

**ELECTRICITY CORPORATIONS AMENDMENT BILL 2013**

*Second Reading*

Resumed from 16 October.

*Declaration as Urgent*

**DR M.D. NAHAN (Riverton — Minister for Energy)** [8.44 pm]: In accordance with standing order 168(2), I move —

That the bill be considered an urgent bill.

This bill has been on the table for two weeks, one week short of the three required. The opposition has had a couple of briefings on the bill. The issue at hand—the merger of Synergy and Verve Energy—is not a new issue. It was announced six months ago. It has been in debate for many years. It is one week early, which is not too long. I look forward to the debate.

**MR W.J. JOHNSTON (Cannington)** [8.45 pm]: I rise to speak against this motion. This is a demonstration of incompetence. The only reason that the minister is seeking to have the Electricity Corporations Amendment Bill 2013 declared urgent is the incompetence of this government. Everybody knows that. This is an outrage. There would have been howls and cries from the other side of the chamber had the former Labor government moved that a bill to deal with the electricity system be declared urgent. The appalling performance of this government in the energy sector is reflected in its incompetence in this bill.

I make another point. The government went to the election promising not to merge Verve and Synergy. That was its commitment at the time of the election. Yet the government has been able to create a bill for the merger of Verve and Synergy. There are many other pieces of legislation that the government promised at the election to introduce. A major bill that the government promised to introduce is mandatory sentencing for people who commit home invasions. This government thinks that the merger of Verve and Synergy is more important than imposing bigger penalties on a person who invades another person's house and rapes them. That is what this government is saying tonight to this house. That is an indefensible disgrace. It reflects the incompetence of this government, the inability of the government to get its priorities right, and the inability of the government to tell the truth and be honest with the people of Western Australia, and we should not stand for it.

The minister says that the opposition has had two opportunities to talk to its advisers. But the process that the government has deliberately used in this legislation—when there is not even two weeks between the introduction of this bill and today, despite what the minister said a moment ago—means that we have not had a proper opportunity to talk to the people in the community who will be affected by this decision. The minister knows that himself. That is not a surprise, because in the six months since the minister announced the decision to amalgamate Verve and Synergy, the minister has not spoken to people in the industry either. We would think that the minister would do his job. The minister sits there, laughing. Tell me, minister, who has seen the regulations that are proposed to be made under this legislation? We all know the answer to that. Nobody has seen the regulations. That is because this minister is too incompetent, too lazy and too stupid to do his job properly. People tell me—I agree with them—that the minister is not bad company one on one, but that does not make him competent. This minister does not understand his obligations to the Parliament of Western Australia. The fact that the minister falsely claimed a moment ago that this bill had been in front of the chamber for two weeks is another demonstration that the minister does not get his responsibilities. The minister's responsibilities are to come to this chamber and tell the truth—not the bit that is relevant and that he wants to tell or that he thinks will reflect well on him, but the truth.

We saw the minister's incapacity to be honest with the people of this state during the Muja scandal. We are seeing again today the arrogance and incompetence of this minister, on behalf of this arrogant and incompetent government. This government is a shambles. Everybody knows it is a shambles. *The West Australian* knows it is a shambles. Channel Seven knows it is a shambles. Channel 10 knows it is a shambles. Channel Nine knows it is a shambles. The radio stations in Perth know it is a shambles. Everyone that we talk to in the community tells us that this government is a shambles. Even FM radio now tells us that this government is a shambles. How can this government be allowed to do these things—to trample on the honesty of this Parliament and ignore the rules of the Parliament, and for what reason and what benefit? It is because of its incompetence; the government is trying to protect itself from its own incompetence. Everybody knows that the government has messed up this year's sitting program. It ran out of work last week and had to get its own members to filibuster on bills, and this incompetence should not be rewarded.

**MRS M.H. ROBERTS (Midland)** [8.50 pm]: I rise to oppose the motion to declare the Electricity Corporations Amendment Bill 2013 an urgent bill. Earlier today, the Minerals Research Institute of Western Australia Bill 2013 was declared urgent by this government, and at that time I pointed out that this government had already

made a dozen bills urgent, and that the minerals bill brought the number to 13. This bill will bring the number to 14, and we are led to believe that tomorrow there could be a fifteenth bill that the government will seek to declare urgent. That is 15 out of a total of 30 bills that have been brought before the house this year; it is extraordinary. Half the bills brought before the house this year have been declared urgent.

At the start of the year there was a feeling that Premier Barnett had recalled Parliament a little early because the government did not have a legislative program. He wiped the lot and said, "We're going to be starting from square one and introducing things." In the normal course of events we would have expected the government, during the first sitting week when the Address-in-Reply speeches to the Governor's speech were being made, to introduce and read in several bills so that they would be ready for debate. The government did not do that, and a few short weeks later we found that the government was running short of business before the house.

What we have seen over the last few weeks has been absolutely extraordinary. I would just like to highlight what occurred last week, and how much time the government wasted. As was pointed out in an answer given to a question from the member for Mandurah during the estimates hearings, the approximate cost of a day's sitting of the Legislative Assembly is \$22 000, so a week spent here instead of out in our electorates costs the taxpayer \$66 000. That is \$66 000 that I would rather see spent on winning back our AAA credit rating or employing education assistants in our schools; it is not \$66 000 well spent.

Let us just run through what actually occurred last week. Under normal circumstances, last Tuesday we would have expected to sit from 2.00 pm until 10.00 pm; sometimes we sit later. Instead, we sat from 2.00 pm until 7.30 pm, so that was two and a half hours that the government did not take. It got us back to Parliament, but it did not take that time. In fact, when we take into account question time and an MPI, there was about four and a half hours of government business available. Then on Wednesday, usually we would sit from 12.00 midday straight through to 7.00 pm; obviously three hours of that time is private members' time and another hour is for question time, which means that there were three hours available to the government. On Thursday we ordinarily would sit from 9.00 am till 1.00 pm, then 2.00 pm till approximately 5.00 pm, with an hour taken up with grievances in the morning, which means that there is usually three hours available for government legislation on Thursdays, and in the afternoon there is another two hours because nearly an hour is taken up by question time. There was the option of having two hours' debate on government bills on Thursday afternoon, but instead the house rose at 3.30 pm; it was barely worth coming back after lunch because, post question time, the house sat for only about half an hour or so. The total amount of government time used last week was just 11 hours; that is what we came to Parliament for—11 hours on government legislation. If the government had sat the regular, advertised hours, we would have been here for about 15 hours' worth of government time, and that is without including question time, grievances, MPIs and the like. The government could have spent 15 hours on legislation—in fact, it could have spent longer than that—but instead it chose to spend just 11 hours.

Let us look at how the government has used its time. We have talked about the filibustering on the Taxi Drivers Licensing Bill. The second reading stage for that bill took five hours and 13 minutes. The vast bulk of that was government member after government member telling stories about their last taxi ride and how they caught a taxi overseas. We heard the member for Perth say that her other role in life is to be a mum taxi and go to Northbridge at one o'clock in the morning to pick up her kids. We heard all kinds of little anecdotes that did not add much to the debate. The government showed an extraordinary effort on the Taxi Drivers Licensing Bill; the third reading stage took 50 minutes.

The second reading debate on the Western Australian Photo Card Bill took five hours, even though it was a bill that had been agreed on and was uncontroversial. The third reading stage took three minutes.

Government members got up to speak on the Medicines, Poisons and Therapeutic Goods Bill 2013.

[Member's time expired.]

**MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan)** [8.55 pm]: I rise to make some comments about the fact that we do not support the urgency of the Electricity Corporations Amendment Bill because, as the members for Cannington and Midland have outlined, the only reason that it has been declared urgent is the government's incompetence in handling legislation in this place. Time and again this year—I understand it is more than 15 times, member for Midland —

**Mrs M.H. Roberts:** It is 15 including the three this week.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Fifteen bills have been declared urgent. The process is not that hard. The government gets its draft legislation, ministers go back to cabinet and get the authority to print it and then the government brings it in and it lays on the table for three weeks. That is the process. I do not quite understand why this government cannot get a handle on that very simple process. When the minister moved to declare this bill urgent, he said that

this issue has been around for a long time. It has, but the government's position has changed time and again. I think the minister declared to a conference that it would not remerge Verve and Synergy. At the election the position was pretty unclear and again there was a commitment that the government would not do it.

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** There was no commitment. Last time the government made a commitment, it was against it, when the "Strategic Energy Initiative 2030" came down in October last year.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Basically, yes, this issue has been around for a long time, but the government's position has changed and gone all over the place. The reality is that the bill has sat in this place for less than two weeks. It is a complex policy. The government is creating a very complicated and messy scenario that members on this side are trying to get their head around. Again, there is no reason to declare this bill urgent. The only possible reason to do that is the incompetence of the government. I do not understand how time and again the government cannot work out with a calendar that we need legislation in this place in three weeks; we have 22 weeks of sitting, so the government should work backwards to decide when to bring legislation to cabinet and get authority to draft and to print it so that it can bring it in in a timely way. I do not understand why the government cannot do it. It is okay once or twice, but 15 times is not okay. I do not think that the minister in charge of this bill has brought in any legislation that he has not declared urgent. As the Minister for Finance, he had to declare the Duties Legislation Amendment Bill 2013 an urgent bill and the Rates and Charges (Rebates and Deferrals) Amendment Bill 2013 also had to be declared urgent. Of course, today he has moved to declare urgent the Electricity Corporations Amendment Bill 2013. We do not all criticise the Leader of the House; he does his best, but look where the government has put him. We can only just see him. As a result, things are all over the place. The government put him in the second row and he does not have the authority to take charge. I know that he tries and I can hear him sometimes suggest, "How about this?" But it is an absolute shambles.

I do not know why the government cannot work it out. The government decided on the parliamentary dates and chose the 22 weeks, not us, so I cannot understand how it can forget to get the legislation ready in time. I can understand once, I can understand twice, I can even understand three pieces of legislation, but it was basically every bit of legislation that has been brought into this place. These guys opposite have not had a system in place whereby they work out that legislation is needed in this place, they bring it in and they let it sit on the table for three weeks to allow Parliament to properly consider it. The minister said that we do not need three weeks. As I have said, the government changes position on this issue all the time. Minister Collier said that they were not going to be re-merged. The government is all over the place. The government is creating confusion and chaos yet again in its management of this issue.

**MR J.H.D. DAY (Kalamunda — Leader of the House)** [9.00 pm]: We certainly do not expect the opposition to support this motion to declare the Electricity Corporations Amendment Bill 2013 urgent. We never expected that. However, I need to put on the record that, firstly, of course, we are asking for this bill to be debated one week earlier than standing orders would normally allow. But, as the minister has said, the bill has been in the public arena for two weeks, so we are not exactly springing this on the Parliament. The policy matter has been in the public arena for months this year, so it is not a surprise either to the Parliament or the public. We could have debated this bill last week in fact. The member for Midland commented on the fact that we finished early on a couple of days last week and also the week before. That is a commonsense thing to do if we do not have the legislation or other issues to deal with at the time. We are no different in principle from a board, committee or local government. We are a committee of the state, essentially. No other organisation ensures that it occupies the amount of time available just for the sake of it, and Parliament should not be any different. We could have brought this bill on last week and made sure that all the sitting hours designated for last week were used. We contemplated that and I put that to the member for Cannington. Quite reasonably, he said that the opposition believed it should have two weeks to consider the bill to ensure that it was considered by the opposition shadow cabinet and so on. That was a reasonable request and a reasonable position to put, which we have agreed to. Therefore, we did not bring it on for debate last week, as we could have. We would have had to move the same motion. In my view, it would have been unreasonable to do so, but, as a result, we had some spare time last week. No-one complained that they were able to go home to their families or other activities somewhat earlier on Tuesday night or Thursday afternoon last week.

The other point I make is that it is a fairly novel suggestion for an opposition to make that Parliament should not sit. Usually, oppositions complain when Parliament does not sit and governments are not keen for Parliament to sit.

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Members!

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** We have set out a sitting schedule for this year. We are abiding by it. We are bringing legislation forward. It takes time to get legislation drafted. There are a lot of complexities involved. In an ideal

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Papalia

---

world, we would not have to move motions such as this, but, on the other hand, we are not being unreasonable. We have ensured that two weeks are available. I hope that the opposition will maintain its concern for the cost of Parliament sitting between now and the end of the sitting year with all the other legislation that we have to debate, including the Workforce Reform Bill, which will be dealt with and the opposition will have its fair say but in a timely manner.

**MR P. PAPALIA (Warnbro)** [9.03 pm]: The criticism of the government's poor record of introducing bills is valid for most other bills, but there is probably a reason behind the Electricity Corporations Amendment Bill 2013 being declared urgent and it is not the same as that for the other bills. The reason is to avoid embarrassment, because quite clearly the government had a completely different position on the re-merging of Verve and Synergy prior to the election but it changed that position post the election. As in so many other cases, the Premier had a position prior to the election that changed post the election.

On 7 March, two days before the state election, when the government responded to WA Labor's accusations that it would do things like this, it denied it. It denied it in the media and it attacked the opposition by calling us liars! It is extraordinary that it has the gall to do it. That is what the government is doing today; it is avoiding scrutiny and demonstrating a complete lack of integrity.

*Division*

Question put and a division taken, the Acting Speaker (Mr I.C. Blayney) casting his vote with the ayes, with the following result —

Ayes (31)

Mr P. Abetz	Ms M.J. Davies	Mr C.D. Hatton	Dr M.D. Nahan
Mr F.A. Alban	Mr J.H.D. Day	Mr A.P. Jacob	Mr D.C. Nalder
Mr C.J. Barnett	Ms W.M. Duncan	Dr G.G. Jacobs	Mr D.T. Redman
Mr I.C. Blayney	Ms E. Evangel	Mr S.K. L'Estrange	Mr A.J. Simpson
Mr I.M. Britza	Mr J.M. Francis	Mr R.S. Love	Mr M.H. Taylor
Mr G.M. Castrilli	Mrs G.J. Godfrey	Mr W.R. Marmion	Mr T.K. Waldron
Mr V.A. Catania	Mr B.J. Grylls	Mr P.T. Miles	Mr A. Krsticevic ( <i>Teller</i> )
Mr M.J. Cowper	Dr K.D. Hames	Mr N.W. Morton	

Noes (17)

Ms L.L. Baker	Mr F.M. Logan	Mr J.R. Quigley	Mr P.B. Watson
Mr R.H. Cook	Mr M. McGowan	Ms M.M. Quirk	Mr D.A. Templeman ( <i>Teller</i> )
Ms J. Farrer	Ms S.F. McGurk	Mrs M.H. Roberts	
Mr W.J. Johnston	Mr M.P. Murray	Ms R. Saffioti	
Mr D.J. Kelly	Mr P. Papalia	Mr P.C. Tinley	

Pairs

Ms A.R. Mitchell	Mr B.S. Wyatt
Mrs L.M. Harvey	Dr A.D. Buti
Mr J.E. McGrath	Mr C.J. Tallentire
Mr R.F. Johnson	Ms J.M. Freeman

Question thus passed.

*Second Reading Resumed*

**MR W.J. JOHNSTON (Cannington)** [9.09 pm]: I want to start by clarifying the Leader of the House's comments. At no time did I say the opposition agreed to have this Electricity Corporations Amendment Bill declared urgent. I said to the minister that if the government had declared it urgent last week, we would have gone troppo because there would have been no opportunity for the matter to go to our shadow cabinet. The government has the numbers. I cannot stop the government declaring a bill urgent. I knew the government would declare it urgent because it had no other legislation. If the house was to sit this week, this bill had to be declared urgent, not because that is a good thing but because it is a fact. I am not disagreeing that the minister and I had the conversation behind the chair, so to speak, but it is not fair to say that the opposition agreed to it being declared urgent this week. I said that if it had been declared urgent last week I would have gone ballistic.

**Mr J.H.D. Day:** I agree with you. I didn't suggest you agreed we should bring it on as an urgent bill. I accept what you say.

**Mrs M.H. Roberts:** You verbalised him. The acting police minister has got to you!

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** Indeed; I said if we introduced the Minerals Research Institute of Western Australia Bill last week, given the government was going to declare it urgent and we did not have the numbers, I would not go troppo on that and, through the party, I got approval on how we would proceed in the chamber. But that is not

the same as any suggestion that I had given any undertaking regarding this legislation. I just wanted to clear that up.

**Mr J.H.D. Day:** I am not suggesting you did, and I accept what you just said.

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** I now want to get onto the legislation before us. The first thing we need to make clear is that this is a betrayal of the people of this state by the election commitments of the Liberal Party of Western Australia. In 2009 the Liberal Party tabled a report that is colloquially known as the Oates report into Verve and its relationship with Synergy. When the minister spoke to that report he attended the Energy in Western Australia Conference run by the Australian Institute of Energy WA branch and stated that the government had decided it would not proceed to merge Verve and Synergy. At the same time, the minister announced that he would create a thing called the strategic energy initiative. Interestingly enough, that was to be called Energy 2010. When it was finally released in 2012, it was then called Energy 2012. When the minister released it in October last year, he established a consumer and industry forum. Firstly, according to the Minister for Energy and the Western Australian Liberal government, the strategic energy initiative was the blueprint for the future of the energy sector in Western Australia. Not one word in that report said anything about merging Verve and Synergy. The government had spent hundreds of thousands of dollars and done thousands of hours of work to produce a blueprint for the future of the energy sector in Western Australia and said nothing about merging Verve and Synergy. That is quite important because in the lead-up to that, both the Premier and the then Minister for Energy had made comments about the possibility of bringing Verve and Synergy together. There was a lot of pressure. In fact, in the middle of last year the Western Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the Chamber of Minerals and Energy of Western Australia said publicly that the government had to say what it was going to do. In October last year it was not as if this was being done in a vacuum; it was being done with a specific issue in mind. The government was being asked by industry to say what it was going to do with the energy sector in Western Australia and it produced a blueprint that it said would take the energy sector forward for 30 years. Nowhere did it suggest anything about merging Verve and Synergy. The minister said it was not on the agenda.

We went to the election campaign and the now government published an energy policy in the lead-up to the election. Again, there was not a single word about merging Verve and Synergy. Here is the blueprint—not a single word. After the election a new minister was appointed. Suddenly the Premier, not the Minister for Energy, issued a press release and said that Verve and Synergy would be brought together. What was the main reason the Premier said that? He said it was because there had been no proper planning for the future needs of energy generation in Western Australia. What the hell was the strategic energy initiative about? What was the Minister for Energy doing? Surely only one person had responsibility for planning the energy sector in Western Australia. Surely that is the guy who gets paid several hundred thousand dollars to do the job—the Minister for Energy. What incompetence is that? The Premier himself said that Hon Peter Collier had failed in his duty to the taxpayers of this state and had done no proper planning. This is interesting because that failure to plan also included any discussion of bringing Verve and Synergy together.

The minister and the government need to make a decision. Do they believe in telling the truth or not? That is the real question for them. The bill before us today is a dishonest piece of legislation. We will go through it when we get into consideration in detail. We will go into consideration in detail because we will divide on a number of clauses as well as oppose the bill. This bill does not provide for a new market for regulation in the energy sector in Western Australia. The government has frequently come into this chamber and said that the disaggregation process from 2006 has created too many regulatory entities in the regulatory sector that are costing too much. Mr Acting Speaker (Mr I.C. Blayney), do you know how many of those entities will be implemented by the passage of this legislation? None. Not a single entity of the regulatory environment in Western Australia will be eliminated. But worse, an additional regulatory framework will be created by yet unseen regulations that the minister is too scared to share with the people of Western Australia. The minister knows what is in those regulations but he will not table them, even though yesterday he told the media at a press conference that he would be tabling them in Parliament today or this week.

**Dr M.D. Nahan:** No, I didn't.

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** I have heard the tape. The minister should not invent things.

**Dr M.D. Nahan:** You're verballing me again.

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** That is not true. The minister got one of his press secretaries to ring around the journalists. I was talking to journalists in the afternoon who still believed what the minister said on Monday morning. He needed to get his press secretary to ring around and clarify the comments. This is just another example of the fact that this minister cannot tell the truth to save himself. I am not saying he is lying; I am saying that he is not telling the truth. For example, the minister says that \$154 million was spent on the reform process. If that is true, he should table a document. I have been asking him for months to table the documents that back

up these allegations, this rubbish that he talks about. When Minister Collier was the Minister for Energy, he used to say that the state government's changes to the vesting contract had saved the taxpayers of Western Australia \$1 billion. Then it was \$1.5 billion, then this minister said it is \$1.5 billion and now in the second reading speech last Wednesday, the minister said it was \$3 billion. He should table the report. He should show me a single document that backs up the nonsense he talks about. If I am wrong, he should prove it. Why is he not prepared to answer any questions on this matter? I ask the minister: is it the policy of the government to amalgamate billion-dollar assets of the state without a business case? His answer was a load of rubbish. That is what he has done. He should table the business case. Even as late as this afternoon, the minister said that he will tell the people of Western Australia how much the merger process will cost and how much it will save after it is complete. What sort of shambles is this? Surely to God the minister could come into this chamber and explain himself! Tell us what the benefit is. How much is going to be saved? What are the details? Go back and have a look at what the Labor government did when it was in office and when the Liberal Party supported the disaggregation of Western Power. The former Labor government spent several years consulting, talking and making sure that industry came along with us in that process, and we amended our beliefs and our intentions based on the feedback from industry.

One small example of what I am getting at here is the question of the capacity market. The minister has on a number of occasions, including in the second reading speech, said that the capacity market is leading to higher costs. Not only did he say that, but also that he will continue with the capacity market. It is interesting to note that on 3 September 2013, at the Committee for Economic Development of Australia lunch at Perth Convention and Exhibition Centre, the minister said that when the Labor Party set up the market, we set up a capacity market, that he could understand the reason for that and that it was probably the right thing to do. This is the problem with the minister—one thing today, another thing tomorrow! It is one of the reasons that there is so much confusion in the power sector.

Here in *The Weekend West* of 21–22 September is an article on the minister's power shake-up in which he announced that whereas once he would have merged Verve and Synergy, now he would split Verve and Synergy into two separate gentailers and sell them off. Yet not more than five days later the minister was in this place saying that it was not his policy to do that. What was this on the front page of *The Weekend West*? Did *The Weekend West* invent this? In his speech on 3 September 2013 the minister said that he endorsed the position of Mark Chatfield; and that is the exact position that Mark Chatfield had put to that lunch. It is no wonder that everybody in the media thought that was the minister's position. But of course on the Tuesday following that front page story, the Premier stood in this place and said, "That's not going to happen," and the next day the Premier said that it was not the policy of the government. Therefore, what was the minister doing? Who was he trying to impress? Was it his friends in the Institute of Public Affairs? What was it all about? It is not the policy of the government, so why the hell was he talking about it? The minister is not a commentator; he is the minister.

The minister criticised the Labor Party in this chamber and he criticised me personally. He said, "You want to see Verve exit the generation sector by retiring plant when it gets old." It is interesting to note that that is what the minister said to me in answer to a question about what his agenda was. It is also interesting to note that the minister in *The West Australian* of 11 April 2013 said —

"The real question is what kind of market structure and incentives, three, four or five years down the track will there be to encourage them not only to build it and sell it (power) to Synergy but take more of the market risks."

Minister, this is your bill. Show me the page number that sets out what the market structure is going to be three, four or five years from now to encourage private enterprise to take that risk.

The minister also on that day said —

"Do I think the State will slowly exit generation? Yes," he said. "Wasn't that the whole purpose of the disaggregation?"

The minister criticises the disaggregation but endorses its policy outcomes. What sort of second-rate policy operation is it on the other side of the chamber? The minister said today in answer to media questions that bringing together Verve and Synergy will lead to a 30 per cent reduction in fuel purchases for gas for the merged entity. That is an interesting issue. The minister knows, because I have asked him questions about it, that last year the two entities of government, in accordance with cabinet decisions, signed a 25-year gas supply contract with the Gorgon joint venture partner. What will happen now? Will the minister junk that gas supply contract and go back and renegotiate the price? The minister cannot go into the media and tell a story about what things may or may not happen; he is the minister! He gets paid an enormous amount of money, not to pose rhetorical questions, but to answer questions. The minister's job is not to tell us what might be, but what is going to be. That is why this legislation is such a failure. We all know the problem here: the minister does not agree with the legislation. The minister thinks the legislation is wrong. That is why the minister is quoted on the front page of

*The West Australian* wanting to split the entity into two. He wants to have two or three gentailers, according to his speech at the Committee for Economic Development of Australia. That is what the minister really wants to do; it is not what is in the legislation today.

The only involvement the minister had in this legislation was to give the second reading speech. Everybody knows that. There is not a single person in the electricity sector in Western Australia who does not know this whole thing comes from the Premier's office. The minister has had no involvement, other than to stand in the chamber and read out a speech written by somebody else. Every time the minister goes away from the Premier, he does not tell the story of the Premier's vision of the energy sector; he tells his own story—a vision of multiple privatised gentailers. That is what the minister tells people when he expresses his view, not the rubbish that is in the legislation before us today. That is what is so disappointing about this minister. We have a longstanding principle in the Westminster process that if ministers do not agree with a cabinet decision, they quit. That is the rule; that has always been the rule! Everybody knows that. This is not a man who is prepared to stand up for his principles. He would prefer to come in here, as we saw in that week back in September, and say, "Oh well, the reporters got it wrong." That is what the minister said to members in this chamber. What a disgrace. If it is the minister's view, he should be proud of it and stand up and tell us about it. This legislation does not represent the minister's view. This legislation is not the minister's opinion, so it must be somebody else's opinion; it must be the Premier's! It cannot be anybody else, because not a single person in Western Australia says that this is legislation they want. There is no question that some generators will say they can live with the format provided by this legislation, but that is a different issue to saying this is what they want. Everybody knows that nobody wants this legislation.

This bill is friendless. Even the minister does not agree with this bill. We know that because that is what he says every time he gets an opportunity to tell it like he wants it to be. That is exactly what he did on 3 September at the CEDA lunch, when I was present and recorded his speech. We know the minister's real views. They are not reflected in this legislation. This legislation is second rate and the minister knows it. The Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Western Australia, the weakest representative body in Western Australia, knows this legislation is hopeless. The WA Independent Power Association knows this is rubbish legislation. The Chamber of Minerals and Energy is opposed to this legislation, and I appreciate Mr Howard-Smith confirming that with me this afternoon. The Sustainable Energy Association opposes this legislation. This legislation has no friends.

I admire Mr Oates, although I am confused because I am not quite sure whether Mr Oates works for the minister or the Public Utilities Office. I am happy to have that explained later on. I make no adverse reflections on this; I am just trying to clarify the situation, because my understanding was that Mr Oates' company had been engaged on a contract of service by the Public Utilities Office, but when he briefed the opposition he introduced himself as being from the minister's office. That is not a negative; I am just trying to clarify exactly who Mr Oates works for. There is nothing wrong with him working for the minister, but I need to understand whether he works for the minister or the Public Utilities Office. The briefing document that I hope the minister will table in Parliament for the benefit of the people of Western Australia, sets out the ring-fencing structure that will take place in the merged entity. Let us understand what ring-fencing means; it means separating two parts of a business, as was done previously by Telstra under instructions from the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission. Telstra separated its wholesale business from its retail business, so even though there is one company, there are two separate business units. So, a ring-fencing structure is proposed. It is not in the legislation, but it is proposed in the briefing notes provided to the opposition.

I can give the minister a tip about how to ring-fence the generation and retail assets of the state. If that was really all he was interested in doing, he would issue a direction to Verve not to be involved in retailing, and issue a separate direction to Synergy to tell it not to be involved in wholesaling. If any contracts were in breach of that direction, they would just swap them between the two entities, because they are both, after all, government-owned. Then Synergy would be entirely retail and Verve would be entirely wholesale, and that would be ring-fenced. Not a single word in the legislation would need to be changed. I just remind the minister that the first direction he issued after he became a minister was to Verve and Synergy, telling them that they were not allowed to compete against each other. He repeated the direction that had previously been issued to Verve, saying that it had to stay as the wholesaler, and he issued one to Synergy saying that it had to be a retailer and they were not to enter each other's markets. That is called ring-fencing. Not a single word in any act of Parliament needs to be changed to get what the government says it wants.

The government says one of the benefits is that there will be fewer directors because there will be only three entities instead of four. Sadly, that is not true. At the moment there are four entities with six directors, and in future there will be three entities with eight directors. If anybody in Western Australia or this chamber thinks there will not be a director in charge of the generation activities—like a line director; an executive director in charge of the generation activities—a separate executive in charge of wholesale activities, and a third executive

in charge of retail activities, they are kidding themselves. There will be a growth in the number of executives by amalgamating these two entities and there will be increased costs. We know that, because if it was not true, the government would tell us. If the government thought it had a plan that delivered lower costs, it would tell us. It has had since April to tell us about that.

[Quorum formed.]

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** Therefore, if the government thought it had a plan that set out how it was going to reduce costs, it would tell us. The government cannot claim that this is going to save costs, because it does not have a plan. As late as today the minister confirmed to the media that he does not have a plan to reduce costs. On a number of occasions I have asked whether there is a plan, whether it is in writing and whether it will be tabled. The answers are no, no and no. I have done that on a number of occasions. The minister cannot say that this is part of some grand plan that will reduce costs, because it does not exist—there is no plan. I invite the minister, if he knows how costs will be saved, to table a document that explains what will happen. Table a document that sets out what those savings will be. The fact that it will not happen is the proof of what I am saying. It does not matter what the minister says later about how we get things wrong, that this is wrong or that I am verballing. None of that stuff matters. Just table the document. Just table the Public Utilities Office plan that shows how this decision, this legislation and these changes will save money. We know the minister cannot do it. We know the minister cannot do it because he cannot do it for anybody. It is not just the opposition that has been asking for these things. Industry has been asking for these documents and none of them have come forward. I note that even the Chamber of Commerce and Industry has asked. The government has gone to sleep in representing industry in Western Australia. As late as 29 October the CCI stated —

CCI has repeatedly stated that it does not support the Verve and Synergy merger.

This is friendless.

It is interesting as well that in the minister's second reading speech he did not mention that he will change the nature of Horizon Power. I imagine that the National Party voted on this issue, and it is up to it to tell us what it did in cabinet. It is an important part of Horizon Power that a majority of directors need to live in the regions and that is being removed. It is an important part of Horizon Power that the CEO resides in Karratha. The legislation allows them to be anywhere in the region, but Karratha is the headquarters of Horizon. We know there has been a drift of Horizon executives back to Bentley and away from Karratha. Now the government is giving up on Horizon Power being a regional-based organisation. It is interesting to see what the National Party will say about why it is abandoning regional Western Australia by supporting this decision.

**Mr D.J. Kelly** interjected.

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** That is right. Very well said, member for Bassendean.

Again this does not refer to the legislation, but in the briefing given to us by the minister's office and the merger implementation group, I was told that this ring-fencing process will be dealt with through regulations so that if there has been a transfer pricing by the merged Synergy, civil penalties will be payable by the merged entity—the new Synergy. They said that the penalty for misconduct by the merged Synergy will be the merged Synergy paying its shareholder a fee. That is a very strange penalty. The penalty is taken out of the profit and loss statement and given to the shareholder. In any other business it would be called a dividend, but in this legislation it will be called a civil penalty. Interestingly, this procedure will not be administered by the Economic Regulation Authority, which is the one part of the government of Western Australia with the skills, experience and background in dealing with this issue; it will be handled by the Auditor General. We were advised that the Auditor General will need to hire technical expertise to conduct that work, because, of course, the Auditor General does not do that work currently for any organisation in Western Australia. The government is not giving the work to the ERA; it is giving it to the Auditor General. The ERA has the capacity, ability and experience to conduct that type of work; the Auditor General does not have the capacity, does not have the experience and will have to hire additional expertise to do that.

I do not understand what it is about the ERA that annoys the government. But that can be the only conclusion. If that was not the case, the government would give the ERA the job of policing these matters.

It is also interesting that I ran into the chairman of the Economic Regulation Authority, Lyndon Rowe, at a factory opening that I attended last Thursday. When I raised this matter with Mr Rowe, he did not know anything about it. That raises two other questions for the minister: Why was this cumbersome procedure developed without any input from the one organisation in Western Australia that has experience in the issue the minister is raising? What prevented the minister from talking to the Economic Regulation Authority about this matter? The minister will need to explain that to us.

As I have said, the minister has obligations to this Parliament. That is the cornerstone of what we are doing here. That is what it means to be a Westminster Parliament. The minister cannot just say the things that make him look

**Extract from Hansard**

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 29 October 2013]

p5619c-5630a

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Papalia

---

good. He needs to tell the truth. He needs to tell the things that are embarrassing to him. The minister did not do that during the Muja process. To give just one example, the minister did not tell the Parliament that he had approved a \$5 million payment into the Muja joint venture. Even though the minister was specifically asked a question about that matter in the other chamber, he left out that \$5 million payment. I do not know about you, Mr Acting Speaker (Mr I.C. Blayney), but I would not forget a \$5 million payment. This minister was asked a question in the other chamber, and he signed an answer, yet that answer did not include a \$5 million payment that the minister himself had only days earlier authorised to be paid to Verve. That is a real problem.

The minister needs to explain to us why he did not consult the ERA. If the minister fails to answer that question in his second reading reply, he will fail as a minister. The minister should not fail as a minister, and this Parliament must not let him fail as a minister. If the minister fails as a minister, he has one choice, and that is to quit. The former Minister for Energy, Hon Peter Collier, did not think it was worthwhile resigning when he failed and blew \$1 billion of taxpayers' money down the toilet. I hope that this minister is prepared to be honest with the Parliament for the first time in quite some time. I am not saying the minister is lying; I am just saying he is not telling the truth—because they are different things. I do not know why the minister has not told the truth, and that is not my problem. But the minister needs to tell the truth.

Another thing about this transfer pricing process needs to be explained. We need to know not only why it is not included in the bill, but also how long it will take before any misconduct by the new Synergy will be discovered. The MIG advised the opposition that the investigation by the Auditor General would be done as part of the Auditor General's usual process of signing off on the annual accounts of the merged organisation. We know, because we have read the legislation, that the Auditor General is required to report to the minister by 30 September of each year. We would imagine that the Auditor General's office would start its work sometime after 1 July, after the accounts have been closed, and would complete it by 30 September. We imagine that it would work with the merged Synergy in advance of that. But the books cannot be audited until they are complete. That means that there could be up to 15 months between any improper conduct by the merged Synergy and the discovery of that improper conduct. Is that acceptable in the mind of the minister? We do not know the details of this, because there is not one word about this in the legislation. All the legislation states is that this will be contained in the regulations. I will come back to why that is a bad thing, but it is not being honest with the people of Western Australia. If the minister can explain to us why he thinks it is a good idea to wait 15 months before any action is taken against improper behaviour by Synergy, it would be very interesting to hear. He might also explain why he thinks the penalty of requiring Synergy to pay a dividend to the state government—which is what a civil penalty effectively is, because money is transferred from the company to its shareholder—is a problem for the merged entity. There are all these strange things being proposed in this legislation, so it is interesting to look at the history of the amalgamation process and the pious commentary from those opposite on this matter.

Another question we have to ask in reviewing this legislation is: if the system was so bad and the minister is honestly telling us that these other things have been happening since 2006, what was the government doing between September 2008 and April 2013? It was the government; it had the ability to do anything it wanted. It had reviews, it had the opportunity to hold the businesses to account and it had the right to bring legislation to the Parliament. It could have issued directions to the energy companies. It had the right to do all those things, but it chose to do none of them. Yes, the government brought in the replacement vesting contract, but let us understand what that did. According to the Economic Regulation Authority's report into the actual cost of electricity for Synergy, the vesting contract increased the cost of electricity for Synergy by between five and seven per cent; I am happy to refer to the report. The ERA's final report noted that one of the differences between the estimation of the actual cost of electricity for Synergy between the draft report and the final report was that Synergy, Verve and the Public Utilities Office on behalf of the state government had made submissions to the ERA to say that the ERA should change the methodology it used to determine the price of wholesale electricity. The ERA was saying that the actual cost to Synergy was the cheapest electricity available on the market; whereas what the government wanted, and what the ERA agreed to in its final report, was that it should be the more expensive Verve Energy electricity costs that were included in the model.

The government wants to argue that the full cost of electricity in Western Australia is higher because Synergy is using the Verve plant and that it would be cheaper if it were using plant from other companies. That is at the heart of what was happening with disaggregation. The purpose of disaggregation was to expose inefficiencies in the market. If the Verve plant cannot deliver electricity at the same price as its competitors, that is called an inefficiency. That is what disaggregation was designed to expose, in the same way as described in the ERA's reports on Western Power and the fact that there has been more than \$1 billion taken from costs by the ERA through its approval process of Western Power, which was one of the results of disaggregation. This is what it was doing; it was exposing the areas in which costs were unnecessarily high. One of those areas is the payment that is used from the south west interconnected system to Horizon Power. That payment is going up

uncontrollably, and one of the reasons is the appalling management of Horizon Power by the Liberal government.

I will give members the example of the Port Hedland power procurement process; there was a detailed conversation about this with Horizon Power during the estimates hearings this year and last year. The government tendered for a gas-fired plant in Port Hedland for two years. It then separately tendered for a permanent solution for the same site. Why would the government buy two power stations to do the same job? There is a good reason for that; the temporary solution is paid for out of the tariff equalisation contribution. It is paid for by energy consumers in the south west of the state. A totally inefficient decision—that is, to build two power plants to do the one job—is being paid for by people living in the south west of Western Australia. Why would the government do that? Why would the government not have just let Horizon build one power plant to do the job because, interestingly enough, the technology is the same? It will be identical technology in the two power stations. According to Horizon, it could do the temporary project as operational expenditure and then not have to get cabinet approval for capital expenditure. It was a rort. Where did the rort come from? It came from the desk of Hon Peter Collier. Hon Peter Collier was warned for three years that he had to make a decision on that project and he failed to do it. We know he did because we went through the FOI process and for three years Horizon was warning the minister that he had to make a decision on this issue. The system in Western Australia is broken because of the incompetence of the government, not the regulation of the system. If there are perverse incentives, as has been claimed on a number of occasions, change them.

The Labor opposition went to the last election promising a few things, one of which was a short sharp review of the electricity system. Nobody ever said the 2006 reforms were the end of microeconomic reform in the power sector, but for some reason the government took the 2006 changes as being the end of the process. It is unbelievable that the Liberal Party of Western Australia does not believe in microeconomic reform and advancing markets. It wants to take them backwards. We know that is the view of only one man, but given not one minister in the state of Western Australia is prepared to stand up to the Premier, they are all guilty and part of the conspiracy to cost taxpayers' money. They are all part of this. Every time government members walk into this place and say, "Look, this cost has gone up. This has blown out", do not look at me. Get a bloody mirror. The Liberal-National government has been in charge for five years. People who were in primary school in 2006 voted at the election. It was the Liberal-National government's fault and not ours. This is an incredibly incompetent argument for the other side of the chamber. In his second reading speech the minister talked about —

New regulators were established in the form of the Independent Market Operator, the Public Utilities Office—the then Office of Energy—systems management, the Coordinator of Energy and the Energy Ombudsman together with some oversight by the Economic Regulation Authority.

I think the minister was trying to say that it was very complex. The minister may be able to tell us which of these will be eliminated. He might say systems management will be eliminated. Systems management is simply a function of Western Power that will apparently be moved from Western Power to the merged Synergy. He said —

The establishment of Horizon Power as the regional integrated provider, although flawed in implementation and governance, was itself not controversial.

The flaws in the governance have been there for the past five years when the costs have been blowing out and not when we were in power and the costs were under control. It is under this government's watch that things have gone wrong.

The minister has also claimed a falsehood about the Labor Party supporting privatisation. That is simply not true. A power plant in this state has never been sold by the Labor Party. It simply has not happened and any claim otherwise is not true. Just so the minister understands, he now knows that to be true. If he then says it, that would be a lie. Again, I am not saying he has lied in the past because I know he has said it in the past, but he probably believed it then. Now he cannot believe it because he knows it is not true. It never happened. Interestingly, in his second reading speech, the minister said —

Since 2008, over 30 per cent of the capacity in the SWIS has moved into private sector ownership.

That is an interesting set of words—the capacity moved into private sector ownership. That is not true. Additional power stations were built by the private sector, just as we said would happen, and they are in private hands. It was not the capacity that moved; there were new power stations. I make the point that the state would be \$330 million richer if the government, with no help from the Labor Party, had not decided to refurbish the old Muja AB power station. It would cost about \$330 million to build an export port in Bunbury for the coal sector. The coal industry is currently in trouble because of the incompetence of the Liberal government. If we had a competent government in Western Australia, the coal sector would not be suffering in the way that it is. If the

Coal Futures Group had continued, as was the case under the Labor Party, the Collie coalfields would be in a healthier state than they are today. There are problems down there because of the decisions that the people on the other side of the chamber made to do the things they have done. We will get to this issue later, but it might not necessarily be in this debate. There was a \$76.966 million writedown by Horizon Power in the cost of the Muja station. It wrote off over half the profit of Verve. Therefore, the 50 per cent reduction in the dividend that would have otherwise been payable by Verve this year to the people of Western Australia was due to the incompetence of this minister and the former minister. It is interesting that intangible assets in the Muja power station are valued at \$48.8 million. The question that I will ask on another day—the minister can answer it if he wants to—is: how many other power stations in the Verve fleet have a \$48.8 million intangible asset in their valuation? We know what has happened here. The government does not want to admit the mess it has made, so it is hiding it in this intangible. It is another rort. It is another dishonest practice of this government. Show me where it is stated in the accounts of intangible assets not inside the business, but inside the valuation of an individual plant. It is a rort. It is not true; it is a falsehood. It is designed to save embarrassment for the government.

I will make a point about outcomes in the system. Members should look at the most recent report of the Economic Regulation Authority regarding the energy price in the short-term electricity market. It has fallen since disaggregation. That is what has happened to the gross price of wholesale electricity in this state. Of course, one of the reasons it has fallen is that we have a lot of over-capacity, and there is a range of reasons that we have a lot of over-capacity, one of which is the stupidity of the government in lifting the cap on Verve. How dopey can it be? Part of it is due to the stupid decision to spend \$330 million on a power station that has capacity but no energy. It would be interesting to know—I will ask the minister on another occasion; he does not have to answer this in his reply to the second reading—how much energy was bought by Vinalco from other generators and then sold to Vinalco customers. It would be an interesting thing to know. If it was such a successful project, why was it buying energy?

There is another good thing that the minister likes to talk about. He says that the big problem with the Labor decision to disaggregate was that it was made without cost-reflective pricing for families in Western Australia. There is an interesting question. I asked the Minister for Energy: is it the state government's policy to have full cost recovery of electricity prices? He answered, "No, it is not." That is what he said the government's policy is. That was bad when Labor did it, but it is good when the Liberals do it! I ask: what sort of perverse activity is going on inside somebody's mind when they say that? Again, I can answer that question—it is not him. He knows that is a rubbish answer and he knows that is stupid, but he has to run the line because of the Premier. He does not get to say anything about energy policy in Western Australia. It has nothing to do with him; it is the man in the other office who makes all the decisions.

On page 5 of the second reading speech, in discussing the boards and other matters relating to the management of the four entities, the minister said —

The changes gave rise to additional annual management cost of \$9.7 million.

I would love to see the table that shows that. I would love to see the minister set down the calculation for that. I know why the minister will never do that—because it is a false statement. If the minister is prepared to table it, we will look at it, but it is not a true statement and he knows it. I do not know that he knows it, but he should know it. The fact that he will not produce the evidence to support the claim is part of the proof. The minister also said —

Over the last seven years of operation, the new market has given rise to over \$500 million in additional establishment, management and regulatory costs.

I point out that the Labor Party was only in power for two of the past seven years. Five of those years—get a mirror! Let us see the table that sets out what those costs were, when they occurred and what they related to. When the minister tables that, we will have a look at it and point out that it actually has nothing to do with the Labor side of the chamber; it is all about this government's incompetence over the past five years.

It is stated on page 5 of the minister's second reading speech —

... Verve had the cheapest fuel, the best sites, excellent grid access, plant diversity and a big organisation with over half a century of history and planning.

The problem was that when that entity went out to market, it could not match the more dynamic, more efficient players that came into the market. For example, Alinta's co-generation plant at Alcoa—that was wasted energy before disaggregation. It is now used to power our state. Of course that was going to be cheaper. Cogeneration will always be cheaper because it is a by-product of another process. That was the reason that Verve had trouble. When the Labor Party was in power, we subsidised Verve because that was the most sensible spot to put the subsidies. It drove efficiency in the system because Synergy was always going to purchase energy from the cheapest operator. Sometimes it was Verve; sometimes it was not. The Minister for Energy has to get away from worrying about dividends and start worrying about consumers. When the Liberal Party came to power, it was too

concerned about dividends and not concerned about consumers. That was why it believed that supporting an inefficient operation was better than supporting an efficient operator. Part of that process was that Synergy underwrote a contract with Bluewaters. I make the point that the Labor Party delivered two coal-fired power stations in Collie. This government said that was a bad decision. The minister's second reading speech says that Synergy's contract with Bluewaters was a bad decision because Verve had plant that could have met that demand. The reason Verve did not win the contract was because it was too expensive. The real question is: why was it too expensive? That is what should be investigated, but the government is not interested in that. The government is not interested in efficiency and outcomes; it is interested in process and regulation.

The minister said on page 6 of his second reading speech —

In terms of capacity credits, this excess capacity cost the market about \$335 million in the past year alone.

The minister should buy a mirror; he has been minister for half that time. If he is running an inefficient system that is not delivering for the people of this state, fix it. Do not tell me this legislation will fix it, because it will not change the capacity market. If it is bad, do not do it. He has had five years to change things. The idea that he can just come into power and ignore what is happening in the system and put on blinkers and complain about things is a ridiculous approach and nobody supports that. The minister says on page 7 —

The system's design has made it difficult for the private sector to enter the retail market and absorb the new private sector generation.

I will tell him why it is difficult for private retailers to enter the market. The franchise market has not been deregulated. At the last election the Western Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry had three demands; one was for deregulation of the small business sector. The Liberal Party said it would not do it and the Labor Party at the time said, "We can't promise to do that from opposition because we don't know the potential impact on dividends from Synergy." We also told the chamber that we thought it was a right approach. I make the point also that deregulating the small business sector in Western Australia would have removed risk from the government because the counter parties would have been the private sector and the retailers they are dealing with, not us. The minister says on page 8 —

Prior to this disaggregation, Western Power was open to public private partnerships, whereby the government underwrites the assets and has operational control over them.

Is the minister saying that was a better system than allowing a market? If he is not saying it was a better system than allowing a market, why is he talking about it? On page 9 he goes on to say —

Verve, meanwhile, struggled to stay afloat. Prohibited from building new non-renewable generation,

That is exactly the minister's position. That is what the minister said in this chamber was his position. He said that Verve should retire its ageing fleet as it gets to the end of its life. That is the justification he gave for his decision to shut Kwinana C. I do not understand what is happening here when he criticises his own decisions, but that is what he says on page 9. Is he telling us that Verve will be permitted to build new non-renewable generation? He will have to explain that because at the moment he has this schizo situation whereby his answers to questions in Parliament conflict with his statements in the second reading speech. We need to know the truth. I make the point that we know what will probably happen. It will be the same thing that happens every time the minister contributes to a debate. He will slag off the opposition and not explain himself. That will be unacceptable. He is merging a billion dollars' worth of state government assets with no business case, no plan, no explanation and no process. It was not as though he held an inquiry. The government in its former capacity held an inquiry and rejected the decision. What has changed since October last year when the former Minister for Energy released his strategic energy initiative? The minister says also on page 9 —

Verve was incentivised to engage with the private sector to stay afloat. These perverse incentives are what led to Verve going down the path of refurbishing Muja AB with an inadequate joint venture partner.

That is rubbish. This government caused Verve to stuff up with Muja. In May 2009 the Premier and Hon Peter Collier left a cabinet meeting, walked down the stairs and held a doorstep press conference that, conveniently for all of us, the Premier left on his website and said, "This is the decision we've made. We will do it through the private sector." It was not perverse incentive of Verve; it was a decision of the cabinet of Western Australia.

The idea that the government can blame perverse incentives of a market for stupid decisions of a cabinet is beyond belief. If it had not wanted Verve to get involved in the debacle of Muja AB, it should not have let it do it.

I conclude my remarks by pointing out that the engineering due diligence on the Muja project was done after the minister gave section 68 approval for Verve to spend money on the project. Can members imagine that? The

**Extract from *Hansard***

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 29 October 2013]

p5619c-5630a

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Johnston; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr John Day; Mr Paul Papalia

---

minister gave approval to the project, then the engineering analysis was done. No wonder the government got taken. No wonder the government got conned. We also know that it is scared of closing out the ANZ loan. The reason it did not dissolve the joint venture last financial year is that it would have been on the hook for \$150 million to the ANZ Bank. That is why it did not do it. It said so in writing via a note from the Treasurer. We know what happened. It was not some perverse incentive; it was incompetence.

Debate adjourned, on motion by **Mr J.H.D. Day (Leader of the House)**.

*House adjourned at 10.11 pm*

---