

NEW SOUTH WALES LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

HOUSE IN REVIEW

Volume 56/44

*Sitting period
19 to 21 September 2017*



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 New South Wales Parliament website 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.

Overview

This week three government bills were agreed to and four private members' bills (three of these being cognate bills) were introduced. One private member's bill, as well as the *provisions* of one government bill, were referred to Portfolio Committee No. 1 for inquiry and report. The House debated two disallowance motions and a private member's motion.

Much of the House's time this week was spent debating the [Retail Trading Amendment \(Boxing Day\) Bill 2017](#). A number of interesting and some complex issues arose during debate on the bill and on the following day, after the bill had been agreed to. These issues included pairing arrangements, the casting vote of the chair, a matter of privilege, a rescission motion, a protest against the passing of the bill lodged by the Opposition and forwarded to the Governor, and a delay in the return of the bill to the Legislative Assembly.

One of the private members' bills introduced this week was the [Voluntary Assisted Dying Bill 2017](#). This particular bill has been developed by a cross-party parliamentary working group and if passed would give terminally ill people the legal right to end their own lives with medical assistance.

The House stands adjourned until Tuesday 10 October 2017.

Motion to disallow a regulation on the management of native vegetation

On Wednesday 20 September 2017, Dr Faruqi (The Greens) moved a motion to disallow the [Local Land Services Amendment \(Land Management—Native Vegetation\) Regulation 2017](#). The Regulation amends Schedule 5A to the *Local Land Services Act 2013*, which lists activities for which native vegetation may be cleared, and deals with other aspects of native vegetation management including regulatory maps and management codes.

The Greens argued that the Regulation will reduce biodiversity, lead to the destruction of native wildlife, conflicts with attempts to combat climate change, and does not reflect many of the submissions received during the consultation process. Particular concerns were expressed in relation to provisions regarding self-assessable codes for land clearing and biodiversity off-sets which enable cleared vegetation to be off-set by an area of revegetation which the Greens argued may not be comparable to what is being lost.

The Opposition supported the motion stating that many farmers are concerned about aspects of the Regulation including the way in which the consultation process was conducted, the capacity of Local Land Services to implement the reforms, the regulatory maps and the fees associated with the compliance

regime. The Animal Justice Party also supported the motion questioning how it was possible to address the decline in biodiversity by removing long established habitats.

The Government opposed the motion arguing that the Regulation takes a balanced approach which was informed by an independent expert panel and an extensive consultation process with the aim of arresting the decline in biodiversity and facilitating ecologically sustainable development. Particular aspects of the Regulation highlighted by the minister include additional protections for core koala habitats and caps on the amount of land that can be cleared.

The disallowance motion was negated on division (16:21).

Motion to disallow the ClubGRANTS guidelines

On 20 September 2017, Mr Field (the Greens) moved a motion to disallow the ClubGRANTS guidelines for the ClubGRANTS scheme established under the *Gaming Machine Tax Act 2001* (the Act). The ClubGRANTS scheme was established to provide that registered clubs contribute to three categories of local community projects: welfare and social services; sporting and cultural programs; and community infrastructure projects. Under the Act the Independent Liquor and Gaming Authority may grant registered clubs a tax rebate provided that the Authority is satisfied that a certain amount of their gaming machine profits have been spent on community development. The regulation amends the ClubGRANTS scheme to enable registered clubs to use the profits from gaming machine revenue to fund a wider range of local infrastructure projects for community care. The regulation also reduces the administrative and reporting requirements that registered clubs previously had to follow so as to be eligible for the tax rebate.

Speaking to the motion, Mr Field argued that if clubs are to be given gaming machine profit tax rebates then priority must be accorded to programs that seek to minimise and prevent gambling harm. Mr Field expressed concern that the regulation instead allows registered clubs to grow their business by establishing and/or improving their community care infrastructure. Under the regulation registered clubs will be able to build facilities for aged care, disability care, mental health services and childcare and then lease those facilities to accredited third-parties to operate them. Mr Field stated that this means registered clubs will be able to use the gaming machine tax rebate to build infrastructure linked to their club, which will attract patrons some of whom are at risk of gambling harm. Mr Field's other main concern was that the ClubGRANTS scheme had become less transparent because the reporting and administrative requirements on clubs have been reduced.

The Government opposed the motion on the basis that the amendments to the ClubGRANTS guidelines will enable more funding to be given to community care projects. The Parliamentary Secretary (Mr Farlow) stated that there is a significant shortfall in the provision of community care services and argued that because registered clubs are not-for-profit organisations, established for the community good, they are well positioned to address this need. The Opposition also opposed the motion on the basis that the amendments to the ClubGRANTS guidelines had been recommended by the McKell Institute – an independent think tank – that in 2014 released a report that examined the role clubs can play in helping address the gap in community care services.

The motion was defeated on division (6:31) with the Greens and Animal Justice Party supporting the motion and the Government, Opposition, Shooters, Farmers and Fishers Party and Christian Democratic Party voting against the disallowance.

Government business

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

[Retail Trading Amendment \(Boxing Day\) Bill 2017](#)

House of origin: Legislative Assembly

In 2015, the Parliament enacted the Retail Trading Amendment Bill 2015, which amended the *Retail Trading Act 2008* to allow shops and banks to open on Boxing Day and to allow banks to open on the Bank Holiday and certain public holidays. Shops and banks may open on those days only if they are staffed by persons who have freely elected to work on those days.

Before it became law, the Retail Trading Amendment Bill 2015 was amended in the Council to, among other things, impose a sunset clause on the provisions of the bill which would lapse following an independent review which was to take place after 1 February 2017. The review was completed this year by Professor Percy Allan AM.

The Retail Trading Amendment (Boxing Day) Bill 2017 amends the *Retail Trading Act 2008* to remove the sunset clause of 1 December 2017 and thus make permanent the removal of the previous trading restrictions.

The second reading speech of the Parliamentary Secretary (Mr MacDonald) was incorporated into Hansard. The Parliamentary Secretary's speech noted that Professor Allan's review consulted widely with and received submissions from stakeholders and found that the extension of Boxing Day trading in 2015 and 2016 was a success. The speech advised that the Government agreed to Professor Allan's recommendations to retain the amendments permitting trading on Boxing Day and that print, broadcast and social media be used to publicise that no one is obliged to work on Boxing Day and that pressuring someone to do so is subject to heavy penalties. The speech concluded that the reforms to make Boxing Day trading available to all retailers were introduced on the premise of providing opportunity and choice.

The Opposition strongly opposed the bill arguing that it will result in retail workers and their families permanently losing valuable shared time and community time, while not delivering any economic benefit. The Opposition contended that the additional day of trading would see no net increase in sales or wages spending over the December-January period, while negatively affecting those members of the community who rely on two consecutive days of holiday in order to reconnect meaningfully with their families. The Opposition argued that the notion of meaningful choice for casual workers whether to work on Boxing Day was flawed and noted that the two-year review found that there had been no prosecutions despite evidence of coercion by employers and that the level of fines did not act as a disincentive.

The Greens also strongly opposed the bill, noting that despite the protections provided for workers the Allan review found that ten per cent of workers who declined to work on Boxing Day suffered a negative consequence from their employer. The Greens emphasised that in reality casual workers are not in a position to complain and seek to have their employers prosecuted for coercing them to work.

The Animal Justice Party opposed the bill and suggested that the Allan review and survey did not really tease out the negative social impacts of the two year trial of Boxing Day trading.

During the debate, members from the Opposition and the Greens criticised the Christian Democratic Party (CDP) for its support of the 2015 bill, arguing that the community would expect the CDP to protect family time over the religiously significant Christmas period.

The CDP stated that it supported the bill as it was founded on the principle of choice and was particularly beneficial to tourist centres. The CDP emphasised that Boxing Day was a secular holiday that held no religious significance. The CDP acknowledged that it had received and considered a number of representations from various church and community leaders who were concerned about the bill, but believed that the concerns expressed were misplaced. The CDP moved an amendment to the second reading of the bill to – without halting the progress of the bill – have the provisions of the bill referred to Portfolio Committee No. 1 for inquiry and report, (curiously) with that inquiry to commence in October 2019.

The amendment proposed by the Christian Democratic Party was agreed to and the bill was read a second time (Division 16:14).

At the commencement of the committee stage, an amendment circulated by The Greens which called for the House to gather each Boxing Day to debate the impact of the bill was ruled out of order.

The Opposition sought to have the protections for employees who refuse or fail to work on Boxing Day fall under the application of Section 210 of the *Industrial Relations Act 1996* and to set minimum penalties and provide for on-the-spot fines for employers who commit an offence. Despite the support of The Greens, the Shooters, Fishers and Farmers Party, and the Animal Justice Party the amendments were narrowly defeated on division (14:15).

The Opposition then sought to extend by two years the current sunset provisions, rather than remove them as provided for in the bill, so that they would continue until 1 December 2019. These amendments again drew support from the same three cross-bench parties and also the support of a Government member who crossed the floor, but were ultimately defeated after an equality of votes on division (15:15), with the Chair voting against the amendments on the principle of maintaining the bill in its original form. However, there was some controversy in relation to the granting of pairs for this vote.

The bill was reported without amendment, and read a third time. The Opposition and the Greens spoke in the third reading debate reiterating their opposition to the passage of the bill. Both parties acknowledged the close and controversial nature of the vote on the Opposition amendments seeking to extend the sunset clause, with the Greens arguing that, while the Opposition amendments were negated in accordance with the convention on the exercise of the chair's casting vote, the equality of votes on division (15:15) did not truly reflect the will of the majority of the House and on that basis the third reading should be opposed. Nevertheless, the third reading was agreed to (Division 15:13) late on Wednesday night.

At the start of the day on Thursday morning the President reported that a Protest against the passing of the bill had been lodged by seven members of the Opposition and in accordance with the standing orders would be forwarded to the Governor. Later in the morning a member of the Opposition (Ms Sharpe) while raising a point of privilege requested that the return of the bill to the Assembly be delayed while negotiations between the Government and the Opposition continued regarding what had transpired in the House the previous night (the issue being whether or not any further proceedings might take place in relation to the legislation). The President agreed to delay the return of the bill.

Later again Ms Sharpe moved that the decision of the House to agree to the third reading of the bill be rescinded, with a view to the bill being recommitted to the committee of the whole and the Opposition amendments on reinstating a sunset period being considered again. The motion was supported by The Greens and the Animal Justice Party but was defeated on division (15:18) with the Government and the Christian Democratic Party voting against the motion.

Following the delay, the President advised that the bill would now be returned to the Assembly without amendment.

[Justice Legislation Amendment Bill \(No 2\) 2017](#)

House of origin: Legislative Assembly

Justice Legislation Amendment bills are typically omnibus bills that amend various Acts relating to courts and crimes and other related matters. This is the second such bill introduced in 2017, with the previous bill considered by the House in August (see volume 56/42 of *House in Review*). The amendments in this bill include provisions relating to 22 separate Acts and a regulation.

In his second reading speech, the Parliamentary Secretary (Mr Clarke) stated that the bill will update and improve the operation of the justice system by improving the efficiency and operation of legislation affecting the courts and other Justice portfolio agencies. In addition, the Parliamentary Secretary stated that a number of amendments related to legislation in the Premier's portfolio.

The Opposition did not oppose the bill, indicating that it contained miscellaneous and purportedly comparatively minor amendments to a number of Acts and regulations.

The Greens cited with approval many of the amendments in the bill but foreshadowed amendments in the committee stage with respect to the proposed changes to the *Drug Misuse and Trafficking Act 1985* and the *Members of Parliament Staff Act 2013*. The Greens noted the concern of the Bar Association with respect to a provision relating to the ability to validate and have applied retrospectively changes to penalties listed in Schedule 1 of the *Drug Misuse and Trafficking Act 1985*. The Greens argued that any retrospective change of the criminal law should be dealt with in a substantive rather than an omnibus bill, and foreshadowed an amendment to omit that section from the bill during the committee stage.

The Christian Democratic Party and the Animal Justice Party supported various provisions in the bill. The AJP drew attention to the provision to broaden the definition of a law enforcement officer, for the purposes of making it an offence to intimidate or harass such an officer, to include an officer of an approved charitable organisation within the meaning of the *Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1979*. The AJP highlighted the need for such officers to be held to the same level of public accountability as law enforcement officers.

The second reading was agreed to.

In the committee stage, the Government opposed the Greens' amendment that sought to omit a section of the bill relating to Schedule 1 of the *Drug Misuse and Trafficking Act 1985*. The Government advised that the section in question had been inserted on the advice of Parliamentary Counsel who had identified the need to retrospectively validate a number of regulations that had inserted new penalties into Schedule 1. The Government advised that there would be no practical retrospective application of the validated penalties. The amendment was negated on the voices.

In relation to amendments to the Members of Parliament Staff Act 2013, The Greens were also unsuccessful in seeking to increase the threshold level, from misconduct to serious misconduct, that provides a Presiding Officer with the powers to terminate or suspend the service of a staff member of a member of Parliament. While garnering the support of the Opposition, the amendments were negated on the voices.

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

[Parramatta Park Trust Amendment \(Western Sydney Stadium\) Bill 2017](#)

House of origin: Legislative Council

The bill amends the Parramatta Park Trust Act 2001 to enable land to be swapped between the Parramatta Park Trust and Venues NSW in connection with the development of the Western Sydney Stadium, to enable trust lands to be leased for the purposes of an aquatic leisure centre, and for other related purposes.

Debate resumed from 13 September 2017 (see earlier House in Review 56/43 for the details of the Minister's second reading speech).

The Opposition opposed the bill. The Opposition called for Wisteria Gardens to be incorporated into Parramatta Park if the Government removes the Parramatta War Memorial Swimming Pool, arguing that this is a reasonable land swap that will add to the value of the park. The Opposition criticised the Government for including 20,000 square metres of commercial space in the Stadium plan. The Opposition foreshadowed amendments designed to limit the amount of green space lost due to the development of the aquatic centre.

The Greens also opposed the bill on the grounds that the people of Parramatta should not face a choice between the loss of open space or the loss of the pool. In addition, the Greens called for more measures to

protect green open spaces. Furthermore, the Greens did not favour the proposed land swap, on the basis that it will lead to public lands passing to private entities.

The Christian Democratic Party (CDP) supported the bill, stating that the construction of the Stadium will benefit the local economy. The CDP also supported the construction of a new aquatic leisure centre as it would benefit young people and promote physical, mental and social well-being.

The second reading of the bill was agreed to.

In committee, the Opposition's amendments regarding the transfer of Wisteria Gardens to the Parramatta Park and the transfer of land to the aquatic leisure centre were defeated on division (16:18), with The Greens, Animal Justice Party and Shooters, Farmers and Fishers Party in support.

The third reading was agreed to on division (18:16) and the bill was provided to the Assembly without amendment.

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.

Bills

[Voluntary Assisted Dying Bill 2017](#) (Mr Khan, the Nationals – co-sponsored by Dr Faruqi, the Greens and Ms Voltz, ALP)

House of origin: Legislative Council

The bill seeks to provide a legislative framework to enable terminally ill persons to request and receive assistance to end their lives voluntarily.

The framework establishes a right for an eligible person to request assistance from a medical practitioner to end their life. A person is eligible to make a request for assistance if the person is at least 25 years of age, ordinarily a resident of New South Wales, suffering from a terminal illness as a result of which the person will die within 12 months in the reasonable judgment of a medical practitioner, and is experiencing severe pain, suffering or physical incapacity to an extent unacceptable to the person.

In his second reading speech, Mr Khan indicated that the bill has been developed by the New South Wales Parliamentary Working Group on Assisted Dying, a cross-party group of members who have come together in a bipartisan manner to provide terminally ill patients, whose deaths are imminent, the choice to end their lives on their own terms.

Mr Khan stated that the bill follows the conservative Oregon model of voluntary assisted dying and not the broader European models of voluntary euthanasia. Under the Oregon framework, only terminally ill patients with less than six months to live are able to request a medical practitioner's assistance for the self-administration of a substance to end their own life, after having been examined by two doctors and assessed as making their decision voluntarily. Mr Khan stated that the Oregon framework has been in place for over 20 years and has not led to an excessive number of assisted dying procedures, with the scheme accounting for less than one half of one percent of deaths in that state.

Mr Khan also spoke of the evidence from the Victorian Coroner of the horrendous circumstances in which people with irreversible physical health conditions, predominantly over 65, currently take their own lives in Victoria, including death through the use of poison, firearms, inhalation of toxic fumes, sharp instruments and on the railways. He cited the case of Annie Gabrielides, the face of Dying with Dignity NSW's campaign for voluntary assisted dying, and the circumstances of his own father's death, while acknowledging that for some voluntary assisted dying advocates, the bill does not go far enough. He concluded by thanking the members of the Parliamentary Working Group – Lynda Voltz, Mehreen Faruqi,

Lee Evans and Alex Greenwich – and the assistance of many others in the preparation of the bill, including Dying with Dignity NSW and the Parliamentary Counsel.

Debate was adjourned for five calendar days.

[Alcoholic Beverages Advertising Prohibition Bill 2015](#) (Revd. Mr Nile, the Christian Democratic Party)

House of origin: Legislative Council

Debate resumed from 10 September 2015. The bill seeks to prohibit advertising and other promotional activities aimed at increasing alcohol sales. (See previous edition of [House in Review](#) for an outline of Revd Nile's second reading speech).

The Greens broadly supported the bill and noted that alcohol related harm can do great damage to the community. The Greens also argued that the House should further consider how alcohol advertising works and expressed concern that the bill may disproportionately affect certain industry groups, such as small bars. To that end, the Greens moved an amendment to the second reading to refer the bill to Portfolio Committee No. 1—Premier and Finance for inquiry and report.

The Opposition also broadly supported the bill, but argued that any alcohol advertising prohibition should be developed through a proper and rigorous consultation process. For that reason the Opposition supported the bill's referral to Portfolio Committee No. 1 which was subsequently agreed to on the voices.

[Environmental Planning and Assessment \(Addressing Climate Change\) Bill 2017](#) and cognates [Local Government Amendment \(Climate Change\) Bill 2017](#) and [Preservation of Trees and Public Open Space \(Miscellaneous Legislation Amendment\) Bill 2017](#) (Mr Shoebridge, The Greens)

The object of the bills is to ensure that State and local government planning and development processes take actions to help minimise the impacts of climate change. The Environmental Planning and Assessment Amendment (Addressing Climate Change) Bill seeks to ensure that climate change is taken into consideration when environmental planning instruments are made and when applications for development are approved or assessed. The Local Government Amendment (Climate Change) Bill seeks to require councils to prepare five-year climate change action plans, exercise their functions in a manner that helps address the impacts of climate change, and allow councils to enter into environmental upgrade agreements. The Preservation of Trees and Public Open Space (Miscellaneous Legislation Amendment) Bill encourages, through a range of means, the preservation of trees in urban areas and provides for the preservation of public green space by allowing Parliament to disallow any sale, lease or other dealing with public green space by a council.

In his second reading speech, Mr Shoebridge said the bills would put climate change into the state's planning laws, empower local councils to plan for climate change and to create enforceable tree-canopy targets across Sydney and other major urban areas. Mr Shoebridge said that the provisions in the bills would help transform New South Wales and set it on a path to meeting the globally agreed Paris targets of a maximum 1.5 degrees to 2 degrees of global warming. Mr Shoebridge asserted that climate change is and remains the largest political and moral challenge of our time, and that in New South Wales the planning system is one of the biggest parts of the problem, whereas it needs to be one of the biggest parts of the solution. Mr Shoebridge said the bills are a key means to change the planning system so that it positively contributes to the reduction in the intensity of greenhouse emissions from new development, which will be vital in a climate constrained future.

Debate was adjourned for five calendar days.

Motions

M5 South West road toll (Mr Mookhey, Australian Labor Party)

The motion called on the House to note that despite the M5 South West toll being due to be lifted in 2026, the Government is negotiating to extend the toll beyond that date and privatise the toll concession as part of the sale of the Sydney Motorway Corporation. The motion asserted that the sale is taking place in order to raise additional funds to pay for planning mistakes and cost blowouts on the WestConnex project, which are said to be due to the mismanagement of the Government. The motion also called on the House to note that despite the possible retention of the toll, the Government is not planning any new service or modification to the M5 South West and motorists from South Western Sydney will be tolled for 40 more years in exchange for no additional service.

In speaking to the motion, Mr Mookhey argued that the expectation among the community and the Opposition was that in 2026 the cost for the construction and subsequent upgrades of the M5 would have been recovered and the road would return to public ownership and the toll would be removed. Mr Mookhey contended that at the very least if the toll was to remain, the community would expect that the proceeds would go into the public purse. Mr Mookhey condemned the Government for what he argued was its secretive behaviour in negotiating an extension of the toll and in the transfer of ownership of the toll concession to the Sydney Motorway Corporation. Mr Mookhey alleged that the Government was seeking to breach its own oft-cited policy of no new toll for no new service.

Members of the Government opposed the motion, arguing that the motion ignored the massive infrastructure upgrade to the connected road network that will bring improved service times to all of the M5. Government members criticised the Opposition for bringing on such a motion given that it had failed to deliver infrastructure when it had been in government. The Government also refuted the assertion that consideration of the extension of the M5 West toll had been conducted in secret.

The Greens supported the motion, agreeing with the premise that the toll on the M5 South West was being extended in order to pay for the Government's financial mismanagement. The Greens argued that the Government was addicted to the use of toll roads and that this was placing an increasingly unbearable financial burden on motorists, particularly those who had to drive for or to get to work.

The motion was negated on division (15:18) with the Opposition, The Greens and Animal Justice Party voting for the motion and the Government and the Christian Democratic Party voting against.

Motions taken as formal business

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

- (1) 70th anniversary of Indian Independence Day (Mr Martin).
- (2) White Rakhi Project (Dr Faruqi).
- (3) 45th anniversary of Ballina's Fox Street Preschool (Mr Franklin).
- (4) Rural Outback Animal Rescue (Mr Pearson).

Committee activities

Committee reports tabled

Portfolio Committee No. 3 - Education: 'Education of students with a disability or special needs in New South Wales', Report No. 37, dated 21 September 2017.

Legislation Review Committee: 'Legislation Review Digest No. 43/56', dated 19 September 2017.

Committee on the Independent Commission Against Corruption: 'Review of the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 Annual Reports of the ICAC Inspector', dated September 2017.

Joint Standing Committee on Road Safety (Staysafe): ‘Driver education, training and road safety’, dated September 2017.

Committee reports debated

Standing Committee on Law and Justice: The House concluded the take note debate on Report No. 61 entitled ‘First review of the Dust Diseases scheme’, dated August 2017.

Standing Committee on Law and Justice: The House continued the take note debate on Report No. 62 entitled ‘First review of the Lifetime Care and Support scheme’, dated August 2017.

Government response

General Purpose Standing Committee No. 3: Response received to the report entitled ‘Child protection’, tabled 16 March 2017, received out of session and authorised to be printed on 18 September 2017.

Inquiry activities

Select Committee on Human Trafficking

The committee has received 28 submissions and held five hearings and is due to report in October.

Select Committee on Electricity Supply, Demand and Prices in New South Wales

The closing date for submissions is 16 October 2017. The committee will hold its first hearing on 31 October, with a second hearing scheduled for 17 November 2017.

Standing Committee on State Development

Inquiry into regional development and a global Sydney

The committee has received 37 submissions and has held hearings in Sydney, Nowra, Orange, the Tweed and Armidale. Further regional visits and hearings will be held in the coming months.

Defence industry in New South Wales

The committee has received 36 submissions and has held six public hearings. The committee will conduct further regional visits in October 2017 and intends to publish a discussion paper toward the end of the year.

Standing Committee on Law and Justice

Statutory review of the State Insurance and Care Governance Act 2015

The committee commenced this review on 19 September 2017, and will be accepting submissions until Tuesday 31 October 2017.

Portfolio Committee No. 1 – Premier and Finance: The House referred to the committee an inquiry into the Alcoholic Beverages Advertising Prohibition Bill 2015.

Portfolio Committee No. 2 – Health and Community Services

Inquiry into road tolling

The report is currently being drafted. The committee is expected to report by November 2017.

Portfolio Committee No. 3 – Education

Inquiry into students with disability or special needs in New South Wales schools

The committee tabled its report on 21 September 2017.

Portfolio Committee No. 4 – Legal Affairs

Inquiry into museums and galleries

The committee is considering holding a further hearing. The report is due to be tabled by 1 March 2018.

Emergency services agencies

The committee has received more than 170 submissions to date. The committee held two public hearings on Monday 18 and Friday 22 September 2017.

Fire and emergency services levy

The closing date for submissions is 26 November 2017.

Portfolio Committee No. 5 – Industry and Transport

Inquiry into water augmentation for rural and regional New South Wales

The committee has received 116 submissions and held 11 hearings in Sydney and regional areas. The committee will hold its next hearing in Sydney on 20 November 2017.

Portfolio Committee No. 6 – Planning and Environment

Inquiry into energy from waste technology

The committee will conduct a hearing and site visit in October.

Reports tabled

Auditor General: ‘Energy Rebates for Low Income Households: Department of Planning and Environment’, dated September 2017.

Adjournment debate

Tuesday 19 September 2017

Animal Welfare (Mr Pearson); Regional New South Wales (Mr Colless); 2016 Census (Mr Wong); Local Government Elections (Ms Cusack); Local Government Elections (Mr Shoebridge); Electricity Prices and Maternity Leave (Mrs Houssos).

Wednesday 20 September 2017

Cootamundra By-Election (Mr Veitch); Aged Care (Ms Walker); Local Government Elections (Mrs Taylor); Euthanasia/Assisted Suicide (Mr Donnelly); Energy Security (Mr Borsak); Henty Machinery Field Days (Mrs Taylor); Members of Parliament Conduct (Dr Phelps).

Thursday 21 September 2017

Tribute to Hannah Rye (Mr MacDonald); Remount Program (Mr Green); Medical Practitioners Mental Health (Mr Amato); West Wallsend Butterfly Cave and NSW Aboriginal Land Council Fortieth Anniversary (Ms Sharpe); Marriage Equality Plebiscite (Mr Clarke); Personal Freedom (Ms Voltz).

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.

All responses will be kept strictly confidential.



David Blunt
Clerk of the Parliaments