
Making Honey in the Bear Pit: Parliament and its Impact on Policymaking

Steven Reynolds

Steven Reynolds is Deputy Clerk, NSW Legislative Council¹

Parliamentary politics is often referred to by analogies of warfare, with major parties seen as the warring armies, sometimes assisted by smaller allies in the minor parties:

One of the core features of the traditional Westminster system is a majoritarian electoral system that tends to produce a political system dominated by two large parties. Where single-party majorities are the norm, the political culture treats elections as the winner-takes-all battles between the two great political tribes. The spoils of electoral triumph are near complete control of the legislature and the apparatus of the state for a full parliamentary term.²

Much of this reference to war, battles and tribes reflects the reluctance of writers to search for more original metaphors. However it also conveys that politics is nothing if not a manifestation of human interaction, of which conflict has always been a feature. If Westminster parliaments are an adversarial environment it is not only because its processes facilitate conflict, it is also because each chamber is a room full of human beings acting in groups seeking to dominate other groups in a competition for resources. Political party discipline assists one group in exerting dominance over the other competitor, in response the other major parties adopt similar discipline. Nevertheless, this group discipline also provides the potential for co-operation, if it moves towards an equality of power that prevents one organised party overwhelming smaller, less organised groups.

In his book *The World until Yesterday* Jared Diamond examines in detail patterns of conflict and warfare in tribal societies, and concludes that while conflict is inherent in the human condition it is also not inevitable, and is strongly influenced by external factors:

It is equally fruitless to debate whether humans are intrinsically violent or else intrinsically cooperative. All human societies practise both violence and co-operation; which trait appears to predominate depends on the circumstances.³

-
- 1 The views expressed in this article are those of the author, and do not represent those of the Department of the Legislative Council. The author is grateful for the research assistance of Christine Lammerton, NSW Parliamentary Library and Aneesa Kruyer, parliamentary intern.
 - 2 Paun, Akash "After the age of majority? Multi-party governance and the Westminster model" *Commonwealth & Comparative Politics* Vol 49, No.4, November 2011, 440–441.
 - 3 *The World Until Yesterday* Jared Diamond (2012) Penguin, p157

While warfare is endemic to the human condition, co-operation is equally part of being human. This duality is examined at the conclusion of Steven Pinker's epic examination of the decrease in violence in human society, *The Better Angels of our Nature*.⁴ He discusses the potential trade-offs between aggressive behaviour and co-operative behaviour, and how over time and repeated interactions the greater potential payoffs for both sides of co-operation can be learnt:

Motives like greed, fear, dominance and lust keep drawing us toward aggression. And through a major work around, the threat of tit for tat vengeance, has the potential to bring about co-operation if the game is repeated, in practice it is miscalibrated by self-serving biases and often results in cycles of feuding rather than stable deterrence.

But human nature also contains motives to climb into the peaceful cell, such as sympathy and self-control. It includes channels of communication such as language. And it is equipped with an open-ended system of combinatorial reasoning. When the system is refined in the crucible of debate, and its products are accumulated through literacy and other forms of cultural memory, it can think up ways of changing the payoff structure and make the peaceful cell increasingly attractive⁵

The quote is a fair summary of a typical week in the NSW Parliament. Despite a ferocious reputation as the "Bearpit" the NSW Parliament also sees political parties working together to achieve policy outcomes that benefit that community the members are elected to represent. The co-operation needs to be celebrated, because there is no shortage in attention devoted to its opposite behaviour. In this paper examples are provided in which NSW political parties have used parliamentary processes to act co-operatively to influence policy outcomes. The impact of the party votes in the chamber is considered – is co-operative behaviour more likely in "hung parliaments", and is there a difference between upper and lower houses in this? Finally a case study of the impact of a minor party, with no ability to influence voting outcomes in the chamber is used to further understand the potential for co-operation in current parliaments.

PARLIAMENTARY PROCESSES USED TO CHANGE POLICY BY LEGISLATIVE AMENDMENT

The most effective form of action in any political chamber is to legislate. Parties in government can vary in their approaches – from pushing a bill through both Houses urgently, shutting down debate and ignoring objections and attempts at amendment in the upper chamber, to taking a measured approach with negotiation behind the scenes and on occasions during debate. In NSW the practice has developed of pushing controversial legislation quickly through the Assembly, which governments have dominated since 1995, and leaving attempts to amend bills to consideration

4 (2012) Penguin, p824–840

5 *Ibid*, p 840.

in the Council, where no government has held a majority since 1988. Even here the exercise of the power to legislate has evolved. The paper by David Blunt "Parliamentary speech and the location of decision making"⁶ examines how the process of bills being amended in the NSW Legislative Council has moved from one in which persuasion and deliberation occurs on the floor of the House during debates on bills to a situation where backroom negotiations are instead reported on to the House prior to amendments being agreed to.

The debate on the Public Health (Tobacco) Amendment (E-cigarettes) bill provides a good example of where negotiations and co-operative discussion, conducted by several political parties behind closed doors but alluded to in the final debates, results in an outcome quite different to that originally intended by the party in government. In the process Parliament is seen to be "adding value" to public policy while performing its legislative function (though manufacturers of e-cigarettes would no doubt beg to differ).

The bill in its original form began in the Legislative Assembly, and was reported to the Council on 27 May 2015. The purpose of the bill was to prohibit the sale of e-cigarettes and accessories to minors, on the basis that the potential risks and benefits (if assisting to give up smoking) are not conclusively supported by evidence. Unusually it was amended in the Assembly (to regulate distribution by vending machines) prior to reaching the Council.

During the second reading debate in the Council on 27 May amendments to the bill were circulated by both the Opposition and the Greens, that if agreed to would have the effect of significantly widening the reach of the bill. These amendments included:

- Prohibitions on advertising of e-cigarettes
- Enacting the same restrictions for e-cigarettes as apply to tobacco cigarettes in "smoke-free zones"
- Giving the minister the power to declare by regulation a class of e-cigarettes to be prohibited
- Banning the "vaping" of e-cigarettes in cars when juveniles are in the vehicle

The full impact of these measures was to effectively put e-cigarettes under the same regulatory regime as tobacco products. Significantly during this debate Revd. The Hon Fred Nile of the Christian Democratic Party (CDP) indicated that he supported the Greens and Opposition amendments.⁷ Given the numbers in the House,⁸ the support of the two CDP members would have been sufficient to carry all the amendments. For several weeks there was a legislative stalemate, with debate on the committee of the whole stage continually postponed.

6 *Australasian Parliamentary Review* Autumn/winter 2015 Vol 30 No. 1

7 *NSWPD (LC)* 27/05/2015 p857

8 The Government has 19 votes out of 41 on the floor of the House, with the President, a Government member, having a casting but not deliberative vote.

Finally the Government reached a compromise position. It agreed to support most of the amendments, but Government circulated its own amendments to that effect, perhaps to be seen to be in control of events rather than defeated by them. The Opposition and cross bench parties allowed the Government to save face by supporting the new amendments, and some Greens amendments were not agreed to. The bill returned to the Assembly and passed into law with a much wider reach than the original proposal. The representatives of each of the parties spoke about how they had reached a compromise during the debate on 24 June:

Minister the Hon John Ajaka: The Government has had the opportunity to consult further with parties in relation to this bill and has accepted the information provided. For that reason the Government has taken the step of moving these amendments at the first available opportunity so that the bill, with its paramount purpose to protect young people, is able to pass and be accepted. I commend the amendments to the House.

Reverend the Hon. Fred Nile: I thank Minister Ajaka for moving these amendments. I had discussions with the Minister for Health about this bill. I was worried that we might have lost this bill. I thought it was important to get this bill through the upper House. We discussed various amendments proposed by different members. We have worked with the Government and agreed on a number of amendments to get this bill through today, near the end of this session. I am pleased the Government has taken the initiative. We are making progress with this bill, which will protect children from e-cigarettes. This bill is the first stage, and I hope the Government will put that on the record.⁹

...

(Mr Jeremy Buckingham): I support the Government's amendments. Today is a good day as it shows how this place should operate—across the Chamber parties have worked together for the benefit for the people of New South Wales, especially the young people of New South Wales. I commend Reverend the Hon. Fred Nile, the Hon. Walt Secord, the Hon. Jillian Skinner—

The Hon. John Ajaka: And yourself.

Mr Buckingham —and myself for all our excellent work in this space. I am pleased, as Reverend the Hon. Fred Nile has said, that this bill is being dealt with before the winter recess. I am pleased to see the substance of the Government's amendments—that is, bringing e-cigarettes and vaping into line with other tobacco products.¹⁰

This is not an uncommon outcome, though the process of compromise in amending legislation is rarely as transparent. Another example is provided in Blunt's paper

9 NSWPD (LC) 24/06/2015 p1748

10 NSWPD (LC) 24/06/2015 p1749

regarding the Police Death and Disability Bill 2011,¹¹ but each parliamentary year sees similar examples. Here the parliamentary process of the second reading debate, where positions can be flagged, and the flexible Committee of the Whole process, where amendments can be explored, facilitates co-operation, just as other standing orders on debate can be used to restrict opportunities and increase levels of conflict. But what of other parliamentary processes?

ORDERS FOR PRODUCTION OF PAPERS AS AN IMPACT ON POLICY

There is one parliamentary procedure that the NSW Legislative Council has exercised which to a degree unique in Australian jurisdictions – the power to order the production of state papers under its Standing Order 52. Since it established conclusively its power to do so in the High Court in 1998 in *Egan v Willis*,¹² the House has on numerous occasions ordered government agencies to produce, within a set period of time, all documents as defined by the order, including documents covered by Executive privilege.¹³ Many times these orders are contested, with the Government arguing the mover of the motion is engaging in a “fishing expedition” that will waste great amounts of public servants’ time and taxpayer money. The adversarial approach is certainly the most common, and generally the greater control the Government has of votes in the chamber the fewer motions moved under standing order 52 are agreed to.¹⁴ But there are exceptions when governments have conceded that there is a public interest in releasing documents without opposing non-government parties in the House.

One exception to this occurred in 2016 when a controversy arose regarding under dosing of chemotherapy patients by a surgeon at a major private hospital, St Vincents Darlinghurst. A motion was moved by Jeremy Buckingham, a Greens member, and was agreed to as formal business without debate on 25 February 2016. The order to produce state papers was directed at both NSW Health and the private hospital (which as a private entity disputed the power for the Council to order papers from it, an area not canvassed directly in the *Egan* cases). The Government’s support for the motion and the subsequent information revealed by the return has led to a NSW Health inquiry, which has uncovered other similar issues in another 5 hospitals. The tenor of debate has now very much turned adversarial in the wake of growing calls for a Special Commission of Inquiry.¹⁵ The development of the issue though, shows how a parliamentary process, used with bipartisan support, has made a significant

11. *Op cit* p91–92.

12. 73 ALJR 75

13. For more detailed discussion see Lovelock and Evans *NSW Legislative Council Practice* (2008) Federation Press p473–486.

14. Lovelock L, “The Declining Membership of the NSW Legislative Council Cross Bench and its Implications for Responsible Government” *Australasian Parliamentary Review* Autumn 2009, p82–95.

15. “Skinner Stares Down Critics” *Sydney Morning Herald* 3 August 2016 p4, “Hospital Crisis A Sick Disgrace” *Daily Telegraph* 3 August 2016 p6–7

contribution to public policy and administration. In this particular instance the nature of that contribution is still unfolding.

COMMITTEE INQUIRIES AND POLICY CHANGE

Of all parliamentary processes, committee inquiries especially lend themselves to making a constructive contribution to public policy, providing an opportunity for members of all parties to work together to reach consensus on difficult issues. In terms of pushing public policy to unexpected directions, the inquiry into the decriminalisation of medicinal cannabis that reported in 2013¹⁶ has had far reaching impacts on public policy, even beyond NSW. The process by which the committee made up of Government, Opposition, Greens and Shooters and Fishers Party members reached a unanimous report has been documented in an earlier paper.¹⁷ Two comments by members of the committee are illustrative:

I was a member of this committee. In a sense, I was a reluctant participant. It is a fraught subject and, quite frankly, I thought that little good would come from the inquiry. I was wrong. Unbeknownst to me, all the committee members approached the subject in a moderate and thoughtful way and the issue did not become politicised, as I had expected.¹⁸

This committee investigated a complex area, namely, the use of cannabis for medicinal purposes, and came to an agreement that, I think, in equal measures was open-minded and open-hearted. I should point out that the committee members came from a diversity of backgrounds comprising the Shooters and Fishers Party, the right of the Labor Party, the Hon. Charlie Lynn from the Liberal Party, The Nationals and me representing The Greens. We had different perspectives, yet we reached a unanimous report. It is to the credit of the Hon. Sarah Mitchell, committee staff and members that we landed somewhere that was positive, open-minded and open-hearted.¹⁹

On 16 September 2014 following the committee's report Premier Baird announced that the NSW Government would support a clinical trial for medical cannabis, and trials have also subsequently been discussed in other states.

Most jurisdictions can point to similar examples of committee inquiries that have contributed to public policy areas, following an inquiry where committee members have worked in a co-operative and constructive way. The inquiry process is a parliamentary activity that actively encourages co-operation, negotiation and consensus as members spend time together working to a common purpose. Arguably it is more powerful in

16 General Purpose Standing Committee No. 4 *The use of cannabis for medical purposes*, (2013)

17 Blunt *op cit* p94–96

18 NSWPD (LC) 27/08/2013 p 22746

19 *Ibid* p22373 .

the longer term than many other parliamentary processes in its ability to impact on policy, although measuring the impact is much harder than, for instance, a legislative amendment, where the policy change is directly achieved.

DO UPPER OR LOWER HOUSES HAVE THE GREATER INFLUENCE ON POLICY OUTCOMES?

There is an argument that the use of parliamentary procedures to influence policy outcomes is only significant when electoral systems produce a result in which no party has a majority. There is a substantial literature on “hung” parliaments, which while rare at a Federal level in Australia have been relatively frequent in State Parliaments, and in New Zealand since the Mixed Member Proportional voting system was introduced. Hung parliaments are still seen as an aberration in Australia, when in non-Westminster democratic systems governments by coalition are the norm.²⁰ The correlation of this perception is that many non-Westminster legislatures rely on co-operation and negotiation in contrast with the more adversarial parliamentary system in Westminster jurisdictions.²¹

But within the Westminster system there are chambers in which government dominance is unusual – the Senate and most Australian upper houses being exemplars. So do upper houses, where a Government in minority is the norm, develop a culture supporting co-operative outcomes? And do lower houses, because they see a period of minority government as a temporary abnormality, engage in more aggressive behaviour than usual because the “government always wins” approach is frustrated? One can only speculate, it is certainly a question worth more detailed examination.

When single chamber legislatures or lower houses diverge from the “elective dictatorship” model in a hung Parliament outcomes vary – witness the NSW Legislative Assembly between 1991 – 1995,²² or the several Tasmanian examples,²³ or the 1996 and current Queensland Parliaments.²⁴ Sometimes instability creates chaos and conflict, at other times considerable policy outcomes are achieved as a direct result of the actions of parliament. Dr Gareth Griffith²⁵ has provided a comprehensive examination of two decades of Australian experience to 2009, summing up this mixed experience. More recently, the House of Representatives from 2010 to 2013 with

20 Green-Pedersen, Christopher and Hoffman Thomsen, Lisbeth “Bloc Politics vs Broad Cooperation? The functioning of Danish Minority Parliamentarianism” *The Journal of Legislative Studies* Vol 11, No. 2 Summer 2005, pp153–169

21 *Ibid* p154.

22 Reynolds S, ‘Minority government from the other side of the fence’ (Spring 1998) 13(1) *Legislative Studies* 17

23 Griffith G, *Minority Government in Australia from 1989–2009*

<https://www.parliament.nsw.gov.au/researchpapers/Documents/minority-governments-in-australia-1989-2009-acco/Minority%20Governments%20Background%20Paper.pdf>

24 Wellington, the Hon Peter, Speaker of the Legislative Assembly “The workings of a hung parliament – the forgotten art of compromise” 47th Presiding Officers and Clerks Conference July 2016.

25 *Op cit*

standing orders more conducive to co-operative outcomes, was noted for its adversarial party politics. Positive policy outcomes such as the National Disability Insurance Scheme arose from co-operation and consensus prior to the any proposal being put to the Parliament, not as a result of parliamentary processes. The Gillard government was able to be effective in implementing its legislative agenda through Parliament, but this was not because the House of Representatives became a forum for co-operation and deliberation on policy outcomes.²⁶

In their unofficial history of the NSW Parliament Clune and Griffith's *Decision and Deliberation*²⁷ depicts NSW parliamentary history as a struggle between the "executive" model which focuses on facilitating the passing of the government's legislative agenda, and the "liberal" model which emphasizes the role of parliament to scrutinise the performance of government. Both are valid models in a democracy. However after reviewing 150 years of NSW political history they conclude that the tension between the two roles of parliament is especially intense for lower houses of parliament, and that the most effective way to balance the two models is through a bicameral system.²⁸

THE POWER OF ONE VOTE: CASE STUDY OF THE ANIMAL JUSTICE PARTY

Whatever the differences between the chambers, voting power between political parties will always influence the use of parliamentary processes. A chamber in which the government does not hold a majority has a structural incentive for major parties to negotiate and compromise and reach revised policy outcomes. But what about smaller parties? What if a party does not have enough votes in the chamber to have a stake in negotiations? Is their case hopeless? Can parliament allow minority parties to influence the policy agenda despite not having any voting power? In New South Wales there is a current instance that warrants close analysis.

The impact of the election of Mr Mark Pearson of the Animal Justice Party (AJP) to the New South Wales Legislative Council in the 2015 election has become increasingly topical in the time (May to August) during which this paper has been written. Mr Pearson was the last of the 21 members elected in the periodic election, gaining 1.78 % of the votes state wide, just over a third of the quota normally required to gain a seat. In the House the Government holds 19 of the 21 votes required to win any division, and all other parties have at least 2 votes each. The consequence of this is that Mr Pearson has no ability to use his single vote to influence the outcome of any decision of the House. As evidence of this, in three elections for cross bench positions on standing committees, Mr Pearson has lost on each occasion to other cross bench

26 "Was Julia Gillard the most productive prime minister in Australia's history?" *The Guardian*
<https://www.theguardian.com/news/datablog/2013/jun/28/australia-productive-prime-minister>

27 Federation Press 2006, p15

28 *Ibid* p693.

parties, and his is the only party without a member appointed to any of the Council's 11 standing committees. He has also moved a number of amendments to bills without any success to date, nor has he been successful in obtaining an order for the production of state papers.

What is notable, however is that his election and participation in the House has opened a whole area of debate and discussion on animal welfare issues. The area was discussed before, but never as a regular concern. In his inaugural speech the representative of Animal Justice stated the significance of his election as a way of reframing the issue:

The people of New South Wales have elected me because the protection of animals is important to many, and that importance is continuing to grow nationally and internationally. The Animal Justice Party can be seen as a single issue party—I thought that when I was participating in its formation. Rather, it is a single purpose party with multiple issues. Interestingly, the Party for the Animals in Holland has found that about 80 per cent of issues that come before this House have some impact one way or another on the lives of animals. But even if the issues brought before this House are not directly or indirectly related to animals, the Animal Justice Party will apply the principles of compassion and consideration to any legislation being considered. Our relationship with animals throughout time is extremely important and complex. It is very much a part of our humanity—for example, I refer to those homeless, broken people in their dirty and torn clothes that we often see in Hyde Park feeding crusts to the pigeons. Clearly they enjoy that experience of interaction.²⁹

Shortly after his election, a joint select committee into “puppy farms”, with membership from both houses, was established on the initiative of the Minister for Primary Industries following adverse media comment.³⁰ This was an issue referred to by Mr Pearson in his inaugural speech, and he was appointed as a Legislative Council member of the joint select committee. The House has also debated a motion by Mr Pearson on sheep mulesing practices, in which 10 members contributed over a debate split across two sitting weeks. The motion was ultimately amended by the Government and passed by the House as amended.³¹

It has become a noticeable feature of Question Time in the Legislative Council that questions on animal welfare are regularly asked. It is not only the new member asking the questions – other parties such as the Greens and ALP have regularly asked questions, perhaps concerned that they are competing for the same voters. In preparing this paper, research was undertaken to compare the number of questions asked by all members on animal welfare related topics in Question Time for the first 12 months since the election of the Animal Justice representative with a comparable 12 month period in the last Parliament. The results are very instructive:

29 NSWPD (LC) 06/05/15

30 NSWPD (LA) 13/05/15, NSWPD (LC) 13/05/15.

31 NSWPD (LC) 10/03/16, 23/03/16.

Table 1: Impact of election of Animal Justice Party on animal welfare questions in Question Time³²

Time period	Number of members asking a question during the period	Total number of questions asked in the period
July 2013 – June 2014	7	19
July 2015 – June 2016	22	72

It can be seen that the number of questions in Question Time with an animal welfare subject has more than tripled since the election of the Animal Justice Party member. Of course the member himself partly explains this, having asked 26 of the 72 questions, but it is apparent that more questions have been asked and by more members since his election. In total 22 members, just over half the membership of the House, has asked a question relevant to the Animal Justice Party agenda. It is difficult to point to any other cause, as this increase was measured prior to the major controversy detailed below.

The middle of this year bought a most dramatic and unexpected illustration of the impact on public policy of increased interest in animal welfare perspectives. The recent announcement by the NSW Government of a ban on greyhound racing following the report findings of a Special Commission of Inquiry has made national headlines. In making the announcement the Premier cited findings of up to 70,000 dogs being killed, widespread use of illegal live baiting by trainers and “catastrophic” injuries suffered by dogs during races.³³ The rationale for closing the industry has consistently been made on animal welfare grounds. Perhaps the most interesting revelation in the reporting of this decision came in an online article explaining the decision. The journalist reported that three weeks prior to the announcement, the Premier had met with the Animal Justice member:

Baird told him it was clear that animal welfare was a new and serious concern for the community, and his election to Parliament in 2015 had opened a new chapter in politics. The pair discussed animal rights issues, touching briefly on the fact the government was yet to respond to the greyhound special commission of inquiry. Pearson walked out thinking Baird had changed, and it was a response to the strong public interest in animal welfare. But he had no idea of the bombshell to come.³⁴

With the passage through both Houses of the Greyhound Racing Prohibition Bill on 10 and 24 August 2016 the closedown of what is estimated to be a \$300 million industry is in the process of occurring³⁵ despite very strong opposition to the move, including

32 The author is grateful for Aneesa Kruyer, parliamentary intern, for her research on the questions asked by each member. The 12 months immediately prior to the 2015 election was not used as, being an election year, there were fewer sitting days and the impact of the Animal Justice Party election would appear even larger.

33 Scratched: Death of the Dishlickers” *Daily Telegraph* Friday 8 July 2016 p1

34 Greyhounds voters led Mike Baird to backdown on NSW industry” Kirsty Needham, *Sydney Morning Herald* Friday 8 July 2016, online version www.smh.com.au/nsw/greyhounds-voters-led-mike-baird-to-crackdown-on-industry-20160707-gq0t2s.html

35 However less than a week after this paper was delivered, the NSW Government announced a backing away from a complete closedown of the industry. The situation is clearly very fluid.

within the Government and its backbenchers. It is certainly a major milestone for the supporters of animal protection:

Euphoric animal protection groups regard the outcome not just as a triumph but a precedent that eventually will lead to a nationwide ban on greyhound racing. Some activist groups see wider potential for eventual prohibitions on the live cattle export trade, battery farming, horse racing and other equestrian sports, fishing and game shooting – even zoos.³⁶

Even more recently, the ripple effect of the greyhound industry decision can also be seen in the recent announcement by Racing NSW that a \$2 million welfare fund will be established for horse welfare funded by a levy on new prize money. Racing NSW will form a new department, including vets and staff to retrain racehorses and place them within the horse community after their racing life is at an end. It will also build partnerships with riding schools and other equestrian clubs. Reports attributed this as a reaction to the Government's decision on greyhounds.³⁷

This is not the first time that the election of a representative of a party with a new constituency or support base has introduced a new policy discourse into the chamber. One of the earliest examples was the election of Ian Cohen, as the first Greens member of the New South Wales Parliament, and similarly John Tingle, representing the Shooters Party. In these cases however the large and complex cross bench gave these members some leverage despite only having one vote. But what is shown by recent experience is that regardless of a voting influence in the chamber, the mere election of a new political party in a chamber can be enough for existing parties to shift and consider new policy debates and priorities: – “people have voted for this, we need to respond.”

CONCLUSION

The Australian parliamentary system contains competing tendencies for both adversarial and co-operative behaviour. Parliamentary processes, such as committee work and legislative debate, can assist and deepen the potential for this to contribute to public policy. The culture of a House, and the extent to which its members believe power will be shared instead of being a temporary aberration, is important. A bicameral system provides a way to reconcile the democratic right of the party of government to implement its legislative agenda with the core tenet of parliamentary democracy, that of scrutiny of the Executive and its policymaking. But as has recently been seen in NSW, even one member in one chamber can have an impact on public policy. Conflict is inherent in our parliamentary system, it always has been. But co-operation is no less a part of what political parties do in Parliament every year, and can have some very surprising results on public policy.

36 Norington B, “What's Next, Premier” *The Australian* 25 August 2016 p11.

37 Roots, C, “Racing NSW creates new welfare fund for horses” *Sydney Morning Herald* 7/9/2016 p36.

