

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 2 April 2019

The **SPEAKER (Hon. V.A. Tarzia)** took the chair at 11:00 and read prayers.

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

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (CHILD EXPLOITATION AND ENCRYPTED MATERIAL) BILL

Final Stages

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendments.

(Continued from 21 March 2019.)

Amendment No. 1:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: When we were last here, I indicated that we were awaiting some information from South Australia Police. As I have now received that, I will provide that information to the committee. I have indicated that to the opposition so that they may be fully informed in relation to their consideration of the amendments from the other place.

Members might recall that the government motion has already indicated a rejection of a number of amendments made to the bill in the Legislative Council, proposing an alternate amendment and making a consequential amendment to ensure that police have the appropriate powers for serious offences beyond child exploitation offences, as limited by the Legislative Council. Further, I have also advised that the government motion accepts those Legislative Council amendments removing ICAC from the bill. Before turning to each motion as indicated, there are examples of some of the offences we are proposing to include in the definition of 'serious offence'.

SAPOL have provided the following advice. For the offence against section 44 of the Summary Offences Act, unlawful use of computer system: SAPOL undertook an investigation concerning a number of students at a secondary school who unlawfully accessed the school computer servers using unlawfully obtained passwords, which required devices to be seized by the police and accessed for forensic examination. Of note, the devices in this case were encrypted but the students provided passwords to their encrypted devices—iPads and laptop computers—used to commit the offences. If the students in this case had not provided the passwords to police, police would not have been able to investigate and secure the evidence in this matter.

For the offence against section 44A of the Summary Offences Act, which is the unauthorised impairment of data: the skimming of ATM cards at the ATM is an example of this type of offence to then replicate the card and use it illegally. Three foreign nationals were arrested in the Adelaide metropolitan area in relation to ATM skimming offences from banks at various locations across South Australia. During the course of the investigation, police seized a number of mobile phones, laptops and iPads, which were suspected of containing multiple victim credit card details. In this case, police were unable to access this evidence on the devices, as they were encrypted. This resulted in a loss of moneys by victims, as the details of credit cards that were skimmed were held on the devices and sent to Europe, replicated and used illegally.

For the offence against section 86E of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, that is, the use of a computer with intention to commit, or facilitate the commission of, an offence: an outlaw motorcycle gang member was arrested for possession of a Glock handgun and ammunition purchased from a darknet marketplace. Mobile phones and numerous laptop computers were seized, but police were unable to extract and examine evidence, as all devices were encrypted. Access to content could have provided evidence in support of these offences and other offences, as information indicated there was also evidence on the devices of procurement of illicit drugs from the darknet.

For an offence against 86F of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, that is, use of a computer to commit, or facilitate the commission of, an offence outside the state: although incidents constituting an offence against this section have been reported numerous times to SAPOL during the last couple of years, investigations have not been able to identify a suspect for these matters to date. Therefore, investigating police have not been provided the circumstances to seek access to encrypted electronic devices; however, it is considered inevitable that such circumstances will occur for this offending.

For an offence against section 86G of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, that is, unauthorised modification of computer data: a South Australian person was investigated in respect of manipulation of data of associates' superannuation accounts to which they were a beneficiary. The person involved consented to access to his devices and made full admissions to the offending, which assisted police investigating the matter. Had this person not consented, police would not have been able to obtain access to that electronic device.

For the offence against section 86H of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, that is, unauthorised impairment of electronic communication: SAPOL was involved in a global operation involving South Australian entities engaged in distribution denial of service offences. This is an attack that floods a computer or website with data causing it to overload and prevent it from functioning properly. This type of attack possibly is more frequently targeted at businesses or government agencies, rather than at individuals.

Three search warrants were executed relative to such a matter, which targeted South Australian and international businesses and citizens. In these matters, mobile phones and portable computers belonging to the suspects were locked and/or encrypted. Police were able to access the evidence to support an investigation, as the suspects consented. Again, without their consent, no charges would have been laid relative to these matters.

For an offence against section 86I of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, that is, possession of computer viruses, etc., with intent to commit serious computer offence: SAPOL has not received reports of this offence and therefore is unable to provide details of this type of offending. I will outline a further example from the South Australian District Court sentencing remarks, which may be helpful to the committee.

A person was charged and found guilty of one count of operating a restricted access computer system against section 44(1) of the Summary Offences Act and two counts of modifying computer data to cause harm or inconvenience against section 86G of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. The offender was employed for six years as a technology support officer at a non-profit organisation. Before resigning, the offender perceived that his or her relationship with management had deteriorated. Following resignation, there was a series of unusual events on the organisation's computer network—for example, files being deleted, calendar and email changed or forwarded to unintended recipients.

After seeing his or her previous job advertised, the offender committed the offences hoping that by disrupting the IT functions of the organisation management would appreciate the importance of his or her previous work. It was proven that the offender conducted remote logons to the organisation's server using various user names belonging to different employees. Similarly, unauthorised access to the organisation's Outlook web access was established. Initially, the offender hoped to cause minimal inconvenience, but later they became embroiled and fixated on the idea that he or she had been wronged and committed more serious breaches.

A further example is provided from the South Australian Magistrates Court. Here, a person was charged and pleaded guilty to one count of operating a restricted access computer system against section 44(1) of the Summary Offences Act. The offender was made redundant by a company. The offence occurred 12 months after that. The offender accessed the webmail system with a user name and password belonging to a different employee and sent emails to two employees with the word 'idiot' in the contents description and then deleted them from sent items. The offender accessed a document attached to an email regarding a performance review and salary information of a current employee.

I hope that information provides some assistance to the committee because, not unreasonably, questions were raised about real-life examples of some of the offences we are seeking

to have the benefit of this new encryption law. What is clear is this: we are on the early part of a wave in relation to cybersecurity for data that ought to be protected for the privacy of individuals and for the operation of governments and the like and, in addition to that, the question of how that might be used to the detriment of other agencies and businesses.

That is something that, as a new government, we are also participating in with national agencies as to how we best protect government data and create laws to best protect individuals and people in the community, including unions—which I mention for the member for Cheltenham—which hold data and which ought to have some capacity to protect. These are very important when it comes to dealing with new and emerging ways that we, as a government and as a parliament, need to ultimately address.

In addition to that, we also have to look at those who commit these offences and how we might best assist those who undertake the investigations. In our state, of course, that is principally SAPOL. They need to have access to this material. I will not repeat all the reasons why they have sought this, but let me just make one point very clear: we are dealing, in the criminal elements, with those who have the capacity, knowledge and tools not only to access data but to delete it and frustrate investigations by SAPOL, in addition to the damage they might do commercially or personally to others.

It is all very well to say that there are other forms of redress—for individuals, they might sue for damages and the like—but the reality is that we need to ensure that our investigative agency has the capacity, firstly, to preserve that material by being able to take possession of it and, secondly, to access it so that they can undertake their investigations competently. I hope that assists the committee in relation to that. I propose that the House of Assembly disagree with amendment No. 1 for the reasons I outlined earlier.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 2:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 2 be agreed to.

I indicate that this is the first amendment that relates to the removal of ICAC from the bill, which we accept for the reasons I have outlined.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 3:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I move:

That the House of Assembly disagrees with the amendment made by the Legislative Council and makes the following amendment in lieu thereof:

Clause 11, page 7, lines 36 to 39 [inserted section 74NB, definition of *serious offence*]—

Delete the definition of *serious offence* and substitute:

serious offence means—

- (a) an offence listed in Schedule 3; or
- (b) an offence prescribed by the regulations for the purposes of this definition.

I indicate that the rejection of the Legislative Council's amendment is based on the fact that it weakens the bill and limits the applicability of the investigative capacity for child exploitation offences. The alternative amendment reinstates the application of the bill to the broader range of offences.

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos 4 to 7:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 4 to 7 be agreed to.

I confirm that these amendments relate to the removal of ICAC from the bill, which we accept for the reasons I have previously outlined.

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos 8 to 11:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 8 to 11 be disagreed to.

Again, this rejection is based on the amendments to the bill in the Legislative Council. We say it weakens the bill and limits the application to child exploitation offences. Again, for the reasons I have set out previously, I propose that the House of Assembly disagree with amendments Nos 8 to 11.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 12:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 12 be agreed to.

The government motion accepts these amendments made, again, on the basis that it removes ICAC from the bill.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 13:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 13 be disagreed to.

This is particularly as it rejects those amendments made to the bill that we say weaken the bill and limit the application to child exploitation offences. For the reasons I have outlined earlier, we propose that they therefore be disagreed to.

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos 14 to 19:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 14 to 19 be agreed to.

Again, I indicate support for the removal of ICAC from the bill, which, for the reasons I have indicated earlier, we agree to their deletion.

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos 20 to 22:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 20 to 22 be disagreed to.

These directly relate to the proposal to restrict and limit application to child exploitation offences and, as indicated, for the reasons outlined, we consider this weakens the bill and therefore recommend disagreement.

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos 23 and 24:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 23 and 24 be agreed to.

Again, these relate directly to the removal of ICAC from the bill, which, for the reasons previously outlined, we accept.

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos 25 and 26:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 25 and 26 be disagreed to.

These, again, relate to the limitation that the Legislative Council imposes to restrict the application to child exploitation offences. That, in our view, for the reasons outlined, weakens the bill and therefore I propose disagreement.

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos 27 to 29:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 27 to 29 be agreed to.

These directly relate to the removal of ICAC from the bill, which, for reasons previously outlined, we accept.

Motion carried.

Consequential amendment to amendment No. 3:

The CHAIR: Attorney, you will speak to the consequential amendment?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Yes.

The CHAIR: The Clerk is advising me that you do not have to go through the whole lot; you can just speak to the amendment, move the question.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Thank you for that invitation to be brief.

The CHAIR: It was not necessarily that, Attorney.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I have not usually acceded to that in the past. I do not think I will set a precedent today.

The CHAIR: You can be as short or as long as you like, Attorney.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I move:

That the House of Assembly makes the following consequential amendment:

New clause, page 16, after line 17—After clause 11 insert:

12—Insertion of Schedule 3

After Schedule 2 insert:

Schedule 3—Serious offences (section 74BN(1))

1—Serious offences

For the purposes of the definition of *serious offence* in section 74BN(1), the following are serious offences:

- (a) the following offences under this Act:
 - (i) an offence under section 26B, 26C, 26D or 26DA;
 - (ii) an offence under section 37;
 - (iii) an offence under section 44 or 44A;
- (b) the following offences under the *Controlled Substances Act 1984*:
 - (i) an offence under section 32;
 - (ii) an offence under section 33F or 33G;
 - (iii) an offence under section 33GA, 33GB or 33H;
- (c) the following offences under the Criminal Code set out in the Schedule to the *Criminal Code Act 1995* of the Commonwealth:

- (i) an offence under Division 72 Subdivision A;
- (ii) an offence under Part 5.3;
- (iii) an offence under Part 5.5;
- (d) the following offences under the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*:
 - (i) an offence under section 11, 12 or 12A;
 - (ii) an offence under section 19;
 - (iii) an offence under section 19AA;
 - (iv) an offence under section 20A;
 - (v) an offence under section 34A or 34B;
 - (vi) an offence under section 39 or 40;
 - (vii) an offence under section 48, 48A or 49;
 - (viii) an offence under section 50 or 51;
 - (ix) an offence under section 56;
 - (x) an offence under section 58, 59, 60 or 61;
 - (xi) an offence under section 63, 63A, 63AB or 63B;
 - (xii) an offence under section 66, 67 or 68;
 - (xiii) an offence under section 80;
 - (xiv) an offence under section 83CA;
 - (xv) an offence under section 83E;
 - (xvi) an offence under section 83GC, 83GD or 83GE;
 - (xvii) an offence under section 86E, 86F, 86G, 86H or 86I;
 - (xviii) an offence under section 138;
 - (xix) an offence under section 139A;
 - (xx) an offence under section 144C or 144D;
 - (xxi) an offence against a corresponding previous enactment substantially similar to an offence referred to in a preceding subparagraph;
- (e) the following offences under the *Firearms Act 2015*:
 - (i) an offence under section 9;
 - (ii) an offence under section 10 or 11;
 - (iii) an offence under section 22;
 - (iv) an offence under section 37 or 38;
 - (v) an offence under section 39 or 40;
 - (vi) an offence under section 45;
- (f) an offence under section 18 of the *Terrorism (Police Powers) Act 2005*

I will just quickly read through the references, because when pieces of legislation do not identify what the actual nature of the conduct that is being either legalised or identified as conduct that is offensive for the purposes of punishment, I think it is important that that occurs at least somewhere on the record.

It is one of these new, modern things that happens in drafting where we get a reference to a section number. I am told that is for the expediency of ensuring that where there are changes to section numbers of criminal law it can immediately apply without the need to make other amendments. However, for people like me who like to read a piece of legislation and know exactly what the offending behaviour is, I like some description. So, for the benefit of the committee, I will quickly run through the offences that we are referring to.

The insertion of new schedule 3 will define 'serious offences' as follows. The following offences in the Summary Offences Act 1953 are:

- part 5A—Filming and sexting offences;
- section 26B—Humiliating or degrading filming;
- section 26C—Distribution of invasive image;
- section 26D—Indecent filming;
- section 26DA—Threat to distribute invasive image or image obtained from indecent filming;
- part 7A—Extremist material;
- section 37—Possession, production or distribution of extremist material;
- part 9—Offences with respect to property;
- section 44—Unlawful operation of computer system; and
- section 44A—Unauthorised impairment of data held in credit card or on computer disk or other device.

The following offences in the Controlled Substances Act 1984:

- subdivision 1—Trafficking in controlled drugs;
- section 32—Trafficking;
- division 3—Offences involving children and school zones;
- section 33F—Sale, supply or administration of controlled drug to child;
- section 33G—Sale, supply or administration of controlled drug in school zone;
- section 33GA—Sale of equipment to child for use in connection with consumption of controlled drugs;
- section 33GB—Sale of instructions to a child (that is, in relation to drugs); and
- section 33H—Procuring child to commit offence.

And the following offences in the Commonwealth Criminal Code:

- division 72, subdivision A—International terrorist activities using explosive or lethal devices;
- part 5.3—Terrorism offences;
- part 5.5—Offences of foreign incursions with the intent of engaging in hostile activities.

And the following offences in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935. I ask members to think about this list, as I do of the others, and how significant they are. Members should ask themselves, as I read through them, whether they think they are important enough to give the South Australian police the right to be able to demand an encryption to get access to investigate these offences and bring to account those who are responsible. The offences are:

- division 1—Homicide;
- section 11—Murder;
- section 12—Conspiring or soliciting to commit murder;
- section 12A—Causing death by an intentional act of violence;
- division 4—Unlawful threats;
- section 19—Unlawful threats;

- division 5—Stalking;
- section 19AA—Unlawful stalking;
- division 7AA—Choking, etc., in a domestic setting;
- section 20A—Choking, suffocation or strangulation in a domestic setting;
- division 8A—Child marriage;
- section 34A—Bringing child into state for marriage;
- section 34B—Removing child from state for marriage;
- division 9—Kidnapping and unlawful child removal;
- section 39—Kidnapping;
- section 40—Unlawful removal of child from jurisdiction;
- division 11—Rape and other sexual offences;
- section 48—Rape;
- section 48A—Compelled sexual manipulation;
- section 49—Unlawful sexual intercourse;
- section 50—Persistent sexual abuse of child;
- section 51—Sexual exploitation of person with a cognitive impairment;
- section 56—Indecent assault;
- section 58—Acts of gross indecency;
- section 59—Abduction of male or female person;
- section 60—Procuring sexual intercourse;
- section 61—Householder, etc., not to permit unlawful sexual intercourse on premises;
- division 11A—Child exploitation material and related offences;
- section 63—Production or dissemination of child exploitation material;
- section 63A—Possession of child exploitation material;
- section 63AB—Offences relating to websites;
- section 63B—Procuring child to commit indecent act, etc.;
- section 63C—Material to which division relates;
- division 12—Commercial sexual services and related offences;
- section 66—Sexual servitude and related offences;
- section 67—Deceptive recruiting for commercial sexual services;
- section 68—Use of children in commercial sexual services;
- division 16—Abduction of children;
- section 80—Abduction of child under 16 years;
- section 83CA—Information for terrorist acts;
- division 1—Participation in criminal organisation;
- section 83E—Participation in criminal organisation;

- division 2—Public places, prescribed places and prescribed events;
- section 83GC—Participants in criminal organisation being knowingly present in public places;
- section 83GD—Participants in criminal organisation entering prescribed places and attending prescribed events;
- section 83GE—Participants in criminal organisation recruiting persons to become participants in the organisation;
- part 4A—Computer offences;
- section 86E—Use of computer with intention to commit, or facilitate the commission of, an offence;
- section 86F—Use of computer to commit, or facilitate the commission of, an offence outside the state;
- section 86G—Unauthorised modification of computer data;
- section 86H—Unauthorised impairment of electronic communication;
- section 86I—Possession of computer viruses, etc., with intent to commit serious computer offence;
- division 4—Money laundering and dealing in instruments of crime;
- section 138—Money laundering;
- division 5A—Dishonest communication with children;
- section 139A—Dishonest communication with children;
- part 5A—Identity theft;
- section 144C—Misuse of personal identification information; and
- section 144D—Prohibited material.

The following offences are in the Firearms Act 2015. I remind the committee that they were specifically requested by SAPOL to be included when we considered this expanded application. The offences include:

- section 9—Possession and use of firearms;
- section 10—Dealers;
- section 11—Employment of persons by licensed dealers;
- section 22—Trafficking in firearms;
- section 37—Manufacture of firearms, firearm parts or sound moderators;
- section 38—Alteration of firearms;
- section 39—Possession, etc., of sound moderator and certain parts of firearms. For the benefit of those who do not know what a sound moderator is, it is a silencer;
- section 40—Possession, etc., of prohibited firearm accessory; and
- section 45—Effect of firearms prohibition order.

Finally, the following offence in the Terrorism (Police Powers) Act 2002 is included:

- section 18—Offences relating to exercise of powers.

I conclude by hoping to persuade the committee of the significance of these consequential amendments and the application to these offences. I have stood here for the last 16 years in

opposition, prior to coming into government, and I can tell you that most of these laws were either introduced or modified by the then Labor government. They considered them to be so serious that we needed to legislate to make sure that they were either expanded to be contemporary or introduced to ensure that we protected citizens in relation to criminal conduct. In opposition, we provided support for the advancement of most of these, with or without amendment.

To think that we have strangulation offences, that we have quite contemporary law in relation to a number of these, which we have added to in the short time we have been in government, and that the opposition is saying, 'We will not support the police to have the tools to ensure that they can access the records, identify the evidence that is relevant and use it,' I am disgusted. I am absolutely disgusted by it.

I say to the committee: for those who are supporting this advance in relation to the bill being restored under this consequential amendment to its broader application, I thank you for considering that. For those who reject it, I wonder why they even considered that it was important for whatever good they did in government and the advance of protection of our children in relation to these matters, let alone those other vulnerable people who might be frail, aged or with cognitive impairment. They have just blown that away by ensuring the secrecy surrounding the gathering of evidence for the purposes of the proper prosecution to bring those who are guilty to account and to exclude those who are not guilty.

It is with a heavy heart that I know that there is still objection in this parliament to the application of this law, which I remind the house, except for firearms and a small number of offences that have been introduced under our government, was the base of a bill presented by the previous Labor government. I think they have gone into some kind of—I would not say a brain fade—complete change of consciousness as to what is important for the protection of our people. It seems to have been introduced as a result of losing an election, and now it is all about politics and no longer about people. Nevertheless, I move that the consequential amendment be accepted.

Motion carried.

NATIONAL ELECTRICITY (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (RETAILER RELIABILITY OBLIGATION) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 28 February 2019.)

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens has the call.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (11:39): It is very generous of you, sir. Thank you very much. I am in great anticipation of this debate. Again, there is more national reform on energy from the COAG Energy Council. That COAG has been grappling—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens, you are the lead speaker, I assume?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, I am. Thank you very much again for your generosity in giving me time to catch my breath. Is there anything else you want to tell me?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you very much for the interjections from the Government Whip. Again, we are here debating a national reform, a national reform that has been the subject of a great deal of controversy nationally. As we enter into the caretaker period of the commonwealth government, and then into an election campaign, with no doubt sometime over the next few weeks or months there being a general election at the commonwealth level, the issues we are debating here today will be debated at a much more fulsome level nationally.

Make no mistake, when an energy security board develops the retailer reliability obligations, I think developed by the Australian Energy Market Commissioner, Mr John Pierce (I hope I am not speaking out of school by informing the house of that), what we are enacting today is part of the National Energy Guarantee. But, of course, the part of the National Energy Guarantee we are implementing today is the part that has nothing to do with carbon—nothing to do with carbon

whatsoever—because, for whatever reason, the commonwealth government cannot agree on a national energy guarantee, they cannot agree on energy policy, they cannot agree on a path forward to generate investment in the energy sector.

A wise investment in the energy sector is important for a number of reasons, the first being liquidity in the contracting market of the National Electricity Market. Liquidity is everything. What has caused the malaise across the country at higher wholesale prices is that large gentailers, that is, generators who are also retailers, have made sure that they have constrained the market, and by constraining the market they have created a market of illiquidity. They are not writing new contracts; therefore, the price of existing contracts is inflated and therefore wholesale power prices are higher than they should be. When wholesale power prices are higher than they should be, it is the consumer who suffers.

As the consumer suffers, we see through legacy privatisations and decisions of governments across Australia to either gold plate their infrastructure through transmission and distribution, and then, of course, to pass on those costs to consumers. The most modern example of that is the current government, which, before the election, was promising a \$200 million injection of taxpayer funds to lower the cost of an interconnector between New South Wales and South Australia. They have now withdrawn that money. That money will now be paid in full by the consumers; therefore, the promise of a \$200 million reduction in infrastructure costs through a regulated return that will be charged to consumers is now gone.

The Treasurer has pocketed that money and members opposite unanimously support it, which is an interesting point of view given that the government opposite has been claiming that they want to lower power prices, that they went to the election promising a \$200 million injection into the construction of an interconnector, but have now withdrawn it, which means that that cost will be borne by consumers. Congratulations to members opposite: you saved yourselves \$200 million and charged us the rest, not that I think the people of South Australia will congratulate you on it, but I suspect that they will be very disappointed.

The government has been very generous in giving me a briefing on what the National Electricity (South Australia) (Retailer Reliability Obligation) Amendment Bill does, no doubt the same briefing that every member of this parliament had. To avoid members of the government reading out the same advice I was given, I am going to read it into the record so that we do not have to duplicate the process over and over again and we can get this important national reform passed. I point out to the minister and government members that the opposition will support this legislation through all stages of the parliament, unamended in this house and the other.

In order to enact this legislation as quickly as possible, I recommend to the house—but I do not think the house will accept my recommendation—that the minister and I be the only speakers. No doubt members opposite are going to inform us of their knowledge of the retail reliability obligation from the important notes handed out by the minister, which was very generous of him.

Mr Patterson: Don't underestimate our team. Don't underestimate them.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, I don't underestimate your team. I know exactly what they are capable of.

Mr Patterson: They are very, very capable.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I know exactly what they are capable of. I have seen it firsthand. Apparently, according to the minister, contracts provide retailers with a more consistent price for electricity—thank you to the government for that piece of advice—which in turn, apparently, according to the government, allows them to write longer term contracts with consumers. For generators, apparently, contracts provide a steadier stream of income. This firm revenue enables them to obtain financing for new investment. What the government is attempting to do is give more certainty to the retailers in the hope that with this obligation, whether there is a shortfall or not, those retailers will attempt to secure new generation, either by contracting it or building it themselves, because they are being made more profitable.

For generators, the firm revenue will enable them to obtain finance for new investment. Further, for generators, greater levels of contracting will have the effect of increasing their

commitment to operate their generation, as a failure to generate at times that they are contracted to would leave them exposed to financial risk, the government says. In other words, sometimes generators do not dispatch, sometimes they do not offer their generation to the market and, as a consequence, wholesale prices increase and retail prices increase. The government is hoping, by writing more contracts, that there is a greater incentive.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, they are the ones who drafted this. Yes, I know—or because they do not want to have a price on carbon. The Retailer Reliability Obligation is probably the largest form of government intervention in the electricity market that we have ever seen. This basically changes the market forever. We will no longer have a free market. It will be a highly regulated market, and I know members opposite are big fans of regulated markets—

Mr McBride interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, I did not change the market. I did not want a market: I wanted government-owned utilities. I do not believe in markets in monopolies, in the same way that members opposite say they do not believe in a market for water. Apparently now I am hearing from the member for MacKillop that he does, which means a lot of things for SA Water, which I will expand upon later on, so thank you for belling the cat, member for MacKillop.

An honourable member: Very interesting.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is very interesting that he believes in markets in all circumstances for all commodities at all times. I do not. I do not believe that essential utilities, like electricity, should be unleashed on South Australians as a monopoly and then pretend somehow that it is a market, and then come back 20 years later after a privatisation and say you are bringing in a retailer reliability obligation. It is basically saying that you failed. Anyway, we will go on.

The government tells us that the Retailer Reliability Obligation is designed to incentivise retailers despite it being a regulatory obligation, and other market customers—that is, liable entities—to support the reliability of a National Electricity Market through their contracting and investment strategies. That is, the ESB, AEMO and AER want to dip in and get hold of the capital of shareholders of these private companies and use it to improve the liquidity of the National Electricity Market, something I am sure every conservative member of the government would support across the board. I can see the member for Morphett smiling in agreement.

An honourable member: A very good member.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: He is a good member, a much better member than he was a footballer, I understand. That is what your colleagues have told me. I do not know.

The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan: He's good at both.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: He's good at both, the minister says.

Mr McBride: In your dreams.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: In my dreams, the member for MacKillop says, assisting me again. The government tells us that the retailer reliability obligations are designed to incentivise retailers and other market customers liable to support the reliability of the NEM. Through their contracting and investment strategies, liable entities are expected to contract in a variety of ways to meet their reliability obligations.

To unpack this for the free marketeers opposite, if you want to participate in the 'National Electricity Market' (and I say that in inverted commas for *Hansard*), you will be given these obligations and you will meet these obligations or suffer penalties. That is all fine; we are supporting this. The government goes on to say that the obligation should increase contracting—it does not say that it will, it does not say that it is inevitable, it says that it should increase contracting to reduce the risk of reliability shortfalls by incentivising deeper and more liquid contract markets, reducing wholesale spot price volatility. Let's unpack that a bit.

The government, the commonwealth government and all the COAG states, all the NEM states, including this government, believe that by grabbing hold of existing retailers and applying

these stringent regulations about what they should do with their capital and when, the people outside the NEM are going to rush in and say, 'What a great market. I have to get involved in this. I want to get a piece of this myself,' and increase contracting and decrease volatility in the wholesale market by somehow increasing competition by having more contracts written.

Apparently, it will also increase demand response. Let's unpack that. Demand response can be two things: it can be a generator sitting idle that is not part of the NEM coming on, but traditionally it is a very large user in the NEM being told to get off. The member for MacKillop will be well aware of the Portland smelter, which is like a circuit-breaker for the Victorian electricity market, and those employees are constantly under the sword of Damocles, as it were, about having to be shed to deal with demand response.

Of course, it can get a lot more detailed when households are incentivised to turn off their air conditioners and just leave the fans going, that is, the compressor in the air conditioner turning off, or where people who have batteries and solar panels to use a demand response, where you may be paid to go off grid for a moment during times of high demand, or it may be a forced demand response, where people load shed to meet these demands.

Importantly, the government believe and they are telling this house that the Retailer Reliability Obligation will increase investment in dispatchable energy. The free marketeers of the Liberal Party are telling us that by regulating new obligations on existing retailers to within an inch of this market's life, it will not scare off capital, it will not push investment away, it will actually draw more investment in to this market. They are courageous assumptions.

Again, we will support the government in their endeavours in this magical world where regulation of a market and a reliability obligation on retailers will actually mean that these retailers will go out and borrow more money and invest more money into dispatchable electricity in South Australia to avoid any penalties that the NEM, AEMO and AER will impose on those retailers who do not meet their obligations. Bold, it is bold. But, again, if you do not want to simply price carbon, this is the method you have to go through to incentivise investment. You have to use a gun rather than anything else.

The government tells us that under the Retailer Reliability Obligation (RRO) there is a high level requirement for AEMO, the market operator, to annually undertake an assessment on whether there are potential reliability gaps in the future.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am glad that the experts are here. AEMO is being told by the Energy Security Board and COAG that their job now is to check gaps going forward. I would have thought that would have been core business for a long time, but apparently we are getting to this now.

If the market operator was told by the government assessors that there is a material reliability gap, it may make a request of the Australian Energy Regulator. So the market operator then goes to the regulator and the regulator makes a reliability instrument. This is where the beauty of the free market will kick in in the NEM, where the free marketeers of the government will now use regulation to use a government agency housed in Treasury in Canberra to tell the publicly listed investors in the energy market that they have a reliability gap and they have to invest more to meet that gap, or contract more.

So again I say to the government and the national bodies introducing this legislation: what a great incentive for new players into the market. Perhaps prices will increase so dramatically under these measures that it will attract new players into the market; I do not know. But if this measure is to lower household prices, and there is a massive regulatory burden put in place on shareholders and their capital and what they do, I am not quite sure how you get the new investment. I am sure the minister will explain that in his concluding remarks.

The government goes on to tell us that should the regulator make a reliability instrument it will trigger an obligation on energy retailers (which they love; any company would love these new obligations on them) to contract with generation, storage and demand response so that there are sufficient contracts in place to meet their share—which will be calculated, no doubt, by some experts

somewhere sitting down working out how much each retailer's obligation should be—of a one in two year peak demand. Then the government tells us that should it occur during the forecast reliability gap period. Let's unpack that.

Contract with generation, that is the first part. The government are telling us that with this extra reliability standard this new generation will be available that they will contract with to provide extra energy into the market, either newly constructed generation, like all the new power stations that are popping up across South Australia, or it could be renewable energy; it could be stored energy through pumped hydro, batteries, whatever it might be. It is making an assumption that there actually is new generation that it can contract with.

What happens if it cannot? We then move to storage or to demand response. So you are sitting in these boardrooms using shareholders' money, and you have a legal responsibility to use shareholders' money in the most appropriate and cost-effective way; if you do not, as a director your indemnities do not cut it.

Mr McBride interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The member for MacKillop agrees with me, which is slightly disconcerting. However, I take his word for it because, having seen his declaration of interests, he is a man who knows how to invest.

So you are sitting on the board of AGL. There is this retail obligation on you: you must contract with new generation or build new generation, have storage or use demand response. What is the cheapest? Is it new generation? I would have thought not. Is it storage? I would have thought not. What is the cheapest option? Demand management: 'Just turn your lights off for a minute. You won't, will you?' That, I fear, may be the consequence. It might not be.

To be fair to the government, this is a national reform that other Labor governments have agreed with. The ESB is made up of experts, as is AEMO, as is the AER and as is the AEMC. No doubt, they have thought this through. No doubt, they believe that this may work and that shareholders and their directors will take the alternative options of more generation or storage and that they will be profitable over the longer term—say, the seven-year period—rather than demand response. My fear is that they may take the demand response option, but I trust the experts.

We are told by the government that, based on current forecasts by AEMO, South Australia's one in two year peak demand is approximately 2,900 megawatts. I think that is probably a little bit conservative, given the economic boom members opposite are talking about and all the new industries coming into South Australia; no doubt, that will grow year on year out. The new companies that are moving, especially into Murray Bridge, and that new Big W—oh, that is closing; I forgot about that. Jobs growth and participation rates are going up. Actually, no, they are not; the jobs growth rate is at zero and participation rate is falling.

The NAB survey that was out today or yesterday showed some of the worst conditions in Australia, but no doubt the government is optimistic about the economy growing and there is going to be an influx of migrants into South Australia, into regional South Australia, to work at abattoirs. That is going to be the growth industry in South Australia. People living in Europe and people living in Asia are going to want to move to South Australia to work in abattoirs. I can see the ads now.

We are then told by the government that the Australian Energy Market Operator will be empowered legislatively, by law, to perform the function of procurer of last resort as a safety net (that sounds like a good idea; why not?) to secure resources necessary to ensure reliability if a gap is still evident a year out. We have the forecast and there is a gap. Step 1, build new generators? No. Invest in storage? No, you pay for it. Demand response? There is not enough. We will procure it. Who pays for that? Consumers. We will be charged that in our bills.

If this regulatory response to getting more generation into the market and to getting more contracts written in the market all fails because we cannot have a carbon price or a mechanism to incentivise new investment in generation, the government wants the parliament—this is the commonwealth government and every state government—as our last resort to go to the people of our constituencies and say, 'You need to pay for this backup generation. You need to procure this

generation. We're not going to tell you how we're going to do it. We're going to go out and do it 12 months in advance and then we're going to charge you in your bills.'

I am sure South Australians will carry all of us on their shoulders when they thank us for passing this legislation because we cannot have a simple mechanism in place to incentivise the market to decarbonise and make new investments. We are going about it with a sledgehammer rather than a scalpel.

As we have said time and time again, the government has agreed to this legislative reform through the COAG process. Because it is a COAG process, a national reform, and we are the lead legislator, I will respect the precedent that we have set, and what the member opposite did when he was a shadow minister, and pass this legislation. Should it fail (and I think it probably will, but we will see), then of course we will have to come back and look at it.

The government then tells us that the energy regulator—again, an agency of the department of treasury and finance in Canberra—will have the ability to apply penalties on liable entities should they not have enough qualifying contracts in place to meet the demand at the right time with amounts not exceeding, for either a natural person or body corporate, \$1 million for a breach relating to a reliability gap period and \$10 million for a breach by a body corporate. That relates to a second or subsequent reliability gap period.

The free marketeers opposite are telling us that people are going to rush into this market, build generation, build storage, build all these great alternatives to create more liquidity in the contract market of the National Electricity Market 'because we are going to put in bigger penalties if you don't'. I am not sure how that logic works, but I am sure that all members of cabinet who signed off on this reform are fully aware of what it is they have agreed to. No doubt the minister was fully aware when he was at the COAG of what the Energy Security Board was asking all the states to sign up to.

We are told by the government that generators providing energy, indeed emergency reserves provided by generators, are not restricted by the market price cap. I repeat that: generators providing emergency reserves are not restricted by the market price cap and the Australian Energy Market Operator (AEMO) may therefore procure at a higher rate. That is generous of them, isn't it? The government wants us to agree on legislation that allows the market operator to suspend the rules of the National Electricity Market and say, 'We are going to go out to emergency reserve generators and pay a higher price than everyone else who is in the market gets paid.' Again, what a great incentive to get into the NEM. What a great incentive!

The costs of the Reliability and Emergency Reserve Trader mechanism were appropriately \$52 million in 2017-18 and \$34 million in 2018-19. Who paid that? Constituents, people in our electorates, on their bills, which was very generous of them. No doubt, they will be so pleased to know that the government opposite in this parliament has agreed to increasing the potential for that cost year on year out as a result of this retailer obligation that the government want to impose on South Australians who they tell us will lower energy prices through more regulation by creating more liquidity in the markets by introducing harsher penalties. No doubt, that will create an influx of new generators into the market. But do not worry; we are supporting this legislation. It will pass.

The government goes on to tell us that the procurer of last resort function and civil penalties, therefore, provide a strong disincentive on the people who are in the NEM, that is, liable entities, against noncompliance and ensure that the market participants respond effectively to the investment signals provided by the Retailer Reliability Obligation. I want to make a few points about what the government is telling the opposition in the parliament about that point.

From my memory, we have not increased thermal generation in this state since Pelican Point power station. I could be wrong, but I think that was the last time we increased our thermal generation capacity. There were, of course, the government's emergency generators, but they are not participants in the NEM. They are just emergency reserve operators.

All the new generation coming in to the National Electricity Market, from what I can ascertain, is not from new coal-fired or gas-fired turbines but from renewable energy. It is solar-powered plants, either on house rooftops or an industrial scale, it is wind farms, it is hydro, potentially in Tasmania—and Snowy 2.0, if that ever goes ahead—and storage, which is moving at a great pace.

But the government want us to believe that, through penalties and a stick but no subsidy, there will be more investment in base load generation, perhaps through storage. To be fair to the government, they contemplate storage as being an option, which will make a lot more renewable energy dispatchable, but I see no incentive in here for that. We took a storage target to the last election which the government did not adopt. Indeed, one of their first acts was to abolish our renewable energy target.

So the government want us to agree to regulate the National Electricity Market quite coercively, impose massive penalties on retailers if they do not meet a reliability gap set by the Australian Energy Market Operator and that that will somehow incentivise them to build more generation, more storage or demand response. If that cannot happen, they want to waive the rules of the National Electricity Market operator to be able to go out and procure new energy, regardless of the cost, and charge South Australians for the privilege of it in their bills. Somehow, this will incentivise more generation.

The question I ask the government is: if privatising ETSA did not result in any new generation being built, how will harsher penalties on the monopoly market you created through that privatisation incentivise more players to come into the market and offer more electrons for sale, creating more liquidity? I assume what the government will tell us is that an interconnector will incentivise more renewable energy to be built because they can dispatch into another market despite other markets also building renewable energy at a rate of knots, trying to get hold of the credits that are available under the commonwealth government's scheme and, indeed, state-based mechanisms that are in place in Queensland and Victoria. I assume one day they will be available in New South Wales.

So if there will be a glut of renewable energy and storage, and these penalties are in place and there are no more incentives in place nationally, which the current government is calling on the commonwealth government to remove, I find it hard to see how this will work. Of course, while we are legislating all of this, we are facing a change of government nationally. I do not want to presume what the outcome of that election will be, but it looks like, if you read the polls, there is going to be a change. But anything can happen. I do not want to be someone who says that Bill Shorten will be prime minister in two months because who knows? Anything can happen.

Let's assume for the sake of this argument that the polls are right and that we are heading for a change of government. The current opposition has adopted the National Energy Guarantee (NEG) as an opposition policy, the same policy that former prime minister Malcolm Turnbull and the current federal Treasurer Josh Frydenberg took through the Coalition party room four times successfully but could not implement.

Let's say it is implemented. I would assume that the National Energy Guarantee will incentivise more generation and may incentivise more procurement of equipment, storage and other forms of dispatch in the NEM because of the certainty it will give industry. If it does, I know that this was always a part of the National Energy Guarantee, but I suspect this was always a safeguard. I suspect there were members of the commonwealth who suspected the NEG, in its full form, might never get through. I wonder how long this legislation will remain or whether it will work.

I congratulate the minister on one aspect of this legislation. He has sought something that other states did not, probably because of the excellent advice he received from his agencies, whom we both recognise as being exceptional, namely, that the South Australian minister may intervene in the reliability gap within a shorter time period than other ministers can. I do not know why, and I still cannot understand why, other member states did not wish to take that power for themselves as well. I think it is a very prudent thing to do because of what the government has implemented—because I think this is high risk. I think this is high-risk poker.

However, I understand the pressure the minister would be under, given that the commonwealth government wants the Retailer Reliability Obligation put in. I understand that the NEM states have all agreed unanimously. I think Victoria came on last. From my discussions with ministers on COAG, I understand that some see it as already being redundant because of the potential for a change of government. I do not know, but my big concern is the message we are sending the market by adopting this. It is a very blunt instrument, and members opposite are putting it all on eight black. They are putting it all on one number, everything. If it pays off, fantastic; if it does not—well.

I would hate to think that units at Torrens Island are going to be mothballed. That would be a disaster. That would be an absolute disaster.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Well, blackouts and price increases.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I enjoy listening to the laughter of members opposite thinking that they have it all right in this bill. I enjoy the laughter of members who are currently in government and who relied on the measures we put in place to keep the lights on during the last summer but are now selling them. It will be interesting to see again next summer, but of course the members opposite claim that they know better than anyone else. We will see.

As I said, we will pass this legislation because it is a national reform. We will pass it through all stages of this house and the other house, maintaining the precedent set—regularly broken by members opposite when they were in opposition, but we will not be doing that. We do not break pairs or precedents. We maintain the traditions of this house and our parliamentary democracy because they are important.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I say with a straight face: I have not broken a pair in my life. The other member has only been here two minutes and apparently he is an expert on House of Commons practice. Mind you, he was my lawyer for a while when I sued a Liberal candidate, which I thought was very generous of him. It was great to have such a fine lawyer representing me taking on a Liberal candidate. Interestingly, that Liberal candidate now votes Labor and my lawyer is now a Liberal member of parliament.

I am not quite sure where that takes us, but I again offer my support to the minister and his legislation. I offer my good wishes to the minister on this reform. I offer my support for a speedy passage. I hope that the minister now gets up to close this debate, that he gets up now to debunk everything I have just said, so that we can move on to other important matters and pass this important national reform immediately and see wholesale prices tumble just from the thought of this legislation passing. I commend the bill to the house.

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (12:18): I am very pleased to rise today and support the National Electricity (South Australia) (Retailer Reliability Obligation) Amendment Bill. This is an important bill. We need to do everything we can to ensure that South Australian households and businesses have secure and reliable power. In fact, electricity has been a fairly controversial or much talked about issue over recent years. I can particularly remember many, many conversations in my own community about power, particularly the price of it as well as the reliability.

In fact, one day in particular I remember was the day after one of the retailers announced an enormous increase—an enormous increase—in the price of electricity in about the middle of 2017. What really struck me was that, for all the issues that come up during a campaign and when you are out doorknocking, as many of us did during that period, this was the one time when something had come up in the news the day before and every person I spoke to the next day was talking about it.

I think that highlights the extent to which this affects everybody, whether it is people at home and their own energy prices or whether it affects the place where they work and whether or not that workplace can continue to afford to employ them, and then the impact that has on the broader state economy. This is not only a very important issue overall but also it is very important to constituents within my electorate, and I am sure all electorates in this state.

This bill implements amendments to the National Electricity Law, which energy ministers agreed to at the COAG Energy Council in December last year. This is an important amendment that will improve energy reliability for South Australians and ensure that the reliability of our grid is being regularly assessed for any future shortfalls so that they can be addressed prior to causing inconvenience to South Australians. As a result of this bill, the Australian Energy Market Operator (AEMO) will be required to assess our energy market and then identify whether there are any potential future reliability gaps.

AEMO will be required to carry out this assessment each year and to identify potential reliability gaps three years ahead of when they would be likely to occur. Should AEMO identify such a gap, it then requests to the Australian Energy Regulator that a reliability instrument be made, which requires energy retailers to build on their contracting and investment arrangements to increase dispatchable capacity. Retailers will then need to demonstrate that they will be able to meet their share of peak demand one year ahead of when the supply shortfall is likely to occur.

Importantly for South Australia—and I certainly congratulate the minister on his work on behalf of our state—the COAG agreement included amendments that apply specifically to South Australia, recognising that in recent years South Australia has experienced supply issues that have not been forecast by AEMO three years ahead of when they would be likely to occur. In light of this, the bill includes provisions that enable a South Australian minister to make a reliability instrument 15 months ahead of when the gap is likely to occur.

It is simply unacceptable that, due to supply issues, South Australians could be prevented from switching on the lights. We must take the responsibility to ensure that South Australians have access to secure and reliable power seriously, and so too must our energy retailers. This bill provides that, should a retailer breach their responsibilities during a reliability gap period, a maximum penalty of \$1 million for a first breach and a maximum of \$10 million for a subsequent breach will be applied.

Importantly, this bill provides for AEMO to act as the safety net procurer of last resort. This allows AEMO to enter into contracts to secure our energy reserves for the forecast reliability gap period if it is still forecast one year out from when it is likely to occur. Certainly, the reliability of our power in South Australia is a very significant issue, and it is significant across all parts of our community. I am sure for some of us when we lose power it is more of an inconvenience in our homes.

It means that, in minor cases, for a short period of time we have to find torches and candles, or whatever other things, to keep things lit, but for a lot of people it actually does have some very serious implications. In fact, I can remember particular examples during the statewide blackout, when on Lower Eyre Peninsula power was out for a number of days and even things like the expiry dates on medicines for families were put at risk because they had limited access to refrigeration. Also, there were issues in some of our hospitals, particularly the Flinders Medical Centre. I am sure hospitals have backup in place to deal with these situations, but sometimes they do not work when they should. Nevertheless, having an unreliable system more broadly still puts risk on these systems.

Of course, businesses, whether they be supermarkets or shops, have things that need to be kept cold, which they then need to throw out if power is out for too long. Larger industrial processes require large amounts of energy for heating things, whether it be for making glass or big furnaces for smelting and making steel and all those sorts of processes. They need to be kept constantly hot, otherwise, after period of time, they cool down, and some very, very serious damage is being done, not to mention the loss of productivity for that period of time, which costs an enormous amount for those businesses, and that has an enormous impact on our state's economy. There is no question that reliability is a significant issue, and in South Australia we have seen firsthand what happens if we have issues with reliability.

This bill very much complements the policies that the Marshall Liberal government is implementing to secure reliable and affordable power for South Australians. It would be remiss of me not to touch on some of our initiatives that will make a real difference to South Australians. Certainly, one of our most exciting initiatives, particularly for local MPs like me, is our Home Battery Scheme. The scheme provides subsidies for households with solar panels to install home batteries so that they can make more use of the energy that their solar panels generate, directly reduce their own bills and reduce pressure on the grid as a whole. Already, we have seen some households have their power bills significantly reduced after signing up to that scheme.

It is important to note that, on one hand, there are significant benefits to households that have these solar panels, particularly now with lower feed-in tariffs and people being out during the day at work, when their panels are doing the most work and all the power is being exported for a relatively low price. With a battery, they are able to store power during the day and then use it in the evening, which is often the peak period, to reduce their total consumption of energy off the grid and make savings. Also, the fact that those people are coming off the grid or having a reduced reliance

on the grid during those peak times reduces the overall demand during peak times for the whole state, and that contributes a benefit for everyone, even those who do not have solar panels. That is a very important part of this policy.

This scheme really does tick all the boxes: it reduces demand on the grid and increases capacity; it is also environmentally friendly and, most importantly for households, it reduces the cost of bills. I have certainly been thrilled by the number of local constituents who have told me that they are certainly very interested in signing up to this scheme, and, in some cases, already have. This is a good, positive example of policies being implemented to make a real difference to South Australians. I would certainly encourage anybody with solar panels to consider joining the scheme.

Of course, an energy policy cannot be dependent on one particular initiative, so we have a whole suite of them. Another very important one is the interconnector with New South Wales. As members in here I am sure will recall, in December last year a memorandum of understanding was signed between the South Australian and New South Wales governments establishing the framework for cooperation that will ultimately lead to the building of this interconnector between our two states. The memorandum of understanding was an important step in progressing the interconnector, which will lead to lower power prices and more reliable power for South Australians. I note that in years gone past the then Labor government supported this initiative but has since changed their mind for reasons best known to themselves.

What this means for South Australia is quite significant. At the moment, we are linked to the National Energy Market primarily through the Heywood interconnector into Victoria and also the Murraylink, the DC connection up through the Riverland, which has a smaller capacity. However, by and large, we are reliant to a great extent on the Heywood interconnector and also what is happening in Victoria. That is fine most of the time, but occasionally, if something goes wrong with the interconnector, as we saw in December 2016, and we end up with 200,000 homes without power, that is certainly a case of us putting all our eggs in one basket and being reliant on one connection.

There are also other benefits in adding an additional connection and having an alternative for when something goes wrong with that connection. Often, the demand profiles between Victoria and South Australia can be similar. We have similar weather patterns: if it is really hot in Adelaide, then it is likely that the same day or the next day it will be really hot in Melbourne as well, and then you have significant demand across that part of the NEM.

This is in contrast to New South Wales, and particularly Sydney, which would very rarely have similar weather patterns to us. What this means is that additional interconnectivity would allow for the sharing of power between different parts and regions of the national energy market to more easily match the demand for supply across different regions. That is, obviously, very important.

The other benefit is that it is not unusual in South Australia for the temperature to be in the low 20s, quite windy, perhaps still sunny, but maybe not. We are generating a lot of power in South Australia, particularly through wind energy, but there is not the demand here, so we end up not only with wild fluctuations in the spot price but with excess energy, which, with the additional interconnectivity, could be exported into another market, particularly New South Wales, which is right in the centre of it.

Also, the opposite is true. When we do not have so much of that renewable energy available and it is really hot, then we have the ability to supplement our own generation with more affordable generation from interstate, where there is not such a great demand, and helping to stabilise the price. The alternative, if we go it alone, is that we pay more; that is really the result. Greater interconnectivity will mean the sharing of power across different markets to deal with the differences in supply and demand that can occur.

Western New South Wales has seen quite large developments in large-scale solar, with quite a large solar plant around Broken Hill and Nyngan, and there is also some industrial activity out that way that benefits from power coming out of South Australia. There are a lot of benefits to come from an interconnector, once it is built. It is great to see so much enthusiasm for this policy from different bodies concerned with energy throughout the country.

There is, of course, another important component to our energy policy and that is the role of grid-scale storage, which was, until right at the very end, completely neglected by the previous government. They were very interested, and I think everyone in this house supports renewable energy, but when you have intermittent energy it is important to be able to dispatch that and at least try to match it with when you need the energy. The fact of the matter is when the generation of energy is reliant on the environment you cannot control when it is available and when it is not.

So headlong pushing down a particular path without matching that with some means for storing it, and dispatching it when you need it, leads not only to massive price fluctuations but also to issues with reliability. It is great to see that we are committed to grid-scale storage in a technology-neutral fashion, as it is not for politicians to decide what the best technology is—we will let engineers and other experts make those decisions—but we are very pleased to see that as part of our plan.

As I said, the bill we are talking about today complements the suite of policies we took to the last election and includes the Home Battery Scheme, interconnector and other things. Our policies are making real differences to South Australians and have attracted praise from the Australian Energy Market Operator in its report on the South Australian energy system. This is a significant turnaround from being the laughing-stock of the entire nation as a result of the high electricity costs and embarrassing blackouts that occurred under the previous government.

I congratulate the Minister for Energy and Mining on his work on the bill and, more generally, on his work in cleaning up the mess—just another example of our cleaning up the mess left to us by those opposite. I commend the bill to the house.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (12:34): I was not going to speak on this bill—I am just here carrying out my parliamentary duty—but I could not resist the level of provocation, so I figured I would get up to say a few words. Not long after the government was elected, I was up in Port Augusta listening to the member for Stuart in his role as the minister. It was at a very good conference. The minister got up and spoke about energy, as he should. The interesting thing was that, when you strip away all the confected differences in the approach to energy and electricity production in this state, there was little significant difference.

Clearly, there are some elements that are different. We could reflect upon some of the members opposite when they were in opposition and how incoherent their approach to energy in this state was at times. They were literally all over the place. I remember some words from the member for Gibson that always stuck in my mind. While in opposition, he said, 'We support cutting in half renewable energy production in this state,' going on to say, 'as do most people on my side'. It was a totally bizarre comment. He got up and said that. It is in *Hansard*. Go back and have a look.

At various times, the leader of the opposition was an incredibly strong advocate for renewables and attacked the former premier when he appeared not to be as supportive as in the Rann period. He attacked us for not being strong enough when it came to renewables, then attacked us when we reinstated our strong position on renewables. When we talk about storage, one of the issues has been the lag effect between the growth of renewables and the growth of suitable storage mechanisms.

The previous government had a relatively good history on this, taking into account the rate of technological improvement that was going on. We were willing to put money into a number of pumped hydro projects, some of which will hopefully start getting the yellow equipment out to start producing some worthwhile projects in my electorate and also close to the member for Stuart's electorate. Goat Hill might well be the first pumped hydro project to get off the ground in South Australia—let's hope. Sanjeev Gupta is talking about pumped hydro in the Middleback Ranges. I think that is still some time away, but progress is being made in that area with their studies.

We put some money into the Cultana escarpment pumped hydro project, as did the federal government, so we might well see some pumped hydro projects in this state. As a government, we put money into the Hydrogen Roadmap, an incredibly important piece of work that I hope is not going to be allowed to drop in this state because it could have very important consequences in the long term for our state in a whole range of opportunities. We funded two hydrogen projects—one down in Port Lincoln and the other near Crystal Brook. That one is running into a degree of controversy

because of the wind farm that will be co-located with that particular project. They were incredibly worthwhile initiatives.

The initiative that we undertook with the virtual power plant is incredibly worthwhile for a number of reasons. I am pleased that the current government are continuing on with that. Let's hope that stage 3 is something that comes to the fore. One of the deficiencies with what we have at the moment when it comes to battery proposals—and I will say this for the current state government and I will say that for the opposition's policy at a federal level—is that it does not go far enough. It primarily benefits those people who already have solar and it benefits those people who, in general, own their own houses.

The thing about the virtual power plant that we, when we were in state government, were actively pushing was that stage 3 would address those people in rental accommodation and especially in Housing SA accommodation who do not have access to solar and do not have access to batteries. We do not want to see them further disadvantaged, even though the point has been made that by moving to batteries it will depress overall prices, which is a good thing. But for people on low income in the rental market to get a benefit, there has to be policy directed at that. Even if stage 3 of the virtual power plant does not stack up, for whatever reason, there still needs to be policy directed at people in Housing Trust properties in this state because they are seriously disadvantaged when it comes to power prices.

A lot has been made of the blackout, and we get it again and again. I actually thought at the time that the federal government's response was absolutely disgraceful. Here we had an intense weather event that took out transmission assets. When you look at reliability, reliability is not about renewables; it is not about generation: reliability is to do with the grid. When it comes to significant blackouts and load shedding in this state and nationally, most of the faults are concerned with the grid and with transmission assets.

Again and again, and especially interstate, we have seen traditional thermal power stations just stop operating, and often on occasions not in a predictable way. Sometimes, you have to suspect that internally, within those companies, it has been in a predictable way to bid up electricity prices. There is no question in my mind that over an extended period there has been real price gouging on the part of the private sector in the operation of electricity assets, nationally. That is an absolute disgrace and anything we can do to address it needs to be done.

We talk about the interconnector and, as stated, our position at times has changed. In principle, interconnection is incredibly important. If you are going to have renewable assets in this state, if you are going to have renewable assets in other states and the different climatic regimes at different times, in principle interconnectors are a sound way to go. What you do not want to do is disadvantage investment in generating assets in our state. It is about getting that balance right.

I mentioned the hydrogen facility at Crystal Brook and the controversy about wind farms. One of the issues that should be revisited—and I am sure the member for Flinders would be a fan of this as well—is a massive, untouched wind energy resource on Eyre Peninsula. During the period of the Rann government, a green grid study done was on the Eyre Peninsula with its 10,000 megawatts, and 2,000 megawatts identified as something that could be readily exploited. That would be worth revisiting, given the spatial conflicts regarding wind farms that you sometimes find in other parts of the state.

On Eyre Peninsula, given the massive resource there, there is an opportunity to do it in a way that is not going to generate as much conflict and in a way that will benefit the state and the nation. As part of that particular proposal at that time, interconnection figured very prominently. It is something we need to get back to, and I am sure an incoming Labor government at a federal level will be keen to look at Upper Spencer Gulf as a renewable energy hub.

When you start talking about renewables, there is a degree of complementation between solar and wind. As a state, we are in the incredibly fortunate position of having a global-class wind resource on Eyre Peninsula and elsewhere and a global-class solar resource. They complement each other and would be enhanced by a range of pumped storage ventures and would be enhanced by grid air batteries and household air batteries.

We can have the argument, but in number of ways you are better than your federal colleagues. A whole bunch of troglodytes at the federal level have gone through the Liberal-Nationals government like an absolute wrecking ball. We need to address climate change seriously. It is a global challenge, but we can do a hell of a lot in this state, and we can do it in a way that will seriously advantage this state.

For many years, I have been one of the advocates for renewables because you just know that, ultimately, it is going to reduce the price of power in this state. It is just common sense because we are shifting from a resource-based industry to a technology-based industry, and so you get economies of scale kicking in, as well as all that learning through manufacturing. The cost keeps coming down and coming down for both solar and wind. That is going to continue, and it is going to put South Australia in an incredibly powerful position. That is the page that we should all be on. I suspect that the minister might well be on that page, so I am not going to be overly hostile.

But I return to the day when power assets were knocked out in this state because of that intense weather event. The day after, I was at the steelworks in Whyalla. The people there were facing incredible challenges, which they got through, which is a credit to the hard work and the intelligence of the people who worked at the steel industry. During that weather event, there were some calibration issues with the wind farms that were on a default from the manufacturers, a default that had been addressed in Europe 10 years before. You would have to ask: where were the national agencies in paying attention to that particular issue? It is interesting that in Port Lincoln, on Eyre Peninsula, the backup unit is a traditional thermal unit and it failed to respond. I do not know whether legal action is still going on about that.

When it comes to energy and when it comes to electricity, I think that South Australia has an incredibly positive future. I am one of those in this chamber—and I am sure there are others—who are incredibly mindful that the greatest threat that we face is complacency when it comes to climate change. We have some of the climate deniers at a federal level in the Liberal Party and the Nationals. I think those people are increasingly being seen as idiots, just totally denying the overwhelming balance of the scientific evidence. But the greatest threat is actually complacency.

There are probably people in this chamber who do not realise just how fundamental the failure to address climate change or global warming is and that we can play a not insignificant role, given the opportunities we have. This failure means that our kids and their kids will be living on a fundamentally different planet because we are on track at the moment for a 3° to 4° average global temperature increase.

When we say that it is up to the engineers, economists and others, it is not. This is about values and setting a framework that reflects those values. That is what is going to drive the engineers, economists, scientists, researchers and all the others. This is an issue that we have to address and we have to start to seriously address it within the next decade.

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (12:50): I rise to speak on the National Electricity (South Australia) (Retailer Reliability Obligation) Amendment Bill. As we have heard from others, the mix of electricity generation in the National Electricity Market includes more and more electricity from intermittent sources, such as wind and solar. While that has occurred, it has exposed the need for a mechanism that will ensure the reliable supply of energy for households and businesses in the National Electricity Market under various weather conditions. I say that because weather now not only affects consumer electricity demand, say, in a hot spell with air conditioners, it is also a basis on which intermittent sources generate their electricity, so it is also on the supply side of the electricity ledger.

The current existing National Electricity Market is an energy-only market in which generators are paid only for the energy they produce to meet demand, so whether or not they have spare capacity standing by they are paid for what they actually produce. This was designed at a time in the 1990s when the National Electricity Market was based predominantly upon these large centralised base load generators, with gas peaking plants to cover the differences between the minimum and maximum demands that occur throughout a 24-hour cycle and also over seasons.

But it is not only Australia's National Electricity Market that is changing its generation mix; energy systems around the world are also transforming. It is a clear case of technological disruption.

We have talked about how technology with these intermittent sources is impacting generation and it is something that all businesses have to contend with in the modern world, not just in electricity markets.

In this case, there is no generator that can be immune from economic pressures when revenues do not cover costs. Now that the older dispatchable generators are being challenged by these intermittent renewable generators—there is an up-front cost for these intermittent sources, the capital, but then the ongoing costs are a lot cheaper in comparison to the thermal generators—we really need to reassess the energy-only market that applies here in Australia and also place a value on the reliability of the electricity being supplied. We have to ensure that the supply of electricity can be matched to the demand at a particular time and dispatched.

The bill we are talking about addresses some of the dispatchable energy requirements because we know that, if the National Electricity Market lacks sufficient dispatchable capacity in any region—because it goes throughout Queensland to south-east Australia in any region to meet customers' peak demands—this will result in supply interruptions and also very high pool prices during those times of dispatchable scarcity, which will eventually flow on to customers. While overall there may be a lot of wind and solar available in the system, if that cannot be dispatched because of weather conditions, for example, then that will produce scarcity.

I think this was realised in September 2017 when the Australian Energy Market Operator (AEMO) reported on the dispatchable capability of the market and recommended development of a mechanism to retain existing investment and provide incentives for new investment in flexible dispatchable capability. There has certainly been a large investment in intermittent sources and it was a matter of trying to manage that and match that with dispatchable capability.

I should mention, as I did before regarding the world situation, that it is not a problem that is unique to Australia. Many other international jurisdictions are having to adjust their electricity markets in response to potential generation shortages as they deal with increasing quantities of intermittent renewable generation. Various options are being explored throughout the world to address this problem, including strategic reserves, capacity auctions that are run by a central agency or decentralised retailer obligation models, similar to what we have before us.

For example, Germany is developing a strategic reserve of around 5 per cent of their generation capacity to make up shortfalls in times of peak usage. Several markets in the US and the UK have also recently introduced capacity auction mechanisms. France last year also adopted a decentralised retailer obligation model. You can see that different jurisdictions have different models. A lot of this is primarily because each energy market has its own history not only in terms of how it got to where it is now and the laws that surround that but also the regulatory structures around that. It is not just Australia that is trying to come up with this as a mechanism.

When looking at this, the Energy Security Board has recommended a retailer obligation model as its capacity mechanism. The idea is that it will integrate with the existing energy market—the energy-only market—to ensure that electricity is available when needed. That will be done by encouraging appropriate generation and demand response capacity and availability. Demand response is also about making sure that that energy is dispatchable when required.

Under this scenario, AEMO takes a central role in determining how much capacity is needed, which the retailers must then procure. The primacy of AEMO in this mechanism gives a level of certainty for customers and consumers, because requirements for capacity are set well in advance of any expected peak demand events.

The flipside is that AEMO is also responsible for the accuracy of peak demand forecasts, so that is not without risk in a way because with this approach the retailers may well meet their obligations but the operator gets the demand forecast wrong. That is a risk, but you can see that, with the 10-year forecast and then updating them on a yearly basis and refining them as we get closer to anticipated forecast, that risk is mitigated. But it is worth noting that it is a forecast, and those forecasts also need to be scrutinised by other bodies to make sure they are correct.

The bill that comes before this house occurs after the energy ministers at the COAG Energy Council on 19 December 2018 agreed to implement the Retailer Reliability Obligation. The Marshall

Liberal government, as the lead government in this sector, is delivering this important national reform, which is a mechanism designed to ensure the electricity system operates to reliably meet electricity demand at the lowest cost and complements the current spot market.

The Retailer Reliability Obligation is designed to incentivise retailers and other market customers to support the reliability of the National Electricity Market through building on their contracting and investment strategies to underwrite investment in dispatchable capacity by encouraging earlier and longer term contracting.

Again, it is trying to take into account that, while there is intermittent generation and capacity being brought into the market, it is also offset by making sure there is a dispatchable component that goes with those intermittent sources. Doing that will give households and businesses confidence that enough generation will be available to meet their electricity needs. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.

SUPPLY BILL 2019

Message from Governor

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

CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY TRAINING FUND (BOARD) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

Petitions

SERVICE SA MODBURY

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): Presented a petition signed by 100 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government not to proceed with the proposed closure of the Service SA Modbury Branch, announced as a cost-saving measure in the 2018-19 state budget.

SCHOOL ZONING

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): Presented a petition signed by 250 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to immediately reverse its decision to exclude from the Adelaide High School and Adelaide Botanic High School zone the children of the families residing in Torrensville, Mile End, Hilton, Richmond, Marleston, Kurralta Park, Black Forest, Glandore and Clarence Park, and to recognise the immediate and adverse impact of its decision on families, students, educational outcomes and property values in the impacted suburbs.

TAFE SA URRBRAE CAMPUS

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): Presented a petition signed by 1,404 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to withdraw all plans to close Urrbrae TAFE and that it remain open in its entirety, to ensure that current and future students can benefit from the quality training and facilities currently provided at this iconic and centrally located campus.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament today students from St Michael's Lutheran Primary School, year 7, who are guests of the member for Kavel.

I also welcome the highly distinguished former member for Finniss, Mr Michael Pengilly, and the current mayor of Kangaroo Island Council, if I am not mistaken.

ANSWERS TABLED

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

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Parliament of South Australia—Members, House of Assembly—Register of Members' Interests—Primary Returns—Registrar's Statement—April 2019
[Ordered to be published]

By the Minister for Education (Hon. J.A.W. Gardner)—

Education, Department for—Annual Report 2018
SACE Board of South Australia—Annual Report 2018

By the Minister for Energy and Mining (Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Opal Mining—
Fees No. 2
Miscellaneous

By the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services (Hon. C.L. Wingard)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Police—Drug Testing

By the Minister for Environment and Water (Hon. D.J. Speirs)—

South Australian—Victorian Border Groundwaters Agreement Review Committee—Annual Report 2017-18
Water Amendment (Murray-Darling Basin Agreement—Basin Salinity Management) Regulations 2018 (Commonwealth)

By the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government (Hon. S.K. Knoll)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Harbors and Navigation—Speed Limits—Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary
Motor Vehicles—South Eastern Freeway Offences
Road Traffic—
Road Rules—South Eastern Freeway Offences
South Eastern Freeway Offences

*Parliamentary Committees***ABORIGINAL LANDS PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE**

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (14:09): I bring up the report of the committee, entitled 'Review into the operations of the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act 2013'.

Report received.

*Question Time***SA PATHOLOGY**

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10): My question is to the Premier. Why did the government wait until federal budget day to release the PwC report into SA Pathology despite having the report for the last four weeks?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:11): This was a document which was considered by the health minister. It was considered by the cabinet yesterday, and it was released within 24 hours.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

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

SA PATHOLOGY

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11): My question is to the Premier. Why did the Premier allow the health minister to sit on the report for four weeks before bringing it to cabinet?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:11): I am very interested in the Leader of the Opposition's line of questioning, so I thought I would do some research on the report that the former government commissioned of Ernst and Young.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Premier, we have a point of order. One moment, please. A point of order from the member for West Torrens.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: From the moment the Premier said a 'former report', he is introducing debate, sir.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is for debate.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order on the point of order. Sorry, Minister for Education?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The question was about the timeliness of the dealing with the report—

The SPEAKER: Yes.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —so it is entirely relevant.

The SPEAKER: Yes. In fairness, the Premier hasn't even warmed up yet. I will allow him a short amount of time to do so and then I expect him to come to this report. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you very much, sir. In deciding exactly and precisely when we would consider this report to government, and when we would consider it in cabinet and release it to the parliament, I have of course checked what the previous government's practice was in regard to this type of issue.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The precedent set by those opposite gave us a lot of latitude. In fact, the report that they commissioned back in 2013-14—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I am listening to the Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —was received in early 2014.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: And let me explain to you, sir, precisely—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Premier, one moment, there is a point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: This is debate, sir.

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order. I am going to allow the Premier some latitude and then I expect him to come to this report.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: All I can say is that I was shocked. I was shocked because the report was received by the former government in May 2014. Did they release it in June, July, August, September, October, November? No. Did they release it seven days before Christmas? Yes, on 18 December 2014. What a disgraceful question! We released it within 24 hours of it going to cabinet.

SA PATHOLOGY

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:13): My question is to the Premier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Child Protection is called to order.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Will the Premier now guarantee that SA Pathology will not be privatised?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:13): As I was saying earlier, we received the report. It was considered by cabinet within 24 hours, and probably within 18 hours we released it in full for everybody to read. Now, I don't know whether you have had a chance to read it yet—

Mr Malinauskas: No.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No. Well, get online!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: What a lazy opposition we have, sir. What a lazy opposition we have. He was the minister for health. He should have a pretty good idea of what a mess we inherited when we came to power. Anyway, the reality is that the work is being done. We completely reject the course that those opposite were taking when they were in government: to close six sites and to remove 323 health professionals from SA Pathology. We completely reject the suggestion of the previous government, that pathway that they had towards efficiency within SA Pathology. We instead—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader is called to order. We have the question.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We have looked at that report very carefully, and we will be implementing its findings. We have considered—

Dr Close interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: There will be no imminent closure of SA Pathology. The report recommends that SA Pathology be given additional time to achieve the efficiencies that we expect, acting on behalf of the taxpayers of South Australia. I think it's pretty hypocritical of the opposition to be raising questions about our motives in terms of SA Pathology. They themselves had commissioned a report. They themselves have said—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, sir: this is debating the point.

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order, Premier. I have given the Premier some latitude in the first four minutes. I ask him to come back to the substance of the question, please.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I was saying, we have a report.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is recommending that further efficiencies be delivered by SA Pathology. It is recommending that a further report be put in place within 12 to 18 months. We have accepted that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

Mr Hughes interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We certainly do expect further efficiencies in SA Pathology. We are acting responsibly on behalf of the taxpayers of South Australia. They expect an efficient hospital system. They expect an efficient use of taxpayer dollars. That's precisely what is contained in the report. I suggest you take a look at it, read it and come back with some other questions.

NORTH-SOUTH CORRIDOR

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (14:16): My question is to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. Can the minister update the house on the fast-tracking of the Torrens to Darlington section of the north-south corridor?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:16): I can indeed, Mr Speaker. I can indeed. To set the scene, the north-south corridor is a 78-kilometre stretch of road that for a long time has had a very bipartisan commitment to complete and to have continuous.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is called to order.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: In the lead-up to the 2018 election, we said consistently and often, and the Premier said consistently and often, that finalising the north-south corridor was the number one infrastructure priority of the Marshall Liberal government, and so it is coming to pass. In our first budget, we put \$5½ million aside to actually do the business case development for this project.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: This is what infrastructure development should look like; that is, you go and do the detailed work to decide what is the best way to deliver this project. We have consistently tried to have a conversation with the South Australian people about what the options are for the north-south corridor. Do we, for instance, go down an upgrade solution of overpasses and underpasses?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Do we look at a long 10½-kilometre tunnel, or do we look at a hybrid tunnel option, which provides a—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —tunnel north of Anzac Highway but also then south towards the Castle Plaza-Darlington end of the project? That work will be completed in the middle of the year, but we know with these infrastructure projects, these big projects that take many years to complete, that, firstly, you need to do your homework up-front and, secondly, what you need to do is get commitment and buy-in from different levels of government to help fund the project. That is precisely what has happened over the last few days.

We have been working and talking to the federal government about our priorities since coming to office and how we want to deal with the most complex section of this corridor. They have certainly left the hardest job to last, and I am extremely excited that it's the Marshall Liberal government that's going to finalise and deliver this project to make sure that we get it right.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: In addition to the \$1.2 billion that was put on the table last year, we have been able to secure from the federal government a further \$1.5 billion this year in the budget. We moved extremely quickly to match that funding to provide a pool of \$5.4 billion—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —on the table. This project is going ahead. This money provides the certainty that it's going ahead, while for those opposite there are zero sleeps to wait. There is a budget that will be handed down in a few hours, and then all will be revealed. What I find interesting is that what we have is a bunch of strawmen that have been propped up by the opposition from time to time to try to, I suppose, disrupt what has been an orderly and structured process.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: What is interesting is that if we were to have been shovel-ready to start this project this year, somebody would have to have done their homework about three or four years ago. Now, that didn't happen—that did not happen. So what we've had to do since—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —coming to government is do the business case development, talk to Infrastructure Australia and Infrastructure South Australia and get the funding so that we can get on and deliver this project. Those opposite hate it. They hate it—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —because we are actually showing them up for how poor a job they did on infrastructure.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader will not interject.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: We as a government are going through an iterative process to deliver the best solution, being transparent with the South Australian public at every single step along the way. So, in summary—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —the first step—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —is do the business case development. Step 2 is secure the funding.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Step No. 3 is to get on and deliver, and that's precisely what the Marshall Liberal government is going to do over this first term.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Sit down! Before I call the Leader of the Opposition, I have to deal with certain interjections from that last answer. I call to order and I warn for a first time the member for Playford. The member for Reynell is called to order. The Minister for Primary Industries is called to order and warned. The member for Ramsay is called to order. The member for West Torrens is called to order and warned. The member for Lee is also warned for a first time. The members for Badcoe and Hammond and the Leader of the Opposition are all called to order. The leader has the call.

SA PATHOLOGY

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): My question is to the Premier. Was it appropriate for the Minister for Health to tell SA Pathology clinicians via talkback radio that one in seven of them would be losing their job?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier has the call. I would like to hear the answer. Members on my left and the Minister for Transport will be quiet. Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:21): I never take anything that the Leader of the Opposition says as gospel.

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: You haven't even read the report.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education will cease heckling the Leader of the Opposition. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think the Leader of the Opposition sometimes gets a little bit confused with facts, so let's just take a look at the facts. Labor had a plan, the former government had a plan, to cut 323 staff at SA Pathology. That ran through until just before the last election, when they paused their plan to cut 323 staff at SA Pathology. That is a fact. On coming to government, we commissioned PwC to write us a report. They do believe that there needs to be a reduction in staff. It's a significantly lower number than that being pursued by the former government. The upper level of that was around 200 people that would need to be delivered over the next three years.

We are not shirking our responsibility to deliver an efficient pathology service to South Australia at an acceptable cost to the South Australian taxpayer. That money will be reinvested into providing quality health services to the people of South Australia, something the previous

government didn't do. They shirked their responsibility to provide the people of this state with an efficient—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: There's a point of order. I will hear the point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It's about debate, sir. The question was about employees being informed on radio they were losing their jobs.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I have the point of order. I believe the answer was relatively germane, and probably until about that point, but I think the Premier has finished.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes.

The SPEAKER: He has finished. The member for Kaurna.

SA PATHOLOGY

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:23): Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PICTON: My question is to the Premier. How will the government determine which SA Pathology staff will be the 200 to lose their jobs?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:23): We have made it clear that doctors and nurses in the South Australian health system will be preserved; we have made that commitment. We are working through the details of the report. This is something that will be considered by the minister, by the department. I am sure we will have further announcements to make.

SA PATHOLOGY

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:23): My question is to the Premier. Will there be any forced redundancies for clinicians at SA Pathology to achieve the 200 job losses?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:23): I don't have that detail with me at the moment, but I can't imagine that that would be the case.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Elizabeth is called to order. Was the member for Lee interjecting?

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: No.

The SPEAKER: No, I didn't think so. The member for Kaurna and then the member for Waite.

SA PATHOLOGY

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:24): My question is to the Premier. Will the government guarantee that there will be no delay for test results from implementing their cuts to SA Pathology?

The SPEAKER: Premier, would you like to have a go at that?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:24): The reality is we have just received this report. We have considered it in cabinet. They—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: PwC has provided a cure plan. I think those opposite are getting very confused about the cost of a system and the efficiency of a system. They often get confused about these concepts. The reality is that the cost of providing pathology services—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —here in South Australia is significantly higher than any other jurisdiction in the nation. This is unacceptable. So, what we want to do is to provide—

Dr Close interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Deputy leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —an acceptable pathology system in this state commensurate with what is required for this health system. We want to be able to use the money that we save to reinvest in the health system. That will be on top of the \$900 million that we have had to put into the health system since coming to government to fix the mess that we inherited from those opposite.

Dr Close interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is warned. The member for Waite has been patiently waiting. I will come back to the member for Kaurna.

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

Mr DULUK (Waite) (14:25): Thank you so much, sir. My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister update the house on how the state government is fixing congestion in my electorate of Waite and across all of South Australia?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:25): I certainly can. I would like to thank the member for Waite for his advocacy in this area and also another follicly challenged member, the Minister for Skills, the member for Unley, who also benefits and his constituents benefit very greatly from this announcement and that is \$61 million—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, leader and member for West Torrens! The minister has the call.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —to fix the Cross Road and Fullarton Road intersections.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I am trying to listen!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Again, this is what happens when a mature state and federal government sit down together.

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: We don't curse. We don't throw ice-creams across the table. We sit down and have a conversation. We talk about the fact that we have a freight corridor and we have—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —an outer ring route that does not work as it should. It does not work as it should, and that's borne out by the facts that are in our Keep Metro Traffic Moving report. It's outlined there in the facts that the RAA has put on the table, that more needs to be done to stop the slowing rate of travel of heavy vehicles and also passenger vehicles going along our inner and outer ring roads. And \$61 million to fix a problem intersection is a massive step forward in helping to deliver congestion-busting infrastructure across our state.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is warned for a second and final time.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: The cacophony, Mr Speaker, does suggest that there is a little bit of angst about the fact that we have been able to move forward on new infrastructure projects maybe in a way that they couldn't. That's what happens when you are mature and grown up and have an adult conversation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: This announcement, together with the north-south corridor, together with Springbank/Goodwood/Daws roads, together with Portrush/Magill roads is sending a very clear message to the electorate that we are a government willing to invest in the infrastructure that's going to support our ambition for higher population growth. The Premier has set down the agenda that we want to be a state that says yes to having more people move here. In doing that, we need to deliver the infrastructure that's going to support that growth and that's precisely what we are doing, and we are doing that in conjunction with the federal government.

There is a broader strategy at play here. There is a strategy to deliver population growth and then a strategy to deliver the infrastructure to support it. This is what governments need to do. This intersection, particularly, has some challenges: 60,000 vehicles a day traverse through this intersection, with 44 crashes having been reported at this intersection over the past five years. This is going to deliver road safety outcomes to the people of the Mitcham Hills, for the people who go up and down busy Cross Road every single day.

This is about supporting population growth. This is about delivering the congestion-busting infrastructure we need. This is also about saving lives. This is part of a broader suite of measures that we have put on the table—

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Elizabeth is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —and worked on together with the federal government to help deliver this for South Australia. I thank the member for Waite for his advocacy in this regard. We have also put down \$20 million for the Mitcham Hills corridor, but dare I say that the works that we are going to do up the hill, including the Blackwood roundabout and also Belair corner that we are looking at at the moment, is that when people get to the bottom of that hill they will now be able to get through that intersection much more quickly. We are here to build the infrastructure to support a growing population and we are extremely proud to do it.

Mr Malinauskas: #SturtMatters.

The SPEAKER: Sturt does matter. The leader is called to order and warned. Member for Kaurana.

SA PATHOLOGY

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:29): Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is to the minister representing the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Does the minister stand by his previous comments that privatising SA Pathology would send regional health services backwards?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:29): I don't automatically accept that quote without the source because—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Boyer interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —this is the third time that the member opposite—

Mr Picton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurna is warned.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —has tried this line of questioning. It would not surprise me at all if he had taken a quote out of context and used it deliberately misleadingly.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, sir, two points of order: impugning an improper motive on a member and accusing a member without a substantive motion of misleading the parliament. I ask him to withdraw and apologise.

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order. I think to say that someone is taking something out of context is within a tolerable level of political argy-bargy. I ask the minister, however, to come back to the substance of the question. If I need to, I will ask for the source, but it's not really for me to weigh into the veracity of the facts. The member for Kaurna seems happy to hear the answer. I will listen to the answer as well.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Let me say, on my behalf and on behalf of everybody on this side of the chamber, that SA Pathology is a very important service that does absolutely outstanding work in South Australia. Let me just inform those opposite, because they may not have all heard it on the radio this morning, which is where the Leader of the Opposition has informed us he gets his information. He chooses not to read the report: he just listens to talkback radio. That's where he gets his information from.

So to help those opposite through this very difficult and challenging issue for them, let me just make it very clear: the Minister for Health and Wellbeing is doing exactly what is in the best interest of the people of this state, including—

Mr Boyer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright is warned.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —those who work at SA Pathology. He has made it very clear that doctors and nurses will not go without employment because of these considerations. He has also made it very clear that the recommendations are just to work through this issue, to consider it. Those opposite want to beat this up as if not the 323 people they were going to sack a few years ago are going to lose their jobs. They are trying to make it sound as if imminently the current government is going to spread some curse across these people. Nothing could be further from the truth. This will be a concept that's difficult for those opposite. It will challenge them—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —but I ask them to listen. I ask them to think about it and to precis the words of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing: the very best way to deal with competition is to be competitive. He is giving SA Pathology every opportunity to be competitive across the whole area in which it provides services.

SA Pathology does an outstanding job. In many areas, they are absolute leaders. Are there other areas where they could improve? Of course they could; who couldn't? It is very fair for the Minister for Health and Wellbeing in the other place to give them time to go about looking at what they can do to improve, to give them every opportunity to be the best service in the state, in the nation, so that they would have no fear of any changes to the way they work.

SA PATHOLOGY

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:33): My question is to the minister representing the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. How many of the 10 SA Pathology centres that are proposed to close will be in regional South Australia?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:33): The reality is that the member opposite is talking about 'proposed to close', etc. The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has made it very clear that there won't be any changes for a year or more while—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Boyer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright is warned for a second and final time. If this level of noise continues, members will be departing the chamber. The minister has the call.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader! The minister has the call.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my right are not assisting. You are not assisting. The minister has the call. The clock is ticking. The minister has the call.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Thank you very much, Speaker. The reality is that those opposite are trying to beat this up in a ridiculous way, but let me share some sensible words with all of us here, and I quote, 'I think invariably when you introduce new—

The Hon. A. Piccolo: Just rethink what you said a couple of years ago—they were sensible words.

The SPEAKER: The member for Light is warned.

The Hon. A. Piccolo: For the first time?

The SPEAKER: Yes.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I will start again, Mr Speaker.

I think invariably when you introduce new technologies to the workforce, efficiencies can be gained, and we're happy to be part of the working party to oversee that process.

Another quote is, 'Members of Professionals Australia do not oppose efforts to aid productivity within SA Pathology.'

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Hang on. Goodness gracious, they are—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: They are in a rush. They are in such a rush that they didn't even read the report. They just want to ask questions.

The Hon. A. Piccolo: Clearly, you haven't either.

The SPEAKER: The member for Light is warned for a second and final time. Don't make me throw you out. The minister has the call.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Those two quotes are from Professionals Australia, who represent people who work in SA Pathology. There are plenty of others, but those opposite might have been listening to the radio and they might have some other questions that they want to get to.

If necessary, I can share these other quotes but, suffice to say, the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, our government, is going about this in a very transparent way. We have released the report. We have engaged with unions. We have engaged with clinicians. We have engaged with the public. We have even offered information to those opposite. We are seeking efficiencies. We are giving SA Pathology every opportunity to deliver those efficiencies. We have laid out a very clear time line about how we are going to do that.

Every opportunity is there for SA Pathology, whether it be in the city or whether it be in the country, to deliver on those efficiencies, which all South Australians deserve, including the people who work in SA Pathology.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: the member was making quotations from a document. I ask that he table it to you.

The SPEAKER: We have been through this before. I don't believe that the member was quoting to a level. He certainly did not say that he was—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I don't believe he was amply quoting, but I will have a look at the footage and the *Hansard*, and if the minister is required to table it then I will order him to do so.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I might be able to help the house by just reading from this piece of paper.

The SPEAKER: If you read it, I will order you to quote it.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Sorry?

The SPEAKER: If you read it, you will be quoting it.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Yes, sir. I will quote—

The SPEAKER: Okay, thank you. The minister has clarified that he will—

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I will quote what is on the page and I will bring it to you.

The SPEAKER: If you read it and it's a public document, you will be required to table it.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: if that is part of a larger document, the whole document must be tabled.

The SPEAKER: Is the minister reading an internal memorandum? What is it?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: It's a note of a set of quotes relevant to this issue that was provided by an adviser. So, Mr Speaker, what I would say is that the member for West Torrens is entirely—

The SPEAKER: If that is a personal note, it is not required to be tabled, but I will listen to the answer.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The member for West Torrens is entirely accurate with his suggestion.

The SPEAKER: I'm seeking clarification here. The minister is seeking clarification. I will allow 30 seconds to clarify this and we will move on to the next question.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Mr Speaker, I quote from this piece of paper:

In August 2017, when Minister Snelling paused Labor's Efficiency Improvement Programme (EIP) to concentrate on the implementation of EPLIS Sarah Andrews said—

The SPEAKER: Another 30 seconds, Rick.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I have ordered another 30 seconds here. Order!

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister for Innovation, be quiet. I have ordered 30 seconds to clarify this issue.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: So this is a quote within the quote:

I think invariably when you introduce new technologies to the workforce, efficiencies can be gained, and we're happy to be part of the working party to oversee that process.

The next one I read states, quote, 'Members of Professionals Australia do not oppose efforts to aid productivity within SA Pathology.' That came, Mr Speaker, from evidence before a parliamentary select committee on 4 February 2019, page 2. If they have any other questions, I am happy to oblige.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, minister. Can I have that original, please? Please bring that original to me.

PRISON SERVICES

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (14:39): My question is to the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services. What steps has the Marshall government taken to improve community safety and deliver better services to our South Australian prisons?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:39): I thank the member for Flinders for his question and note his enthusiasm for having a safer community and better services within our state. At the March 2018 state election the Marshall Liberal government made a number of commitments relating to the Correctional Services portfolio, and we are delivering in that area. That includes the banning of outlaw motorcycle gangs from our state prisons and a zero tolerance policy in relation to drugs in prisons.

Banning outlaw motorcycle gang members is a significant step in the right direction towards achieving this aim, which, for those opposite, seems to be some kind of pipedream sitting off in never-never land. We are delivering an important reform that supports the government's war on drugs and delivers enhanced safety and security within our South Australian prisons. The new legislation took effect on 25 March 2019 and impacts on anyone who is identified as a member of a criminal organisation or outlaw motorcycle gang entering a prison.

All correctional jurisdictions are challenged by prisoner drug use and attempts to introduce drugs into prison, and the Marshall Liberal government is very keen to deliver these reforms. Unfortunately, the cohort of prisoners detained in South Australia for drug-related offences is not insignificant. Prisons have traditionally been prime locations for members of outlaw motorcycle gangs and organised crime groups to recruit more members, and those same groups attempt to continue their criminal activities and associations while they are in custody.

That is something that, I think, both sides of the house are very aware of. It happens the world over, and we want to do everything we can to stop those organisations from expanding their operations through our prison system. Such behaviour varies from opportunistic attempts to perform illegal acts and the distribution of contraband to recruiting people in a very systematic way.

As such, our efforts to stop outlaw motorcycle gangs from continuing their operations while they are in prisons is a very popular implementation of a new policy. In fact, not that long ago Correctional Services officers did a wonderful job identifying some contraband and actually found an outlaw motorcycle gang flag in prison. The flag had infiltrated in, and clearly that is an indication they are operating there. We are doing everything we can to close them down.

Added to that, just last week I was at Port Lincoln Prison in the electorate of the member for Flinders. We went out and had a look around, and it was wonderful to see some of the work being done there. We want to do all we can to try to rehabilitate people in prison and stop that cycle of recidivism and reoffending, and it was great to be there and have a look at the 200-hectare farming property. The member for Flinders was very impressed.

They produce barley and canola and they have livestock there as well, and you can see the prisoners are incredibly engaged in the programs they are running. They also have a commercial supermarket. Some of the fruit and veg they were growing was absolutely outstanding, and they are looking at expanding into flowers as well. They supply that to the local towns, and one of the very well-established local cafes is coming in sourcing some of the produce. It is great to have the prison giving back to the local community as well.

The engineering workshop was also outstanding. Both the member for Flinders and I were very impressed with that, creating racks and all sorts of equipment to go with the oyster industry over on the West Coast—a booming industry, as we know. The prisoners were very engaged with the work they were doing and the materials they were producing and, again, that sense of giving back to the community was outstanding. It was wonderful to be there and great to see the positive outcomes from the operations and work programs they have in place.

The SPEAKER: Before I move to the member for Kaurna, please stop the clock, Mr Clerk. I want to reiterate a point. We have been through this, but I will reiterate it. A memorandum made by a minister or by anyone else for the use of the minister, with a view to furnishing information to be communicated to the house, is not treated as a public document whose production can be enforced. But if I see a public document that is quoted, and the minister says that he or she is quoting from it, I am not going to be impressed and I may well order that it be tabled. Member for Kaurna.

SA PATHOLOGY

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:44): My question is to the minister representing the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Are there any clinical or patient risks from the SA Pathology cuts?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:44): Well, I am not a clinician, but let me say that the Minister for Health and Wellbeing has made it very clear that all patients will receive the very best care possible from SA Pathology now and into the future. It would be preposterous—perhaps that is what the shadow health minister is contemplating—for the minister to be contemplating trading off health risks in that way. He has made very clear public statements about not wanting to take any risks whatsoever with patient care.

SA PATHOLOGY

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:45): My question is to the minister representing the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Will there be any additional pathology tests now sent interstate following the SA Pathology cuts?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:45): When the member opposite says 'any additional tests', he might be trying to be fairly tricky with that question. The Minister for Health and Wellbeing—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Light can leave for half an hour under 137A.

The honourable member for Light having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education will be joining him shortly, I am sure. The minister has the call.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The Minister for Wellbeing has made it very clear that, for now, it is business as usual. He wants to give SA Pathology clear air to get on with the work and get on with what they are doing while other recommendations are considered. He has said that there is no change he intends to implement within the next 12 to 18 months. Let me just be very clear, though: there might well be ongoing operational changes within any agency that the minister, myself or anyone here in this chamber might not be aware of.

The member opposite needs to be pretty clear that he is specifically asking about changes directed by the Minister for Health. Will the Minister for Health be directing SA Pathology to be sending interstate additional work? I don't think so, but I will check it in terms of will he be directing them to do it. They have been given clear air to get on with their business and, as I said before, we want SA Pathology to continue to be outstanding, to continue to be improving and to have every opportunity to do whatever is necessary so that it actually has no fear of improvements and embraces improvements and efficiencies.

ONLINE GAMBLING

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:47): My question is to the Attorney-General. Will the Attorney-General detail to the house the steps she has taken as minister responsible for gaming in the online space and illegal online wagering?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:47): I thank the member for Heysen for this important question. I am very pleased to advise the house that as of 26 November last year the state governments and the commonwealth have started to implement a number of measures to deal with consumer protection for those who are either problem gamblers or

at risk, particularly under what was identified and signed up to, namely, a national consumer protection framework for online wagering.

As part of this approach, which is to have a unified position as to how we best protect consumers, there are 10 new ways that we are dealing with it. Key improvements under the framework itself include restricting online gaming providers from either offering or providing credit; preventing payday lenders from advertising with online gaming platforms; stricter time frames on online wagering providers to verify their customer's identity to better prevent people who are either underage or self-excluded from finding another means to gamble online; restrictions on inducements, so that gambling providers will be banned from giving rewards or other benefits to either open an account or to successfully refer someone; and establishing a national self-exclusion register, enabling those who have a gambling addiction to exclude themselves from all other online gambling platforms.

I was pleased to report to the house the initiative we have done here locally to ensure that there was a prompt self-exclusion opportunity. Further, with respect to the new industry code of practice, all gambling advertisements will be banned during live sporting broadcasts from 5am to 8.30pm. It is important, I think, to understand the significance of online gaming and gambling, and there are approximately 100 Australians who take part in some form, highlighting the importance to deal with a coordinated approach.

Members probably are aware from their own electorates that the consumer demand for poker machines in hotels and clubs, and the use of online gaming apps, has really been a significant shift to the latter, and clearly that means that, together with regular advertising and incentives, it is putting a number of our younger Australians at particular risk.

I recently wrote to commonwealth ministers about the measures to curb illegal offshore gaming activity and their commitment in this space around website blocking, financial transaction blocking and other online measures. Further, I have also called on the commonwealth to investigate options to block sites that are not licensed and, as regulators, make it harder for Australians to access unlicensed sites, many of which seek to exploit unwitting and vulnerable customers.

As I have often said, the safest place for people to gamble and game is in licensed venues. However, we all know that currently people can lose their homes while they are sitting in their lounge room, and it is important that we address this issue. Let me assure the house that the South Australian government will work with our state, territory and commonwealth counterparts on the implementation of these important measures over the next 18 months to ensure that our regulatory system is as robust as it needs to be.

PRIVATE LEGAL MATTERS

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:51): My question is to the Attorney-General. Why did the Attorney-General issue a concerns notice regarding a private legal matter on a government letterhead and have it delivered by a public officer to the member for Lee?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:51): These issues were raised the last time we were here in the parliament, and I think I made it very clear that I did issue—

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell interjecting:

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

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —a concerns notice. It was clearly on the Attorney-General letterhead. I maintain the position that the member for Lee had made a publication which was not only reckless and inaccurate but was wrong and defamatory, and I maintain that. Unfortunately, he hasn't seen fit to remove it from the public arena, and that is his risk. I think I have 12 months to deal with it further, but nevertheless that is the position, which is very clear. It may have escaped the attention of the member for West Torrens—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —but about 12 months ago—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —I was appointed the Attorney-General. It is a position which I am proud to have accepted and which I have a high respect for. So that is the position.

PRIVATE LEGAL MATTERS

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:52): My question is to the Attorney-General. Has the Attorney-General been advised by anyone in government that it is inappropriate to use government resources for personal legal matters?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:53): No.

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens then the member for Newland.

PRIVATE LEGAL MATTERS

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:53): My question is to the Attorney-General. Does the Attorney-General agree with the evidence given by her chief executive, Ms Caroline Mealor, that government resources should not be used for personal legal matters by government-employed lawyers?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:53): Well, I think it would be helpful—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —for the member for West Torrens to actually read the transcript of what the chief executive said—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —in expressing her commentary in relation to that matter and, when he has read it, I am happy for him to review the question.

REAL-TIME FUEL PRICING

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (14:53): My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General provide an update to the house on real-time fuel pricing?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:53): I thank the member for Newland because this is an important question in the lead-up to the Easter and ANZAC Day long weekends. It is a very important matter, and, of course, prior to the election we had a number of discussions with the RAA and indicated that we would follow this up. So it is with some disappointment that I advise that the government ultimately didn't find a workable and productive solution with the RAA to improve South Australia's access to real-time information about petrol pricing around the state following their calls for this over the last two years.

Over the last few months, the government has been in talks to partner with the RAA to establish a new system, with a system offered to them. However, I regret to inform the house that the RAA is unable to commit to its involvement as part of the initiative at this time. Unfortunately, despite our best efforts we have been unable to agree on a model that would give South Australians access to real-time information that would help them find the cheapest petrol. The government appreciates that the data collection of this type of information requires significant investment and organisation and commends the work of private app developers in collating a timely fuel price for the public.

The RAA has been a longstanding advocate for consumers in this area, and their involvement in this work would have been a fantastic addition to any real-time fuel pricing program,

which of course would have improved South Australians' access to up-to-the-minute data about petrol prices. There are, however, existing measures for consumers to seek information about the cost of petrol around the state right now. There are a range of smart phone apps, such as MotorMouth, that can help South Australians determine where they can find the cheapest petrol price. I am pleased to stay—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —up to date with the work of the MotorMouth and the ways in which they work with retailers to provide up-to-date data for their consumers. While our preference would be for the RAA, who have been pursuing this issue for a considerable period of time, to partner with the government to implement systems that would be enabled by legislation that we would develop, I now explore other options available.

The government will continue to monitor the Queensland government's current trial of real-time reporting to see if something similar could work here for South Australia. We will also explore other options available to government in mandating the disclosure of fuel prices across the state. Further, we will continue to monitor the situations in both New South Wales and the Northern Territory and, as I have previously, remain cautious of any real-time option which may inadvertently increase petrol prices and add further cost-of-living pressures to South Australia, an issue that in fact was alerted to us by the RAA.

Reducing cost-of-living pressures and red-tape reduction remain a priority for the government. We will continue to look at other options. So it is with regret that I advise the house that the RAA won't be partnering with us in this matter.

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens has two warnings and has the call.

PRIVATE LEGAL MATTERS

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:57): Thank you, sir, for the reminder. My question is to the Attorney-General. Does the Attorney-General agree with the evidence given by the Director of Public Prosecutions, Mr Adam Kimber QC, that the use of government resources for personal legal matters by government-employed lawyers could be the subject of disciplinary proceedings?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:57): Yes, I think the DPP may well be right. I don't recall the context in which he has made that statement but, in a vacuum, I don't think I can add any other useful information for the member.

PRIVATE LEGAL MATTERS

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:58): My question is to the Attorney-General. What disciplinary procedures are in place for government lawyers employed by AGD who use government resources for personal legal matters?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:58): I will make some inquiry with the chief executive and the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment as to what is to occur in relation to any abuse of office for personnel in those circumstances, as to whether there is any disciplinary or code of conduct consequence to that.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Certainly, if there's any other matter specifically as to the nature of it, I would be happy to take that and get some advice on it.

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:58): My question is to the Attorney-General. Is chief executive, Caroline Mealar, involved in any way in the process for the selection of a new Director of Public Prosecutions?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:59): I think this has been made very clear. Although the chief executive is of course responsible for the administration of the department, a panel has been appointed—an independent panel of four, two of whom I think were there as part of the panel under the previous government for the last appointment, which was constituted for that purpose.

As I understand it, the practice from here is that whatever applications have been received are presented to the panel and that they in due course will give a recommendation to me, as Attorney-General, for presentation to cabinet. That's as I understand it. Certainly, the chief executive is not a member of the panel.

NATIONAL LITERACY AND NUMERACY ONLINE

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister update the house on preparations for the transition to NAPLAN Online?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:00): I am very pleased to be able to do so. I know that NAPLAN Online is a very important progress for our education system and, indeed, for jurisdictions across the country. It is an improvement to the system that last year saw 141 schools that undertook NAPLAN Online testing—100 government schools and 41 non-government schools—report feedback suggesting that students found the online assessment engaging and that the platform worked well for that number of schools.

Indeed, ACARA has advised, with their series of expert reviews—including one commissioned by the Education Council that was independent of ACARA—that both the online and the paper test results were comparable, and the results were presented on the same scale. I also confirm, of course, that we are looking to substantially increase, both in South Australia and across the country, the number of schools that are proposed to be moving to NAPLAN Online. When the shadow minister was the minister, the original start date for all schools was to be 2019. That was shifted back in 2017, and I believe that we are now looking at 2021 for all schools across the country, all being well.

In South Australia, we are in a position where we are able to significantly increase the number of schools doing NAPLAN Online this year. One of the things we have to do is ensure that the platform is capable of delivering on the load for all states and all jurisdictions. Obviously, this is why we have tests and technical tests. Last week, there was one such test where I think it is useful to give some clarity about what happened because I think that some people have been suggesting that the situation is much more difficult than indeed is the case.

I will go through this in a very straightforward fashion. A platform readiness test was conducted first on 22 October and 2 November last year to validate that the 2019 NAPLAN Online version is fit for purpose and ready for this year. A further platform readiness test was undertaken between 4 and 15 February 2019. The purpose of that test was to test changes or enhancements to the platform that were made as a result of issues with the LockDown Browser that were identified in the first test in 2018.

Nationally, the February 2019 testing was positive, with the online platform being locked down on 25 February 2019. The schools practice test window, which is a critical thing we are doing at the moment to ensure that issues when schools log in are picked up, is scheduled for between 25 March and 26 April, with a nationally coordinated practice test scheduled for last Thursday, 28 March. The nationally coordinated practice test is to simulate how the platform will perform under live load conditions. South Australia and Victoria participated on 28 March, with South Australia coordinating the majority of our proposed 2019 schools to commence testing at 10am last Thursday.

On the morning of the practice test, a number of schools across multiple jurisdictions, mainly Victoria and South Australia, progressively reported connectivity issues with the national platform. For South Australia, the department commenced receiving calls from schools prior to 8.30. These schools were attempting to connect to the national online platform in readiness for the 10am start but were unable to do so. These issues were reported and logged to Education Services Australia through the agreed process.

By 9am, the national program management office advised that this was a critical national issue, as it was experienced by more than one jurisdiction, and non-government sector representatives were advised as well. In accordance with the protocols, all schools were advised at 9.54am that the department was aware of an issue and that they would be doing their test at another time. At approximately 10am, six minutes later, the department was advised by the national PMO that the issue had been resolved. Schools were now able to recommence their schedule of testing, which they will do over the next couple of weeks.

This is an important reason why we have these checks in the first place—so that we can iron out these technical problems and get the process right for all our schools right across the country.

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:04): My question is to the Attorney-General. Is the Attorney-General aware that Ms Caroline Meador has stated that she specifically told the Attorney that she should be stood aside from the process to select the DPP? Could she inform the house why?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:04): Yes, and it may also not have come to the member for West Torrens' attention, but the chief executive, Ms Meador, is a former long-term prosecutor, obviously in the DPP's office. In fact, she held a position there until she was appointed, under this government, to be chief executive. In a circumstance where there's every possibility, where there's an invitation to submit for the position that other members of the Director of Public Prosecution office may wish to apply for, it was entirely appropriate that she recuse herself from being on any panel, and she did so.

MCDONALD, MS S.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:05): My question is to the Attorney-General. Is the Attorney-General aware that deputy DPP officer, Sandi McDonald, gave evidence to the Budget and Finance Committee that she was a Liberal Party donor?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:05): I haven't read the transcript on this yet, but my recollection is that I was informed that Ms McDonald had been asked whether she had ever attended a Liberal Party event.

Mr Picton: It was a fundraiser.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Well, it may have been, but I'm just making the point. That's all I can recall. That's all I'm aware of.

MCDONALD, MS S.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:06): My question is to the Attorney-General.

The Hon. S.S. Marshall: Did any of the people you appointed do legal work for the Labor Party?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What process has the Attorney-General put in place to avoid the perception of nepotism in relation to the candidacy of Liberal donor Ms Sandi McDonald—

The Hon. S.S. Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —for the position of DPP?

The SPEAKER: That question is in order.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:06): It is a very important question to ensure that the public have confidence in relation to the appointment of the Director of Public Prosecutions, which is an independent statutory role seized with the responsibility to make a determination and prosecute matters on behalf of the State of South

Australia, so it is an important role. It is also very important that the process of appointment is independent and fair and ensures that there is every opportunity for the best candidates to step up and make that application.

I read in the paper somewhere that there are six applicants—or purported to be—in respect of this, but I haven't been briefed in respect of who they are, nor have I asked, for obvious reasons. We have put in place a senior panel, including two retired judges, a Queen's Counsel (a QC not an SC) and a senior member of the public sector as a broad area of experience that would, I think, be competent in advising me and the government as to a recommended final appointment for consideration and to then formally go through the process. It is a Governor's appointment, and so of course we want to make sure that that process, as I say, is both appropriate and independent.

LIVE MUSIC INDUSTRY

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:08): My question is to the Minister for Industry and Skills.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens can leave for the rest of question time.

The honourable member for West Torrens having withdrawn from the chamber:

Mr PEDERICK: Can the minister update the house on how the state government is supporting live music talent across the state?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (15:08): I am very pleased that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —the member for Hammond has asked me that question. I know he likes both kinds of music: country and western. The Marshall Liberal government is supporting South Australia's live music industry and nurturing musical talent across South Australia. I will use this opportunity to thank minister Fifield for the \$30 million that he announced on Saturday for the live music industry throughout South Australia. There is \$2.7 million for South Australia for the development of Indigenous music in South Australia, a great initiative for South Australia. I know the Premier is thrilled to bits with that announcement, with his passion for Indigenous South Australians.

We are growing new opportunities. We want to see more live music being played in more venues and in more regions in South Australia. The state government wants to foster live music outside Adelaide. I first launched RAMP—and RAMP is not a punk revival band; it is, in actual fact, an anagram for Regional Accelerator Music Program—in Port Pirie. Last week, I was in Kadina with the member for Narungga and we launched the program there. On Friday, I was down in Mount Gambier. The launches were followed by round tables.

I had the benefit of catching up with James Morrison at his music academy, and he attended the round table on Friday. He was very complimentary of the engagement of the government with the industry in actually being able to understand what the industry requires. He said, after the commitment to regional music in South Australia by this government, that it is now up to the music industry in regional South Australia to work together to help make this happen. The round table was very excited about the outcomes of that day.

RAMP is a state government initiative, run out of the Music Development Office, providing practical and financial support for regional musicians, event organisers and venues.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: The new program will be driven by a partnership of regional stakeholders, including local councils and schools, Regional Development Australia, music practitioners and not-for-profit arts and music organisations. The music industry is a significant contributor to South Australia's economy, delivering around \$375 million and generating jobs for

6,300 South Australians. After food and wine, live music is the biggest tourism drawcard for our regions. The potential growth for both music talent and tourism in our regions is significant. RAMP is one of the several Marshall government initiatives available to assist South Australians keen to pursue a career in music.

With extra funding committed to the live music fund and various contemporary music grants, Adelaide has a strong culture of live music and we want to see this level of activity expand throughout regional South Australia because we want to see regional South Australia grow and thrive. As the Minister for Primary Industries would say, #RegionsMatter.

Grievance Debate

AFL NATIONAL WOMEN'S LEAGUE

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:12): I rise to heartily congratulate the Adelaide Crows women on their historic and magnificent AFLW grand final win, a win that speaks to the outstanding talent, extraordinary courage and inspiring team spirit and camaraderie inherent in this remarkable group of women. Throughout the season, this team enthralled fans with their skill, relentless endeavour and positivity. On Sunday, they moved many of the 53,034 strong crowd to the heights of joy and, in some instances, to tears—53,000-plus people who forged a new attendance record for a domestic women's sporting contest in Australia.

Winning with a final score of 10 goals 3 points, this game held us captivated with a number of highs and lows throughout. With Carlton out early, there were some initial nerves, but we soon settled, with Anne Hatchard scoring Adelaide's first goal, followed quickly by a goal each from Ailish Considine and Eloise Jones, three in total from Danielle Ponter and two from Erin Phillips. There was relentless, tough tackling from all and incredible on-oval and in-stands celebrations of goals, marks and every step toward victory taken.

The 53,000-plus, however, were also heartbroken when Chloe Scheer was taken off with a suspected ACL injury, when Carlton's Tayla Harris was taken off with a knee injury—luckily, she returned later in the game—and when extraordinary leader, Erin Phillips, was stretchered from the Oval in the third quarter. Every person was deeply moved at this moment when she bravely waved to the crowd. When Carlton and Adelaide players alike offered support and wished her the best, thousands jumped to their feet and clapped this sporting legend as she left the Oval and did so again when she returned on crutches to be awarded best on ground.

In another deeply moving moment, legendary first AFLW grand final winning coach, the clever, engaging, driven and inspiring Bec Goddard, presented the coach's medal to this year's brilliant coach, Matthew Clarke. This team exemplifies why sport is important and what sport has the power to do.

Before the commencement of the first season of the AFL Women's competition, there were around 16 clubs with women's teams here in South Australia. Since its advent, there are now well over 100 and it continues to grow and flourish. This team is a shining example of what the saying 'if she can't see it, she can't be it' actually means. Their trailblazing football, their conduct on and off the oval and the pathway from community football that they now complete have all ensured that girls and women are inspired by this twice premierships-winning team to follow their football and other sporting dreams because they know that they can and because they know that they are welcome and supported to participate and succeed.

These women are unfailingly generous in their support of the girls and women who follow them, running numerous clinics around our state and regularly showing up to back other women in the SANFL, Adelaide Footy League and SFL women's competitions and in many other ways. Every time I have asked one of them to speak, or a club or league has asked for their support, they are there for them. As well as managing jobs and study, they give so much of their time, passion and energy to others interested in football or in any sport, to our community and to our collective fight for equality.

So many of us were deeply angered by the treatment of Carlton's Tayla Harris in the lead-up to Sunday's final. Tayla is a woman who should always be celebrated for her startling athleticism, her incredible kick and her leadership. Instead, we saw trolls engage in sexist, derogatory nonsense

and, initially, Channel 7 remove a remarkable picture of Tayla to avoid it rather than call those trolls out. Thankfully, Channel 7 reversed that decision and apologised—a very good and well-received move. This saga and other examples of this type of treatment continue to galvanise sportswomen, the many of us who continue to fight for equality in sport and everywhere else, the clubs who genuinely welcome and include women, and so many others.

This group of Adelaide Crows women, and the hundreds of thousands who backed them and their sisters from Carlton, on the weekend took a huge step forward towards equality in sport and everywhere on Sunday. When we see women play football at such a high level as we did on the weekend and see them being supported and celebrated in doing so, the way we see women is transformed. We see them as strong and physical, taking their place in the midst of a contest, not on the sidelines.

This transformation of the way we see the roles of men and women gives us immense opportunity to influence the many other issues of persistent inequality our community confronts. For this, as well as for their spectacular performance on Sunday, I say thank you to these trailblazing women who refused to accept no, who have pushed the boundaries and who have ushered in a new era that will see us together achieve equality in sport and in so many other aspects of community life.

Time expired.

CRIME STOPPERS SA

Ms LUETHEN (King) (15:17): Today, I am going to provide an update on Crime Stoppers because everyone needs to feel safe in our community and crime and safety continue to be raised as a priority while I have been out doorknocking. Crime Stoppers is part of a suite of measures that SAPOL uses to prevent crime in our state.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for King, could you take a seat, please. Members, we are partway through the grievance debate. The previous speaker was heard in silence and with respect, and I would hope that continues for the member for King's contribution.

Mr DULUK: Point of order, sir: can I ask for the clock to be restarted for the member for King because I could not hear any of her contribution at the beginning?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have considered that, member for Waite, and I think it is a fair and reasonable suggestion given that the member for Reynell went a little over time. We will restart the clock, and the member for King will be heard in silence. You have the call.

Ms LUETHEN: I will start again. Today, I am going to provide an update on Crime Stoppers because everyone needs to feel safe in our community and crime and safety continue to be raised as a priority when I am out doorknocking. Crime Stoppers is part of a suite of measures that SAPOL uses to prevent crime in our state. Crime Stoppers is a highly successful program in which the community and the media help the police solve crime. It is simple, effective and a secure way for someone to provide information anonymously.

It is concerning that Crime Stoppers has led to over 32,496 solved cases. In February, nearly 180 calls were made to Crime Stoppers SA about drug growing, making and selling activity, reinforcing that the destructive impact of drugs remains a real concern for people in our community. In addition, 43 calls were made about firearms, providing investigators with good leads to follow and resulting in three firearms being located, along with an array of other illegal weapons.

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

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

Ms LUETHEN: Information from the community in February led to 50 apprehensions, including 23 men and six women charged with a range of serious offences. Other February 2019 results included more than 2,000 calls and nearly 400 online reports received, 906 actions issued for investigation, amphetamine and fantasy (GHB) seized and 7,614 people visiting

the Crime Stoppers SA website resulting in 22,400 page views. If anyone in King has any information about criminal activity and unsolved crimes, do not forget that you can call the free hotline on 1800—

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for King, could you take your seat again, please. I am sorry about this. Member for Reynell, you had the chance to contribute to the grievance debate today. You were heard in silence and with great decorum, I felt, on an important subject. The member for King believes this is an important subject. I ask that you hear her out in silence, and I call you to order. Member for King.

Ms LUETHEN: Recently, I read inaccurate information published online about Crime Stoppers. As with all important state government issues, I encourage people living in King to contact me any time they have a question to receive accurate information about what our government is doing to support the community in SA to be the absolute best it can be.

I take a moment today to say that it is farcical and dishonest that the opposition would claim that there has been a cut to Crime Stoppers' funding. The opposition never paid a cent to Crime Stoppers during their 16 years in government. Crime Stoppers asked the previous government for funding in April 2015, but it was knocked back. There has never been anything in a Labor budget to provide Crime Stoppers with one iota of funding.

We, too, could pull dollar figures from the sky and hope that the media do not question those numbers, but we do not do that because we are a transparent, responsible and ethical government that care deeply about our community members and their safety. The Leader of the Opposition embarrassingly admitted on live radio that there are no cuts to Crime Stoppers and that the Labor Party funding to Crime Stoppers was only an election promise.

The unfortunate fact is that sponsorship for Crime Stoppers has waned, and that is why I am taking a moment today to highlight the important outcomes Crime Stoppers achieve in collaboration with the community and media. Our government will endeavour to work with members across this house to find a sustainable business model for Crime Stoppers. Crime Stoppers' funding requests will be considered in the lead-up to this year's budget.

Our government will continue to take a strategic focus on the future to plan for and deliver on the needs of South Australians in an efficient and sustainable way. Community safety is paramount and everyone needs to feel safe in our community. South Australians deserve to access the best emergency services, police force and criminal justice system. Community safety requires us all to be vigilant, so we must be careful to heed reminders to dial 000 for police, fire and ambulance in an emergency and 131 444 for the Police Assistance Line for non-urgent police assistance.

If you have any information about criminal activity and unsolved crimes, do not forget that you can call the Crime Stoppers' free hotline or go to Crime Stoppers online or download the free report suspicious behaviour app for phones. Do not forget that rewards are available and that you can remain anonymous—it is your choice.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the next speaker, it is my sad duty to call to order the members for Mawson and Playford and also warn the member for Elizabeth.

HURTLE VALE ELECTORATE COMMUNITY EVENTS

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (15:24): I rise today with some sick air in this deck we call the House of Assembly. I am no fakie, so let me carve it out for you. The Weatherill Labor government funded a shelter and drinks station at Investigator Drive at the Hurtle John Potter Reserve. On Friday 15 March, the weather was perfect for the Onkaparinga Flip'n It Fridays Skate, Scooter, BMX event that was held at the reserve.

I was very proud to sponsor that event and run the sausage sizzle with my office, while Neighbourhood Watch areas 406, 407 and 436 ran the drinks. Emma Cadd, a community development officer from the City of Onkaparinga, ran an amazing event that was enjoyed by many local families, who had a great evening mixing it up with various ages on the ramp.

It was a great opportunity to see the shade sail and drinking fountain at the reserve being used as intended. This was delivered following a street corner meeting where local mum Natalie raised the issue. Being there and watching the kids run around, filling up their water bottles and having a great time while the parents also had somewhere to sit and watch in the shade, it was clear that the investment in the park has really paid off.

Thank you and congratulations also to the organisers of and participants in the wonderful festive events that were held in Hurtle Vale in the lead-up to Christmas last year. It is great to have an opportunity to celebrate the Old Reynella Christmas pageant, which was a wonderful family event held on 14 December. It was really wintry weather that day, a lot of rain, but it held off and the event had a fantastic turnout. It was great fun for all involved, and well done to the parade committee and all the local community groups and volunteers who participated.

The popular community Christmas carols event was held again and hosted by Neighbourhood Watch. This was also another really successful family night. Even though the event was again unlucky, with a lot of rain causing some difficulties at the reserve and a postponement for a week from the initial date, the Neighbourhood Watch team pushed along and delivered a fantastic night, with Carols in the Park being held on 22 December.

The event is a tradition in Hurtle Vale, where the community joins together at Mount Hurtle Reserve in Woodcroft to spread some Christmas cheer and sing along to the carols that everyone knows and loves. Neighbourhood Watch SA area 414, Woodcroft, is a not-for-profit group, and they use the proceeds from the event to support their organisation. Other organisations there included the Onkaparinga Harmony Chorus, the Happy Valley CFS, St John Ambulance and the Lions Club of Noarlunga/Morphett Vale.

A special mention goes to Vicki Smythe, who has recently retired from her position as secretary on the carols committee for Neighbourhood Watch area 414. Vicki has contributed so much to the association and has been an outstanding member of the committee, ensuring that Carols in the Park is a success year in, year out. Thank you so much, Vicki, for your hard work.

We have an abundance of great Christmas lights in Hurtle Vale, and it is great to be able to mention them. They always bring a smile to the faces of not just the children but also the adults alike over summer nights in December. I would especially like to mention the impressive Christmas lights on Emmerson Drive in Morphett Vale. The Branson family uses it as an opportunity to raise money for the Cancer Council year in, year out.

There is also Dorrien Avenue, and 1 Partalunga Circuit, the home of the Bradwell family, Natalie and Peter, who do a fantastic job. Their sister and brother-in-law, Bev and John Bradwell on Rothschild Street at Woodcroft, also do a fantastic job entertaining the kids and going that little bit further with their Christmas lights. Thank you very much to those families.

Finally, I would like to express my joy at the imminent move of the Hurtle Vale electorate office. We are returning to the heartland of Hurtle Vale. We are moving in this coming Friday, and the office will be open from Monday 8 April. In the 12 months since the election, a whole Bunnings has actually been built at St Marys and will open this weekend, with its sausage sizzles and trade nights, so it has been a bit frustrating waiting for the office to open, but thank you to everyone at Electorate Services for the all the effort they have put in.

Thank you especially to my office during this period of transition. We have also had some great support from the local people, including everyone at the Woodcroft Morphett Vale Neighbourhood Centre. The centre has helped us by facilitating an office when we have needed to talk to local constituents. We are having an official opening day on Wednesday 17 April at 10.30 and the community is very welcome.

Mr BROWN: Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

WAITE ELECTORATE ROAD UPGRADES

Mr DULUK (Waite) (15:30): I rise today to talk about an issue that has plagued my constituents for many years, and that is the lack of road investment in my wonderful electorate. Under the past 16 years of Labor government, my people were ignored and our roads were not upgraded.

However, under the new Marshall Liberal government, I am extremely pleased to see the Mitcham Hills road corridor receiving funding in last year's budget, being a \$16.5 million road funding upgrade in addition to the \$3.5 million allocated to fixing the Blackwood roundabout. The \$3.5 million Blackwood roundabout upgrade, which is nearly completed, will improve traffic efficiency and safety as well as pedestrian access through this high-traffic area. The upgrade will include construction of a new, larger roundabout, road surfacing, new line marking, and lighting upgrades.

As well, the Blackwood roundabout project has seen the restoration of the soldier at the Blackwood War Memorial, and I would like to thank the fantastic team at Artlab for their work on this historic stone monument. A complex process was undertaken to conserve the respected soldier, who has recently been brought back into position in his new home on the roundabout and will be unveiled just before ANZAC Day. Thank you so much to the community, who for many years has lobbied and fought for the upgrade of the Blackwood roundabout. It is finally being delivered by a Marshall Liberal government.

The Mitcham Hills road corridor requires upgrading to improve safety for residents and commuters. In the 2018-19 state Liberal budget, \$16.5 million was invested into improving traffic flow throughout that corridor. This is addressing urgent infrastructure needs that for too long were neglected by the former government. This significant investment along these roads will ease delays and deliver safety to motorists.

Some of the road projects that will be undertaken for improvement include upgrading the safety and operation of the Main Road and Russell Street intersection in Belair, alleviating safety concerns and reducing traffic congestion at the intersection of Shepherds Hill Road, Brighton Parade and Waite Street in Blackwood, upgrading key lighting along sections of the corridor and working with the City of Mitcham to prioritise other upgrades, including looking at the Laffers Road intersection and the James Road intersection as well.

Almost 10 years ago, a state parliamentary report recommended upgrading the Mitcham Hills road corridor to ensure that residents could leave quickly in the event of a major bushfire. Many sections along the corridor cause concern and frustration for local commuters, and it has taken 10 years for this issue finally to be addressed by a Liberal government. I am so glad that we are getting on with implementing the report of a parliamentary committee that made its recommendations more than 10 years ago.

Another fantastic announcement in the electorate of Waite was made a fortnight ago by the Premier and the Prime Minister to spend \$61 million upgrading the intersection of Cross Road and Fullarton Road. This intersection takes 60,000 cars per day, and so many of those cars start their commute at the bottom of my electorate, through Coromandel Valley, come through the Mitcham Hills road corridor and go through that intersection on their commute to work. Of course, the east-west traffic is on a big freight corridor, as part of the Cross Road intersection, so it is a fantastic announcement by the federal government and by our state Liberal government.

There are so many projects happening around our state. The upgrade of the Springbank Road intersection and the Magill Road/Portrush Road intersection are all funding commitments into our communities and into our road networks that are made possible by the harmonious working relationship between the federal Morrison Liberal government and the state Marshall Liberal government.

That is what is so important. That is what the people of South Australia want to see: they want to see collaboration and they want to see governments of all persuasions working together, and I know that is the formula that is working right now for South Australia. It did not work before because the former Labor government did not want to work with the federal Liberal government. Should there ever be a future Labor government in 2030 or 2040, God forbid, I am not sure how they will work with a Marshall Liberal government here.

Another fantastic announcement recently was the upgrade of Blackwood Road and the push-button crossing there. That is a great win for parents and families with children at Scotch College and the local residents of Torrens Park who are seeing a much improved safety project as part of the Way2Go project. I must thank the department (Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure) for working with me and the community in recent months to see that happening. The Liberal government is delivering on bus congestion and improving road safety in our communities.

LIMESTONE COAST

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (15:35): I rise today to talk about my recent visit to the Limestone Coast. Most of my time was spent as a member of the Economic and Finance Committee, but I spent the first part of my time meeting with key stakeholders across my shadow portfolio of trade, tourism and investment. I thank the Hon. Clare Scriven in the other place for joining me in what is an absolutely beautiful part of South Australia.

The Limestone Coast has more direct tourism employment than any other region in South Australia. In 2017, visitors spent \$321 million. One in 18 jobs is supported by the tourism industry, and there are nearly 800 tourism businesses in the Limestone Coast. It is predominantly a self-drive visitor market, connecting up with the Great Ocean Road and the South Australian Southern Ocean Drive touring route, which we have promoted quite substantially and which highlights the region's beautiful landscapes, the wildlife experiences and the local food and wine.

The Regional Visitors Strategy released last year looked at the priorities for the area: an increase in overnight visitors from both international and domestic markets and the conversion of daytrippers to linger longer and stay overnight. These are the key priorities of that strategy, as well as upgrading rooms from three star to four star and increasing accommodation at scale in the Coonawarra. Another priority is about strengthening the promotion of events—for example, Generations in Jazz, the Penola Coonawarra Arts Festival and the Coonawarra Cabernet Celebrations.

During my time, I had the opportunity to meet with Biddie Shearing from the Limestone Coast LGA and talk about the many positives happening in the area, particularly developing the tourism and visitor economy. She is working with local tourism businesses to be visible and bookable online. Only a proportion of businesses in the Limestone Coast—about 300—are listed on the Australian Tourism Data Warehouse, and that is an important place to be in order for people to find you online. She is working on building the capacity of the local region. They are also launching the Guides of Mount Gambier, which means that you can have a one-on-one opportunity or a small group opportunity for locals to show you the best places in Mount Gambier.

I also spent some time with the Wattle Range Council, which includes Millicent, Penola and Beachport, amongst others. They are very focused on tourism and developing their regional area. They are very RV friendly—and they have had many conversations with the Cave Divers Association, who have had increased interest in the many opportunities that the caves present around that area—and they are very excited because they are building a nature play area near the council chambers, including a rage cage, which is new to me; apparently, it lets people do many things, such as basketball, etc. They talked to me about their beautiful golf course in Millicent. Others might be familiar with it, as it is one of the top 100 courses in Australia, and they are looking at the opportunity of developing it in the future.

What was most interesting to me is the future they see for value-adding with the artisan food in the area, not just for its exporting potential but for on-farm tourism experiences as well. However, they do have challenges. The Southern Ports Highway needs work, and they are keen to activate the Coonawarra rail trail. They will also be hosting the Great Victorian Bike Ride and need some support, so they have asked me to advocate on their behalf for that event in October.

Despite all these positive developments in tourism, it is so disappointing to hear this week that we are going backwards in the number of international visitors to South Australia. We are down year on year for visitor numbers, spending and international visitor nights. With 40 per cent of spend in regional areas, this is very concerning as it is down 3.5 per cent on regional trip expenditure for international visitors. It is not because tourism is down nationally—everyone else is up—but what is

different here is the \$11 million cut from the budget. Sources tell me there are more cuts to come in this budget. It is a key industry employing 36,000 South Australians. Tourism equals jobs—no more cuts.

HAMMOND ELECTORATE

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:40): I rise today to talk about one sad happening in my electorate, amongst a lot of growth in my electorate as well. I mourn the closure in a couple of years' time of the Big W distribution centre at Monarto. It is a massive centre set on 35,000 square metres under cover and employs 212 people—that is, 212 individuals, not full-time equivalents. I want to thank Paul Crossley from the Woolworths government relations team for at least discussing this issue with me.

I acknowledge that Big W and Woolworths have made a business decision. They have been losing on average something like \$100 million a year and, sadly, out of the three distribution centres—at Warwick, in Queensland; Melbourne; and obviously Monarto, in my electorate—two are going to close. Monarto will finish up in a couple of years and Warwick in three years' time. It is not only disappointing for my constituents but disappointing for those in Warwick.

This is about investment and people who take a risk. It is also about making money. As much as I hate the decision, I understand why it is being made. I do not like it, and I want to reinforce that I do not like it, but there is a strong transition program for workers funded through the Liberal federal government, and there could be also opportunities through the Skilling South Australia fund for workers at Monarto. The beauty of it is that workers have been given two years to work through this. If they can be fitted in with a Woolworths team elsewhere, they will be offered positions.

I wish all the workers all the best for their futures. It is a tough thing that has happened only yesterday. As I said to the Mayor of the Rural City of Murray Bridge, Brenton Lewis, we have been riding the crest of a wave for a long time in our area in a range of areas. I now want to talk about the multimillion dollar investment we have had from different growers working with Ingham's.

Only recently, the Premier came down and opened the \$50 million feed mill for Ingham's. Not only do we have the chicken sheds all around Monarto, Langhorne Creek and Murray Bridge, but there are also the layer sheds that have just been built down at Yumali, not far from where I am at Coomandook. It is a multimillion dollar investment there. Recently, Big River Pork invested millions of dollars to put on a whole range of extra staff at the abattoirs. The Bridgeport Hotel redevelopment coming up will build a six-storey, 4½ star hotel, with 99 4½ star-rated rooms to be built by the Tregony Group. That will start towards the end of this year.

Obviously, we have The Bend Motorsport Park, where the Shahin family, the Peregrine Corporation, have invested at least \$110 million. That is what they will admit to, but I think it is a lot more than that. It is a fantastic facility that is growing beyond the multiple track layouts through to a VMAX track, which will be an airstrip as well as a drag strip.

There has also just been a \$64 million investment by Costa Adelaide Mushrooms, which, incidentally, is looking for 200 jobs, which is close to the notified number of jobs that are going to be wound up at the Big W distribution park—so there is plenty of opportunity in the area—and we are still awaiting the Thomas Foods announcement. I must say that, with the Costa discussions, over time the biggest issue they had was whether they would have enough workers for the job. They had the \$64 million secured, and I am hoping that very soon we will have a positive announcement from Thomas Foods International.

I think it is outrageous that the member for West Torrens can reflect that advertising for skilled migration into the area is a bad thing when the skilled migrants who come into Hammond and MacKillop and other areas of the state are actually such a boon, doing these vital jobs to boost the state economy.

*Bills***INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER AGAINST CORRUPTION (INVESTIGATION POWERS) NO 2
AMENDMENT BILL***Introduction and First Reading*

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:46): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill amends the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption Act 2012 (ICAC Act) to address the government's commitment to transparent justice in South Australia when the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption is investigating serious or systemic maladministration and misconduct in public administration. In short, the bill seeks to clarify how the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption investigates matters raising potential issues of serious or systemic misconduct and maladministration in public administration. Importantly, it will provide the commissioner with the discretion to hold public hearings into matters.

It should be emphasised that the amendments do not affect anything in the ICAC Act relating to investigations into corruption. Neither the government nor the commissioner support open hearings into such investigations. Under the current convoluted scheme, the commissioner's power to investigate misconduct or maladministration is provided by reference to the Ombudsman Act 1972. The Ombudsman has the powers of a commission, as defined in the Royal Commissions Act 1917. However, that power is curtailed by section 18(2), which requires investigations to be carried out in private.

Because the commissioner is both the investigator and the decision-maker in these types of investigations, persons whose rights, interests and legitimate expectations might be adversely affected must be accorded procedural fairness. Therefore, it is crucial that the process be transparent for that to occur. The commissioner is able to determine when and if an investigation or part of an investigation should be held in public.

This bill does what the commissioner himself has been requesting for several years. However, the Oakden investigation particularly highlighted the issue of open hearings. On page 16 of the Oakden report, the commissioner wrote:

This investigation has firmly reinforced my view that the legislation under which I operate ought to be amended to give me the discretion to conduct investigations of this kind in public.

He went on to state:

There is a tension between the Act which provides jurisdiction to investigate and the Acts which provide the powers during the investigation...The tensions could be resolved if the ICAC Act were modified to seamlessly include powers of investigation and reporting in respect of misconduct and maladministration. I have previously proposed to the Government that the powers to investigate such conduct be found by a more direct route than is presently the case. The Government did not accept my proposal. I am hopeful that these issues will be considered again.

Well, they have. These amendments indeed address the commissioner's comments in a practical and simple way. They remove the requirement for the commissioner, when dealing with an investigation into matters raising a potential issue of serious or systemic maladministration or misconduct in public administration, to exercise powers of an inquiry agency and set out the powers and functions relating to such investigations in schedule 3A of the ICAC Act. The schedule consolidates the powers and functions available to the commissioner under the Ombudsman Act and the Royal Commissions Act, clarifying the manner in which an inquiry is to be heard and the powers available to the commissioner and ensuring those powers are fit for purpose.

In particular, the bill clarifies the extent to which legal professional privilege and public interest immunity are abrogated during a maladministration or misconduct investigation and provides for the commissioner to report on one or more investigations in such manner as the commissioner thinks fit. Setting out the powers and functions in this way will ensure that arguments about the scope

and nature of investigative powers available to the commissioner are avoided in future investigations of this nature.

The first version of this bill was introduced in the House of Assembly on 10 May 2018 and passed this house on 30 May 2018. That bill was received in the Legislative Council on 31 May 2018. However, it was subsequently withdrawn and referred to the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee for report and recommendations on 26 July 2018. The Legislative Council received the report of the committee on 20 September 2018, and a second version of the bill, the version now before the house, was then introduced in the Legislative Council on 15 November 2018.

In addition to the above, this version of the bill makes further changes to the ICAC Act in accordance with recommendations made by the committee in its report. The committee's final report contained eight recommendations. The government has accepted many of the committee's recommendations and has reflected this acceptance in the bill that was presented to the Legislative Council, which, subject to some amendment that I will refer to hereafter, has now come to our house. The recommendations were as follows:

- make clear that, unless the commissioner makes a determination to conduct a public inquiry, an investigation into misconduct or maladministration in public administration must be conducted in private;
- provide that the commissioner, a public officer or public authority that may be affected by the investigation may apply to the Supreme Court to determine whether the decision to conduct a public inquiry was properly made, and make any orders necessary to give effect to that determination;
- provide that a witness or other person may apply to the person heading the investigation for the making of an order forbidding the publication or disclosure of a matter, and to include an appeal process when an application is refused;
- permit a person to refuse to answer a question, provide information or produce a document only if it would tend to incriminate the person of an offence; and
- clarify the operation of the clause of the bill relating to legal professional privilege.

The bill also includes further amendments intended to improve some operational aspects of the legislation. For example, the bill will provide a delegation power so that, if for some reason the commissioner is unable to conduct an investigation, the deputy commissioner and/or the examiner may head the investigation and report to the commissioner. The bill also provides for the person heading the investigation to make non-publication or suppression orders. These changes are necessary for purely practical reasons.

The bill further clarifies that, where a person other than the commissioner is heading an investigation, that person may make findings relating to that investigation and can publish a report setting out those findings and recommendations. It is necessary because currently the power to make findings lies with only the commissioner.

Further amendments were made to the bill by a majority of members in the other place. We will see that in the case of a public inquiry an examination of a witness must be conducted in accordance with the rules of evidence, practices and procedures applicable to witnesses giving evidence in summary proceedings in the Magistrates Court, as well as enabling persons who give evidence to call and present evidence relevant to the investigation.

These further amendments, I should point out to the house, were not in the bill introduced by the government member, namely, the Hon. R.I. Lucas, in the other place. As has been stated publicly by the commissioner, the application and operability of public hearings are likely to be compromised by some of these amendments.

The government will consider these matters, and we have commenced assessment of the same, but foreshadow that if the bill is to be progressed and effective some modification may need to be presented to this house for consideration. That said, however, I commend the bill to members and seek leave to insert the explanation of clauses into *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of Independent Commissioner Against Corruption Act 2012

4—Amendment of section 7—Functions

This clause amends the provision specifying the functions of the ICAC to remove references to the ICAC exercising the powers of an inquiry agency and instead refer to the ICAC investigating misconduct and maladministration in public administration. The provision also makes some amendments that are consequential to allowing public inquiries.

5—Amendment of section 24—Action that may be taken

This clause removes references to the ICAC exercising the powers of an inquiry agency and replaces them with references to the ICAC investigating misconduct and maladministration in public administration.

6—Repeal of sections 26 and 27

7—Repeal of sections 33 to 36

Clauses 6 and 7 are related to the ICAC's new investigatory powers in relation to misconduct and maladministration in public administration. These provisions that currently relate to corruption investigations are able to apply equally to misconduct and maladministration investigations and so are being relocated to a new general Division (see clauses 9 and 10).

8—Substitution of section 36A

This clause substitutes the current section 36A (which allows the ICAC to investigate potential issues of misconduct and maladministration in public administration by exercising the powers of an inquiry agency, i.e. the Ombudsman's powers) with a new section 36A that applies the proposed Schedule 3A to investigations by the ICAC into potential issues of misconduct and maladministration in public administration. In addition, proposed new section 36B provides for applications to the Supreme Court to determine whether the ICAC has jurisdiction to conduct an investigation in respect of a matter raising potential issues of misconduct or maladministration in public administration or to determine whether a decision to conduct a public inquiry was properly made. Proposed section 36C provides for appeals to the Supreme Court from a refusal to make an order forbidding publication or disclosure of matter under proposed Schedule 3A clause 3(1).

9—Heading to Part 4 Division 2 Subdivision 4

This clause substitutes a heading to make Part 4 Division 2 a Division containing general provisions relating to investigations by the ICAC.

10—Insertion of sections 39A to 39F

This clause relocates the provisions deleted by clauses 6 and 7 and provides that, if the Commissioner decides to hold a public inquiry under proposed new Schedule 3A, the Commissioner is required to head the investigation.

11—Amendment of section 42—Reports

This clause deletes a provision that would be inconsistent with the power to hold public inquiries.

12—Amendment of section 45—Commissioner's annual report

This clause deletes a provision that required the ICAC to report on the number and general nature of occasions on which the ICAC exercised the powers of an inquiry agency. The requirement to report on investigations by the Commissioner is already contained in subsection (2)(b)(ii) (and this provision will now cover both corruption investigations and misconduct and maladministration investigations).

13—Amendment of section 48—Commissioner's website

This clause requires the Commissioner's website to include information relating to Schedule 4.

14—Amendment of section 54—Confidentiality

This clause is consequential to the new provisions on public inquiries.

15—Amendment of section 56—Publication of information and evidence

This clause is consequential to the new provisions on public inquiries.

16—Amendment of section 57—Victimisation

This clause amends section 57 to bring the provision in line with the victimisation provision contained in section 9 of the *Public Interest Disclosure Act 2018*.

17—Insertion of section 62

This clause requires the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee of the Parliament to inquire into and consider the operation of the whole of the *Independent Commissioner Against Corruption Act 2012* (as amended by this measure) by 31 July 2020.

18—Insertion of Schedule 3A

This clause inserts a new Schedule containing provisions relating to investigations into misconduct and maladministration. The new Schedule contains provisions dealing with the following matters:

- the power to conduct a public inquiry and requirements to give notice of such an inquiry
- orders that may be made in the course of an investigation into misconduct or maladministration in public administration to prevent undue prejudice or undue hardship to any person, or otherwise in the public interest
- the application of rules as to procedure and evidence to public inquiries
- the right to present evidence at a public inquiry
- representation for participants in the investigation
- dealing with the privilege against self-incrimination, legal professional privilege and public interest immunity
- admissibility in evidence of statements or disclosures etc made in an investigation
- examination of witnesses (including powers to compel attendance and deal with contempt)
- power to require a written statement of information about a specified matter or to require answers to questions
- power to require a person to produce a document or thing for the purposes of the investigation
- power to enter and inspect any premises or place occupied by a public authority and anything in or on those premises or that place
- action that may be taken following an investigation, including the making of findings, recommendations or reports

19—Amendment of Schedule 4—Reviews

This clause amends Schedule 4 to require the reviewer to maintain a website, to include a mechanism for calling for public submissions prior to an annual review and to specify certain categories of information that must be included in a report on an annual review.

Schedule 1—Transitional provisions

1—Application of amendments

The transitional provision deals with the replacement of section 36A and the introduction of the new investigation powers.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Cook.

**NATIONAL ELECTRICITY (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (RETAILER RELIABILITY OBLIGATION)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (15:56): The National Electricity (South Australia) (Retailer Reliability Obligation) Amendment Bill 2019 seeks to implement the framework for the Retailer Reliability Obligation through amendments to the national electricity law, which is set out in the schedule to the National Electricity (South Australia) Act 1996.

The Australian Energy Market Operator forecasts supply and demand of the market over a 10-year outlook period and, as I mentioned previously, it refines its forecasts annually, which provides the market with the opportunity to address identified reliability gaps. New section 14F requires that each year the Australian Energy Market Operator undertakes forecasting on reliability gaps for future years.

A forecast reliability gap is linked to the National Electricity Market reliability standard and a reliability gap would occur where the forecast reliability in a particular region in a given financial year would result in the National Electricity Market reliability standard not being met to a material extent. The reliability standard was reviewed by the independent Reliability Panel in 2018, which is a specialist body within the Australian Energy Market Commission and includes large energy users, consumer groups from industry and also AEMO representatives.

To deliver a reliable supply, the level of supply needs to include a buffer so that the supply is greater than expected demand. This allows actual demand and supply to balance, even in the face of unexpected changes. It should also be noted that there are other aspects to system security, including the need to deliver ancillary services, such as frequency control and inertia for grid stability, which are also being progressed outside this bill.

The Reliability Panel recommended the current standard remain unchanged from its current level. In other words, the current standard requires that there will be sufficient generation and transmission interconnection into a region such that at least 99.98 per cent of expected annual demand for electricity in that region will be supplied.

As I mentioned previously, the AEMO forecasts supply and demand of the market over a 10-year outlook period. New section 14I provides for the triggering of the Retailer Reliability Obligation if AEMO continues to forecast a material reliability gap three years from the period in which the forecast is to occur. To trigger this Retailer Reliability Obligation, AEMO requests that a reliability instrument be made by the Australian Energy Regulator.

Importantly, the request to the Australian Energy Regulator will provide information about the forecast reliability gap, such as the region in which it is to occur, and also the gap period. The purpose of triggering this Retailer Reliability Obligation is to put liable entities on notice of that period for which they may be required to hold net contract positions that will be sufficient to meet their share of a one in two year peak demand forecast for the forecast reliability gap period.

The Australian Energy Market Operator request to the Australian Energy Regulator is therefore required to outline the relevant trading intervals during the forecast reliability gap period. Once that request by AEMO goes to the Australian Energy Regulator, it serves as a check and balance because AEMO, as the market operator, could potentially have a bias towards reliability over efficiency and affordability. The AER is there to ensure that the reliability guarantee is only triggered when absolutely necessary. That said, if the Australian Energy Regulator agrees with AEMO's request then, under section 14K, the Australian Energy Regulator may make a reliability instrument and the Retailer Reliability Obligation would be triggered.

One of the key objectives of such a reliability instrument is for the market to have the right signals to contract and invest to minimise the likelihood of the reliability gap occurring in the first place. That means that if the market adequately responds to these incentives, then any material reliability gaps should be resolved before the actual reliability obligation needs to be placed on those retailers; that is, the reliability obligation does not need to be triggered to act as the safety net particularly.

Even in circumstances where the reliability obligation was not triggered, the Energy Security Board expects that it would certainly incentivise market participants to engage in more long-term contracting up to an appropriate and sustainable level. At the same time, there is also a need to carefully consider the effects of market power and the liquidity of the contract market in the design of this obligation. A market liquidity obligation will be placed on large vertically integrated retailers to ensure that smaller retailers and liable entities will have access to contracts.

The impact analysis that was done on the modelling for the Retailer Reliability Obligation shows a number of things that bear out why we are going down this path. The forecast committed projects up to 2021 show that all the 7,775 megawatts of generation, or capacity into the markets,

are from renewable sources. They also show that only 180 megawatts of that is in storage, in batteries. You can see that really only about 2½ per cent of this generation capacity is actually dispatchable compared with a great percentage that is intermittent, and that is really what this bill is about.

The bill introduces some form of recognition or capacity market to change the way generators will invest and to place a really clear value on dispatchability because, at the moment, that is what is missing. We can see the unintended consequences of not much storage being brought into the market. Certainly, that is the way it is going in many other jurisdictions internationally, and I mentioned before the US, the UK, Spain, France and Germany. For people to say that investors would not be used to these circumstances is a little bit misleading. The market internationally is maturing towards this, and this is a step that our government is taking to shore up reliable energy here in Australia.

Another impact of increasing contracting is that it will help to reduce the risk of reliability shortfalls. The longer term contracts will also help to reduce wholesale spot price volatility, and South Australia is certainly very aware of the effects of very high spot prices brought about by a lack of capacity. If we look at the closure of the Northern power station in Port Augusta and the effects that had previously, in the 2014-15 year the total value traded in the NEM in South Australia was around \$450 million. In 2016-17, after it had been closed, the dollar value traded in South Australia shot right up to over \$1,450 million. That is a massive jump, upwards of a billion dollars, really brought about by capacity scarcity.

We saw spot prices over \$300 million, at that time jump up to \$380 million, so you can see that, if the capacity is scarce, spot prices tend to go right up. That impacts wholesale prices, and they are passed on with devastating effect to South Australia, which we saw. This instrument, while not being the only means of trying to put downward pressure on prices, is certainly very important in trying to manage the whole incentivisation of new generation into the system.

That said, the contracts will provide retailers with more consistency in their electricity, in terms of their longer term contracts, and for the generators themselves it will provide a steadier stream of income. Another point is that the impact analysis of this Retailer Reliability Obligation modelling indicated that it will lead to more competitive bidding in the spot market, as generators will bid lower to increase their chances of being dispatched in order to cover their contracted capacity.

Getting back to the bill itself, once the Australian Energy Regulator has made a reliability instrument and the obligation is triggered, the reporting by liable entities associated with the reliability obligation will not be triggered unless a material reliability gap continues to be forecast one year out from when it is expected, so the market effectively has two years to respond to that gap in the forecast reliability. However, should the AER continue to forecast a material reliability gap one year from the period in which it is forecast to occur, the bill provides for AEMO to request another reliability instrument be made by the AER.

If the AER makes such a reliability instrument, liable entities must ensure that their net contract position for the trading period described in that instrument is no less than their share of a one in two year peak demand forecast for that reliability gap period. By doing that, generators will be encouraged to build dispatchable generation, including conventional generation, pumped hydro and battery and storage systems. By placing a value on this dispatchability, it is also intended to assist in keeping critical generation in operation until replacements are in place.

There is also a compliance regime. In terms of this, if the instrument is triggered during peak demand, the bill provides for civil penalty provisions in respect of the Retailer Reliability Obligation, with amounts not exceeding, for a natural person or a body corporate, \$1 million in the first instance and \$10 million for a breach that relates to a second or subsequent reliability gap.

In closing, I would like to thank the energy minister for his hard work in trying to bring down prices in South Australia. This is a long-term solution that will encourage investment in generation technology to ensure reliability and an appropriate level of dispatchable energy from on-demand sources. The reform itself is another way that this government is supporting a reliable energy system—by requiring companies to hold contracts or invest directly in dispatchable energy to meet demand. This will give households and business confidence that enough generation will be available to meet their electricity needs.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (16:08): I rise to support the National Electricity (South Australia) (Retailer Reliability Obligation) Amendment Bill 2019. At the beginning of my contribution, I want to talk about why we have ended up discussing reliability in this place. I believe that some poor policy decisions were made by the former Labor government, including the Rann Labor government, when we were flung headlong down a path into renewable energy without having a clear plan for transition. It was basically, 'Let's go with wind, solar, and let's blow up coal.' That is the very short version, but that is exactly what happened.

The issue is that we have all this energy being generated by renewables—which is great—but it does not blow all the time, or sometimes it blows too hard for the wind turbines, and it is not sunny all the time, so we need to find a better way. I go back to the Rann Labor government. They were so fixated on wind that they put some mini turbines on top of this very building that were not effective at all. There is an agricultural name for that, but I will not repeat it here. They were completely useless and would not be any good even as centrepieces in your lounge room.

Then we moved on to where this whole thing of embracing wind just took over, and over time we saw the power stations at Port Augusta shut down. That obviously affected the coalmines up at Leigh Creek and basically put to bed something like 650 jobs. My father-in-law, Richard Abernethy, used to work at the Port Augusta power station, and he would be turning in his grave.

It is this headlong rush into renewables. I note what the member for Giles said earlier that, yes, we should be playing our role and that we are a significant player. Well, Australia contributes less than 1 per cent of greenhouse gases. I believe we are also the number one coal exporter in the world; in fact, we have ships lining up on the east coast of this country to take coal out to those coal-fired generators—not just those running at the moment but also those being built as we speak in places like China. We have to be realistic.

I remember having a conversation here in this house and speaking to, I think, some year 11 or year 12 students. I was representing the Minister for Environment, and we had Mark Parnell from the Greens and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, as well as Senator Tim Storer from the federal parliament here as a panel. I do not often agree with the Hon. Mark Parnell from the other place, but when he said that we needed global action I said, 'I admit that's what we do need.' We cannot be in the eye of the storm, basically destroying our economy for an ideal without taking everyone else with us. Unless everyone else goes with you, you are completely wasting your time and are destroying your economy.

Before anyone says that I do not support renewable power, I do. I have renewable power at the farm and I have it here at my Adelaide residence in the form of solar panels. My main impetus for putting on renewable power was the extreme cost of electricity, which came about because of Labor government policy. It is a huge cost to this state. There are people who are reluctant to switch on their lights or their heaters, or to switch on their coolers when it is hot as it has been during the summer recently.

It is outrageous. Supposedly, we live in a First World country but we are having some very Third World outcomes because of poor policy decisions that have been crippling a whole society. It does not matter what socio-economic base you come from, but it is those on the lower socio-economic levels who are getting belted the hardest. It is ridiculous, if you look at that in a global context, that we have people we trade with around the world who have a lot cheaper and a lot more reliable power.

The member for West Torrens, the former minister for energy, bemoaned the need for this bill. Well, governments he has represented prior to our taking office last March have caused the problem. They have absolutely caused this problem. We were sitting on that day, 28 September 2016. It was around 10 minutes to 4pm when South Australia went out. The whole state lost generation.

There is a whole range of discussion about why, when, how and what, but the simple version is there were about 23 pylons knocked down. You have to wonder about how well they were put in but, yes, they did suffer some terrible storm damage. I think it is just ridiculous that with those lines going down we lost the whole state. We should never have lost the whole state from those transmission lines going down.

I was told that, at one time, there was the equivalent—I will call them circuit-breakers—of five circuit-breakers that ran the state. We are basically down to one. What happened was everything just tripped out and we were left in the dark. Victoria was trying to do its job, sending power to us through the Murraylink and Heywood interconnectors, but that failed as well. We became the butt of jokes, not only in Australia but internationally. It just should not be.

What has happened since is that we have had to move to a regime of getting cheaper power. I commend the Minister for Energy, the member for Stuart, for the work he is doing not just on a broad scale but on that house scale by giving the opportunity for people to put batteries in homes—the 40,000 homes—and have batteries teamed up with solar. I believe that something close to 25 per cent of South Australian households have solar on their roof.

We also have the grand policy plan of the interconnector to New South Wales so that when we do have that overabundant energy mix from our end of the interconnector of solar, wind or both, we can be pumping that power directly into New South Wales with reach into Queensland and obviously into Victoria as well, while also utilising the Heywood interconnector into Victoria and the Murraylink interconnector that goes up through the Riverland. The beauty of it, and what people need to remember, is that with that interconnector into New South Wales, we can pick up that coal-fired power, that base load power, that we will and do need to keep our electricity supplies going into the future.

We have a lot of gas generation in South Australia. I also want to note that it is interesting that before we were elected, in the discussion around the interconnector into New South Wales the Labor minister (member for West Torrens) and the Labor Party were all quite happy to say, 'Let's have an interconnector. That's a great grand policy plan.' As soon as we were elected, it fell over and they said, 'No, we don't want an interconnector.' That was another fly-by-night idea. Today, we see a softening of that. We have the member for Giles, who suddenly seems to be the energy spokesperson over there, saying he supports the interconnector in principle.

So what do they support? Do they support the interconnector or not? I will tell you what, even the Labor opposition members in this house like the fact that they can have their lights on and their heaters going or their coolers going, and the simple fact is that interconnector will save many millions of dollars over time for the residents of South Australia.

It is a necessary infrastructure build that needs to happen and I fully back the policy we took to the people and are implementing. It will be interesting, because I think that by the time the interconnector will be built we might not just have in-principle support from the opposition but that it will fully support it. What we need to understand is that we cannot just fly headlong—whether or not you believe in climate change—into a policy like complete renewable when you need base load power.

The simple fact is that base load essentially is coal or gas. More gas has come online in recent times, but we see that there is still the potential to unlock that power out of that coal in the seams below Leigh Creek. We see that people like the Hon. Mark Parnell are dead against that, but that could supply energy well into the future and supply a much-needed workforce in an area that obviously has the town of Leigh Creek. Leigh Creek is a beautiful little town. It is so underutilised—

The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: —absolutely—since we saw that terrible decision 'Oh, no, we'll just get out of base load, we'll get out of coal and we'll destroy those jobs,' forgetting completely that in the global market Australia earns at least \$10 billion from coal exports. It is just crazy thinking. I certainly urge the production and the research into getting that gas extraction at Leigh Creek if at all possible because it is a great part of the world and the infrastructure is there and the town and the facilities are there. It is a fantastic place, and I do not get there afternoon enough, unlike the member for Stuart.

As a result of poor policy decisions made by previous governments, we get to the situation where now we have to put in a Retailer Reliability Obligation. Let's not forget the diesel emergency generation that 'diesel Tom', the member for West Torrens, put in place, because their climate policy was not working, and guess what? You have to go to dirty diesel to back it up and, yes, we have had

to fire them up, but one thing that has not happened under the Marshall Liberal government is that the lights have not gone off. That is the stark difference between us managing not just the power in this state but managing the whole state.

People are so happy not just because we are running the electricity supplies in this state but because we are here running the state, as the place was going backwards. I was down at Lot Fourteen just yesterday and the Premier was talking to us about the investment coming into the state since we were elected because people can see hope. People in huge companies like BHP, OZ Minerals and others can just see that light that people who understand business are here and that we are keen to make sure that it works and to work alongside them.

In regard to the retailer reliability obligations, contracts are in place to provide retailers with a more consistent price for electricity, which in turn allows them to write longer term contracts with consumers, and for generators contracts provide a steadier stream of income. This firm revenue enables them to obtain financing for new investment. A whole range of ideas has been discussed about what can happen with new investment in the field, such as pumped hydro.

I know that Hillgrove, which operates the mine at Kanmantoo, Callington, is talking about the possibility of putting in pumped hydro there. Yes, it would be a very expensive proposal if it goes ahead, and there are other proposals like this right around the state. We see a lot more solar farms going in. We have one at Tailem Bend, which I believe is fired up. We have had some battery storage put in place—the so-called 'big battery' that would power the state for about four minutes. As I said, there are more solar farms going in all the time. However, it is not base load power and we still need that base energy generation.

I have always been intrigued with Snowy Hydro. We have heard the discussion about Snowy 2.0, and I sincerely hope they get that project through to completion. The first Snowy project was fantastic. I have visited there a couple of times, once with work. A very smart marketing tool is used with hydro: they wait until the opportunity to generate yields the maximum price. Back when I visited I think it was \$10,000 a megawatt hour, but I think that the highest you can go for now is about \$14,000 a megawatt hour, so it is really a market mechanism.

When I was young, I used to think that with Snowy Hydro they would just be spilling water and generating power, but that is not how it works. They wait for that market opportunity. There is either a severe cold snap or a hot period, a heatwave, and the market signals, 'We need to spill the water.' They can fire up the turbines within about 90 seconds at Tumut in the Snowy Mountains. Initially, they probably did think, 'Yes, we will just spill water and generate power all the time.' It can almost completely manipulate when they operate to give that maximum benefit as a power generator, and it is a great business model.

The Retailer Reliability Obligation is designed to incentivise retailers and other market customers (liable entities) to support the reliability of the National Electricity Market through their contracting and investment strategies. Liable entities are expected to contract in a variety of ways to meet their reliability obligation. If the market operator assesses that there is a material reliability gap, it may request that the Australian Energy Regulator make a reliability instrument.

Should the regulator make a reliability instrument, it will trigger an obligation on energy retailers to contract with generation, storage or demand response so that there are sufficient contracts in place to meet their share of a one in two year peak demand should it occur during the forecast reliability gap period. Based on current forecasts by the Australian Energy Market Operator, South Australia's one in two year peak demand is approximately 2,900 megawatts. That is a significant amount of power. We reflect on what happened when Port Augusta went offline. That was 520 megawatts of generation of total base load that disappeared just like that, burning away in the background, making sure that power was being supplied to the good constituents of South Australia.

To manage the transition to the new mechanism, local South Australian amendments to the obligation will allow the South Australian minister to make a reliability instrument three years out and 15 months out in transitional years if it appears on reasonable grounds that there is a real risk that electricity supply to all or part of South Australia may be disrupted to a significant degree on one or more occasions during a period. There has been significant consultation regarding this bill. I fully

commend the legislation. I wonder whether we would be here today debating this bill if we still had generation in Port Augusta from that Leigh Creek coal.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (16:29): I rise to commend the bill to the house. This is an important step in amending our National Electricity Law further to enhance reliability and put downward pressure on prices for consumers nationwide. It provides me with an opportunity to reflect on the contribution of the member for West Torrens earlier, as well as on the inspired remarks of the member for Giles earlier.

In this area, we are really embarking on a restoration of adherence to the importance of a National Electricity Market. It is that fundamental. For the 16 years prior to 17 March last year, we had a government in this state whose record was wholly and entirely abominable. Labor's record was prices up and reliability down with the result that, in the course of the period of time from 2015 until the state had the travails it did commencing on 28 September 2016 and then the further extended blackouts that occurred in late 2017, we saw the previous government go from adherence to the National Electricity Market, to COAG processes and to the SA-hosted legislative reform process, to an entirely opportunistic about face and a go-it-alone theme.

In listening to the contribution of the member for West Torrens earlier today, I was heartened to hear that there has been another about face. It seems as though the National Electricity Market is back in vogue as far as the member for West Torrens is concerned. The bottom line is that energy—its management, pricing and reliability—has been so abominably managed by the previous Labor government in this state that it is core and necessary business for this new government to go about repairing the damage.

What is our record in the early days of the Marshall government under the excellent stewardship of the Minister for Energy? We know that pricing is now under control and on track to steadily reduce. We know—the evidence shows us—that reliability is up already as we restore a rational approach to the grid. We have just been through a summer without significant major widespread blackouts, which we came to regard as *de rigeur* under the previous government: there would be a major blackout every so often.

I see members opposite shaking their heads and saying, 'Well, that's a gloss,' and words to that effect. It is not so long ago that it was regarded as necessary and prudent practice for businesses in my electorate in the Hills—small businesses and businesses of various sizes conducting all sorts of different business—to purchase very expensive independent power sources in anticipation of what in all likelihood was going to be several days in a row of power blackout, particularly through the summer months. It is well to remind ourselves that this is the backdrop against which these reforms are now brought to the house.

In a debate on a bill of this kind, one might think that the member for West Torrens, of all people, might just sit quietly back in his room and let the whole thing go on quickly and hope that nobody notices that he is still in the building, but he came along here and he said that the opposition would support the bill's speedy passage and that 'we hope it all gets through the house'. Perhaps what he meant was, 'We hope someone comes along, and we hope it gets passed pretty quickly because we don't want a spotlight shone on our recent record.' It is indeed a very sorry record, and we can all learn the lessons. However, one thing ought to be clear in this process, and there is no better time than now to focus on it: this state is best served by having a coherent and thoroughgoing connection to the National Energy Market—and long may that prevail.

After the frolics from the member for West Torrens and to those in the dying days of the previous government with notions of telling COAG, 'We're going to restore sovereignty to South Australia, we're going to go it alone, we're going to dis-attach ourselves,' I say that never again should those words pass the lips of those responsible for making decisions in the energy space in this state. I note, because these things are matters of record, what the member for West Torrens said back in February 2017. Let's remember that February 2017 comes off the back of 28 September 2016, and that is the day the whole state was blacked out, and we all remember that very well.

It was not only on the back of that. Just after Christmas, in the heat of summer, having a whole lot of extended further blackouts leading to the focus on independent energy production, as we approached a year out to the election we had this this politically opportunistic about face from the

then energy minister, the member for West Torrens. He was quoted as saying, on 27 February 2017, that he was going to participate in a phone hook-up with COAG at lunchtime that day and he was going to tell them that he would be using the failures in South Australia as a reason to retake control of the power network to ensure that it would not happen again. He was going to tell COAG that South Australia was going to go it alone.

There was no coherent science behind any of that. There was no coherent economics behind any of that. It was pure politics. What did we see further in that context? We saw the government announcing a half a billion dollar emergency energy plan. We saw the government going ahead to spend well over \$100 million on what the previous premier, now left this place, described at the time as 'hybrid generators', if I recall correctly. I think that was with a view to making them sound a bit cleaner and greener than the sort of impression one might have been left with if he had described them as diesel generators.

They are hybrid for the reason that they are capable of running on gas. They are wonderful generators, capable of producing a huge amount of power. They went ahead and entered into a lease of these generators, and that was supposed to signal to South Australians that, as part of this sovereignty push, we were going to have our own emergency backup power. However, it gets even better than that.

Having secured access to these power generators, on the eve of the election the former premier and the member for West Torrens, the dynamic duo, thought it might be advantageous politically (or at least I can surmise that that must have been their thinking) to go ahead and accelerate the purchase provisions, notwithstanding there being no obligation to do so, and to double-down and spend a whole lot more money to acquire these assets in circumstances where the assets were not to be used—in fact, they were excluded from use—in the ordinary energy market. They were to be quarantined for that special occasion when they were permitted to be used.

We had about faces in relation to the national energy market, we had an irrational approach to the economics of acquiring further generation and then we had a completely irrational approach to the application of the assets that were required. It is not just me saying that, because, as promised, the new government sought to have some detailed inquiry into the process that was followed by the former government. As all members are well aware, the report of the special investigator was laid on the table in this house in October last year.

I take every opportunity to commend the report of the special investigator to honourable members. It spells out that there was a lack of thoroughgoing, if any, analysis around the need to acquire and indeed accelerate the purchase of these assets and that there was no explanation for the very large sum of money—in excess of \$600 million—that was committed. One is left to think that the former government, and the member for West Torrens in particular, was willing to make decisions based on politics rather than in the best interests of South Australians when making decisions relevant to securing reliable energy supply in this state and at the best available price.

It does not sit well in the mouth of the member for West Torrens to query whether or not these reforms are likely to succeed and the degree to which they may succeed. Indeed, it would be far more appropriate if the member for West Torrens were simply, on matters of this kind, to hop up very briefly, indicate his contrition, apologise and then get out of the way so that we can get back to managing the National Electricity Market in the best and most efficient way that we possibly can.

At the outset, I referred to the additional remarks in this debate on the other side of the house from the member for Giles. I listened very carefully to his contribution as well. I welcome the member for Giles' observation. He put it quite clearly. I think he has come to the conclusion, a concession, after what has been a considerable amount of back and forth, at least from his point of view, that an interconnector is a good thing after all. I welcome that because that is a signal that at least some of the more enlightened members opposite, including the member for Giles, have come to that realisation.

It is another part of what the previous government did not seem to get. We had an adherence to 'interconnectors are good' for a little while. We then had the opposite view for a little while. Meanwhile, prices were going up, reliability was going down and the previous government's reputation in relation to stewardship of the electricity market in this state was in tatters.

The member for Giles made a number of observations around the importance of renewable energy. That is, again, something that we on this side of the house wholeheartedly agree with. A whole lot of scratching of heads is happening on the other side of the house because it seems as though they had a period in which there was a mantra-like ideological adherence to renewables and so on but, without the rational interconnectedness, the market forces allowed to play their part. As a result, they had this signalling to a public, this rush off in a direction based on ideology, and that has led to the unfortunate situation that we have had under the previous government.

All that is in the past. We on this side of the house embrace the energy future. We embrace the great capacity of this state to generate energy and to deliver that energy into a national energy market with confidence and abundance. That is very much what we ought to be doing in this state, not cutting ourselves off, not going it alone, not claiming back our energy sovereignty and beating our energy chests. We should be doing precisely what we are doing, and that is participating in and, indeed, leading these important reforms.

Whether it is in relation to the reform of the National Electricity Law, whether it is about getting to grips with the capital investments that have been made in the whole range of different sources of energy production in the state or whether it is about ensuring that our energy customers—that is, all of us in this state—have access to the very cheapest and most reliable power we possibly can. That is what we are all about. We will not seek to hide behind ideology. We will not seek to make up a political agenda to hide failure. We will look to ensure that we have a robust and nationally connected market so that South Australia can get back to leading the way and we can put the dim and literally dark days under the previous government long behind us.

With those brief words, and welcoming as I do the contribution and the indication from the member for West Torrens and the member for Giles that this bill will be supported through both houses of the parliament, I look forward to its speedy passage. With a further advert to the good work of the special investigator and an encouragement to all of us to look to the merits and the facts in all things, I commend the bill to the house.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (16:49): I, too, rise to make a contribution. I rise with a fair amount of concern, not only for South Australian businesses and their prosperity but for what we are seeing around the impact of power, particularly in South Australia.

At the COAG Energy Council meeting on Wednesday the 19th, ministers agreed to amendments to the National Energy Retail Law to create a Retailer Reliability Obligation. I am sure that many people on this side made a contribution with concerns about what a previous government did. I am not going to try to look over my shoulder. What I am going to do is to just paint a picture of what bad government policy has meant to business here in South Australia, what the lack of reliability has meant and what the ongoing implications of a government's ideology have meant not only to power prices but to the confidence of the business sector to come into South Australia, whether it is to set up a new business, expand an existing business or whether it is just about the confidence of the conversation around doing business in South Australia.

There are a number of obligations that should increase in contracting and reducing the risk of price volatility from generator retirements without adequate replacement investment. To manage the transition of new mechanism, South Australian-specific amendments to the obligation will allow the South Australian minister to make a reliability instrument three years out and 15 months out from a transitional year, if it appears on reasonable grounds that there is a real risk that supply might be disrupted to a significant degree during that period.

Obviously, we now have a competent minister, who has done his time in opposition. He is very diligent and meticulous with detail. He is meticulous with the transparency that he wants to give the sector because, having been a businessperson in a previous life, he understands the vagaries of trying to do business and what uncertainty means, and power is no exception. He has been working tirelessly on ways to reduce the cost of energy in this state.

We all agree that renewable energy is an important part of our energy mix now and into the future. As many have said, it is about the transition. It is about how a lot of businesses were unaware and what it has done to them. I know that in my electorate there have been a number of businesses

that have made very large investments, but they have made them in New South Wales and Victoria because they lost confidence in South Australia's ability to produce not only power but reliable power at an affordable cost.

The high electricity cost that we had previously has had a huge impact, particularly on regional South Australia. I will touch a little bit more on the impact of the increasing cost not only on reliability but on the losses in transmission to some regional centres and, by and large, what it has meant to South Australia, particularly with those transmission lines coming into the state and what it has meant to businesses. There are solutions. A number of business leaders are in discussions with the government, looking at solutions to how we can negate some of the issues, particularly around transmission losses.

Irrigators cannot pick and choose when they water. Nowadays, if we look at what water efficiency means, we have to water plants when the plants need it. We cannot go back to the old days of irrigating at night. We cannot go back to the days of broad spectrum irrigation. We now use precision irrigation: we water a root zone and we have to water that root zone when it is screaming out for water. Plants are thirsty normally in the heat of the middle of the day. It is pretty self-explanatory. It is just like us. We are a working moving organism. When we are thirsty, we drink. The plant cannot be told, 'Just hang on. When the hot weather finishes tonight, we will give you a drink, if you're lucky.' That cannot happen.

What we are seeing now is that water efficiency is driving up the price of power because we are now irrigating plants in the heat of the day. We are irrigating plants during the day and we let them rest at night, just as we rest at night. What we are seeing is that we cannot wait for those price spikes to go away. As I said, waiting for the sun to go down is now not an option. Once, if we wanted to we could water on the weekends and get cheap power, but that is also not an option now. I would like to touch on an organisation I chaired that was instrumental in bringing weekend tariffs to irrigators and primary producers in South Australia a number of years ago.

South Australian Murray Irrigators negotiated with the power supplier back then, ETSA, to implement weekend tariffs. That was absolutely groundbreaking, a game changer, when it came to finding some efficiencies. The majority of irrigators nowadays are irrigating a lot on high country, so in a lot of instances they are lifting water about 30 metres. That comes at a cost not only of power but also of having to put in significant pumping capacity to make sure the best ground can be planted, the irrigation put on the best ground, so that we get the best result, so that we grow the best food, so that we can export and create a vibrant economy as well as being price competitive on a global stage.

I also want to talk about what I have seen in a very short period of time with irrigation along the River Murray. The edge of the River Murray is now littered, although littered is probably not the right way to describe it: there is a large amount of alternative power generation on the river. If I go anywhere along the river now, I can hear diesel generators or see a lot of PV panel farms that are there not only to supply power. A lot of the pumps require large-scale PV farms.

I went up and visited a local almond grower who has just bought himself a big Cat diesel generator. He generates about one megawatt of power from that generator, and he needs that to water his farm. He grows almonds, but he needs to water the almonds when the almonds need water. If he is going to be a successful primary producer, he cannot be held to when he can use power. He cannot be held to when his app or phone lights up and tells him that power has just hit \$1,399 per kilowatt hour. He has to make a decision: does he turn off the pumps or does he continue to pump at great cost?

That particular grower has made a significant investment, but right along the river's edge we are seeing irrigators putting in small pumps as ancillary pumps just to get by. It is not ideal, but it is a measure that has been implemented through sheer desperation. We are seeing the increase in costs to a lot of these pumpers, a lot of wineries by and large but also our irrigation trusts.

As I have said, they are looking at ways to solve a problem coming our way, and that is the continual increase in the cost of transmission losses through the transmission lines. If we look at the Central Irrigation Trust, the largest irrigation business in South Australia apart from SA Water, of course, their increase in transmission loss costs was \$250,000. That is significant, and where does that money come from? It comes out of the growers' pockets because that cost is then passed on.

Kingston Estate Wines, a family-owned winery in the Riverland, crushes a significant amount of fruit—120,000 tonnes or thereabouts this year, probably more with the acquisition of more private vineyards. They have seen an increase of up to \$380,000 in transmission losses. That is a family-owned vineyard and winery. The Wine Group at Loxton has had an increase of \$190,000 and the Renmark Irrigation Trust has had an increase of \$50,000. Again, all these increased costs are put back onto growers. If we are going to be globally competitive in the wine sector, we cannot just increase the price of wine. We have to absorb it somewhere and, by and large, it comes back to a reduced return to growers for their fruit. That is a real concern.

We have seen recently that there are a number of initiatives that this government has put in place. The current energy and mining minister's initiative to put an interconnection from New South Wales into South Australia makes sense and it puts South Australia into a ring of supply. We will not be at the end of the line, as we currently are. The \$200 million interconnection fund to improve connectivity with the National Electricity Market and the \$100 million household battery program are great initiatives that give certainty to the marketplace and show that we have a government that actually understands the transition from what was to what we are now about to use.

We have a number of other initiatives that are going out there to help. Hundreds of South Australians are now seeking more affordable, reliable power. So far, we have seen the subsidy through the Home Battery Scheme, where 40,000 South Australians have the opportunity to access up to \$6,000 to help them. Ultimately, the scheme will benefit all South Australians as more batteries are added to reduce the total demand.

Recently, I announced \$400,000 out of the Regional Growth Fund to the apple and pear growers in the Adelaide Hills for them to find efficiencies in their pumping so that they can look at ways of reducing the cost. It is about helping them become competitive, it is about helping them remain in the game and it is also reducing those energy costs. The project includes upgrades to 42 existing water pumping systems and the installation of solar technology across 22 properties. That represents investment into power generation that would have once been into expanding farms or putting in new varieties the world is calling out for. While these farmers are dealing with what they were dealt by the previous government's ideology of power generation, that transition really hurt them dearly.

A French renewable energy company, Akuo Energy, has also invested \$12 million into the Riverland. It has signed a long-term lease to build, own and operate a 4.98 megawatt renewable energy site in partnership with the Renmark Paringa Council. It will power about 2,000 homes with some 15,000 solar panels.

These are some of the initiatives we are seeing happen. We are seeing initiatives that are supporting business, but I think it is more important to note that, after what we were dealt by the previous government's ideology, people are now realising that this government cares, that this government is giving them opportunity to make savings with their power bills and that this government is making decisions that will put more reliability into their power supply. That is showing us that businesses have seen too much investment into the alternative power supply, rather than dealing with a reliable grid—a grid that is affordable.

It is through sheer frustration that I make this contribution. As a previous irrigator, having to have power on stand-by and having to have power at exorbitant costs, I know that your phone lighting up with an app service that tells you that power has just hit that \$13,999 is a rude awakening. Do you turn your pump off and risk the viability of crops, or do you keep on pumping and pump away the profit you hoped to be making out of a very viable crop?

So I have made a contribution, and I think the current minister is doing an outstanding job to alleviate the concerns not only for investment in this state but for dealing with the sandwich that the majority of high power users have had to deal with over a long period of time. I look forward to the current government's policies coming online, making sure that we have a high level of confidence and that reduce the cost of power and increase the reliability.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (17:04): I rise to speak on the National Electricity (South Australia) (Retailer Reliability Obligation) Amendment Bill 2019. It has taken me a lot to come to speak on this bill. I have just spent the last half an hour

reading one of the most gruesome coronial reports I have ever read, and I will be talking about that on another day in this house.

However, I was motivated to interrupt myself in relation to that matter, difficult as it was, to speak on this bill because I do not think there was any question in our new Premier's mind that if we had the opportunity in March last year to form government what the priorities would be. So single focused was he in relation to some matters that he made sure that there would be an energy minister with no other responsibility other than to ensure that we secured affordable and reliable power. That is how important it was to him that we would address that.

There were some very pressing issues, including child protection, about which there had been a shameful history of failure under the previous government. But in a positive sense, in terms of a key ingredient to resurrect some economic future for our state power was one of those important ingredients. For most of our primary industry, power and water and people are critical to the provision of those jobs and not just a future for our children but economic sustainability of our own economy here. He understood that very well, so he appointed the current minister to exclusively have this responsibility. I just want to say that not only has he brought this bill to the parliament but also he has been completely and utterly dedicated to ensuring that we have a restoration of reliable power in this state, and I commend him for that.

Only some weeks ago, South Australia had a blisteringly, I dare say, hellishly, hot day. It was over 40°. The Premier had rather inconveniently gone overseas, and I was left with the responsibility ensuring that we kept everything in order. There were no floods, and there were no serious bushfires. There was a fire on the day, but there was no serious consequence. We did not have any cyber attacks, and we did not have any major problems, but I have to say that the Minister for Energy, minute by minute, was monitoring the supply and availability of power to deal with that very hot day.

I just place on record my admiration for his staying focused and completely disciplined on that task. I was sweating a lot, but he just stayed completely calm and got us through that difficult day. Following on from the public's attention to this, there was a critical period of time when I think there was a desire to have just enough power to meet demand, and that was achieved. We did not want too much more wind. We did not really want any wind because of the risk of bushfire, but the Minister for Energy was saying to me, 'Actually, we need a bit of wind.' I said, 'Well, hang on a minute. We might need to balance this so that we don't have a problem if we do have a major fire.'

These are the sorts of situations that the minister was able to steer through and keep a steady lever on ensuring the state had its continued secure supply. Most of us who are able bodied can endure a heat event, but the fact is that we need to take into account that there are many people in our community who, without power and without cooling, whether it is because they are frail aged, vulnerable or in disabled circumstances or a young infant, can be in a desperate situation if they do not have power.

My understanding is that the bill here, in having a Retailer Reliability Obligation, is designed to incentivise retailers and other market customers to support the reliability of the National Electricity Market through building on their contracting and investment strategies that underwrite investment in dispatchable capacity by encouraging earlier and longer term contracting. That is the gist of it, and it is very important. The detail has been outlined by other speakers.

I would just like to say that, whilst we had an era of comprehensive failure under the previous government on the provision of reliable and affordable power, and we continued to have the burden on the general community as a cost of living unfairly imposed on South Australians by incompetent ministers, it is very pleasing to see a new era come in, and there are other important initiatives that are being presented by the government.

I want to go back to circa 2002 when there was a change of government and I think the Hon. Patrick Conlon became the minister for energy—if not at that time, it might have been later. For a period, he had a stint as transport minister, but that is a period we would rather forget. I remind members that the previous Rann government adopted a policy to do two things. One was to go into a national system; that is, there was going to have to be a call on significant amounts of power in the states, in this part of the country—New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia in particular—and we needed to think about how we were going to accommodate a national scheme.

I can fully admit to the house that I think I was the only person in South Australia who voted against going into the national scheme. I felt that there were significant risks to South Australia and I was not prepared to support them. They were in my wild younger days of being prepared to cross the floor. In any event, I make the point that, at the time, my concern was that the then state Labor government would abandon any real attempt to have lower power prices, would then blame the national scheme and say, 'It's their problem now.' That is about what happened; nevertheless, it still had to be resolved.

One good thing that Mr Conlon did was to announce on behalf of his government that it was important to have an interconnector, that if we were in a national scheme, we should have an interconnector. He also promised a desalination plant on the West Coast because they were in desperate need of water, but that promise came and went, but in relation to the interconnector, he was right: if we were going to go into a national scheme, we had to be connected so that we could have the benefit of this scheme.

Whilst I was sceptical about their abandonment of responsibility in providing for South Australians in this space, I nevertheless agreed that an interconnector was very important and year after year, budget after budget, we would look in there to see where this mysterious interconnector was going to start, or at least the planning for it, and that it was going to happen.

Fast-forward to 2019 and we do not have one, but we do have a government that is committed to the very essence of the fundamentals of underpinning reliable power, namely, having an interconnector with New South Wales. Again, I am very pleased that the Minister for Energy is responsibly advancing this project, and that it is progressing. No doubt, he will give us further updates as to the important advancement of that.

The reliability issue is pretty important to the extent that we also need to consider what access we have to connection in other parts of this state. Most of you know that I grew up on Kangaroo Island. Until I was about 12, we did not have mains power. My job was to turn the generator on daily and turn it off at about midnight, or let it just run out of fuel—that was the other option. If you let it splutter away for a while, it would eventually run out, and mum would be halfway through the ironing or something. In any event, that is what would happen.

Just last weekend I was home on the island and stayed with my cousin, who does not have mains power. He has a long drop, too, so it was an interesting experience to revisit. Nevertheless, we got through the night. He would go off to put his generator on, and so on. It just reminds us how lucky we are to have a system where we can go into a room and turn on a light and be able to have access to power in our ordinary living, but we should remember the critical needs of somebody conducting surgery on a little baby in a hospital or making provision for irrigation that needs to be powered, as the Minister for Primary Industries has just outlined to us. In every way, we rely on regular power and its interruption can be very costly in money and in lives.

I will give an example of the human harm that arises out of a blackout like we had under the previous government. There had been a major failing at the Flinders Medical Centre, and couples had their hope of a family extinguished when their frozen embryos started to defrost. The embryos were lost as a direct consequence of the interruption to power and the failure to bring online the diesel backup generators. Apparently, there was no fuel in them or something. In any event, little human embryos were lost and families' hopes of having children were lost. There was a significant cost to the community through taxpayer-funded claims that needed to be settled to resolve these things. There are real and present costs and consequences to these things, so I think that it is terribly important that we recognise the significance of reliability and ensure that we maintain it.

Another thing I learned is that the replacement for the cable from South Australia to Kangaroo Island that currently provides mains power to Kangaroo Island is underway. It is due to be replaced after a 65-year arrangement. I am not sure whether they have actually started rolling them off the back of the ship yet, but it is underway. I very much thank the Minister for Energy for whatever role he has to ensure that happens. I know that one of our operators does undertake that. I think it is SA Power Networks that actually undertake that role. I look forward to the day when that is connected up and we have other opportunities for renewable and sustainable energy being developed on Kangaroo Island.

I would be happy to put windmills all down the coast, but these are things that have to be worked through to ensure that we are able to be a positive contributor to the energy production market down the track. I look forward to that day. I think that would be a great opportunity. However, in the meantime we need to have some backups. The experience we have had of mismanagement by governments in the past has meant that we have had to ensure that we all go out and buy generators and make sure that we have some capacity to survive, especially if one is living in a regional community.

On a positive note, I will say that we pulled out the generator when my nieces and nephews were home recently. We taught them what to do in the event of a fire approaching, and they seemed at least to have some understanding of what to do. In any event, it is terribly important that we recognise the significance of the reliability of energy, and our obligation in this will be assisted by the passage of this bill.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (17:17): I thank all people who have contributed to this debate. Everybody has put in a very clearly thought-out contribution. I appreciate that enormously. I appreciate some of the very generous comments that have been made, some of them perhaps slightly too generous. Nonetheless, I appreciate the fact that people have spoken and contributed very well on this bill.

When I said 'clearly thought-out contribution', I include the member for West Torrens in that. He thought out his contribution very clearly, very carefully and very deliberately—and very mischievously as well. He is a very smart bloke. There is no doubt about it. He knows his business, and his business is politics. We know that, and that is okay. That is part of what all of us do to a smaller or larger degree, and I do not complain about that whatsoever.

However, the member for West Torrens comes in here as the former energy minister and says time and time again that he does not think that this or that is a very good idea but that he might be wrong and that he hopes he is wrong. For just about every aspect of the bill that he could come up with, he found a way to make it seem bad but then said that he might be wrong and he hopes that he is wrong.

There were other very well thought-out contributions, and probably more constructive as well. I found the member for Heysen's contribution entertaining. He showed a side of himself that we have all known is there, but he has not let it flow in this chamber quite as well as he did today. I have to say that I am incredibly impressed by the focus, effort and diligence of our members of parliament. You would have heard, Mr Speaker, some very well thought-out contributions. I will not single out those individuals because it was just about everybody, to be quite blunt. They were trying to get to the bottom of these issues. What does it mean for our state? What does it mean for energy? What does it mean for consumers, prices and reliability? If the previous government had made that much effort to deliver what was best for consumers rather than what was best for politics, our state would be in a much better place.

As Minister for Energy, I take this responsibility incredibly seriously. I want to note and acknowledge the contribution of the member for West Torrens in regard to the opposition's support in this place and in the other place for anything that comes from our government to this parliament that has COAG's backing. As he said, I did exactly that when I was the shadow minister. I felt comfortable to put whatever I wanted on the record, but as the opposition at the time we never impeded the passage of COAG legislation. I thank the current shadow minister for returning that courtesy and that practicality. I think that it is important, and I acknowledge his contribution.

Another contribution I would like to pick up on is that of the member for Giles, my friend and neighbour. As everybody knows, I am a Port Augusta-based MP and he is a Whyalla-based MP. It was terrific to have such a ringing, sound and genuine endorsement of the Marshall Liberal government's energy policy from the member for Giles. It was no accident that he spoke the way he did. I know him well. We work very closely in the Upper Spencer Gulf, to the best of our ability, for our constituents.

We are members of different political parties, one in government and one in opposition, and we do our very best to confine our conflict, if you like, to within parliament and, occasionally, within the media; however, I have to say that for the member for Giles and myself it is very rare. Face to

face and in the electorate, we work as collaboratively as we possibly can on behalf of our constituents. It was lovely to have his endorsement of our energy policy in this chamber. I really do appreciate that. As I said, he was not going to speak but he could not help himself.

Mr Teague: He was inspired.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The member for Heysen said he was inspired; thank you, member for Heysen. During the contribution of the Deputy Premier, I was also fortunate enough to receive a very positive reminder from the member for Colton. He gave me a copy of an old election flyer from the 2002 election, so it would have been just before the election. We all know that the Labor Party took to that election a commitment to build an interconnector between South Australia and New South Wales. We all know that they did not do it, but what I did not know about is a flyer, which I will read from my phone—and I will not use this as a prop in any way. This is from the then leader of the opposition, Mike Rann, who, as we know, went on to become premier. It states:

We will fix our electricity system and an interconnector to NSW will be built to bring in cheaper power.

I should read the section at the bottom. It is signed by Mike Rann, and states:

Keep this card as a check that I keep my pledges.

I will not go into the detail of that. I thought it interesting, in fairness to the former premier, that his pledge be noted as well.

I forget which one of my colleagues talked about the interconnector. We, too, took that to the last election as an election commitment from opposition. We are doing everything we possibly can to deliver that election commitment as soon as possible. We are also working through our household battery scheme delivery, our grid-scale storage fund, our demand response trials and many, many things.

In fairness, some of those things we are working on—not the things I have just mentioned—were started by the previous Labor government. Our whole team has a very strong ethos, which says that whatever good things the previous government was doing we will do our best to retain and run on with our new policies and our new implementation program. We are doing that quite openly and straightforwardly, and that is what we want to do for the benefit of the people of South Australia.

One of those things, of course, is the interconnector. The Labor Party said they would do it and they did not. We said that we would do it and we will. We will do that in partnership with industry. It is not obviously going to be built by the state government in South Australia and in New South Wales. We will do that in partnership with the industry and the regulators. We acknowledge the enormous contribution that other parties make in regard to the delivery of our election policies.

Another thing that we will do is work responsibly with COAG, with Liberal and Labor governments from other states and with the current federal Liberal government. After the election—of course, I hope it is a Liberal government again—regardless of the outcome of the federal election, we will work as constructively as possible with whichever political party is elected to government in Canberra.

This Retailer Reliability Obligation has come to us from COAG. It is roughly half of what the NEG was going to be. The Retailer Reliability Obligation makes up a big part of the NEG and then the omissions component makes up the other half of the NEG. I think it is beholden on us all to get this through, and that is what we are all doing, regardless of which political party we are in.

I appreciate the comments of the member for West Torrens, who said that they will not slow it down and that they will not amend it in the upper house either, in which case we know that with the support of the government and the opposition it will get through. We need to implement these schemes. We need to show, at the very least, that what COAG agrees to we can implement in South Australia. We can do that not only for the benefit of South Australia but for the benefit of the nation, and, at the very least, the National Electricity Market members of the nation.

There is an enormous amount of work to be done on energy. I am incredibly fortunate, as minister, to be supported in many ways. As I said, people are very kind to me in their contributions, but let me be the one who says what everybody knows, which is that lots of people—my advisers in my office, my colleagues in the government and the people from our department—provide

constructive feedback and good ideas on a very regular basis. I am pleased to have Vince Duffy and Mark Pedler in the gallery here today. They have been waiting since late morning just in case it was necessary to go into committee. I have been reliably informed by our whip that we will not be going into committee. Let me just acknowledge the work of those two people and people just like them when it comes to delivering on our energy policy.

The Deputy Premier was very kind in regard to her comments about 24 January, when we had the hottest day on record in South Australia. Through the work of many people, not least the executive director from the Department for Energy and Mining, Vince Duffy, we managed to get through that day. I am a cautious guy. We have a big job ahead of us. I do not underestimate what is necessary to deliver cheaper, more affordable and cleaner electricity to the people of South Australia, but I am heartened by the green shoots we have seen so far.

I am heartened by the fact that retail electricity prices have flattened. I am optimistic that it is the turning of the tide. I do not take that for granted, but I am optimistic that, if we keep working on it, that is where we will get to. I am heartened that, for the first summer that I can remember, we have got through without any load shedding whatsoever. That is not to say that nobody had a blackout in their home or their business, but they were because of equipment failures, typically from an SAPN perspective. I am not trying to point the finger at them, as those things do happen, but we got through this summer without any forced load shedding.

There was no time when we did not have enough electricity available in our system this summer. Do I assume that means it is easy from here on in? No, of course not. I am a cautious person, and I know how hard we have to work to make sure that this is the turning of the tide and that these positive signs continue unabated. I say through you, Mr Speaker, to the Deputy Premier: nobody was sweating more than Vince Duffy on that day, and there is nobody who deserves more credit from a South Australian perspective for getting us through that day than Mr Vince Duffy. I thank him for that: he was one of the most important people in a team.

We are not going about our energy policy in any way with regard to politics: we are going about our energy policy with regard to doing what is the very best for South Australian electricity consumers. I have to say that, while we are overwhelmingly on the side of consumers, we acknowledge that suppliers must have a positive, sustainable, attractive role to play in all this.

If we do not have suppliers in whatever part of the supply chain for which they take responsibility, if we do not have suppliers who want to be in the market—and that typically means that they see they can make money for their shareholders by being in the market—then consumers have nothing. So while, yes, of course we are overwhelmingly on the side of consumers, we recognise that suppliers need to find it attractive to be in the market or consumers are supplied with nothing.

We will not play politics with this. We are glad that it seems that, after a vote in a few minutes, we will get this bill through this chamber and almost certainly through the other chamber. We will continue to work incredibly hard, and we recognise that there is a whole team of people. Everybody on the energy side of the Department for Energy and Mining is doing what is best for South Australians. Everybody on this side of the chamber is doing what is best for South Australians. My ministerial advisers are doing what is best for South Australians. I know that approaching it that way will do better for South Australians than we became accustomed to over the last 16 years.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining)
(17:34): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT AND REPEAL (SIMPLIFY) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

At 17:36 the house adjourned until Wednesday 3 April 2019 at 10:30.

*Answers to Questions***TREASURY AND FINANCE DEPARTMENT**

627 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (27 February 2019). As at 31 December 2018, how many total public sector FTE positions were funded in the Department of Treasury and Finance?

1. What is the number of funded FTE positions by classification level?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

As at 31 December 2018, 1,643 FTE positions were funded in the Department of Treasury and Finance. A breakdown by classification level is currently not available.

TREASURY AND FINANCE DEPARTMENT

642 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (27 February 2019). As at 31 December 2018, how many total public sector FTE positions were funded in the Office of the Valuer General branch of the Department of Treasury and Finance?

1. What is the number of funded FTE positions by classification level?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

As at 31 December 2018, there were zero funded FTE positions in the Office of the Valuer-General branch of the Department of Treasury and Finance. The Office of the Valuer-General was transferred to the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure on 1 July 2018.

As at 31 December 2018, there were 18 funded FTE positions in the Office of the Valuer-General branch of the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure. The number of FTE positions by classification level is provided below:

Classification	Total number of FTE funded positions
ASO2	1
ASO3	1
ASO5	3
ASO6	1
ASO7	1
PO2	2
PO3	6
PO4	2
PO5	1
Grand Total	18

Note: The Valuer-General is not included in the above table as the position is a statutory appointment and is funded by Special Acts.

INDUSTRY ASSISTANCE

653 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (27 February 2019). When will the audit into industry assistance be completed?

1. Will the report be made public?
2. Who has conducted the audit?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

The industry assistance audit is currently being updated to reflect assistance where the terms of the grant/loan have recently been finalised by SAFA. The former government provided assistance in over 30 separate programs/arrangements. Finalisation of some negotiations have been delayed due to some proponents requesting amended contract terms.

1. As previously advised, it is intended that the audit report will be made public. However there are still some issues relating to claims of commercial confidentiality to be clarified.

2. The audit was conducted by the Department of Treasury and Finance, with information collated from across government in recognition of the substantial number of industry funding schemes previously on offer.

BUDGET PAPERS

661 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (27 February 2019). As at 31 December 2018, how much of the \$12.061 million savings task identified in the 2018-19 budget papers for the Department of Treasury and Finance has been delivered in 2018-19?

1. What measures, programs or initiatives have been implemented to meet these savings?
2. How many FTEs have been reduced in total in the department?
3. How many FTEs have been reduced per branch?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

The Department of Treasury and Finance has implemented the following to meet the 2018-19 savings

- FTE reductions associated with general efficiencies, organisation restructures and work reprioritisations of business units across the department
- FTE reductions associated with the identification of and the abolition of longstanding vacant positions
- FTE reductions associated with a reduction in ministerial chauffeurs
- Reduction in general goods and services expenditure
- Reduction in SafeWork SA vehicle fleet and associated FBT cost
- Recovery of car parking costs from staff at SafeWork SA and associated FBT cost
- Abolishment of the Young Workers Legal Services Funding Program and WHS Representative Training Subsidies Program of SafeWork SA
- A rationalisation of computer program licences across the department
- Increased compliance revenue resulting from both industry specific support and the implementation of a taxpayer education strategy

		\$m
2019-20 (reflects full year impact of DTF savings detailed in 661.1 above)		22.291
New strategies to be implemented in 2020-21 savings	1.920	
Indexation on 2019-20 savings	0.557	
Total 2020-21 savings		24.768
Indexation in 2021-22 on 2020-21 savings	0.568	
Total 2021-22 savings		25.336

The new strategies to be implemented in 2020-21 relate to further FTE reductions associated with general efficiencies, organisation restructures and work reprioritisations of business units across the department together with a reduction in general goods and services expenditure.

The FTE reductions by branch as at 31 December 2018 are shown below:

Branch	FTE Reduction as at 31 Dec 2018
Organisation & Governance	5.4
SAFA & Accounting Services	3.8
Super SA	7.9

Branch	FTE Reduction as at 31 Dec 2018
Government Services	23.8
Budget & Performance	4.0
SafeWork SA	7.0
Revenue SA	6.2
Commercial & Economics	1.0
Total	59.1

BUDGET PAPERS

662 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (27 February 2019). As at 31 December 2018, how much of the \$22.291 million savings task identified in the 2018-19 budget papers for the Department of Treasury and Finance has been identified for the 2019-20 financial year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

I refer the member to my answer to question with notice number 661.

BUDGET PAPERS

663 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (27 February 2019). As at 31 December 2018, how much of the \$24.768 million savings task identified in the 2018-19 budget papers for the Department of Treasury and Finance has been identified for the 2020-21 financial year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

I refer the member to my answer to question with notice number 661.

BUDGET PAPERS

664 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (27 February 2019). As at 31 December 2018, how much of the \$25.336 million savings task identified in the 2018-19 budget papers for the Department of Treasury and Finance has been identified for the 2021-22 financial year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

I refer the member to my answer to question with notice number 661.

MOTOR ACCIDENT COMMISSION

672 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (19 March 2019). What preparations have SAPOL and/or DPTI made in relation to assuming the role of the Motor Accident Commission in the promotion of road safety messages?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): South Australia Police and the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure are working together to put in place the best arrangements to honour the state government's ongoing commitment for targeted road safety messaging, programs and sponsorships for the benefit of the entire South Australian community.

MOTOR ACCIDENT COMMISSION

673 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (19 March 2019). Who in SAPOL or DPTI will be responsible for coordinating the road safety promotion function, currently performed by the Motor Accident Commission, after 30 June 2019?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): South Australia Police and the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure are working together to put in place the best arrangements to honour the state government's ongoing commitment for targeted road safety messaging, programs and sponsorships for the benefit of the entire South Australian community.

POLICE PROSECUTION STAFFING

674 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (19 March 2019). What was the number (FTE) of civilian, or non-sworn, police prosecution staff as at 31 October 2018?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): As at 31 October 2018, the FTE of civilian, or non-sworn, police prosecution staff was 29.8. Of these, 22 relate to civilian solicitor positions.

POLICE PROSECUTION STAFFING

675 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (19 March 2019). What was the number (FTE) of civilian, or non-sworn, police prosecution staff as at 31 December 2018?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): As at 31 December 2018, the FTE of civilian, or non-sworn, police prosecution staff was 54.4.

POLICE PROSECUTION STAFFING

676 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (19 March 2019). What was the number (FTE) of civilian, or non-sworn, police prosecution staff as at 31 January 2019?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): As at 31 January 2019, the FTE of civilian, or non-sworn, police prosecution staff was 54.4.

MOTORCYCLE RIDERS SAFETY

681 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (19 March 2019). What specific measures has the minister implemented to enhance the safety of motorcycle riders in this state?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): A number of measures have been implemented to enhance the safety of motorcyclists in South Australia.

The South Australian government is currently undertaking a trial along one of the key motorcycle routes in the Adelaide Hills which has a relatively high motorcycle crash rate. This will involve the installation of Audio Tactile Line Marking along the centreline of Gorge Road for a distance of approximately 20 kilometres at a cost of about \$110,000.

Also in the Adelaide Hills, motorcycle safety works are being undertaken on Tippett Road. \$260,000 will be spent on the installation of roadside safety barriers, tree removal and culvert extensions.

The state government has also continued to provide funding to the Motorcycle Clothing Assessment Program, a consumer information program designed to provide riders with scientifically-based information on the relative protection and comfort on a range of motorcycle protective jackets, pants and gloves available in Australia and New Zealand.

Work is also progressing on proposals to strengthen the Graduated Licensing Scheme and improve training for novice motorcycle riders.

TRANSPORT ORGANISATIONS

683 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (19 March 2019). Provide the dates of all meetings the Minister had with the following organisations between 4 September 2018 and 22 February 2019?

- (a) Centre for Automotive Safety and Research (University of Adelaide);
- (b) Bike SA;
- (c) Bicycle Institute of SA;
- (d) St John Ambulance;
- (e) Motorcycle Riders Association of SA; and
- (f) Ulysses Motorcycle Club

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):

The Hon C.L. Wingard:

- (a) 13 September 2018—meeting with Director Centre for Automotive Safety Research and University Government Relations Officer.
- (b) 30 October 2018—meeting with Chief Executive Officer.
- (c) No meetings held during this period.
- (d) No meetings held during this period.

- (e) 30 January 2019—meeting with president and vice-president and representatives from DPTI and SAPOL.
- (f) 30 January 2019—meeting with club representative and representatives from DPTI and SAPOL.

KALANGADOO POLICE STATION

685 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (19 March 2019). When will Kalangadoo Police Station reopen?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): There are no plans to close the Kalangadoo Police Station.

South Australia Police is undertaking a review of all country services and the Kalangadoo Police Station, along with all service delivery across the state will be considered by the review team. Currently, the Kalangadoo Police Station is serviced by police from Millicent and Penola.

All patrols across the state are tasked centrally from Adelaide. If a person has an emergency they should call 000 as this is the quickest way for emergency services to respond in an emergency situation. Call 131 444 for all other police enquiries.

The deployment of policing resources to deliver the best service delivery for the South Australian community is a matter for the police commissioner.

POLICE STAFFING

686 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (19 March 2019). How many sworn police (FTE) were attached to the Prosecution Services Branch, as at 31 January 2019, and how many of those were police prosecutors?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): As at 31 January 2019, the number of sworn FTE attached to the Prosecution Services Branch was 212. Of the 212 positions, 207 were occupied by sworn members who perform a prosecutorial function.

POLICE STAFFING

687 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (19 March 2019). How many non-sworn staff (FTE) were attached to the Prosecution Services Branch, as at 31 January 2019?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): As at 31 January 2019, the FTE of civilian, or non-sworn, police prosecution staff was 54.4.

HIBBERT REVIEW

In reply to **Mr PICTON (Kaurna)** (26 February 2019).

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

It is important not to conflate investigations of individual cases with the Hibbert review. Paramedics have been engaged in relation to the individual investigations of all 17 cases.

The Hibbert review did not replicate the individual investigations but looked at those investigations as a whole to determine whether there were any systemic issues. However, the Hibbert review did consider the comments provided by 150 clinicians who were given the opportunity to provide their views about the cluster of events through a series of focus groups led by SAAS.

I am therefore confident that the views of paramedics were taken into account in Professor Hibbert's report.

EASTERN EYRE HEALTH ADVISORY COUNCIL

In reply to **Mr PICTON (Kaurna)** (6 September 2018).

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised that:

The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has met with the mayor and members of the District Council of Kimba.

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE NOROVIRUS PATIENTS

In reply to **Mr PICTON (Kaurna)** (16 October 2018).

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised that:

An internal memo was sent to a small group of Nurse Managers to explore patient flow from the emergency department (ED) with a focus on ensuring patients do not remain in the ED for longer than 24 hours.

One of the suggestions outlined in the memo was, following risk assessment by the Flinders Medical Centre (FMC) Infection Control Service and executive, to cohort low risk infectious patients with the same infectious status.

This particular suggestion was not pursued or implemented. The memo was not referring to management of patients with Gastroenteritis symptoms.

SA Health infection control standard guidelines and processes and the South Australian Local Health Network gastroenteritis outbreak management processes are in place within FMC.

There are measures in place for staff to raise any concerns related to patient safety. Recent Norovirus cases have been tracked and monitored through this mechanism.

No instruction has been issued to staff about speaking publicly on the risk of Norovirus outbreak.

COUNTRY HOSPITALS

In reply to **Mr PICTON (Kurna)** (16 October 2018).

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised that:

The transfer of patients from metropolitan hospitals to country hospitals was available to LHNs as part of the winter demand strategy.

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE IMMUNOLOGY AND PATHOLOGY SERVICES

In reply to **Mr PICTON (Kurna)** (16 October 2018).

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised that:

No such decision has been taken.