?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We are not bloody-minded; we are not attempting to destroy the national market. There is always more than one path to victory, always more than one path to get to where we want to go. If there are two or three paths available to us, and two of the three broadly will cut large gouges through the operation of the national market and one that is broadly consistent with the national market, which is the more conservative option and more in keeping with the national market? Why? I want investment in the National Electricity Market in South Australia.

Again, my powers are powers of last resort. This is not the idea that I would somehow start using this to say that, regardless of cost, regardless of market conditions, regardless of your market position, regardless of everything else, operate now in perpetuity forever at this rate. I am not saying you are. This is always about a last resort. The entire plan, from this legislation through to the temporary generation, through to the backup generation, through to our contracts for the battery, through to our renewable technology fund, are all about making sure that we are building a safety net for South Australia.

The contract with the battery is about us calling on it when we think there will be a time of peak demand without sufficient ability to meet that demand through the market. So we will put them out of the market using a contract that will be transparent to the market, they will pull out, they will start charging and they will dispatch what we tell them to dispatch.

The backup generator, the 250 megawatts that we are putting in, will be offering constant inertia to the system, working in that ancillary market, being able to have a fast start capability to turn on, like a jet engine, and provide services when load shedding is about to occur, and in substitute of load shedding our generation comes in place.

We are not interested in market participation. The market is here now: I voted against the creation of a private market. I am interested now in minimising our impact, but if we do intervene it will be decisive, and in times when there needs to be intervention we will choose the path that gives us the best outcome with the least inference in the market, because we want people to invest in South Australia.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Part of this act makes it very clear that there will be no compensation or no right to claim against the government for any directions that are given. What advice have you had about potential sovereign risk implications to exist in current market operators, organisations that are in the market already who are now exposed to the potential that they might receive directions from which there is no compensation—having never been exposed to that risk before?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Then they should not manipulate the market. It is very simple. We are not talking about people selling cars. I am not trying to be disparaging of the shadow minister; I am saying that we are not talking about commodities like Coke or Pepsi or milk or bread or clothes. We are talking about essential utilities: water and electricity. Because we do not control electricity anymore, I think sovereign risk can be imposed on us by other people who operate these assets, like with the debate about Alinta.

I understand the local member of parliament's frustration at the closure of Alinta, but I was not going to have a company imposing on us their terms and conditions, no more than I would let AGL or Origin or anyone else do that—we are a sovereign state—because they are involved in the marketplace of an essential service: power. The public demand and expect the government have control of this market in emergencies and that is what we are giving them. So, I do not think it causes any sovereign risk.

This is a political question and the political response is this: the public of South Australia were outraged when the market gave us the outcome of a second unit at Pelican Point sitting idle when South Australians were load shed. It did not need to happen. The direct consequence of that is being debated today.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Linking those comments back to something that you said quite a while ago, is it a fair characterisation to say that this bill is as much about having the power so that the market will operate the way that all those who have South Australian's best interests at heart would want the market to operate as it is actually about getting your hands on the levers yourself?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That is a very good point the shadow minister makes. These rules give us the levers. How we touch them is often in its absence. So, it is better sometimes not to touch the levers but to know that they are there. When the levers are not there, and you cannot pull them or push them, the market does its own thing. They will now know that we have these powers. Whether it is Mr Dan van Holst Pellekaan or minister Koutsantonis, they know that the parliament and its ministers will act in the sovereign interests of South Australia for our security.

I do not begrudge the market acting in their own interests because they are good little capitalists. They have a set of rules that the market gives them and they operate within those rules. If they can do things within the rules that returns a better return for their shareholders, good luck to them. Shame on us for letting it happen. Our job is to make sure that our constituents, our shareholders are looked after, and they are our constituents. So, we have these rules. I do not want to use these rules but I will have no hesitation in using them if South Australians are put at risk.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Another slightly philosophical question, but directly relevant: is it a bit of a double-edged sword to have these powers? Does it expose the minister and/or the government of the day to criticism or potentially some other form of liability if the powers are not used under certain circumstances? This is all about trying to predict when there is going to be a problem, and, if the market and the participants do not respond to that prediction the way you would like them to, you do grab the levers with your own hands. Given that people are involved in this all the way through, and people are fallible, is there an exposure to the government if, in hindsight, it could be said that the powers should have been used but they were not?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, if I do not exercise the powers in a scenario, I think the opposition will criticise me. If I exercise the powers under the same scenario, I think you will criticise me. There is massive political risk, but with political risk, elections have consequences. With those consequences we govern. I want the tools to govern, and those tools are, I am not going to let a marketplace send South Australians without power because it suits them.

So, yes, using it will give me more political risk because I will not have the refrain that you privatised our assets and it is run by a private market. I am giving myself powers to intervene. It will not work every single time, but these powers will give us a fighting chance to make sure that South Australians have a system that is on their side, not on the side of the successful purchasers of our generators.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: You have just highlighted a key difference between us. I did not say anything about political risk, and I did not think of political risk, but it was the first and only thing that you mentioned with regard to risk. I was thinking more about a community, or an industry, or a company—think of any large company that requires electricity to do what it does. If the powers are not used and an event occurs so that company does not have electricity, could that company or that community have any claim over the government for not having used those powers?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Not under the clauses of this act.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I refer to clause 8, new section 27G, which is about delegation. Like many other things, that is very wide open. The minister could delegate these powers to anyone—absolutely anyone. Could you give some examples of the types of people who you would contemplate delegating those powers to if you were using them?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is likely to be to another minister, or it could be to a senior departmental official.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Would it be anybody outside of government?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Section 27E(3) states, 'Information classified by the Minister as confidential under this section is not liable to disclosure'. What type of information would you predict that you would classify as confidential if you were using these powers?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Commercial information.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: So, purely commercial information. That might potentially be some operational information if there was a commercially sensitive element to it, but purely commercial information?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Generators have costs. They do not want their competitors to know what their costs of generation are. I would keep that confidential.

Clause passed.

Clause 9.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: My question is in relation to the dollar rates for the penalties. I understand that is always a difficult issue. How do you set those? I did a really quick calculation, and I am looking at section 28A(1), which contains a \$250,000 maximum penalty for a person who fails to comply with the direction of the minister. If the market price was \$14,000 then \$250,000 equates to 18 megawatts, if I have done my sums correctly. That is not a lot in terms of potentially

trying to direct a generator to do something. I understand this is largely about trying to get generators into the market, it is not about trying to stop them from doing it. How are these figures determined?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Most of these companies are listed on the ASX, and they will obey Australian laws. There are not many companies in Australia, or any companies that I know, that would deliberately break the law or a lawful instruction. So, the fine really is irrelevant, it is just there because we have the ability to charge them.

More importantly, some of these offences are summary or indictable. So, if the system in this country gets to the point where Australian companies can wilfully break the law and pay the fine, that is not how this country operates and it is not how our corporate sector operates. The Australian corporate culture is not like that. The ASX and the corporations laws make sure that Australian companies operating here operate within the laws of this land, and they will take lawful instructions.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (10 and 11) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (18:29): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (18:30): As everybody in this house would know, it is extraordinarily frustrating for the opposition to have a bill come with such speed and lack of warning. I know that the government would have known about this before 11 o'clock. The minister has explained how urgent it is to get this through, and I accept that explanation. I said right at the beginning of this debate, shortly after 11 on Tuesday morning, that we would not oppose the passing of this bill in this place but that we would take the opportunity to do as much homework as possible between the houses and return with an opposition position in the other chamber.

I have absolutely no desire to thwart the passage of any legislation that will make things better for South Australia and South Australians. I am learning as much as I possibly can about everything to do with energy and electricity, and I take these matters very seriously. The opposition will not make this difficult for any reason whatsoever. If the opposition decides that there are flaws in it and that there are reasons why it needs to be changed or objected to, then that will be the case, but there will be no other reason to prevent or thwart the passage of this bill.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (JUDICIAL REGISTRARS) BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 18:32 the house adjourned until Tuesday 11 April 2017 at 11:00.

*Estimates Replies***ATTRACTION AND RETENTION ALLOWANCES**

In reply to **Mr KNOLL (Schubert)** (1 August 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change): The Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, the Minister for Water and the River Murray, and the Minister for Climate Change has received the following advice:

Attraction, retention and performance allowances as well as non-salary benefits paid to public servants and contractors:

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT, WATER AND NATURAL RESOURCES (DEWNR)

(a) 2014-15:

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount (pa)
DEWNR	Principal Aquatic Ecologist	PO4	Attraction/Retention	\$12,573
DEWNR	Principal Hydrologist (M21635)	PO4	Attraction/Retention	\$6,189
DEWNR	Principal Hydrologist (M21670)	PO4	Attraction/Retention	\$1,942
DEWNR	Principal Groundwater Modeller	PO4	Attraction/Retention	\$3,900
DEWNR	Manager Coast & River Murray	PO5	Attraction/Retention	\$10,000
DEWNR	Program Leader Coorong Lower Lakes Murray Mouth	PO5	Attraction/Retention	\$15,000
DEWNR	Regional Asset Services Office (Northern & Yorke region)	ASO4	Attraction/ Retention	\$13,073
DEWNR	Executive Officer (WR1289)	ASO5	Attraction/Retention	\$6,322
DEWNR	Communications Officer (Minister's Office)	ASO6	Attraction/Retention	\$4,870
DEWNR	Operations Manager	ASO6	Attraction/Retention	\$12,800
DEWNR	Plan, Policy and Partnership	ASO6	Attraction/Retention	\$4,643
DEWNR	Media Manager	ASO7	Attraction/Retention	\$11,027
DEWNR	Senior Consultant Smartforms	ASO7	Attraction/Retention	\$5,000
DEWNR	Manager Urban Water Economics	ASO8	Attraction/Retention	\$10,000
DEWNR	Manager Business Development	ASO8	Attraction/Retention	\$16,650
DEWNR	Manager People, Capability & Culture	MAS3	Attraction/Retention	\$10,000
DEWNR	Manager Landscape Service (SA Murray Darling Basin region)	MAS3	Attraction/Retention	\$10,000
DEWNR	Manager Planning & Evaluation (Adelaide Mount Lofty Ranges region)	MAS3	Attraction/Retention	\$6,500
DEWNR	Director Community Engagement	MAS3	Attraction/Retention	\$20,000

(b) 2015-16:

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount (pa)
DEWNR	Groundwater Modeller	PO2	Attraction/Retention	\$2,098
DEWNR	Principal Aquatic Ecologist	PO4	Attraction/Retention	\$12,573
DEWNR	Principal Hydrologist (M21635)	PO4	Attraction/Retention	\$6,189
DEWNR	Principal Hydrologist (M21670)	PO4	Attraction/Retention	\$1,942
DEWNR	Principal Groundwater Modeller	PO4	Attraction/Retention	\$3,345
DEWNR	Regional Asset Services Officer (Northern & Yorke region)	ASO4	Attraction/Retention	\$13,073
DEWNR	Communications Officer (Minister's Office)	ASO6	Attraction/Retention	\$4,870
DEWNR	Operations Manager	ASO6	Attraction/Retention	\$12,800
DEWNR	Media Manager	ASO7	Attraction/Retention	\$11,027
DEWNR	Senior Consultant Smartforms	ASO7	Attraction/Retention	\$5,000
DEWNR	Manager Business Development	ASO8	Attraction/Retention	\$16,650

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount (pa)
DEWNR	Mgr Urban Water Economics & Water	ASO8	Attraction/Retention	\$10,000
DEWNR	Manager Planning & Evaluation (Adelaide Mount Lofty Ranges region)	MAS3	Attraction/Retention	\$6,500
DEWNR	Manager, Fire Management	MAS3	Attraction/Retention	\$10,000
DEWNR	Director Community Engagement	MAS3	Attraction/Retention	\$23,519

ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY

(a) 2014-15:

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
EPA	Work health Safety & Injury Management Adviser	ASO5	Retention	\$2,749.00
EPA	Senior Administration Officer Public Information	ASO3	Retention	\$4,062.00
EPA	Senior Adviser PMO	ASO6	Attraction	\$6,088.00
EPA	Manager Resources and Energy	PO5	Attraction	\$11,165.00
EPA	Senior Environmental Planner	ASO5	Retention	\$1,972.00
EPA	Manager Site Contamination	PO5	Retention	\$21,787.00
EPA	CFO Manager Finance and Corporate Administration	ASO8	Retention	\$4,678.00
EPA	CIO Manager Knowledge, Information and Strategy	ASO8	Retention	\$6,088.00
EPA	Program Manager Legislation and Policy Reform	ASO7	Retention	\$3,806.00
EPA	Principal Scientific Officer Marine	PO4	Retention	\$3,858.50
EPA	Manager Strategy and Executive Office	ASO8	Retention	\$5,989.00

(b) 2015-16:

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
EPA	Work Health Safety & Injury Management Adviser	ASO5	Retention	\$2,817.00
EPA	Senior Administration Officer Public Information	ASO3	Retention	\$4,062.00
EPA	Senior Adviser PMO	ASO6	Attraction	\$6,088.00
EPA	Manager Resources and Energy	PO5	Attraction	\$4,181.21
EPA	Senior Environmental Planner	ASO5	Retention	\$1,972.00
EPA	Manager Site Contamination	PO5	Retention	\$22,816.30
EPA	CFO Manager Finance and Corporate Administration	ASO8	Retention	\$4,678.00
EPA	CIO Manager Knowledge, Information and Strategy	ASO8	Retention	\$6,088.00
EPA	Manager Strategy and Executive Office	ASO8	Retention	\$5,989.00

SA WATER

(a) 2014-15:

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
SAW	Apprentice Fitter & Turner	Apprentice	Performance	\$709.22
SAW	Construction and Mtce Worker	SAW2	Performance	\$776.36
SAW	Construction and Mtce Worker	SAW2	Performance	\$776.36
SAW	Construction and Mtce Worker	SAW2	Performance	\$776.36

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
SAW	Construction and Mtce Worker	SAW2	Performance	\$776.36
SAW	Construction and Mtce Worker	SAW2	Performance	\$776.36
SAW	Construction and Mtce Worker	SAW2	Performance	\$776.36
SAW	Construction and Mtce Worker	SAW2	Performance	\$776.36
SAW	Construction and Mtce Worker	SAW2	Performance	\$776.36
SAW	Construction and Mtce Worker	SAW2	Performance	\$776.36
SAW	Construction and Mtce Worker	SAW2	Performance	\$776.36
SAW	Construction and Mtce Worker	SAW2	Performance	\$776.36
SAW	Construction and Mtce Worker	SAW2	Performance	\$776.36
SAW	Construction and Mtce Worker	SAW2	Performance	\$776.36
SAW	Construction and Mtce Worker	SAW2	Performance	\$743.84
SAW	Construction and Mtce Worker	SAW2	Performance	\$743.84
SAW	Construction and Mtce Worker	SAW2	Performance	\$743.84
SAW	Construction and Mtce Worker	SAW2	Performance	\$743.84
SAW	Construction and Mtce Worker	SAW2	Performance	\$776.36
SAW	Construction and Mtce Worker	SAW2	Performance	\$783.43
SAW	Customer Serv Centre Officer	SAW2	Performance	\$566.86
SAW	Customer Serv Centre Officer	SAW2	Performance	\$776.36
SAW	Customer Serv Centre Officer	SAW2	Performance	\$743.84
SAW	Lock Attendant	SAW2	Performance	\$776.36
SAW	Lock Attendant	SAW2	Performance	\$478.11
SAW	Lock Operator	SAW2	Performance	\$776.36
SAW	Records Support Officer	SAW2	Performance	\$776.36
SAW	Account Investigations Officer	SAW3	Performance	\$697.58
SAW	Accounts Payable Officer	SAW3	Performance	\$825.07
SAW	Business Support Officer	SAW3	Performance	\$825.07
SAW	Construction and Mtce Team Ldr	SAW3	Performance	\$871.98
SAW	Construction and Mtce Worker	SAW3	Performance	\$871.98
SAW	Construction and Mtce Worker	SAW3	Performance	\$825.07
SAW	Construction and Mtce Worker	SAW3	Performance	\$871.98
SAW	Construction and Mtce Worker	SAW3	Performance	\$825.07
SAW	Construction and Mtce Worker	SAW3	Performance	\$871.98
SAW	Construction and Mtce Worker	SAW3	Performance	\$871.98
SAW	Construction and Mtce Worker	SAW3	Performance	\$871.98
SAW	Construction and Mtce Worker	SAW3	Performance	\$871.98
SAW	Construction and Mtce Worker	SAW3	Performance	\$871.98
SAW	Construction and Mtce Worker	SAW3	Performance	\$871.98
SAW	Electrical Tradesperson	SAW3	Performance	\$776.36
SAW	Field Technician	SAW3	Performance	\$899.80
SAW	Field Technician	SAW3	Performance	\$871.98
SAW	Specialist Networks Op/Vac	SAW3	Performance	\$871.98
SAW	Team Leader Salinity O and M	SAW3	Performance	\$871.98
SAW	Technical Officer Chemistry	SAW3	Performance	\$899.80
SAW	Technical Officer Chemistry	SAW3	Performance	\$719.84
SAW	Technical Officer Chemistry	SAW3	Performance	\$899.80
SAW	Admin Officer	SAW4	Performance	\$596.27
SAW	Admin Officer	SAW4	Performance	\$397.51
SAW	Chemist	SAW4	Performance	\$960.68
SAW	Construction and Mtce Worker	SAW4	Performance	\$796.66
SAW	Contract Administrator	SAW4	Performance	\$993.78
SAW	District Leader Crystal Brook	SAW4	Performance	\$960.68

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
SAW	District Leader Wudinna	SAW4	Performance	\$993.78
SAW	District Leader Yorketown	SAW4	Performance	\$993.78
SAW	EA to GM Business Services	SAW4	Performance	\$993.78
SAW	Electrical Tradesperson	SAW4	Performance	\$993.78
SAW	Electrical Tradesperson	SAW4	Performance	\$993.78
SAW	Electrical Tradesperson	SAW4	Performance	\$960.68
SAW	Extensions Officer	SAW4	Performance	\$703.29
SAW	IS Administration Serv Officer	SAW4	Performance	\$894.40
SAW	L and D Support Coordinator	SAW4	Performance	\$993.78
SAW	Payroll Officer	SAW4	Performance	\$993.78
SAW	Property Support Officer	SAW4	Performance	\$993.78
SAW	Recruitment Support Officer	SAW4	Performance	\$645.95
SAW	Salary Sacrifice Officer	SAW4	Performance	\$993.78
SAW	Senior Field Officer	SAW4	Performance	\$960.68
SAW	Snr Accounts Payable Officer	SAW4	Performance	\$993.78
SAW	Snr Billing Officer	SAW4	Performance	\$993.78
SAW	Snr Service Centre Officer	SAW4	Performance	\$927.58
SAW	Snr Service Centre Officer	SAW4	Performance	\$927.58
SAW	Treatment Plant Operator	SAW4	Performance	\$960.68
SAW	Treatment Plant Operator	SAW4	Performance	\$993.78
SAW	Treatment Plant Operator	SAW4	Performance	\$993.78
SAW	Wastewater Treatment Plant Opr	SAW4	Performance	\$993.78
SAW	Wastewater Treatment Plant Opr	SAW4	Performance	\$993.78
SAW	Business Tech Supp Consultant	SAW5	Performance	\$1,128.68
SAW	Comm & Stakhldr Liasn Supp Off	SAW5	Performance	\$1,128.68
SAW	Construction and Mtce Worker	SAW5	Performance	\$825.07
SAW	Construction Team Ldr -Cap Del	SAW5	Performance	\$993.78
SAW	Contractor Mgmt Sys Supp Ofcer	SAW5	Performance	\$1,081.57
SAW	Coordinator Major Maintenance	SAW5	Performance	\$1,128.68
SAW	Customer Feedback Advisor	SAW5	Performance	\$1,081.57
SAW	Development Adviser	SAW5	Performance	\$1,128.68
SAW	Development Adviser	SAW5	Performance	\$1,034.58
SAW	District Leader Jamestown	SAW5	Performance	\$1,128.68
SAW	District Leader Mt Gambier	SAW5	Performance	\$993.78
SAW	District Leader Pt Lincoln	SAW5	Performance	\$1,128.68
SAW	District Leader Woodside	SAW5	Performance	\$1,128.68
SAW	EA to Corporation Secretary	SAW5	Performance	\$1,128.68
SAW	EA to GM Comm & Business Dev	SAW5	Performance	\$1,128.68
SAW	EA to GM of People & Culture	SAW5	Performance	\$1,015.81
SAW	Electrical Team Leader	SAW5	Performance	\$1,128.68
SAW	Electrical Tradesperson	SAW5	Performance	\$993.78
SAW	Energy Contract Officer	SAW5	Performance	\$1,128.68
SAW	Field Officer Eyre	SAW5	Performance	\$1,128.68
SAW	Locks Coordinator	SAW5	Performance	\$1,128.68
SAW	Mgr Customer Assistance	SAW5	Performance	\$927.58
SAW	Procurement Systems Supp Off	SAW5	Performance	\$1,128.68
SAW	Property Consultant	SAW5	Performance	\$1,128.68
SAW	Scientist	SAW5	Performance	\$1,081.57
SAW	Scientist	SAW5	Performance	\$1,128.68
SAW	Scientist Wastewater Research	SAW5	Performance	\$1,034.58

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
SAW	Snr Connections Officer	SAW5	Performance	\$1,034.58
SAW	Snr Payroll Officer	SAW5	Performance	\$1,128.68
SAW	Snr Technical Officer	SAW5	Performance	\$1,128.68
SAW	System Controller	SAW5	Performance	\$1,128.68
SAW	System Controller	SAW5	Performance	\$1,128.68
SAW	System Controller	SAW5	Performance	\$1,128.68
SAW	Tech Officer Life Sciences	SAW5	Performance	\$1,034.58
SAW	Technical Services Officer	SAW5	Performance	\$1,081.57
SAW	Wastewater Treatment Plant Opr	SAW5	Performance	\$1,128.68
SAW	Work Planner	SAW5	Performance	\$993.78
SAW	Asset Planner—Networks	SAW6	Performance	\$1,276.65
SAW	Asset Planner—Treatment	SAW6	Performance	\$1,223.48
SAW	Business Relations Consultant	SAW6	Performance	\$1,276.65
SAW	Coordinator Lake Victoria	SAW6	Performance	\$1,170.35
SAW	Electrical Team Leader	SAW6	Performance	\$1,170.35
SAW	Engineer	SAW6	Performance	\$1,276.65
SAW	Environ Impact Assess Officer	SAW6	Performance	\$1,274.12
SAW	Environmental Mgmt Officer	SAW6	Performance	\$596.26
SAW	Fabrication Team Leader	SAW6	Performance	\$1,170.35
SAW	IS Portfolio Plan Comm Analyst	SAW6	Performance	\$1,276.65
SAW	L&D Advisor Solutions Spec	SAW6	Performance	\$946.75
SAW	Major Development Specialist	SAW6	Performance	\$1,170.35
SAW	Management Accountant	SAW6	Performance	\$862.23
SAW	Management Accountant	SAW6	Performance	\$1,276.65
SAW	Mid Range Analyst	SAW6	Performance	\$1,276.65
SAW	Network Operations Officer	SAW6	Performance	\$1,276.65
SAW	Planner	SAW6	Performance	\$1,276.65
SAW	Pricing Analyst	SAW6	Performance	\$1,276.65
SAW	Project Delivery Analyst	SAW6	Performance	\$1,276.65
SAW	Project Engineer	SAW6	Performance	\$1,276.65
SAW	Records Mgmt Compliance Spec	SAW6	Performance	\$1,276.65
SAW	Recruitment Consultant	SAW6	Performance	\$1,276.65
SAW	Recruitment Consultant	SAW6	Performance	\$949.58
SAW	SCADA Systems Analyst	SAW6	Performance	\$1,276.65
SAW	Scientist	SAW6	Performance	\$1,276.65
SAW	Snr Property Consultant	SAW6	Performance	\$1,170.35
SAW	WS Optimisation Engineer	SAW6	Performance	\$1,276.65
SAW	Catchment Mgmt Specialist	SAW7	Performance	\$1,363.43
SAW	Community Investment Lead Cons	SAW7	Performance	\$1,363.43
SAW	Design & Standards Specialist	SAW7	Performance	\$1,435.34
SAW	Land Mgmt Coord Port Lincoln	SAW7	Performance	\$1,432.04
SAW	Major Development Proposal Off	SAW7	Performance	\$1,435.34
SAW	Mgr Collections	SAW7	Performance	\$1,170.35
SAW	Mgr Connections & Extensions	SAW7	Performance	\$1,291.75
SAW	Mgr Major Development Process	SAW7	Performance	\$1,435.34
SAW	Process Engineer	SAW7	Performance	\$1,435.34
SAW	Project Manager	SAW7	Performance	\$1,435.34
SAW	Project Manager Mount Barker	SAW7	Performance	\$1,363.43
SAW	Project Manager Mount Barker	SAW7	Performance	\$1,435.34
SAW	QS Improvement Coordinator	SAW7	Performance	\$1,435.34

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
SAW	Reticulation Infra Spec	SAW7	Performance	\$1,435.34
SAW	Revenue and Pricing Lead	SAW7	Performance	\$1,291.75
SAW	Snr Asset Information Analyst	SAW7	Performance	\$1,363.43
SAW	Snr Engineer	SAW7	Performance	\$640.38
SAW	Snr Process Engineer Water	SAW7	Performance	\$1,435.34
SAW	Snr Scientist	SAW7	Performance	\$1,435.34
SAW	Snr Scientist Microbiology	SAW7	Performance	\$1,435.34
SAW	Snr Scientist WQ Modelling	SAW7	Performance	\$1,435.34
SAW	Specialist—Vegetation Services	SAW7	Performance	\$1,435.34
SAW	Sup Officer Reticulation Ntwks	SAW7	Performance	\$1,435.34
SAW	Supervisor Bacteriology	SAW7	Performance	\$1,435.34
SAW	Technical Svces Coord Metro	SAW7	Performance	\$1,435.34
SAW	Wastewater Treatment Coord	SAW7	Performance	\$1,291.75
SAW	Water Risk Frameworks Officer	SAW7	Performance	\$1,435.34
SAW	Contract Mgr	SAW8	Performance	\$1,611.49
SAW	Snr Scientist Marine Science	SAW8	Performance	\$1,291.91
SAW	Mgr Water Assets	Manager— SAW9 Perf	Retention	\$18,019.00
SAW	Mgr Wastewater Treatment	Manager— SAW8 Perf	Retention	\$5,750.00
SAW	Mgr Wastewater Assets	Manager— SAW9 Perf	Retention	\$10,869.00
SAW	Snr Mgr Business Development	Snr Manager— TEC	Retention	\$10,000.00

(b) 2015-16:

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
SAW	Mgr Water Assets	Manager—SAW9 Perf	Retention	\$11,501
SAW	Mgr Wastewater Treatment	Manager—SAW8 Perf	Retention	\$4,255
SAW	Mgr Wastewater Assets	Manager—SAW9 Perf	Retention	\$26,913
SAW	Snr Mgr Business Development	Snr Manager—TEC	Retention	\$10,000

GISA

(a) 2014-15:

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
GISA	Director Operations	PO503	Retention	\$31,728.32
GISA	Director Business	ASO803	Attraction	\$31,995.93

(b) 2015-16:

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
GISA	Director Operations	PO503	Retention	\$38,002.09
GISA	Director Business	ASO803	Attraction	\$32,754.92

GRANT EXPENDITUREIn reply to **Mr KNOLL (Schubert)** (1 August 2106). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change): The Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, the Minister for Water and the River Murray, and the Minister for Climate Change has received the following advice:

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT, WATER AND NATURAL RESOURCES 2015-16

The following provides information with regards to grants of \$10,000 or more:

(Controlled Grants)

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
MURRAY DARLING BASIN AUTHORITY	\$20,476,244	Annual contribution to the Murray-Darling Basin Authority (\$19.054m), Coorong, Lower Lakes & Murray Mouth Program (\$906k), Constraints Management System (\$410k), SA Riverland Floodplains Integrated Infrastructure program (\$93k) and The Living Murray projects (refund) \$13k.	Yes
PRIMARY INDUSTRIES AND REGIONS	\$2,507,383	Regions SA grant (\$2.0m), marine parks habitat enhancement (\$285k), NRM Biosecurity Priorities Project (\$100k), Joint fur seals population project (\$50k) & Shellfish reef restoration in SA (\$50k), Monitoring of Giant Australian Cuttlefish (\$22k).	Yes
GOYDER INSTITUTE	\$2,000,000	Annual funding payment.	Yes
BHP BILLITON LTD	\$1,264,500	Great Artesian Basin Sustainability Initiative.	Yes
GOOLWA TO WELLINGTON LOCAL ACTION PLANNING ASSOCIATION INC.	\$1,158,368	Projects funded under the Coorong, Lower Lakes and Murray Mouth Program for restoration, environmental management and volunteer support.	Yes
RSPCA SOUTH AUST INC	\$1,051,000	Grant for the administration of the <i>Animal Welfare Act</i> .	Yes
BETTS PARTNERSHIP (LARWOOD INVESTMENTS PTY LYD)	\$901,182	Great Artesian Basin Sustainability Initiative.	Yes
PIRSA—RURAL SOLUTIONS SA	\$669,624	Murray Futures funded projects.	Yes
NGARRINDJERI REGIONAL AUTHORITY INC.	\$596,602	Revegetation and Community Engagement grants under the Coorong, Lower Lakes and Murray Mouth Program.	Yes
UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE	\$537,518	HMS Womersley Chair in Systematic Botany (\$178k), Genetic analysis for species identification & management of natural resources (\$70k), Koala population modelling for Kangaroo Island (\$50k), Coorong Lower Lakes & Murray Mouth program (\$49k), Bushfires & Biodiversity (\$30k) and various other smaller research projects (\$160k).	Yes
WATERED AUST PTY LTD	\$400,000	Milestone payments under grant agreement with the Minister.	Yes
BUREAU OF METEOROLOGY	\$276,109	Hydrology products assisting Local Government in flash flood management.	Letter of acceptance
MILANG & DISTRICT COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION	\$271,700	Coorong, Lower Lakes & Murray Mouth Program projects (\$253k) and interactive display (\$19k).	Yes
DISTRICT COUNCIL OF COOBER PEDY	\$237,392	Breakaways grant.	Yes
SA MURRAY-DARLING BASIN NRM BOARD	\$231,403	National Partnership Agreement funding allocation to the Board (\$141k) and Rabbit Management grant (\$91k).	Yes
CONSERVATION COUNCIL OF SA INC	\$187,110	State Community grant (\$118k), Nature conservation principles in NRM (\$50k) and Spearfishing for the future (\$19k).	Yes
MARALINGA LANDS UNNAMED CONSERVATION PARK	\$170,000	2015-16 funding for the Maralinga Lands Unnamed Conservation Park Board.	Yes
ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY	\$160,000	Water quality monitoring.	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
LIGHT REGIONAL COUNCIL	\$156,501	Gawler River School disposal.	Yes
RECFISH SA	\$120,698	Recreational fishing grants.	Yes
THE NATURE CONSERVANCY AUSTRALIA	\$100,000	Yorke Peninsula Oyster Reef Restoration project.	Yes
DISTRICT COUNCIL OF RENMARK PARINGA	\$99,000	SA Riverland Floodplains Integrated Infrastructure program.	Yes
ADELAIDE MT LOFTY NRM BOARD	\$91,960	Adelaide Living Beaches (Tennyson) \$50k and Green infrastructure grant (\$42k).	Yes
NGARRINDJERI RUWE CONTRACTING PTY LTD	\$86,668	Restoration of culturally significant lands.	Yes
EWATER LTD	\$75,000	National Hydro Model Partnership.	Yes

(Administered Grants)

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
SA MURRAY-DARLING BASIN NRM BOARD	\$7,288,358	Water levy transfer payments	Legislative requirement
ROYAL ZOOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF SA INC.	\$5,485,982	Support grants.	Yes
STORMWATER MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY	\$4,995,000	Annual grant paid to support the authority	Yes
SOUTH EAST NRM BOARD	\$3,748,459	Water levy transfer payments	Legislative requirement
SA MURRAY-DARLING BASIN NRM BOARD	\$3,658,384	National Landcare Program grants	Yes
SOUTH EASTERN WATER CONSERVATION DRAINAGE BOARD	\$2,237,000	Allocation of funding to the Board.	Yes
ADELAIDE & MT LOFTY RANGES NRM BOARD	\$2,009,206	Water levy transfer payments	Legislative requirement
SOUTH EAST NRM BOARD	\$1,843,398	National Landcare Program grants	Yes
ADELAIDE & MT LOFTY RANGES NRM BOARD	\$1,704,746	National Landcare Program grants	Yes
KANGAROO ISLAND NRM BOARD	\$1,505,180	National Landcare Program grants	Yes
ADELAIDE CITY COUNCIL	\$1,486,000	Payment for park land activities.	Yes
EYRE PENINSULA NRM BOARD	\$1,474,320	National Landcare Program grants	Yes
ALINYTJARA WILURARA NRM BOARD	\$1,401,040	National Landcare Program grants	Yes
SA ARID LANDS NRM BOARD	\$1,326,960	National Landcare Program grants	Yes
NORTHERN & YORKE NRM BOARD	\$1,253,680	National Landcare Program grants	Yes
NATIVE VEGETATION FUND	\$1,080,000	Native Vegetation Fund support grant	Yes
KANGAROO ISLAND NRM BOARD	\$1,029,000	State recurrent allocation grant	Yes
ALINYTJARA WILURARA NRM BOARD	\$1,029,000	State recurrent allocation grant	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
SA ARID LANDS NRM BOARD	\$953,000	State recurrent allocation grant	Yes
SA ARID LANDS NRM BOARD	\$794,518	Water levy transfer payments	Legislative requirement
COAST PROTECTION BOARD	\$503,000	Funding to support the board.	Yes
EYRE PENINSULA NRM BOARD	\$405,231	Water levy transfer payments	Legislative requirement
NATURE GLENELG TRUST	\$329,000	Native vegetation—Significant Environmental Benefit grant.	Yes
LIGHT REGIONAL COUNCIL	\$156,501	Payment to council on sale of the Gawler River School House.	Yes
SA ARID LANDS NRM BOARD	\$141,385	Land levy transfer payments	Legislative requirement
PRIMARY INDUSTRIES & REGIONS SA	\$125,000	Various grants relating to native vegetation.	Yes
GREENING AUST SA LTD	\$93,950	Native vegetation grants.	Yes
FRIENDS OF MOORES RD INC	\$90,500	Native vegetation—Significant Environmental Benefit grants.	Yes
ECOLOGICAL HORIZONS PTY LTD	\$80,000	Optimised grooming traps for targeted feral cat control.	Yes
NORTHERN & YORKE NRM BOARD	\$77,776	Water levy transfer payments.	Legislative requirement
AUSTLAND MANAGEMENT PTY LTD	\$32,680	Native vegetation grants.	Yes
FLINDERS UNIVERSITY OF SA	\$26,817	Native vegetation grants.	Yes
ARDEOTIS BIOLOGICAL CONSULTANTS PTY LTD	\$25,687	Native vegetation—Significant Environmental Benefit grants.	Yes
EYRE PENINSULA NRM BOARD	\$23,554	Land levy transfer payments	Legislative requirement
FORESTRY SA	\$20,800	Native vegetation grants.	Yes
TREES FOR LIFE INC	\$12,000	Native vegetation grants.	Yes
GRANTS LESS THAN \$10,000	\$166,800	Large number of small grants.	N/A
Total	\$48,613,911		

Major Grant Programs

Grant	2016-17 \$000	2017-18 \$000	2018-19 \$000	2019-20 \$000	2020-21 \$000
Royal Zoological Society	5,547	5,543	5,674	5,958	6,107
Stormwater Management Authority	5,120	5,248	5,379	5,513	5,651
South Eastern Water Conservation Drainage Board	2,293	2,350	2,409	2,469	2,531
Adelaide City Council—Parklands	1,574	1,613	1,653	1,694	1,736
Water Levy transfer payments—NRM boards	14,516	15,019	15,026	15,086	15,463
State recurrent allocation grants—NRM boards	2,479	2,479	2,571	2,664	2,731
National Landcare Program	13,612	13,719	0	0	0
Native Vegetation	1,108	1,653	1,694	1,737	1,780
Goyder Institute	2,000	2,000	2,000	-	-
Murray-Darling Basin Authority	15,437	16,055	16,697	17,365	18,060
Regions SA	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000

Grant	2016-17 \$000	2017-18 \$000	2018-19 \$000	2019-20 \$000	2020-21 \$000
RSPCA	1,077	1,104	1,132	1,160	1,189
Coorong, Lower Lakes & Murray Mouth Program	1,555	-	-	-	-
Riverine Recovery Program	1,549	-	-	-	-
Marine Parks	1,640	-	-	-	-
Other grants	6,863	6,028	5,615	6,021	6,657
Total	78,370	74,812	61,850	61,668	63,210

SA WATER

SA Water does not administer any grants and hence its forward estimates do not include grant contributions.

ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY 2015-16

The following provides information with regards to grants of \$10,000 or more:

Environment Protection Authority

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Cooperative Research Centre (CRC)	\$100,000	Contribution towards research to enhance Australia's industrial, commercial and economic growth through development of sustained user driver cooperative public private research centres.	Y
National Environment Protection Council	\$22,151	SA's contribution towards the secretariat operational budget for the NEPC Service Corporation.	Y
National Packaging Covenant Industry Association	\$14,775	SA's contribution towards the scheme to manage packaging. Contribution agreed at ministerial level.	Y
Conservation Council	\$10,598	Annual Conservation Council contribution as per the agreement reached by the Environment and Conservation Portfolio Chief Executives on a cost sharing arrangement.	Y
Star of the Sea – Marine Discovery Centre	\$42,000	Contribution towards works undertaken as part of the Commonwealth funded Caring for our Country project	Y
City of Mitcham	\$57,223	Contribution towards works undertaken as part of the Commonwealth funded Caring for our Country project.	Y
City of Unley	\$27,000	Contribution towards works undertaken as part of the Commonwealth funded Caring for our Country project.	Y
City of West Torrens	\$13,500	Contribution towards works undertaken as part of the Commonwealth funded Caring for our Country project.	Y
City of Onkaparinga	\$10,800	Contribution towards works undertaken as part of the Commonwealth funded Caring for our Country project	Y
Adelaide City Council	\$10,000	Contribution towards works undertaken as part of the Commonwealth funded Caring for our Country project	Y
Adelaide & Mt Lofty Rangers NRM Board	\$10,000	Contribution towards works undertaken as part of the Commonwealth funded Caring for our Country project	Y
Royal Automobile Association of SA	\$15,030	Contribution towards works undertaken as part of the Commonwealth funded Caring for our Country project	Y

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
RICCA TERRA Farms	\$42,000	Funding towards RICCA TERRA Farms Vineyard Post Project as part of the SA Premium Food and Wine Co-Innovation Cluster Program (2013 Budget Measure with lead Agency PIRSA).	N

The following provides information with regards to budget for grant programs in forward estimates:

Name	Budget 2016-17	Budget 2017-18	Budget 2018-19	Budget 2019-20	Budget 2020-21
Star of the Sea – Marine Discovery Centre Caring for our Country project	\$20,000	\$20,000			
Commonwealth funded Caring for our Country project to be allocated	\$271,000	\$390,000			
Cooperative Research Centre (CRC)	\$100,000	\$100,000			
National Environment Protection Council	\$21,000	\$22,000	\$23,000	\$25,000	
National Packaging Covenant Industry Association	\$16,000	\$16,000			
Conservation Council	\$10,000	\$11,000			

GREEN INDUSTRIES South Australia 2015-16

The following provides information with regards to grants of \$10,000 or more:

Office of Green Industries SA

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Advanced Plastic Recycling	\$65,000	Purchase of a multi-waste timber processing plant which will streamline existing manufacturing processes	Y
Alexandrina Council	\$15,200	Extend organics processing and composting pad	Y
CDL Solutions SA Pty Ltd	\$50,000	Develop automated sorting technology	Y
District Council of Streaky Bay	\$14,000	Develop a waste transfer and resource recovery facility in Streaky Bay	Y
Holla Fresh Pty Ltd	\$13,500	Feasibility study for biomass to energy project based on pyrolysis technology	Y
Integrated Waste Services	\$230,000	Establish a facility for the sorting of comingled and commercial and industrial packaging materials	Y
Mondelez International	\$10,755	Feasibility study for anaerobic digestion of waste products	Y
Municipal Council of Roxby Downs	\$14,000	Establish a waste management facility at Roxby Downs	Y
Pernod Ricard Australia	\$10,000	Support with quantifying the potential of biogas generation utilising site wastewater and organic waste streams	Y
Penola Recyclables	\$55,000	Relocate and expand recycling facility in Penola Recycling Depot	Y
Plastics Granulating Services	\$55,000	Improve flake sorter processing	Y
Plastics Granulating Services	\$20,000	Improve technical capability to mechanically recycle packaging film	Y
SA Group Enterprises (trading as Aspitech)	\$50,000	Develop conveyors and expanded polystyrene recycling machine to improve processes and capture additional material for recycling and export	Y

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
South Australian Wine Industry Association	\$32,950	Implementation of Lean Production for Wineries in 2015-16	Y
Van Schaik's Bio Gro Pty Ltd	\$11,250	Waste to Energy Anaerobic Digestion Feasibility Study	Y
Transpacific Industries (SA) Pty Ltd	\$22,000	Design and construct a major Resource Recovery Facility at Monash to service Berri Barmera Council, DC Loxton Waikerie and Renmark Paringa Council.	Y
TOTAL	\$668,655		

Grant programs for each year of the forward estimates*

Grant Program (excluding management costs)	2016-17 \$000	2017-18 \$000	2018-19 \$000	2019-20 \$000	2020-21 \$000
Industry Program—Assessment, Evaluation & Feasibility	265	264	78	81	82
Tradewaste Initiative—Resource Productivity Assessment	880				
Tradewaste Initiative—Implementation Grant	1,066	1,066			
Infrastructure Grant Program	546	1,278	3,321	3,229	3,310
Local Government Infrastructure Grant	1,100	2,550	3,250	3,500	3,588
Commercialisation of Innovation	750		750	500	513
Innovative Solutions for Problematic Waste		100	245	245	251
Scrap Metal Grant	408	809			
Total	5,015	6,067	7,644	7,555	7,744

* These forward estimates and grant programs are subject to expenditure authority approved by the government in accordance with budget processes, and the Board of Zero Waste SA and the minister through the business plan pursuant to section 14 of the *Zero Waste SA Act 2004*.