

Speaker; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Martin Whitely; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Rob Johnson; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Joe Francis; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Adele Carles; Mr John Day; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Ben Wyatt

MINISTER FOR ENERGY — ENERGY PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT

Matter of Public Interest

THE SPEAKER (Mr G.A. Woodhams) outlined that he was in receipt within the prescribed time of a letter from the Leader of the Opposition seeking to debate a matter of public interest.

[In compliance with standing orders, at least five members rose in their places.]

MR M. McGOWAN (Rockingham — Leader of the Opposition) [3.34 pm]: I move —

That this house express its lack of confidence in Hon Peter Collier and calls on the Premier to dismiss him from cabinet as a consequence of his mismanagement of the energy portfolio.

This is a very serious motion. To move a motion of no confidence in a government minister is one of the most serious matters that can take place in Parliament. The opposition has moved this motion advisedly. The Minister for Energy has been responsible for a range of problems and mistakes in his portfolio that have cost the taxpayers of this state very dearly indeed. I will go over some of the matters, as will some of my colleagues. The most important thing to note in this context is that through increased state government fees and charges we have seen, for ordinary families, the most dramatic increases in the cost of living in the history of this state. There has been a 57 per cent increase in electricity tariffs, a 57 per cent increase in gas charges, a 40 per cent increase in water bills, and a range of other new fees and charges imposed on ordinary citizens in this state. This latest episode of incompetence will merely put more cost-of-living pressures on ordinary families.

But it gets worse than that. The problem here is not just the incompetence of the Minister for Energy, not just the misleading by the minister about these matters and not just the hiding of freedom of information documents, but also the fact that the government itself, including the Premier and the Treasurer, have misled this house about the amount of money involved and the amount of money lost. Today we saw further evidence of that misleading and slippery behaviour by both the Premier and Treasurer in relation to this.

I will take members back to the time the government first announced its scheme. The Premier, as the former Treasurer, in his own budget speech of 20 May 2010 is quoted in *Hansard* as saying —

I'm also pleased to announce that funding of \$23 million has been provided to introduce a residential net feed-in tariff scheme from 1 August 2010.

The figure started at \$23 million. What did it then go to? Twenty-three million dollars was what the Premier said in Parliament when this thing started. We then go to the Minister for Energy on 1 August 2010. He also said that it would cost \$23 million. We then go to the Minister for Energy on 21 May 2011—the figure has gone from \$23 million to \$114.5 million! It is in writing, on paper—\$114.5 million. Then on 1 August, a few months later, the Minister for Energy stated —

“The scheme was so popular that to meet demand the Government increased the original \$23 million budget allocation to \$127 million.

Over the course of a year, the figure went from \$23 million to \$114 million to \$127 million. The Treasurer has the temerity to stand in Parliament today and say that all sorts of figures are being bandied around by all sorts of other people. In the course of one year, the government had three sets of figures on what this scheme would cost. This matter was being talked about everywhere. We received information that the scheme had blown out massively and we brought that matter before Parliament. We had been advised that it had grown to \$500 million and we wanted to know whether that was true—whether the cost had blown out from \$23 million to \$500 million. What did the Premier and the Treasurer say? I quote the Premier on 30 November —

There will be expenditure well beyond what was intended, but nothing in the order of \$500 million.

Not \$500 million, only \$453 million! The Premier said it a number of times. Again, on 23 November, the Premier said —

It is nothing like \$500 million.

He goes on and on denying that it was any figure in the vicinity of \$500 million. What we have discovered is that the scheme, originally advised in *Hansard* by the Premier as being a \$23 million scheme over four years, has now gone to a \$453 million scheme over 10 years. If we extrapolate a \$23 million scheme over 10 years, it reaches a \$60 million scheme, so I suppose it could be argued that it was really only a \$60 million scheme, not a \$23 million scheme, because it is four years at \$23 million and 10 years at \$60 million. That is still a \$400 million blow-out in the scheme. That is the best argument the Premier could make. Sixty million dollars to \$453 million is a \$390 million to \$400 million blow-out that we know of at the moment. When we asked him

Speaker; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Martin Whitely; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Rob Johnson; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Joe Francis; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Adele Carles; Mr John Day; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Ben Wyatt

in November last year he disputed outright that there would be in any way a blow-out to the magnitude of \$500 million. But through the freedom of information process, which I might add the Premier pooh-poohs in this house regularly saying what a waste of time that freedom of information process is, we have discovered two things; one is a \$400 million blow-out—a \$400 million loss to the state through this scheme. The second thing we have discovered via the FOI process and other documents that have come to light outside the FOI process is that the Premier's ministers deliberately misuse, and do not comply with, the law in relation to the FOI process. Documents that should have been released via the FOI process were not released, because the Premier claimed cabinet-in-confidence when emails between press secretaries are clearly not cabinet-in-confidence documents. That is what took place.

I want to come to the Premier. In question time I asked him a range of questions on this matter and he basically 'fessed up to the fact that, yes, there was a meeting between chiefs of staff in June 2011. I have a copy of what he read from. And we now discover that his chief of staff and the Treasurer's chief of staff were at the meeting held on 27 June 2011 where the former chief of staff to the Minister for Energy brought to the Premier's attention the fact that the feed-in tariff had reached its capacity.

Mr C.J. Barnett: I wasn't there.

Mr M. McGOWAN: He was not there, no, but I will get to him.

His most senior, \$350 000-plus-a-year staff were at this meeting from which we learn that the program has exceeded its capacity, thereby costing taxpayers many millions of dollars. That became apparent to the Premier's staff at that meeting and the Premier is saying that nothing was done. But it gets worse because in the Premier's flippancy with his answer, he said that he had been aware of problems with this scheme from the moment he was elected. He then said that he became even more aware from early June when Darren Brown, the former chief of staff to the Minister for Energy, actually said, "I think this scheme has been exceeded" —

Mr C.J. Barnett: Is Darren Brown now your confidant?

Mr M. McGOWAN: I have not spoken to Darren Brown but I can tell the Premier this: Darren Brown got the sack for bringing these matters to light, but the Minister for Energy loses \$400 million and nothing happens to him. What sort of standard is that? His standard is to sack the messenger and protect the failure—sack the messenger and protect the failure. We discovered that the Premier, himself, admitted in what he had to say that he has known for a long time about problems in the scheme. The only reason he acted on 1 August, according to his own admission having known about this issue for some months, is that he got calls from journalists. What we discovered from all the FOIs —

Mr C.J. Barnett: Rubbish! That is absolutely untrue. You cannot come in here and state blatant untruths.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Read the FOI documents. I know the Premier does not like releasing FOI documents; I know his ministers cover them up. But when they become public we learn what has gone on internally. All those FOI documents showed that the Premier's government was far more concerned about the media strategy to manage this issue than the losses themselves. All those documents obtained under FOI between the Premier's office, other press secretaries within the government and the Minister for Energy's office said, "We need to work out a media strategy to manage this in case we decide to cut it off." The day before it was cut off, the Premier got calls from journalists at *The West Australian*. It became the front-page story of *The West Australian*, and at 9.45 that morning he cut it off. The only reason he stepped on this program was that he got calls from *The West Australian* and it was on the front page of that newspaper. He did not take action for two months that we know of when it was plain there was a multimillion dollar blow-out in this scheme. Chiefs of staff knew—the Premier's chief of staff knew, the Treasurer's chief of staff knew and, by implication and from what the Premier said, the Premier knew. He took no action in regard to this. Who is the victim here? The taxpayers are. The taxpayers have to pick up this \$400 million loss.

Mr C.J. Barnett: There is no loss.

Mr M. McGOWAN: There is an attempt at sugar coating by saying that \$150 million will be absorbed by Synergy so the taxpayers do not have to pay. I do not know whether the Premier knows, but the taxpayers own Synergy, so if Synergy loses \$150 million, that means the taxpayers are paying for that.

This is incompetence on a grand and gross scale. It is a loss of a fantastically large amount of money by the taxpayers of Western Australia.

Mr C.J. Barnett: It is not lost.

Mr M. McGOWAN: The Premier claims it is not lost. It is lost to the taxpayers of Western Australia. It is no longer under the control of the Treasury of Western Australia. It was lost by a bungled and mishandled

Speaker; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Martin Whitely; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Rob Johnson; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Joe Francis; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Adele Carles; Mr John Day; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Ben Wyatt

government program that will cost the people of Western Australia. The Premier needs to take action in relation to this minister. The Minister for Energy has made an incredible mistake that was brought to his attention and then he sacked the staffer who brought it to his attention. This is the same minister who put up gas prices 57 per cent and put up electricity prices 57 per cent and is pursuing this madness of a merger between Synergy and Verve, which will drive away private investment in Western Australia. It is the same person who presides over an agency that has been identified by the Parliament and who has apologised for misleading the Parliament of Western Australia. That minister has made a monumental mistake. If he worked for a private corporation and lost \$400 million, he would be sacked the same day. His possessions would be put into a cardboard box and he would be marched to the door and be out the door. The only reason the Premier will not deal with this minister is that he is a factional heavy in the Liberal Party and everyone in Western Australia and everyone in the Liberal Party knows he is a factional heavy in the Liberal Party.

Several members interjected.

Mr M.P. Whitely: Don't you talk about corruption when you have a forger in the cabinet.

The SPEAKER: Member for Bassendean, I formally call you to order for the first time today.

Mr T.G. Stephens: He is too.

The SPEAKER: Member for Pilbara, I do recognise your voice; I formally call you to order for the first time today.

Dr A.D. Buti: The Premier won't deny it.

The SPEAKER: Member for Armadale, I formally call you to order for the second time today.

Mr M. McGOWAN: I will conclude there. This minister has been responsible for a massive loss to taxpayers.

Mr M.P. Whitely interjected.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Ordinary people will have to pay for it and the only reason the Premier will not take action —

Withdrawal of Remark

Mr C.J. BARNETT: The Leader of the Opposition was clearly referring to Hon Peter Collier, and the member for Bassendean interjected by way of saying "a forger" and I ask him to withdraw that.

An opposition member: Is it inaccurate?

Mr M.P. WHITELY: No; it was completely and utterly accurate. I did refer to Peter Collier when I called him a forger. That is just a statement of historical fact.

The SPEAKER: Withdraw the comment.

Mr M.P. WHITELY: I will not withdraw; it is a statement of fact.

The SPEAKER: I formally call you to order again, member for Bassendean. The instruction, member for Bassendean, is for you to withdraw the comment. That is what is being asked; that is what I am endorsing; that is what I am asking you to do, member for Bassendean.

Mr M.P. WHITELY: It is a statement of fact. It is true, as was outlined in the *Stateline* program. Peter Collier is a forger. I am not going to withdraw because it is true.

The SPEAKER: Member for Bassendean, I am going to give you an opportunity to withdraw the comment in the context of this debate. I give you one final chance to do that, member for Bassendean.

Mr M.P. Whitely: I am not going to.

Suspension of Member

The SPEAKER: That being the case, member for Bassendean, I will name you and ask you to leave this Parliament for the remainder of this day's sitting.

[The member for Bassendean left the chamber.]

The SPEAKER: Members, it is quite simple and this process unfortunately has happened in this place before. I put the question to you that the member named, the member for Bassendean, be suspended from the service of this state's house for the remainder of this day's sitting and for the next day's sitting of this Parliament.

Question put and a division called for.

Bells rung and the house divided.

Speaker; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Martin Whitely; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Rob Johnson; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Joe Francis; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Adele Carles; Mr John Day; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Ben Wyatt

Point of Order

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Mr Speaker, you ordered the member for Bassendean out of the chamber before the vote was taken. Can I just question whether that is in accordance with standing orders or whether he should have been allowed to remain in the chamber until the vote was taken to determine his fate?

The SPEAKER: I indicate to you, member for Midland, that it is within the standing orders and we are voting on that process.

Division Resumed

The division resulted as follows —

Ayes (32)

Mr P. Abetz	Mr G.M. Castrilli	Mrs L.M. Harvey	Ms A.R. Mitchell
Mr F.A. Alban	Mr V.A. Catania	Mr A.P. Jacob	Dr M.D. Nahan
Mr C.J. Barnett	Dr E. Constable	Dr G.G. Jacobs	Mr C.C. Porter
Mr I.C. Blayney	Mr M.J. Cowper	Mr R.F. Johnson	Mr D.T. Redman
Mr J.J.M. Bowler	Mr J.H.D. Day	Mr A. Krsticevic	Mr M.W. Sutherland
Mr I.M. Britza	Mr J.M. Francis	Mr W.R. Marmion	Mr T.K. Waldron
Mr T.R. Buswell	Mr B.J. Grylls	Mr J.E. McGrath	Dr J.M. Woollard
Ms A.S. Carles	Dr K.D. Hames	Mr P.T. Miles	Mr A.J. Simpson (<i>Teller</i>)

Noes (24)

Ms L.L. Baker	Mr F.M. Logan	Mr J.R. Quigley	Mr C.J. Tallentire
Dr A.D. Buti	Mrs C.A. Martin	Ms M.M. Quirk	Mr P.C. Tinley
Mr R.H. Cook	Mr M. McGowan	Mr E.S. Ripper	Mr A.J. Waddell
Mr J.N. Hyde	Mr M.P. Murray	Mrs M.H. Roberts	Mr P.B. Watson
Mr W.J. Johnston	Mr A.P. O’Gorman	Ms R. Saffioti	Mr B.S. Wyatt
Mr J.C. Kobelke	Mr P. Papalia	Mr T.G. Stephens	Mr D.A. Templeman (<i>Teller</i>)

Question thus passed.

Debate Resumed

MR W.J. JOHNSTON (Cannington) [3.57 pm]: I want to quickly get rid of one of the straw man arguments that is going to be used by the Liberal Party in defending this incompetent minister; that is, that all it was doing was matching the Labor Party’s commitment. I just want to make a point about the Labor Party’s commitment. Our commitment was —

A gross residential photovoltaic feed-in tariff of 60 cents/kWh will be payable for systems of 1–10 kW until the cost of installing the panels is paid back.

That is a fundamentally different process from what was being put by the government. I have read that the Minister for Energy said that if we had implemented our policy, it would have cost \$1.8 billion. That is rubbish. It is because he has not been able to read the English language and understand the difference between what he promised to do for \$23 million and what we promised to do.

I could talk about the chaos and the complete shambles that has become Western Power under this minister’s leadership, the fact of the 680 per cent increase in billing complaints to Synergy, the failure of the Horizon Power underground power project in the Pilbara and the farce that is the re-merger policy of this government whereby cabinet has decided not to re-merge and no advice is being sought or received on re-merger, but the Premier continues to talk about it. I could talk about all those things but what I want to do is focus firstly on the question of freedom of information.

I have the FOI applications from Hon Kate Doust and the member for Victoria Park. I draw the chamber’s attention to document 27 of the Wyatt FOI. That document was also covered by the more extensive FOI request of Hon Kate Doust, yet it does not appear in the schedule to the freedom of information application by Hon Kate Doust. That in itself is a breach of the act. But we then have to go on and look at this famous document 50, which was excluded by a piece of shameful dishonesty. It is excluded on the basis of being a cabinet document. I will talk about this document later because it proves that the minister’s defence in this matter was false; that his defence is not based on the truth. But I will come to that later. That shameful dishonesty was that it was an email from a journalist. The minister in his defence stood in front of the media yesterday and said, as quoted in *The West Australian* —

... he had no knowledge of the FOI application, could not explain why the document had not been released ...

Speaker; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Martin Whitely; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Rob Johnson; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Joe Francis; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Adele Carles; Mr John Day; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Ben Wyatt

That is a very interesting issue, because I am holding the FOI application and it states “decision maker”. Whose name appears there? Hon Peter Collier, MLC! He is the decision maker!

A government member: He knew nothing about it!

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: He knows nothing about his own decision! On another page of this decision, members will see this document 50. It is on the finding of the facts that document 50 was exempt on the basis of it being a cabinet document. Whose signature appears at the end of the document? Oh my god! It is the minister’s signature. Perhaps it was a forgery? Perhaps one of his staff has taken up this approach and forged the signature and that has been the problem. The poor minister—the hapless, hopeless and incompetent minister—does not know that he is responsible for the decision. He does not know that he made the decision. So perhaps he did not make the decision—in fact, it was a forgery that led to the breach of the FOI act and the shameful and typical ignoring of the law of this state by the Liberal Party.

It is not as though the Liberal Party did not know what it was buying when it let Hon Peter Collier into cabinet and made him a minister. I draw members’ attention to the transcript from ABC online *Stateline Western Australia* of 6 May 2005, in which Lorraine Allchurch, a member of the Liberal Party, said about the now Hon Peter Collier —

Well, I’ve got a whole folder of documentation here, which I’m happy to provide if it’s ever necessary ...

Point of Order

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I refer to the motion before the house. It reads —

That this house expresses its lack of confidence in Hon Peter Collier and calls on the Premier to dismiss him from cabinet as a consequence of his mismanagement of the energy portfolio.

“Mismanagement” is the word that the member should be concentrating on—not other forms of libellous words.

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: The member for Cannington is directly referring to the motion. It is the Leader of the House who is in error here.

The SPEAKER: Order! I am sure the member for Cannington will return to the subject matter.

Debate Resumed

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: This goes on. The Liberal Party knew exactly what it was buying when it allowed Hon Peter Collier into cabinet. So it is not a surprise that he is incapable of doing his job. We all knew that he would be incapable of doing his job.

Let us understand why this document was deliberately excluded and not properly made public. It is because this document shows the minister’s dishonesty. This document demonstrates the fact that the minister knew the truth and was not telling it in public. That is why it was so important that the minister cover up what he was doing.

I want to draw the attention of the chamber to the exclusions that are allowed for this procedure that the minister was claiming. In the minister’s decision, he notes the following —

Matter is exempt matter if its disclosure would reveal the deliberations or decisions of an Executive body, ...

This document did no such thing. But, even if it did, it would still be able to be disclosed, because there is a limitation on that exemption, as the minister’s own decision points out. The limitation on that exemption is —

Matter is not exempt by reason of the fact that it was submitted to an Executive body for its consideration or is proposed to be submitted if it was not brought into existence for the purpose of submission for consideration by the Executive body.

It was an email from a journalist. It is incapable of being a document intended for cabinet.

We need to go on and look at the shambles that is the feed-in tariff. The government said that the feed-in tariff would cost \$23 million. The government is now saying that it will cost \$450 million. But apparently that is not a \$450 million blow-out. It is only a \$130 million blow-out—it goes from \$23 million to \$450 million. I can tell members that there is no bigger advert for the National Assessment Program — Literacy and Numeracy than the mathematics of the Treasurer of this state! We do not have any confidence in the Treasurer’s capacity to do mathematics. Perhaps we should bring NAPLAN testing in here! My son is doing his NAPLAN test today. What about getting the Treasurer to line up for my son’s year 9 NAPLAN test?

Speaker; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Martin Whitely; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Rob Johnson; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Joe Francis; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Adele Carles; Mr John Day; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Ben Wyatt

I will go on. On 17 August 2011, Minister Collier said this in Parliament about the scheme —

It blew out from around \$28 million to almost \$120 million and the projections were even more excessive.

Those are not the figures that have been quoted to us today. He goes on to say —

The uptake of the solar PVs and the capacity of the solar PVs was regularly updated on the Office of Energy's website.

He goes on —

We did reach the cap. As far as the decision making was concerned, *The West Australian* ran a story, which was largely prompted by the solar industry, because it knew we were getting to that point. Would it have been any different if we had given the solar industry another two weeks?

So, the government knew on 31 July—we will go to that—that the cap had been reached. The minister also said —

To suggest that the decision just came out of the blue is nonsense.

So, the government knew what it was doing. That is what the minister was telling us. So now, when we get the figure of \$450 million, let us understand that the minister knew what he was doing. The minister went on to say —

We knew that if we waited two or three weeks there would be this mad rush on the solar industry. We were very, very conscious of that.

The government knew what it was doing. It was getting proper advice constantly. I will go through some of that advice in the brief time that I have. On 8 June, the minister's chief of staff asked for a briefing, because, as he said, they were getting close to the cap. On 28 June, an email from the Premier's Office says —

Darren told us yesterday at CoS meeting that the capacity for the FiT has been reached.

On 30 June, the Office of Energy provided a table to the minister's office. In the box "Scheme cap", it says, "After Review, 150MW". Immediately below that, in the box "Current installed capacity", it says, "Cap reached". Indeed, the email that covers that advice from the Office of Energy says —

Synergy data indicates that there should be around 140MW of panel capacity installed under the scheme. ... However, after closure of the scheme, panels could continue to be added, to the point where total generation capacity becomes limited by the capacity of inverters installed under the scheme (probably more than 170MW).

Therefore, on 30 June, the government already knew that potentially 170 megawatts was involved in this scheme. So, the idea that the government did not know, or that it was rubbery figures, is just rubbish.

It is interesting to look at FOI document 45a of 5 July. That document is described as an options table. What do members think is in that options table? I do not know, because access to that table has been denied, on the basis that it was a cabinet document. Given that we know that the minister has failed in his duty on FOI, how do we know that it actually was a cabinet document? But, anyway, we know what is in that document. It is not that hard to work it out.

What action did the government take? A couple of days later, the government started a file for the closure of the feed-in tariff scheme. That is a good action. The next thing the government did was develop its plan—not its plan to close the scheme, and not its plan to communicate with the installers or the people who would be affected by the decision, but its communications plan. That plan particularly highlights its communications strategy for its backbenchers. That is what the government was worried about. The government wanted to make sure that its backbenchers were included in the plan so that they could get their spin cycle ready. Even after the government had made the closure, it was the spin cycle that dominated. On 9 August, the Premier's office asked in an email, "When did we breach the cap?" Funnily enough, that email has never been answered, and the minister has never stood up in Parliament to explain when the cap was breached. We can go on and see how it was the media secretaries from the Premier's office who were dominating the discussion. It was not about what was a good outcome.

Mr C.J. Barnett: That is absolutely untrue!

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: That is not untrue.

Mr C.J. Barnett: You always play the man, don't you!

Speaker; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Martin Whitely; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Rob Johnson; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Joe Francis; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Adele Carles; Mr John Day; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Ben Wyatt

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I can say that if you have an incompetent minister. You have a government that is involved in spin and slipperiness. Perhaps it is time to have a look at that.

Mr C.J. Barnett: You are the most disgraced member in this chamber!

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: I am the only member who has ever been proved to tell the truth!

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms A.R. Mitchell): Thank you, members!

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: The email says, “Dixie and I have spoken.” Members can go on and have a look. It is very interesting. It was edited and approved by Dixie.

Mr C.J. Barnett: Here we go! Play the woman! That is your standard! That is what you are doing!

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: It says, “Hi David, I know you’re under the pump but at some stage today if you could distribute the speaking points for members around the feed-in-tariff.”

Several members interjected.

Withdrawal of Remarks

Mr J.M. FRANCIS: Madam Acting Speaker, the member for Armadale clearly just called the Premier a hypocrite. I suggest that is unparliamentary and I would ask you to direct him to withdraw.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms A.R. Mitchell): Member for Armadale, I did not hear you say that, but, if you did, would you please withdraw it now.

Dr A.D. BUTI: Madam Acting Speaker, I did say it. But the Premier just called the member for Cannington the most disgraced member of Parliament.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Armadale, I did not ask for an explanation; I asked for a withdrawal.

Dr A.D. BUTI: I withdraw.

Mr T.G. STEPHENS: On a point of order, I want to test the Chair on this question.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Pilbara, I have not given you the call.

Mr T.G. STEPHENS: I ask for the call on a point of order.

The ACTING SPEAKER: On a point of order, member for Pilbara.

Mr T.G. STEPHENS: The Premier has called the member for Cannington “the most disgraced member in this chamber”. If I find that offensive, will you ask the Premier to withdraw that? Because I find it offensive and I want you to ask him to withdraw that.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Pilbara, that should normally occur as quickly as it is said. I understand that may have taken a little while.

Premier, could I ask you to withdraw that comment as well for the member for Cannington.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I withdraw.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, Premier.

Debate Resumed

The ACTING SPEAKER: Now I will give the call back to the member for Cannington and ask him to stay on line. The member for Cannington has finished.

MR C.J. BARNETT (Cottesloe — Premier) [4.12 pm]: Let me take the house through the history of the feed-in tariff. I will start prior to the last election. I do so because that is the period in which this issue arose. At that time, prior to this government being elected, the renewable energy sector was lobbying anyone who would listen for the introduction of a feed-in tariff. In the lead-up to the last election, every other state, with the exception of Tasmania, already had a feed-in tariff of one form or another, although they varied in design. There was a heavy lobbying effort to the government of the day—the Labor government—to the opposition, to the media and to anyone else who would listen. The Labor government made a commitment that if it was re-elected, it would introduce a gross feed-in tariff set at a price of 60c a kilowatt hour. It was estimated by the former government to cost \$13 million over four years for up to 10 megawatts of capacity. The then Liberal opposition agreed with that and matched that commitment in the lead-up to the election.

Mr W.J. Johnston: You made a different commitment.

Speaker; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Martin Whitely; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Rob Johnson; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Joe Francis; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Adele Carles; Mr John Day; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Ben Wyatt

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I do not need to hear from the member for Cannington.

Mr W.J. Johnston: Sorry! I am clouding the issue with facts! My fault!

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Madam Acting Speaker, I am trying to treat this with some seriousness.

Mr W.J. Johnston: You're not! You're not telling the truth.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I'm not telling the truth?

Mr W.J. Johnston: You're not!

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Cannington!

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Madam Acting Speaker, it is becoming pointless.

Several members interjected.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Look at you! You are just a rabble. You have already had one member thrown out.

Following the election and the great victory of the Liberal and National Parties to form government, the government introduced, according to its election commitment, a feed-in tariff. We did. We made two changes. For a start, we said that it would be based not on gross generation, but net generation. I will explain the difference for anyone who does not understand. The Labor Party had said that it would pay 60c a kilowatt hour, not only for electricity from a photovoltaic system sold back into the grid, but also for every unit of electricity produced by the household. That is what a gross system is.

Mr W.J. Johnston: That is not true. That is not right. That is wrong.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Cannington, you have had your chance to speak.

Mr W.J. Johnston: You should tell the truth!

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Cannington, I call you for the second time today.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: I was defining the difference between gross and net in the generic sense.

Mr W.J. Johnston: You have got it wrong.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Cannington!

Mr C.J. BARNETT: A gross feed-in tariff system, which some states have, means that the 60 cents a kilowatt hour would be paid on every unit of electricity generated whether it is sold back into the grid or used in the premises on which the PV system is installed. That is a definition of gross. The Liberal–National government decided that was not what it would do and that it would apply any subsidy only to net generation—in other words, to electricity that was sold back into the grid. I think that was eminently sensible, and I remember that discussion very well. We also reduced the amount of payment from 60c a kilowatt hour to 40c a kilowatt hour. They were appropriate decisions, and certainly the way to go was from gross to net.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Cannington, you are not in your seat and your voice is being heard above everyone else's. If you wish to go outside and speak, you can do so.

Several members interjected.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Madam Acting Speaker, I am trying to address the motion.

The scheme for a 40c-a-kilowatt-hour net feed-in tariff and not a 60c gross feed-in tariff was introduced and began to operate on 1 August 2010. By October 2010, just a couple of months later, the scheme had already passed the 10 megawatt level. That was an indication of the take-up rate and an aptitude within the community to reduce their emissions and their electricity bills by installing domestic photovoltaic systems onto their roofs. It also became obvious that even after reducing the feed-in rate from 60c to 40c a kilowatt hour, even that figure was way too high. It was way above the cost of generating electricity in the south west interconnected system and even above the cost of generation and distribution. It was clearly too high, so a decision was made that the rate would be reduced to 20c a kilowatt hour, which is closer to the cost of general power generation and distribution on the grid; it was a more sensible figure. Changes were made in the very early days of this scheme in response to, frankly, being too generous and a way-above-expected take-up of the scheme. What was done was to try to create a scheme that would be, in a sense, more sustainable.

Demand continued to grow. It continued to grow very strongly for a variety of reasons. Electricity bills had gone up, which would have encouraged more people to go into photovoltaics; the price of photovoltaic units came down significantly; and the capacity of photovoltaic units increased so people got more bang for their buck.

Speaker; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Martin Whitely; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Rob Johnson; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Joe Francis; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Adele Carles; Mr John Day; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Ben Wyatt

There was a lot of promotion of photovoltaics and a lot of debate at that time about greenhouse emissions and reducing our carbon footprint, and to their great credit people did this. So, even at a reduced tariff and by changing the scheme from gross to net, the scheme was still in a sense being oversubscribed. Therefore, the government made a conscious decision that it would again alter the scheme. In this case, we did it by the amount of capacity being generated through domestic photovoltaic systems, and we did that by setting a cap. What started at 10 megawatts was expanded by this government to be a 150-megawatt scheme. That cap was above the level of demand for installation at the time. There were some good reasons for that: about 150 megawatts of electricity generated at the home, with an appropriate share being fed back into the system—basically 150 megawatts going back into the system as it was a net scheme—was about what the south west interconnected system could cope with. That is bearing in mind that the peak demands are in the morning and the evening, while photovoltaic systems generate electricity during the middle of the day when the demand is not there.

There is a logical limit to how much PV-generated power we want to go into the system and at what time. The cap was changed for that reason. But still people continued to subscribe to the system and still it continued to grow. This became clear towards May to June 2011, around that time, even with this substantial increase in the scheme, bearing in mind that this government expanded the scheme from an initial 10 megawatts, which was exceeded, to 150 megawatts. Is all that wrong—renewable energy, self-sufficiency in electricity, coping with higher electricity bills and reducing your greenhouse footprint, emissions and the like? The government expanded the renewable energy scheme to 150 megawatts, but we capped it and we made that very clear. As I said in question time, there were some issues because the industry was growing, with a lot of retailers, producers and installers who were out there selling and signing people up to the feed-in tariff or helping them fill in their applications for the scheme. These applications were being processed through Synergy, the retailers and the Office of Energy. We were very conscious, knowing we were approaching that cap, and indeed were at risk of going over that cap, that people not be treated unfairly, so we provided a period of grace. That is because the feedback from the industry itself was that a whole lot of applications for the feed-in tariff were in the system—and, beyond that, these were applications that not only, I guess, could have been rejected but also were from people who had ordered and paid for their photovoltaic systems in good faith. Because a feed-in tariff was in place, they had made the decision and turned up to a retailer or supplier and had paid for the system, and in other situations, systems had been installed by the retailer and the installer but not yet paid for by the consumer. There would have been a significant potential loss to householders—that is, consumers—and a significant loss to small business retailers and installers of photovoltaic systems. As a government accepting responsibility—something the opposition never did in government—we had a period of grace. We allowed those transactions to go through. If I followed the opposition's line, we would have chopped off those consumers and small businesses cold. We were not going to do that. We allowed those transactions to go through to a final cut-off date. We probably thought that would go above 150 megawatts but, as a principled government, we honoured the commitments that consumers—householders—and small business installers and retailers had made. I was part of that decision. That is what I and the Minister for Energy, with the support of cabinet, particularly the Treasurer, decided to do. That was the principled decision we made. We knew it would cost more money but it was the right decision, something the Labor Party could never get to in government. That was done and a decision was made.

The cap was exceeded, but not by all that much. In setting the cap, the government considered some further alternatives. We considered extending the cap further—that is, expanding the system further. We looked at expanding it to 175 megawatts or even 200 megawatts, but we decided not to do that because the total cost of the scheme was so high and, indeed, more renewable energy would have been fed back into the system than the system could cope with or would want at that point. We decided to keep the cap but recognise that it may overrun in honouring contracts that people had entered into in good faith. Members may say that was wrong but I think it was the principled and correct thing to do.

The opposition is making great play of the fact that the cap was not applied immediately. If it had been, householders and small businesses would have lost substantially. We allowed it to run from 1 July to 1 August. These applications were in the system. How many were there? There were 600 applications in the system that had a total value of \$1.6 million. Yes, the cap was exceeded but at a cost of \$1.6 million for those 600 applications that were already in the system. How much was the cap exceeded by? We set the cap at 150 megawatts. What the Minister for Energy said is true. We did not have reliable information on how many applications had been approved and how many were in the system or how many people had been signed up by retailers. That information had yet to go through the system and even reach Synergy or the Office of Energy. We did not know the number of applications, but it turned out to be 600. When the scheme was finally closed and all the applications were finally dealt with, including those in transit, the cap was exceeded by 14 megawatts. The blow-out was such that the expanded scheme went from 150 megawatts to 164 megawatts. The scheme was

Speaker; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Martin Whitely; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Rob Johnson; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Joe Francis; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Adele Carles; Mr John Day; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Ben Wyatt

expanded—I stress that again—because of its popularity. Because of the demand and the focus on renewable energy, this government progressively expanded the scheme. When we finally put a cap on it, it was at 150 megawatts. When all the transactions and orders had flowed through so that we could finally close the books on it, 600 more households had signed up and the cap was exceeded by 14 megawatts, in the context of 76 000 households that had signed up for the feed-in tariff. A total of 76 000 households in Western Australia have a photovoltaic system and have saved money because of this government. Some of them got a better deal than others. Those 76 000 households got a better deal than consumers who might buy the system today. The scheme stimulated the solar energy sector and it stimulated photovoltaics. The public responded and 76 000 households have a photovoltaic system. I concede that the scheme blew out by 14 megawatts or 600 households. That is the extent of it.

As the Treasurer remarked during question time, as this scheme had expanded, \$303 million was put in the 2011–12 budget for the scheme. The scheme was funded to the tune of \$303 million. It was an expanded scheme. Because of the further growth in the scheme, the total cost is now \$453 million. That is the total cost of the scheme over its entire life. The overrun beyond the planned 150 megawatts—the 14 megawatt overrun—has a total cost of \$150 million over the full life of the feed-in tariff because it does not just apply for one year; it applies over a 10-year period. For the full life, there was a blow-out of \$150 million, so there was a 14-megawatt blow-out over the 150 megawatt scheme. The blow-out had a cost of \$150 million over 10 years or, in other words, \$15 million a year, not \$500 million or \$600 million. The total cost of the scheme was \$453 million.

What is Labor's position? I do not know what Labor's position is. Immediately the scheme was suspended, the Labor Party called for it to be reinstated. Is the Leader of the Opposition changing the commitment made by Hon Kate Doust to reinstate the scheme?

Mr M. McGowan: Our commitment is that your minister should be sacked.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Once again, the Leader of the Opposition cannot make a statement on policy without equivocation. His spokesperson in the upper house called for the scheme to be reinstated. Does the Leader of the Opposition want the scheme reinstated—yes or no? It is not a hard question.

Mr M. McGowan: He should be sacked.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Let the public record show that once again the Leader of the Opposition cannot answer a simple question. Does he want to reinstate the scheme or not? This government is not going to reinstate it. It served its purpose. The Labor spokesperson is calling for it to be reinstated. What is the Leader of the Opposition's position?

Mr M. McGowan: I have already said; it is so incompetently managed that it won't be reinstated.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: So the Leader of the Opposition is not going to reinstate it?

Mr M. McGowan: No; I have said that.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: What is it all about? What has it all been about today? You are so weak.

Mr M. McGowan: It is about you losing \$400 million.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: We did not lose \$453 million.

Mrs M.H. Roberts: Those in the eastern suburbs are going to be paying more for their electricity.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: No, they will not. The dreary member for Midland keeps on playing things down, talking about doomsday and hard work. She is hard work. She is boring and tedious and she does not get across the issues properly because she is a lazy member of Parliament.

Mrs M.H. Roberts interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms A.R. Mitchell): Member for Midland, I call you for the second time today. Members, I remind all of you that this is not about personal reflections on members in this house; it is about the topic of the MPI.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: That is quite right. Let me conclude.

Yes, the scheme has cost much more than was originally intended.

Mr E.S. Ripper: That's a blow-out.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Belmont, I call you to order for the second time.

Speaker; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Martin Whitely; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Rob Johnson; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Joe Francis; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Adele Carles; Mr John Day; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Ben Wyatt

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Yes, demand was underestimated. Clearly, the response of the public was way beyond what anyone in government, Synergy or the Office of Energy thought likely. Yes, the original versions of the scheme were too generous. They were too generous in the initial proposal, which did not happen, for a gross scheme, and they were certainly too generous in the feed-in tariff that was set. The government did provide a period of grace—a principled and correct decision—when the scheme was reduced from 40c to 20c. Yes, there was a flood of applications during that period of grace. When the scheme was finally suspended, there was a period of grace. Again, that was a principled decision and the right decision, otherwise we would have had business failures all over the place and people would have suffered significant financial loss by paying or ordering or contracting for a scheme that would not provide them with the financial benefits they expected.

Money has not been lost. I do not deny that the scheme has had a blow-out. I have made that very clear. The government accepts that. We acknowledged that from day one. The Labor Party implied that money has been lost.

Mr M. McGowan: It has been.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: It has not been.

Mr M. McGowan: Is black white?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Does the Leader of the Opposition think it is a blatant lie?

Mr M. McGowan: No; I said is black white? Is white black?

Mr C.J. BARNETT: The money has not been lost. The scheme has blown out—gone over; it is bigger than was ever anticipated—but every single dollar has gone into renewable energy. This has not been lost. Every single dollar has gone into renewable energy in the 76 000 households that now have a photovoltaic system installed—76 000. This scheme had an uptake way beyond anyone’s expectations, which is why the costs rose, in addition to the initial tariff being too generous—no doubt about it—which has been proved by experience. Yes, there has been a reduction in emissions as a result of that; this is green energy applied in a practical sense. It gave people an opportunity to do something about global warming, something about their emissions, and something about the environment at a local home–private dwelling level. That is what happened; 76 000 said, “Yes, we will do that.” The uptake of the scheme has been evenly distributed. In looking at different electorates, Labor and Liberal are very similar—10 to 11 per cent, whether we look at a Labor electorate or a so-called higher-income Liberal electorate in some cases.

I concede—the minister has conceded right from when this issue was first raised seven or eight months ago—that, yes, the scheme has blown out. But this government expanded the scheme. It set a cap, and there was a small blow-out beyond that cap simply because the government honoured and provided a period of grace to both business proprietors in the sector and householders. That was totally appropriate. For Labor to call it as money lost and scandals and all the sort of other rhetoric —

Mr M. McGowan: It is lost.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: It is not lost. The Leader of the Opposition can continue to say that, but what the Leader of the Opposition will finally learn is that if he continues to tell half-truths and make misleading statements to the people of Western Australia, as he consistently does, then finally they will learn what the word “sneaky” really meant. They will finally grasp the meaning of it, because the member consistently does not tell the full and open truth. He has a reputation in this Parliament and throughout the bureaucracy for that; he has a reputation for being short on the truth, for being misleading, and for being what his colleagues describe him as. His colleagues describe him as sneaky—it is their term that they apply to him.

MS A.S. CARLES (Fremantle) [4.32 pm]: I rise to say that I will not be supporting the opposition motion today because I fully support the government’s implementation of the feed-in tariff scheme. The scheme has been so successful, as we know, in meeting its objectives and increasing the uptake of PV panels that it has actually been shut down. That is a great shame for the state.

I have been raising the importance of a feed-in tariff ever since I came to Parliament; I raised it in my inaugural speech, and then again in my speeches in reply to the budgets of 2010 and 2011. In fact, the Germans were the architects of this feed-in tariff and they introduced it in the late 1990s. It was successfully adopted in many other European countries, and Australia has been quite slow to get on board. But we now have the evidence that it works and that this is the way to encourage the uptake of renewable energies. Now is the time to phase out the coal industry; the federal carbon tax will make that industry more expensive anyway. I urge the government to seriously invest in clean energy technologies and to bring back the feed-in tariff. It is a great green scheme, and I

Speaker; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Martin Whitely; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Rob Johnson; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Joe Francis; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Adele Carles; Mr John Day; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Ben Wyatt

ask the government to have the conviction it had when it brought it in; it knew it would encourage the investment it has.

Finally, cost overruns are often discussed in this Parliament, and in my view this cost overrun is outweighed by the ongoing benefits of the production of clean green energy.

MR J.H.D. DAY (Kalamunda — Minister for Planning) [4.34 pm]: I will make some brief comments. Firstly, I think there is a valid question to be asked in relation to this renewable energy scheme; that is, does it represent good value for money for taxpayers in Western Australia compared with the cost of providing electricity from other forms of generation? I hope that that aspect is analysed at some stage. The Premier referred to the representations made to the former opposition prior to the last election, which were similar to the representations made, no doubt, to the former government prior to the last election, from the renewable energy sector—it was from the WA Sustainable Energy Association in particular. I well recall that because I had responsibility for energy in the opposition at that time. There was a very strong request for a feed-in tariff scheme to be introduced, and, as the Premier said, the opposition committed to that in a similar way to the government prior to the last election, so there has been bipartisan support for the introduction of a feed-in tariff scheme using photovoltaic facilities. However, it is valid to ask whether what is now in place is good value for money. Certainly there must be an avoided cost to other electricity generators—Verve Energy in particular, or private sector generators from which Synergy would have to purchase power—in not having to install peak-generation capacity to some extent. Therefore, having this solar-generated capacity on householders' roofs clearly saves that cost to some extent, but it would be nice to know the comparative differences at some stage.

But that is not the question being asked by the opposition. It is criticising the minister, in particular, for the management of this scheme and the cost being imposed on taxpayers. The Premier has given a very good analysis of the real cost in excess of what was budgeted for by the government; it is about \$150 million over 10 years, or about \$15 million a year. A significant dose of hypocrisy is being dealt out by the opposition, however, in relation to this issue, and the Treasurer referred to it in question time today. I will reiterate it. The shadow energy minister at the time, Hon Kate Doust, on 1 August 2011, in relation to the possibility of the scheme, at that stage, being brought to an end, stated —

It is truly perverse that a Government would wind up a scheme, purely on the grounds that it has been too successful.

“Western Australians who want to act on climate change have been doing what they can to reduce their carbon footprint and many are looking to save on their bills by investing in renewable energy generation.

“Western Australians who may have been saving for solar panels to reduce their bills will be faced with a door being slammed in their face.

“With electricity charges skyrocketing, Western Australian families should be allowed to do all they can to reduce their bills and the Barnett Government is giving them little opportunity to cope.”

How could that be interpreted as anything other than calling for the scheme to be left open and for people to be able to have continued access to the scheme as it was operating at the time? That is the reality of the position that the opposition was putting in August last year. Presumably that sentiment is still held within the opposition, and it is grossly hypocritical of the opposition now to be criticising the government and the minister for the management of this scheme when its approach would have meant that the costs to taxpayers would have been far greater than is the reality of the case at the moment. The government took action through the cabinet, the Treasurer, the Premier, and the Minister for Energy primarily, to bring this scheme to an end when it was realised that the cap had been reached—had been exceeded to some extent—and when it was realised what the cost to consolidated revenue was going to be. If the approach being espoused by the shadow energy minister at that time had been taken, presumably the scheme would still be operating, or what the shadow energy minister said at the time has no relevance or currency. The opposition has to make up its mind where it stands on this issue; either it backs what the shadow energy minister was saying at the time or it backs the convenient argument being put today.

I think all this shows that the opposition, in reality, has no credibility on this issue. The government put in place a scheme that has been very popular, and, as the Premier said, it is not as though the money has just disappeared. It has not gone down some WA Inc-type black hole, as happened when Labor was in office in the late 1980s, early 1990s; it is actually being used to pay for electricity generation that is being consumed in Western Australia. People are being paid for that, and there must be, at least to some extent, an avoided cost of having to

Speaker; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Martin Whitely; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Rob Johnson; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Joe Francis; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Adele Carles; Mr John Day; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Ben Wyatt

pay for the electricity that is being used that would otherwise be generated in some other form. Therefore, for all those reasons and those put by the Premier, this motion should not be agreed to.

DR M.D. NAHAN (Riverton) [4.40 pm]: I would like to make a few comments on this matter of public interest. It has been interesting. Essentially, the opposition is arguing that the Premier should sack a minister for being highly successful in promoting alternative energy. This opposition, when in government, promoted the 20–20 policy; that is, 20 per cent of our electricity being generated by renewable sources. This is the opposition that supports the carbon tax —

Mr F.M. Logan interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms A.R. Mitchell): Member for Cockburn, I call you to order for the first time today.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: This is an opposition that supports the carbon tax designed to increase energy. Its central intent is to try to encourage people to use other sources.

Mr P.C. Tinley: Are you talking about state issues?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Yes. The member supports the carbon tax, does he not?

Several members interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Here we have the Labor Party, deeply embedded in its typical hypocrisy, criticising a minister for doing what it argued he should do all along—that is, promote alternative energy. And, I might add, the Labor Party also promoted a similar scheme, in government and in opposition, as did every state around the nation, instigated through the Council of Australian Governments. There was an agreement, through the 20–20 policy implemented by the commonwealth, that all states would adopt a policy that the electricity generation in each state would have 20 per cent alternative energy. That policy was accepted by all states. Part of that was to help, through these types of buyback mechanisms, to promote solar cells on rooftops. That was also done through other means. We did what other states did. What has to be recognised on this side is that this has actually been one of the most popular policies implemented by this government.

Mr R.H. Cook: The most mismanaged!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: No, it is not. It is exceedingly popular, and they all know it. Members opposite, like me, have been inundated with people coming into their offices worried about the scheme expiring. They have been encouraging it. I am personally sceptical about the scheme and always have been, but it is exceedingly popular. It is probably a cost effective way to do it. Once there is a policy of 20 per cent of electricity generated by alternative energy, this is probably a lower cost means of doing it. It depends what is paid for it. We had a net tariff buyback of 60c, decreased it to 40c, decreased it to 20c, and then targeted it. The reason it was very popular was that it was a policy to adopt. People could see that electricity prices were going up, they knew about the carbon tax and they wanted some mechanism to shelter themselves from those policy effects. We allowed them to do it. The argument from the other side—the former member for Armadale argued this ad infinitum—is that we needed to encourage the solar cell industry. The way we needed to do that was to encourage the buyback—encourage the industry to spur it on to have people buy. That is what the scheme was designed to do by members opposite. As the Premier has highlighted clearly, how badly has this thing blown out? Ten per cent! That was in the face of rapid growth in demand. As we all know, huge numbers of people were trying to get into the scheme. They were struggling to get in, many of them, as the Premier made clear —

[Member's time expired.]

MR B.S. WYATT (Victoria Park) [4.44 pm]: “What is it all about?” the Premier asked. Fundamentally, that is the problem, because we have a government policy apparently costed at \$28 million. On 17 August 2011, the Minister for Energy in the other place said that the scheme would cost \$28 million. It ultimately cost \$450 million! Apparently that is not a problem. Apparently that is not a loss because it is okay; we have 76 000 houses out there getting the benefit of the feed-in tariff. Now the issue has been dumped into Synergy, but the problem the government has is that every other Western Australian is picking up the cost of that particular failed policy.

I enjoyed the Premier and I enjoyed the Treasurer—I am not sure what the member for Riverton was saying—redefining the blow-out by saying, “If we actually look at the blow-out over the blow-out over the blow-out!” If we look at the cost of the final blow-out separate from the original two blow-outs, it is not that big a blow-out, but when we have a policy that starts at \$28 million but ultimately costs the taxpayer \$450 million, Premier—news to you—that is a \$422 million blow-out. For some reason the minister seems to think it is okay, Synergy is

Extract from Hansard
[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 15 May 2012]
p2495c-2508a

Speaker; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Martin Whitely; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Rob Johnson; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Mr Joe Francis; Acting Speaker; Dr Tony Buti; Ms Adele Carles; Mr John Day; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Ben Wyatt

wearing it. He says, “Give it to Synergy”, as though there is some magical mystery third party out there that will wear that cost. However, unlike Alinta—which is now owned by the Yanks, thanks to the Premier—Synergy is still owned by the taxpayer. The government can fudge those figures all it likes, but it is the Western Australian taxpayers, in particular those Western Australians who do not have a solar panel on their roof, who are paying extra. As the Economic Regulation Authority has pointed out with this botched idea to merge Synergy and Verve, it will put upward cost pressures on power prices for consumers. That is exactly what this will do. Ultimately, this failure by the Minister for Energy, Hon Peter Collier, and this failure by the Premier will mean that Western Australians face higher bills. Western Australian families’ electricity bills will go up as a result of this failure. We have already seen a 57 per cent increase in electricity.

It is also worth noting what the Premier said when he was still in opposition. I want to quote the Premier from April 2008. He was complaining about the community service obligations in the former Labor government’s budget when he said —

We owe it to those families and households, to single mothers and pensioners ... to explain why they face increases in the price of electricity of 10 per cent plus 10 per cent plus 10 per cent.

He said that, as paid members of Parliament, we owed them that. What he did not say was they were to cop an increase of 57 per cent. Now, as a result of a \$422 million blow-out, Western Australian households and families face further cost pressures. Their bills will go up as a result of this incompetent minister and the fact that the Premier and the Treasurer did nothing—not a thing! That condemns this government: the spin doctors knew but the Treasurer said, “I didn’t know until November”, despite the fact that in June the chiefs of staff, the spin doctors, were furiously trying to work their way out. The Minister for Energy has to go, not the 30 staff sacked from his office. This minister has to go. He has to be held accountable. He has to be held responsible for what has been an abysmal and catastrophic failure of government policy.

Question put and a division taken with the following result —

Ayes (23)

Ms L.L. Baker	Mr F.M. Logan	Mr J.R. Quigley	Mr P.C. Tinley
Dr A.D. Buti	Mrs C.A. Martin	Ms M.M. Quirk	Mr A.J. Waddell
Mr R.H. Cook	Mr M. McGowan	Mr E.S. Ripper	Mr P.B. Watson
Mr J.N. Hyde	Mr M.P. Murray	Mrs M.H. Roberts	Mr B.S. Wyatt
Mr W.J. Johnston	Mr A.P. O’Gorman	Mr T.G. Stephens	Mr D.A. Templeman (<i>Teller</i>)
Mr J.C. Kobelke	Mr P. Papalia	Mr C.J. Tallentire	

Noes (30)

Mr P. Abetz	Mr G.M. Castrilli	Mr A.P. Jacob	Dr M.D. Nahan
Mr F.A. Alban	Dr E. Constable	Dr G.G. Jacobs	Mr D.T. Redman
Mr C.J. Barnett	Mr M.J. Cowper	Mr R.F. Johnson	Mr M.W. Sutherland
Mr I.C. Blayney	Mr J.H.D. Day	Mr A. Krsticevic	Mr T.K. Waldron
Mr J.J.M. Bowler	Mr J.M. Francis	Mr W.R. Marmion	Dr J.M. Woollard
Mr I.M. Britza	Mr B.J. Grylls	Mr J.E. McGrath	Mr A.J. Simpson (<i>Teller</i>)
Mr T.R. Buswell	Dr K.D. Hames	Mr P.T. Miles	
Ms A.S. Carles	Mrs L.M. Harvey	Ms A.R. Mitchell	

Pairs

Ms J.M. Freeman	Mr C.C. Porter
Ms R. Saffioti	Mr V.A. Catania

Question thus negatived.