

# NEW SOUTH WALES LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

## HOUSE IN REVIEW



Volume 56/13

Sitting period  
10 to 12 November 2015



The *House in Review* provides regular updates of the activities of the New South Wales Legislative Council. Clicking on a hyperlink will take you to the relevant webpage. For further information refer to the NSW Parliament website [www.parliament.nsw.gov.au](http://www.parliament.nsw.gov.au) or contact the Procedure Office on (02) 9230 2431. To be placed on the email distribution list of the *House in Review*, please contact us on [council@parliament.nsw.gov.au](mailto:council@parliament.nsw.gov.au).

### Overview

This sitting week the House focussed on the consideration of Government bills. The House resolved to dispense with private members' business on Thursday and sat past midnight on both Tuesday and Wednesday to deal with government bills prior to moving into the likely final sitting week of the year.

Nevertheless, the Council held true to its role as a House of Review and entered into detailed scrutiny of the legislative proposals presented for its consideration. In all, the House passed six Government bills, but only after each was examined in detail in committee of the whole, with the House agreeing to amendments to four of the bills.

Among the notable bills passed by the House were the Retail Trading Amendment Bill which will see all retail outlets across the State able to trade on Boxing Day, and the Greater Sydney Commission Bill which will reform planning processes in Sydney and potentially other areas in the State.

Given the controversial nature of some of the bills, the sitting week was characterised by often passionate and robust debate and was notable for the fact that on three occasions, members spoke in debate on the third reading of the bill in question.

On 10 November, the Chair of the Select Committee on the Legislative Council committee system tabled a [discussion paper](#) to assist stakeholders in making a submission to this important inquiry.

On 12 November, the House agreed as part of formal business to a motion acknowledging the 175<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Parliamentary Library (see article below).

The House now stands adjourned until Tuesday 17 November which is nominally the last sitting week of the year.

### Executive Manager, Parliamentary Services

On 10 November 2015, the President informed the House of the resignation of Mr Robert Stefanic, Executive Manager Parliamentary Services, to take up the

position of Secretary of the Department of Parliamentary Services in the Australian Parliament.

### 175<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Parliamentary Library

On Thursday, the House acknowledged that 2015 marked the 175<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the NSW Parliamentary Library, and commended the exemplary service it provides to members and staff and the significant role its publications and resources play in the development and scrutiny of public policy.

### 2016 Sitting calendar

On 12 November 2015, the House agreed to the sitting calendar for 2016 as proposed by the Government in the House. In 2016, the House is scheduled to sit for 48 days, with an additional 3 days held in reserve.

### Government business

**Note:** Government business includes Government bills introduced or carried by ministers in the Council.

### Retail Trading Amendment Bill 2015

The bill originated in the Legislative Council.

*Summary:* The *Retail Trading Act* currently requires shops and banks to close on Good Friday, Easter Sunday, Anzac Day until 1.00 pm, Christmas Day and Boxing Day (with certain exceptions). Banks also have to close on weekends and on all public holidays.

The bill as introduced deregulates shopping hours so that a shop or bank may open on Boxing Day, a shop may receive, unpack and prepare goods for sale on any restricted trading day, and a bank may open on the Bank holiday and other public holidays, provided in all cases that staff have freely elected to work on those days.

*Proceedings:* Debate on the second reading of the bill resumed on 10 November 2015 from 20 October 2015 (see Vol 56/11 of *House in Review* for earlier debate).

The Opposition opposed the bill, arguing that many workers did not have legal protections under the *Commonwealth Fair Work Act 2009*, that State retail trading legislation was all that protected many employees who

were without secure working arrangements, and that the provisions of the bill eroded those protections. The Opposition argued that there was no economic reason for further deregulation of restrictions on retail trade, but that there was a compelling social argument for maintaining the status quo and allowing families the continued ability to spend meaningful time together. A number of Opposition members spoke against the bill.

The Greens also opposed the bill, arguing that it was anti-family and an attack on public holidays and on vulnerable workers who are currently only guaranteed four and a half days off a year. The Greens argued that the bill would not provide for additional economic growth, wages would not increase for low-income, retail or bank workers, and that the bill did not provide real protection for workers who chose not to work.

The Animal Justice Party also opposed the bill arguing that it erodes the fundamental values of family and community life, and that it would unnecessarily impact on the existing Christmas plans of employees.

The Christian Democratic Party supported the bill's objective to provide consistent Boxing Day trading across the State, but foreshadowed amendments to ensure that employees are able to freely elect to work, which they argued was a critical feature of the bill. The Christian Democratic Party argued that their proposed amendments would remove the ability of stores to prepare for normal trade on restricted trading days, and hence protect religious public holidays.

The Shooters and Fishers Party commended the Christian Democratic Party for their amendments, but nevertheless opposed the bill.

Speaking in reply, the Parliamentary Secretary (Mrs Mitchell) stated that the current laws are outdated and out-of-step with the community and that the provisions of the bill removed trading inconsistencies while providing protections for employees and small businesses.

The second reading was agreed to on division (20:19).

In the committee stage the Christian Democratic Party moved six amendments which sought to: impose fines on employers for each employee who had not freely elected to work or on lessees which forced small businesses to open on restricted trading days, to remove provisions that allowed limited activities on restricted trading days, and to impose a sunset clause on the provisions of the bill which would lapse only following an independent review which demonstrated that the provisions of the bill worked as intended and without compliance issues.

The Government supported the amendments, arguing that it is committed to protecting the rights of employees and small businesses. The Opposition and Shooters and Fishers Party also supported the amendments. The Greens opposed the amendments arguing that they did not resolve their concerns. The amendments of the Christian Democratic Party were agreed to on the voices and the bill was reported to the House with the amendments.

The Opposition and The Greens spoke to the third reading and reiterated their opposition to the bill. The

third reading was agreed on division (20:19) and the bill was forwarded to the Legislative Assembly for concurrence.

On 11 November 2015 the House received a message advising that the Assembly had agreed to the bill.

### **Greater Sydney Commission Bill 2015**

The bill originated in the Legislative Assembly.

*Summary:* The bill establishes the Greater Sydney Commission (the Commission) which will exercise planning and development functions in the Greater Sydney Region. The bill provides for the establishment of Sydney planning panels for any part or the whole of the Greater Sydney Region which will operate as joint regional planning panels under the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*. The bill also amends the 1979 Act to authorise the Commission to make local environmental plans for the Greater Sydney Region and to establish a scheme for strategic planning in that region and other regions declared by the Minister.

*Proceedings:* Debate on the second reading of the bill commenced on 11 November 2015. The Minister (Mr Ajaka) incorporated his second reading speech into Hansard. In that speech the Minister stated that the introduction of the Greater Sydney Commission demonstrated the Government's commitment to metropolitan governance and intelligent and thoughtful planning for Sydney in order to improve the sustainability, livability and productivity of the city. The Minister argued that the Commission will ensure that Sydney has the necessary governance framework to compete with other global cities and is fundamental to achieving successful planning outcomes.

The Opposition supported the bill and the introduction of a strategic planning body for Sydney, acknowledging the long standing need for a planning body that coordinated and collaborated with all arms of government. The Opposition stated that infrastructure, planning and governance in Sydney had not adequately responded to population movement or community expectations and that Sydney needed an innovative and robust planning framework to support sustainable and equitable growth. However, the Opposition also argued that the proposed commission should be more ambitious, consultative, transparent and accountable in order to manage the future challenges of a world-class city and foreshadowed it would be moving a number of amendments in committee designed to improve the Commission.

The Greens opposed the bill arguing that the proposed Commission was undemocratic, overrode planning powers of elected local councils and imposed top-down oversight and controls on planning processes in New South Wales. The Greens raised concerns over the structure of the Commission, the appointment process for commissioners, and the management process for Sydney's planning strategy and local environmental plans.

The Christian Democratic Party supported the bill, arguing that sensible and sustainable development was required for Greater Sydney to provide the necessary oversight and planning framework to manage the needs

of Sydney's growing population, and to ensure that Sydney is a livable city which is sustainable, accessible, and affordable.

Speaking in reply, the Minister addressed concerns about how the Commission and local councils will work together, stating that strategic directions will continue to be implemented at the local level and that the Commission would be given clear direction about important matters relevant to local government by the Minister for Planning.

The second reading of the bill was agreed to on division (29:6) with The Greens and the Animal Justice Party voting against the bill.

In the committee stage 62 amendments were considered.

The Greens moved a series of amendments in an attempt to: protect or strengthen the role of local government in planning; vary the composition and expertise of commissioners to include Aboriginal representation and expertise in Aboriginal culture and heritage; change the appointment process for the chairperson of the Sydney Planning Panel; and change the reach of the bill outside the Greater Sydney area. Amendments concerning consultation processes with local councils, the commission's powers, and ministerial oversight regarding the preparation of strategic and local environmental plans by the Commission were also introduced. These amendments were negated on division or on the voices.

An Opposition amendment to introduce parliamentary oversight of the Commission by the establishment of a joint parliamentary committee to oversee the Commission was negated on division (14:21). However, Opposition amendments which: provided for greater public involvement and participation as an objective of the commission; removing the ability of the Commission to liaise directly with local council staff; amendments to the Infrastructure Delivery Committee of the Commission to include the Secretary of the Ministry of Health, the Secretary of the Department of Education as permanent members, and more than one District Commissioner as casual members as appropriate; and requiring the Minister to publicly state the reasons for the removal of members from the Commission or Sydney Planning Panel were supported by the House and agreed to on the voices.

In total seven amendments were agreed to and the bill was reported to the House with amendments.

The Greens spoke to the third reading of the bill, restating their opposition, and arguing that the amendments made only marginal improvements to the bill. The third reading of the bill was agreed to on division (31:5) and returned to the Assembly for consideration of the Council's amendments.

On 12 November the House received a message advising that the Assembly had agreed to the Council's amendments to the bill.

## **Gaming and Liquor Administration Amendment Bill 2015**

The bill originated in the Legislative Assembly.

*Summary:* The bill makes a number of changes to the Independent Gaming and Liquor Authority (ILGA) including abolishing the position of Chief Executive, clarifying that the ILGA does not employ staff but that Public Service employees may be used to enable the ILGA to exercise its functions, removing certain functions from the ILGA that it holds under the *Casino Control Act 1992*, providing for administrative review of certain decisions of the ILGA, and making provisions with respect to the Minister's control over the ILGA.

*Proceedings:* Debate on the second reading of the bill commenced after midnight on 10 November 2015. In his second reading speech, the majority of which was incorporated into Hansard, the Minister (Mr Blair) said that the bill implements structural reforms to the liquor and gaming regulatory framework that will better support the policy settings applying to these areas. The Minister argued that the current regulatory model which commenced in July 2008 is no longer fit for purpose, that a more integrated approach is required and that this concern had been increasingly expressed by industry and community stakeholders.

The Opposition stated that while it supported some aspects of the bill, such as the introduction of an affordable appeal mechanism, it still held some significant concerns as it believed the bill primarily compromised and undermined the independence of the ILGA. The Opposition foreshadowed that it would move a range of amendments in the committee stage aimed at preserving the integrity and independence of the ILGA.

The Greens strongly opposed the bill arguing that it undermined the independence of the ILGA and created a bias in favour of approval for applications for extended liquor licences, new licences and poker machine entitlements. The Greens particularly opposed the removal of inspectors from within the casino and raised concerns over the expertise of the NSW Civil and Administrative Tribunal (NCAT) to hear appeals against decisions made by the ILGA. The Greens moved that the bill be referred to a select committee for inquiry and report.

In reply, the Minister listed the stakeholder groups with whom consultation on the bill had been undertaken and argued that the bill introduces efficiency, transparency and timeliness into the regulatory structure without sacrificing the independence of the ILGA. The Minister further stated that the bill adopts worldwide best practice by not having inspectors embedded in casinos.

Debate was adjourned prior to the question on the second reading being put.

The following day The Greens amendment to refer the bill to a select committee was negated (Division 17:22), with the Government, the Christian Democratic Party and the Shooters and Fishers Party voting against the amendment.

The second reading was then agreed to on Division (33:6), with the Greens and the Animal Justice Party voting against the second reading.

In the committee stage, the Opposition and the Greens each moved amendments that sought to remove provisions from the bill which they argued eroded the independence of the ILGA. While supported by the Animal Justice Party, all of the amendments were negatived, primarily on division, with the Government, Christian Democratic Party and the Shooters and Fishers Party voting against the amendments.

The bill was reported to the House without amendment, read a third time (Division 21:16) and returned to the Assembly.

### **Data Sharing (Government Sector) Bill 2015**

The bill originated in the Legislative Council.

*Summary:* The bill facilitates the sharing of government sector data within government, including with the NSW Government Data Analytics Centre (DAC); enables the Minister to require government sector agencies to share government data with the DAC; enables the Minister to obtain information for the DAC from government agencies; and specifies safeguards to be complied with by government agencies in connection with data sharing under the bill.

*Proceedings:* Debate on the second reading of the bill resumed on 10 November 2015 from 28 October 2015 (see previous edition of *House in Review* for earlier debate). The Opposition did not oppose the bill, stating that it accepted that data sharing and data analytics was happening now and was a positive innovation if done correctly. However, the Opposition argued that there had been inadequate community consultation on the impact and scope of the bill and that neither the bill nor the Minister's second reading speech provided enough practical detail on how the provisions in the bill would operate. The Opposition moved that the bill be referred to General Purpose Standing Committee No. 6 for inquiry and report by the last sitting day in April 2016, stating that its aim was not to block the bill but to have it appropriately examined as expeditiously as possible and.

The Christian Democratic Party supported the bill, noting that the Government needed to keep pace with an ever increasingly technologically driven society.

The Greens supported the bill, stating that they supported data-led decision making and believed that evidence based government was critical in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. However, the Greens cited some reservations regarding aspects of the bill which they would seek to address during the committee stage.

In reply, the Minister (Mr Gay) argued that privacy protection was at the centre of the bill and that it had been developed in close consultation with stakeholders.

Despite the support of the Greens, the Opposition amendment to refer the bill to GPSC 6 for inquiry and report was negatived (Division 16:22), with the Government, Christian Democratic Party and the Shooters and Fishers Party voting against the proposal.

The second reading was agreed to.

In the committee stage, The Greens, with the support of the Opposition, moved amendments that variously sought to put beyond doubt that the bill did not inadvertently override data privacy provisions in other legislation, to require that health or personal information data be de-identified unless certain circumstances applied, to require that such data only be held on a storage medium owned or controlled by a government agency, and to require that the Auditor-General, Information Commissioner and the Privacy Commissioner each conduct a separate review of the Act after two years. However, all of The Greens amendments were opposed by the Government, the Christian Democratic Party and the Shooters and Fishers Party and were negatived, either on the voices or on division.

A Shooters and Fishers Party amendment to require recipients of government sector data containing health or personal information to inform the Privacy Commissioner of any actual or likely contravention of privacy legislation drew unanimous support and was agreed to on the voices.

The bill was reported to the House with the amendment, read a third time and forwarded to the Assembly for concurrence.

### **Fisheries Management Amendment Bill 2015**

The bill originated in the Legislative Council.

*Summary:* The bill contains a range of amendments to the *Fisheries Management Act 1994* designed to benefit the commercial, recreational, charter boat and Aboriginal fishing sectors, improve aquatic habitat and threatened species protection and strengthen biosecurity measures.

*Proceedings:* Debate on the second reading of the bill resumed on 11 November 2015 from 21 October 2015 (see Vol 56/11 of *House in Review* for earlier debate). The Opposition noted that this was a large omnibus bill that sought to make more than 150 amendments of varying degrees of complexity to the Act. The Opposition argued that many significant aspects of the bill's amendments were being left to the regulations and that this would only cause uncertainty and distrust among stakeholders. The Opposition further noted that there were only minor differences between this bill and an earlier iteration which was presented to the Assembly in October 2014 despite the earlier version being used as the basis for targeted consultation with stakeholders. The Opposition stated that despite the bill containing a number of good initiatives, these were outweighed by what it asserted was significant stakeholder dissatisfaction with other elements of the bill, and that on balance it could not support the bill.

In contrast, the Shooters and Fishers Party stated that on balance it could support the bill, on the basis that the Government had undertaken further consultation with stakeholders in the weeks following the bill's introduction and on its understanding of the assurances given by the Minister to stakeholders during those consultations. The Shooters and Fishers Party argued that the bill provides a basis for carrying forward a reform process for the management of the recreational fishing sector. The Shooters and Fishers Party emphasised that it was in effect placing its reputation

with its party constituents on the line and that it was not giving its support to the bill lightly.

While also acknowledging that it contained some positive elements, The Greens did not support the bill on the grounds that to do so would be taken as support for the Minister's eventual structural reform program for the commercial fishing sector, which may or may not come before the House for review. The Greens also foreshadowed amendments related to shark finning and the composition of the Total Allowable Fishing Committee.

The Christian Democratic Party supported the bill, noting that a complex bill of this nature would never be able to satisfy all of the concerns and desires of the numerous stakeholders of the various fishing sectors. The Christian Democratic Party also acknowledged the consultation with stakeholders undertaken by the Government since the introduction of the bill, and argued that the bill should be seen as the start of an ongoing process of reform.

In reply, the Minister reiterated that the bill was not about making decisions on proposed commercial fishing reforms, which will be dealt with at a later time. The Minister argued that overall the bill had received positive feedback from stakeholders, and that on a number of issues he had committed to ongoing consultation with those stakeholders. The Minister stated that the bill would replace a 20-year old statute that was no longer fit for purpose and that the bill would allow for more flexible, streamlined and modern fisheries management.

The second reading of the bill was agreed to.

In the committee stage the Greens sought to broaden the prohibition of shark finning on board a boat in any waters to also include the practice occurring in, on or adjacent to any waters. The Government explained that it opposed the amendment as it could have unintended consequences for fishers and legitimate businesses that process sharks adjacent to waters, and noted that the issue could be addressed through regulation at a later date. The amendment drew the support of the Animal Justice Party only and was negatived (Division 6:29). The Greens also unsuccessfully sought by amendment to ensure that the Total Allowable Fishing Committee included a representative with expertise in marine biology and environment conservation.

The bill was reported without amendment, read a third time and forwarded to the Assembly for concurrence.

### **Courts and Other Justice Legislation Amendment Bill 2015**

The bill originated in the Legislative Assembly.

*Summary:* The bill makes a range of amendments to various courts and justice legislation.

*Proceedings:* Debate on the second reading of the bill commenced on 12 November 2015. The Parliamentary Secretary (Mr Clarke) incorporated his second reading speech into Hansard. In that speech the Parliamentary Secretary detailed the various provisions of the bill, and stated that the proposed provisions were part of the

Government's regular legislative review and monitoring program.

The Opposition stated that this kind of legislation is usually technical and minor in nature and that they did not oppose those aspects of the bill. However, the Opposition argued that the bill contained one controversial provision, in that it provided authority not only to certain officers of the Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC) and the Police Integrity Commission (PIC), but blanket authority to all public officers engaged or working for a range of agencies, as listed in the Criminal Procedure Regulation 2010, to bring forward a criminal prosecution by way of a court attendance notice. The Opposition stated that it did not support such a substantial change without proper public consideration, and foreshadowed amendments to the provisions of the bill regarding the proposed new power, and to allow for a limited role for the ICAC in bringing prosecutions under the supervision of the Director of Public Prosecutions.

The Greens also stated that while they supported the royal commission powers of the ICAC, they did not support these agencies having the power to commence criminal prosecutions, stating that checks and balances were needed for agencies which have extensive powers, though a clear separation between those agencies and criminal courts. The Greens also foreshadowed amendments in committee concerning this aspect of the bill.

The Christian Democratic Party also expressed concerns concerning the operation of the ICAC and the PIC, stating that they would support the bill following amendments to those provisions.

The second reading was agreed to.

In the committee stage the Opposition moved an amendment so that an officer of the Police Integrity Commission does not have the power to commence proceedings for an offence. The amendment also provided that an officer of the ICAC does not have the power to commence proceedings for an offence unless the Director of Public Prosecutions has advised the ICAC in writing that the proceedings may be commenced. The Greens moved amendments to the Opposition amendments, arguing that they were not strong enough in their wording and sought to make it clear that bodies with royal commission powers should never be able to commence prosecutions. The Government did not oppose the Opposition amendments, noting that they did not create a new system but made an existing system transparent. The Christian Democratic Party supported the Opposition amendments. The Government opposed the amendments of The Greens as did the Opposition.

The amendments of The Greens were negatived, however the Opposition amendments were agreed to. The bill was reported to the House with the amendments.

Speaking to the third reading, The Greens stated that they remained opposed to the bill. The third reading was agreed to and the bill was returned to the Assembly for consideration of the Council's amendments.

## Disallowance of delegated legislation

**Note:** The Legislative Council may disallow pieces of delegated legislation such as statutory rules and instruments under Part 6 of the *Interpretation Act 1987* or under the provisions of the primary act.

### Disallowance of sections [2], [3] and [4] of Schedule 1 of the Game and Feral Animal Control Amendment (Native Game Birds) Regulation 2015 (Mr Shoebridge, The Greens)

*Summary:* The regulation allows native game birds to be hunted at night under the authority of a native game bird management licence if the birds are in the immediate vicinity of, or are reasonably likely to adversely impact on a planted crop, and sufficient lighting is used to identify the birds being hunted. Currently a licensed hunter is required to have the written permission of the holder of a native game bird management licence to hunt native game birds on the licence holder's land. The regulation provides that this permission need not be in writing. The regulation also provides that an application for a restricted game hunting licence must be refused if the applicant has in the 10 years prior to the application been found guilty of an offence under sec 68 of the *Forestry Act 2012* (which relates to unauthorised hunting and use of firearms in forestry areas).

The disallowance motion sought to disallow sections [2], [3] and [4] of the Regulation. Section [2] relates to the allowance of hunting of native game birds at night, while sections [3] and [4] relate to the giving of permission by a holder of a native game bird management licence.

*Proceedings:* The House agreed that the motion proceed as business of the House on 10 November 2015. In speaking to the disallowance motion, Mr Shoebridge argued that the introduction of licensed hunting at night would inevitably lead to a significant increase in the number of protected native ducks mistakenly injured and killed, and noted that no other Australian jurisdiction allows night time hunting. The Greens further argued that native ducks pose only a negligible risk to the State's rice crop and that the number of native ducks injured and killed as part of the game bird mitigation program is disproportionate to that risk. The Animal Justice Party supported the motion, arguing that the current program of native game bird management results in too many birds suffering slow and lingering deaths and that non-lethal crop protection alternatives need to be found.

The Government, the Opposition, the Christian Democratic Party and the Shooters and Fishers Party all opposed the motion on the grounds that the regulation represented reasonable amendments to the native game bird mitigation program to help protect the State's annual \$800 million rice crop. It was noted that the regulation arose from a one year review of the mitigation program and was a direct response to concerns raised by rice growers who argued that the current program was ineffective in protecting crops as the majority of damage was incurred at night. The Opposition stressed that the regulation was a crop protection measure and could not be construed as a return to pre-1995 duck hunting.

The disallowance motion was negatived (Division 6:33), with the Animal Justice Party joining the Greens in

voting for the motion and the Government, Opposition, Christian Democratic Party and the Shooters and Fishers Party voting against the motion. The regulation remains in force.

## Private members' business

**Note:** Private members' business is business introduced by members of the House other than Government ministers. There are two types of private members' business: private members' bills and private members' motions.

### Motions taken as formal business

The following items of private members' business were agreed to as formal business without amendment or debate:

- (1) Repton Public School 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary (Mrs Maclaren-Jones)
- (2) Katoomba Men's Shed 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary (Mrs Maclaren-Jones)
- (3) 'Beyond The Father's Shadow' film launch (Dr Faruqi)
- (4) Hindu Council of Australia Deepavali Fair (Mr Clarke)
- (5) Gunnedah White Ribbon mosaic (Mrs Mitchell)
- (6) 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Greek National Day celebrations (Mr Clarke)
- (7) Royal Australian Historical Society (Mr Clarke)
- (8) Indian Support Centre Inc. (Mr Clarke)
- (9) Council of Indian Australians Inc. Deepavali Fair (Mr Clarke)
- (10) Indonesian peatland and forest fires and palm oil (Dr Kaye)
- (11) 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary Kangaroo March re-enactment (Mr Amato)
- (12) NSW Parliamentary Library 175<sup>th</sup> anniversary (Mrs Maclaren-Jones)
- (13) HIA-CSR Hunter Housing Awards (Mr MacDonald)
- (14) TAFE NSW Gili Awards (Mr MacDonald)
- (15) Sydney Fish Market (Mr Franklin)
- (16) State Emergency Services Hunter awards ceremony (Mr MacDonald)
- (17) Grandmothers Against Removals (Mr Shoebridge)
- (18) Compass Housing (Mr MacDonald)
- (19) South Coast Waratahs Recruitment March 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary (Mrs Maclaren-Jones)
- (20) Liverpool Plains Youth (Mr Buckingham)
- (21) Passing of John Davis and Carolyn and Richard Green (Mr Buckingham)
- (22) Passing of John George Kaye (Dr Kaye)

(23) NSW Youth Frontiers (Mr Franklin).

## Petitions

*Petition received*

- (1) National Partnership Agreement on Skills Reform – 1032 signatures (presented Dr Kaye).

## Reports tabled

**Information and Privacy Commission:** Annual Report for year ended 30 June 2015.

**Advocate for Children and Young People:** Annual Report for the period 9 January 2015 to 30 June 2015.

**Domestic Violence Death Review Team:** Annual Report for the period July 2013 to June 2015.

**Inspector of the Police Integrity Commission:** Annual Report for year ended 30 June 2015.

**Inspector of the Independent Commission Against Corruption:** Annual Report for year ended 30 June 2015.

**Auditor-General:** Performance Audit Report of the Acting Auditor-General entitled 'Activity Based Funding Data Quality: NSW Health', November 2015.

## Committee activities

**Note:** Committee activities includes committee references, reports tabled, debate on committee reports, government responses received and any other significant committee activity in the House. Committee activity as part of a current inquiry is summarised in the following section entitled 'Inquiry activities'.

*Committee report tabled*

**Legislation Review Committee:** 'Legislation Review Digest No. 10 of 2015', 10 November 2015

*Committee reports debated*

**General Purpose Standing Committee No. 3:** The House continued the take-note debate on Report No. 31 entitled 'Progress of the Ombudsman's investigation "Operation Prospect"', August 2015.

**General Purpose Standing Committee No. 3:** The House continued the take-note debate on Report No. 32 entitled 'Registered nurses in New South Wales nursing homes', October 2015.

**General Purpose Standing Committee No. 6:** The House continued the take-note debate on Report No. 1 entitled 'Local Government in New South Wales', October 2015.

## Inquiry activities

**Select Committee on the Legislative Council committee system**

On 4 November the committee published a discussion paper to assist stakeholders in making a submission. The closing date for submissions is 6 March 2016.

## Law and Justice Committee

*Inquiry into the security classification and management of inmates sentenced to life imprisonment*

The committee has received 32 submissions and will hold a public hearing in Sydney on 23 November 2015.

*Inquiry into remedies for the serious invasion of privacy in New South Wales*

The committee will hold its second and final public hearing in Sydney on Monday, 16 November 2015.

## State Development Committee

*Inquiry into economic development in Aboriginal communities*

The committee has received 14 submissions and has extended the submission closing date to 14 February 2016. The committee anticipates holding hearings and site visits in the first half of 2016.

*Regional planning processes in NSW*

The closing date for submissions is 11 December 2015. The committee anticipates holding hearings from March 2016.

## Social Issues Committee

*Inquiry into service coordination in communities with high social needs*

The committee visited Bourke on 5 November 2015 and held its final public hearing in Sydney on 6 November 2015. The committee is now drafting its final report, which will be tabled by 11 December 2015.

## General Purpose Standing Committee No. 2

*Inquiry into elder abuse in New South Wales*

The closing date for submissions is 15 November 2015. The committee will hold its first public hearing in Sydney on 20 November 2015.

## General Purpose Standing Committee No. 3

*Inquiry into reparations for the stolen generations in New South Wales*

The committee held its first public hearing in Sydney on 5 November and a hearing and site visit in Wagga Wagga on 6 November 2015. The committee will be having a public hearing and site visit in Kempsey and Grafton on 7 and 8 December 2015.

## General Purpose Standing Committee No 6

*Inquiry into vocational education and training in New South Wales*

The committee has completed all of the hearings scheduled for this inquiry. The committee's final report is due to be tabled by 15 December 2015.

## Adjournment debate

### Tuesday 10 November 2015

Agricultural education (Mr Colless); Travelling stock routes (Mr Veitch); Automotive industry (Mr Amato); Gross domestic product growth (Mr Mookhey); Fernhill Estate subdivision (Mr Shoebridge).

### Wednesday 11 November 2015

Remembrance Day (Mrs Houssos); Climate change (Ms Barham); Northern Rivers Arts (Mr Franklin); Fit for the Future (Mr Primrose); Australian-Indonesia relationship (Mr Borsak); The Greens (Ms Cusack).

### Thursday 12 November 2015

Heywire competition (Mrs Taylor); Coal industry (Mr Buckingham); Tribute to the Hon Paul O'Grady, a former member of the Legislative Council (Ms Voltz); Retail trading laws (Mr Green); HMAS Sydney (*IV*) (Mrs Maclaren-Jones); Drug abuse and addiction (Mr Wong).

## Feedback on *House in Review*

We welcome any comments you might have on this publication.

We are particularly keen to know which parts of the *House in Review* you find most useful and whether you have any suggestions for improvement. Please email your comments to [stephen.frappell@parliament.nsw.gov.au](mailto:stephen.frappell@parliament.nsw.gov.au).

All responses will be kept strictly confidential.



David Blunt  
Clerk of the Parliaments