

# NEW SOUTH WALES LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

## *HOUSE IN REVIEW*



*Volume 55/6*

*Sitting period  
20 to 23 June 2011*

The *House in Review* provides a summary of the New South Wales Legislative Council's activities for each sitting week. 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).

### **New member elected**

A joint sitting of the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly was held on 20 June 2011 to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of the Hon Tony Kelly. At that sitting Mr Steve Whan was elected to fill the vacated seat.

On 23 June 2011 Mr Whan was sworn in as a member of the House and also gave his first speech.

### **Consideration of the removal of a judicial officer – Magistrate Maloney**

Under Part 9 of the *Constitution Act 1902* and the provisions of the *Judicial Officers Act 1986*, the Parliament is responsible for considering the removal of a judge or magistrate where the Conduct Division of the Judicial Commission has provided a report expressing the opinion that the conduct of the officer could justify such action.

In accordance with this procedure, on 4 June 2011, a report of the Conduct Division concerning Magistrate Brian Maloney of the Local Court was tabled in the House along with a response from Magistrate Maloney. The report included a finding that Magistrate Maloney was and would remain incapacitated in the performance of his judicial duties by his medical condition, which could justify Parliamentary consideration of the Magistrate's removal.

The matter arose only a week after the Legislative Council considered the removal from office of Magistrate Betts, also of the Local Court. The only previous occasion on which the House considered the removal of a judge or magistrate was in 1998.

On 21 June 2011, in accordance with a resolution of the House, Magistrate Maloney attended at the Bar of the House and delivered an address as to why he should not be removed from office.

The following day, the Leader of the Government in the House (Mr Gallacher) moved a motion for an Address to the Governor for the removal of Magistrate Maloney on the grounds of incapacity. In doing so, Mr Gallacher made it clear that the inquiry and report of the Conduct Division is a process that is entirely separate from the Government.

Mr Gallacher also tabled two items of correspondence: a letter from the Attorney General to the Chief Justice of NSW, in his capacity as President of the Judicial Commission, and a reply from the Chief Executive of the Judicial Commission. The correspondence to the Chief Justice sought advice in relation to further complaints about Magistrate Maloney.

In view of the content of this correspondence, the Leader of the House (Mr Gay) moved that debate on the matter be adjourned to allow Magistrate Maloney an opportunity to respond to the new material.

### **Government business**

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

### **Environmental Planning and Assessment Amendment (Part 3A Repeal) Bill 2011**

*Summary:* The bill repeals Part 3A of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*. Developments previously dealt with under Part 3A will henceforth be dealt with as follows:

- Developments that are not State significant developments or infrastructure will be dealt with under Part 4 by local councils or joint regional planning panels. Joint regional planning panels will play an important role in determining large-scale projects, particularly those residential, commercial, retail and coastal projects that were previously dealt with by the Minister under Part 3A.
- Developments that are State significant developments will be dealt with under Part 4 by the Minister, although in most instances this function will be delegated to the Planning Assessment Commission. State significant developments are predominantly lodged by private developers and include major industrial development such as coal mining and other large scale resource projects. State significant developments will also include major social infrastructure projects valued at over \$30 million such as large hospitals and medical facilities, correctional centres, schools, TAFEs and universities, museums and sporting facilities. It is proposed that classes of State significant

development will be listed in a State environmental planning policy.

- Developments that are State significant infrastructure will be dealt with under a new Part 5.1 by the Minister. State significant infrastructure includes classes of development undertaken by or for public authorities such as major road and rail projects, electricity transmission and distribution projects, telecommunications infrastructure and water and sewerage systems. Once again, classes or descriptions of State significant infrastructure will be listed in a State environmental planning policy.
- Developments that have already been the subject of substantial assessment under Part 3A before its repeal will continue to be dealt with under transitional arrangements in accordance with the former provisions of that Part.

The bill also includes provisions to reform the membership and operation of the Planning Assessment Commission and joint regional planning panels. As indicated, they will play an expanded role in the new planning system.

The repeal of Part 3A and adoption of the above new provisions is an interim measure until a comprehensive review and rewriting of the planning laws has been completed, expected to take 18 months.

*Proceedings:* The bill was received from the Legislative Assembly and read a first time. In his second reading speech, the Minister (Mr Pearce) indicated that the repeal of Part 3A fulfils the Government's election commitment to return planning powers to local councils, while providing an open, transparent and fair planning framework for genuine State significant developments and infrastructure.

The Opposition did not oppose the bill, accepting that the repeal of part 3A was an election commitment by the new Government. However, it argued that the bill fails to deliver on the election promise to return planning powers to local councils and communities. While it abolishes part 3A, the Minister retains discretion in calling in State significant development and infrastructure in parts 4 and part 5.1. Even where the Minister does not retain planning powers, these powers are not necessarily returned to local councils due to the retention of joint regional planning panels.

The Greens supported the bill and the repeal of Part 3A as a modest step forward in reform of the planning system, arguing that since it was introduced in 2005, Part 3A has been used to push through inappropriate developments such as at Barangaroo. However, the Greens also raised concerns, including that the Minister is not required to follow the advice of the Planning Assessment Commission in relation to State significant developments, essentially duplicating the former discretion of the Minister under Part 3A in relation to private developments. The Greens submitted that there is no reason that this class of matters should be considered at a State level.

The Christian Democratic Party supported the bill, arguing that it returns planning powers to councils and

local communities. However it noted concerns that some developments may be outside the capabilities of local councils to assess, necessitating external assistance, in which case the scale of development approval fees should be increased to recoup the costs.

The Shooters and Fishers Party also supported the bill, while raising issues in relation to recreational fishers. The second reading was agreed to.

In the committee stage, the Greens moved an amendment to make State environmental planning policies which list State significant developments and infrastructure subject to review and disallowance by the Parliament. The amendment was negatived (Division 17:21). The Greens also moved amendments to remove the exemption of private developments of State significance and State significant infrastructure from various pieces of State legislation protecting heritage, coastal districts, fisheries, waterways, vegetation and wildlife. The Government argued that such protections are provided separately. The amendments were negatived on the voices and on division (Division 18:21).

The Government moved amendments to its own bill in relation to the commencement of work on State significant developments once the matter is determined but an appeal is made to the courts, to require the re-exhibition of plans of developments of State significance where they have been substantially changed and to require separate approval for developments which interfere with aquifers or ground water. These were matters raised with the Government after the introduction of the bill. The amendments were agreed to on the voices and on division (Divisions 30:5 and 32:5).

The bill was reported to the House with the Government amendments, read a third time and returned to the Assembly.

### **Infrastructure NSW Bill 2011**

*Summary:* The bill establishes a new government agency, Infrastructure NSW, for the purposes of improving the planning, coordination, funding and delivery (among other things) of infrastructure in NSW. The establishment of Infrastructure NSW is intended to ensure that infrastructure decisions are informed by expert professional analysis and advice. The Board of Infrastructure NSW will consist of a Chairperson appointed by the Premier, up to five persons appointed from the private sector, the CEO of Infrastructure NSW, and the heads of four government agencies. Infrastructure NSW will be required to prepare and submit a 20-year State infrastructure strategy and a 5-year major infrastructure projects plan.

*Proceedings:* The bill was received from the Legislative Assembly and read a first time. In his second reading speech, the Minister (Mr Gallacher) indicated that the bill is part of the Government's election commitment to address infrastructure issues in NSW. Mr Gallacher described Infrastructure NSW as an innovative and ground breaking new body that will take the politics out of infrastructure decisions. In relation to the leadership of Infrastructure NSW, Mr Gallacher advised that the Premier has appointed the Hon Nick Greiner AC to be the independent Chairperson.

The Opposition did not oppose the bill but raised a number of concerns, including that the new agency is not independent as promised by the Government prior to the election, citing the appointment of the former Premier Mr Greiner as the Chairperson and noting that Infrastructure NSW will report to the Premier. The Opposition also questioned the transparency of the agency's processes and whether the agency's plans would be published. In addition, the Opposition raised concerns about the agency's public consultation processes and argued that the bill does not commit new funds for infrastructure programs.

The Greens did not oppose the bill on the grounds that they support the creation of an agency to centralise infrastructure planning. However, the Greens argued that the new agency should be required to take account not only of economic outcomes but also ecologically sustainable development. The Greens also raised concerns about the number of private sector members on the Board and the potential for this to create a conflict of interest with those companies bidding for infrastructure projects. The Greens foreshadowed amendments to the bill to strengthen the public consultation processes.

The Christian Democratic Party supported the bill and highlighted the need for investment in local government infrastructure. The Party commended the representation of the private sector on the Board, on the grounds that it would assist in attracting the private sector funds needed to fund infrastructure development.

The second reading was agreed to.

In the committee stage, the Greens and Opposition moved several similar amendments. These included amendments to expand the membership of the agency's Board to include the Director-Generals of the Department of Transport and Department of Health. Other similar amendments required the 20-year State infrastructure strategy, 5-year infrastructure plans, sectoral State infrastructure strategy statements, and implementation plans for major infrastructure projects to be published on the web within 30 days of being adopted.

Other significant Greens amendments were to:

- require Infrastructure NSW to exercise its functions consistent with the principles of ecologically sustainable development;
- decrease the number of private sector appointees on the Board from five to three;
- require community consultation on the proposed 20-year State infrastructure strategy.

Another key Opposition amendment was to increase transparency by ensuring that if the Premier makes any changes to the strategies, plans and statements of Infrastructure NSW and the Board advises the Premier that it does not agree with the changes, the Board's advice must be published on the web within 30 days of being provided.

All the Opposition and Green amendments were negatived.

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

### **Local Government Amendment (Elections) Bill 2011**

*Summary:* The bill amends the *Local Government Act 1993* to provide a local council with the option to administer its own council elections, council polls and constitutional referendums, or to arrange for the Electoral Commission to do so. Currently the elections and polls must be conducted by the Electoral Commission. The bill also enables a council to apply to the Minister for Local Government for approval to reduce the number of its councillors, or to abolish all wards of the council's area, without the need for approval by the voters at a constitutional referendum. Finally, the bill makes provisions relating to when a by-election must be held to fill a casual vacancy in the office of a councillor.

*Proceedings:* The bill was received from the Legislative Assembly and read a first time. In his second reading speech, the Minister (Mr Pearce) indicated that the bill returns autonomy to local councils, and will provide a transparent and effective framework for the administration of local government. The Minister also noted that the bill ensures that councils in certain circumstances do not need to fill casual vacancies by way of by-elections, resulting in significant cost savings. Other Government members highlighted the increased cost of requiring elections to be run by the Electoral Commission, particularly in regional areas, and referred to the importance of regional and urban councils having the flexibility to choose the election model that best suited them.

The Opposition expressed concern that the bill will undermine community confidence in the integrity of local government elections, and criticised the Government for a lack of consultation. In addition, the Opposition questioned the cost benefit of returning to council-run elections. The Opposition also indicated that the proposal to allow councils to abolish all wards by application to the Minister could lead to smaller communities being unrepresented on councils. The Opposition foreshadowed three amendments.

The Christian Democratic Party supported the bill and argued that local councils can conduct their own elections more cost-effectively than the Electoral Commission, and that councils should be empowered to conduct their own elections if they wish to do so.

The Greens indicated that while they saw some merit in the bill they opposed certain provisions. The Greens raised concerns that the cost of elections conducted by the Electoral Commission was damaging local councils, and supported the proposal to allow local councils to conduct their own elections. However, the Greens opposed the abolition of all wards by application to the Minister on the grounds that it would reduce the diversity of voices on local councils.

The second reading was agreed to.

In the committee stage, the Opposition moved an amendment, supported by the Greens, to remove those



provisions that would enable councils to apply to the Minister to abolish all wards of the council's area. The amendment was negatived (Division 16:19). The Opposition moved a further two amendments, not supported by the Greens, to remove those provisions that would allow councils to conduct their own elections, if they wished to do so. The amendments were negatived (Division 11:24). The Government opposed all three of the Opposition's amendments on the basis that the amendments would strip the bill of its core provisions. The Greens moved two amendments to the provisions in the bill that increase the period at the end of a councillor's term from 12 to 18 months where the council is not required to fill a casual vacancy. The Greens expressed concern that this could allow newly-elected Coalition members in the Legislative Assembly to resign from their positions on local councils, without triggering a by-election. The amendments were negatived.

The bill was reported to the House without amendment, read a third time (Division 19:16) and returned to the Assembly without amendment.

### **Parliamentary, Local Council and Public Sector Executives Remuneration Legislation Amendment Bill 2011**

*Summary:* The bill amends various pieces of legislation to extend the wages cap of 2.5 per cent recently applied by the Government to the public sector to the remuneration of ministers and other members of Parliament, local councillors, statutory officers, public sector executives and hospital visiting medical officers. Wage rises beyond 2.5 per cent based on employee-related savings will not be available.

*Proceedings:* The bill was received from the Legislative Assembly and read a first time. In his second reading speech, the Minister (Mr Pearce) argued that the wages policy applying to public servants, adopted to help bring the State budget under control, should equally be applied to elected members and senior officials. The Opposition supported the bill, arguing that although the Opposition could not prevent public servants having their wages capped below inflation at 2.5 per cent, politicians should at least face the same wage restrictions. At the same time, the Opposition noted that members of Parliament are highly paid and are in very different circumstances to public servants on significantly lower wages. The Greens also supported the bill, but similarly argued that members of Parliament are generally paid in excess of \$150,000 per annum, and that as such, the wage restraint adopted by members of Parliament is not commensurate to that imposed on nurses and teachers on \$50,000 or \$60,000 per annum.

The second and third readings of the bill were agreed to and the bill was returned to the Assembly without amendment.

### **Regional Relocation (Home Buyers Grant) Bill 2011**

*Summary:* The bill provides for a regional relocation grant of \$7,000 to be paid to persons who currently own a home in a metropolitan area and who relocate to a regional area and buy a home valued at \$600,000 or less.

The bill defines a metropolitan area to encompass Sydney, Newcastle and Wollongong. The grant will apply to the purchase of a home between 1 July 2011 and 30 June 2015, with a maximum of 40,000 grants available.

*Proceedings:* The bill was received from the Legislative Assembly and read a first time. In his second reading speech, the Minister (Mr Pearce) emphasised the Government's commitment to regional NSW and noted that the bill delivers on one of the Government's election promises to provide an incentive for people to move to regional NSW. The Opposition did not oppose the bill but argued that the grant is not part of a strategic plan to promote regional growth, and will not encourage skilled people to move to regional areas. The Greens opposed the bill and described the grant as a waste of \$280 million of public funds. The Greens argued that people move to regional areas for a variety of reasons including jobs, services and infrastructure, and that there are more effective ways to use Government funds. The Christian Democratic Party supported the bill on the grounds that the grant will provide an incentive for much-needed skilled labour to move to regional areas.

The second and third readings of the bill were agreed to and the bill was returned to the Assembly without amendment.

### **Destination NSW Bill 2011**

*Summary:* The bill established Destination NSW as a government agency responsible for developing tourism and procuring major events in NSW. Tourism in NSW is worth \$28 billion to the State and supports more than 160,000 jobs. Destination NSW will replace Tourism NSW and Events NSW, amongst other bodies. The Government is also creating the Visitor Economy Taskforce, to guide Destination NSW on tourism policy. The Taskforce will be charged with developing a strategy to double tourism expenditure in NSW by 2020.

*Proceedings:* The bill was received from the Legislative Assembly and read a first time. In his second reading speech, the Minister (Mr Gallacher) argued that tourism and events are key drivers of the NSW economy, and that Destination NSW will be better equipped and more focused on working with the State's tourism and major events sector to sell Sydney and NSW to the world. The Opposition did not oppose the bill, while seeking assurances from the Minister about tourism funding for regional and rural NSW, and whether the merger of Tourism NSW and Events NSW will lead to job losses. The Greens did not oppose the bill, accepting the need for a new vision for increasing tourism in NSW, and indicating that the governance framework for the new Destination NSW is more transparent and accountable than previous arrangements. In her reply, the Parliamentary Secretary (Ms Ficarra) indicated that the creation of Destination NSW will not result in any job losses.

The second and third readings of the bill were agreed to and the bill was returned to the Assembly without amendment.

## Statute Law (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill 2011

*Summary:* The bill makes minor amendments to various Acts and Regulations and amends various Acts to enable the repeal of certain legislation.

*Proceedings:* The bill was received from the Legislative Assembly and read a first time. In his second reading speech, the Minister (Mr Gallacher) indicated that the bill is part of the established statute law revision program, and implements minor and non-controversial policy changes and minor technical changes to legislation. The Greens and Opposition expressed concern that the effects of some provisions of the bill were unclear, and foreshadowed amendments to remove those provisions from the bill. The second reading was agreed to.

In the committee stage, the Greens moved three amendments, which were largely the same as the proposed Opposition amendments, to remove three sections from the bill. The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the House with amendments, read a third time and returned to the Assembly.

### Private members' business

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

*Bill(s)*

### Marine Parks Amendment (Moratorium) Bill 2011 (Mr Brown, Shooters and Fishers Party)

The bill originated in the Legislative Council.

*Summary:* The bill provides for a five-year moratorium on the declaration of additional marine parks or the expansion of sanctuary zones within existing marine parks.

*Proceedings:* Standing orders were suspended to bring on the item of business (Division 19:16). Debate on the motion resumed from 6 May 2011 (see *House in Review 55/1*). On the resumption of the debate, the Deputy Leader of the Government (Mr Gay) indicated that the Government agrees with a moratorium on additional marine parks and sanctuary zones. However, he indicated that the Government made an election commitment to undertake an independent scientific audit of management of marine parks, after which marine parks and sanctuary zones can be reassessed. The Minister therefore indicated that the Government would propose amendments to the bill to allow the moratorium period to be either five years or a shorter period based on the outcome of the scientific audit. It is anticipated that the audit will be completed by 31 December 2011.

The Opposition opposed the bill, indicating that it did not support the bill in Government when it was brought forward by the Shooters and Fishers Party, and would not support the bill in Opposition. The Opposition argued that the bill is contrary to the protection of marine habitat and biodiversity, while also submitting that fishing is permitted in over 93 per cent of the marine

jurisdiction of NSW and on average in 80 per cent of marine park waters in NSW. The Opposition also criticised the Government for already having overturned the zoning plans for the Solitary Islands and Jervis Bay marine parks prior to the proposed scientific audit. While respectfully disagreeing with the policy position of the Shooters and Fishers Party, the Leader of the Opposition argued that the bill has been brought on as part of an arrangement between the Government and the Shooters and Fishers Party to secure the passage of other pieces of Government legislation, notably the capping of public sector wages.

The Greens also opposed the bill, arguing that there is irrefutable scientific literature warning of impending collapse of many fish stocks, and indicating the effectiveness of marine parks and sanctuary zones in supporting the recovery of fish stocks. Particular reference was made to the Grey Nurse Shark. The Greens also argued that the bill constitutes an attack on marine science and marine scientists. Similar to the Opposition, the Greens criticised the Government's overturning of sanctuary zones at Solitary Islands and Jervis Bay marine parks, and criticised the alleged arrangement between the Government and the Shooters and Fishers Party.

The Christian Democratic Party supported the bill, on the basis that it implements the recommendations of the Select Committee on Recreational Fishing.

In his address in reply, Mr Brown from the Shooters and Fishers Party indicated that they would support the Government amendments, provided that the Government ensured that the scientific audit was undertaken quickly and with adequate funding.

The second reading was agreed to (Division 21:18).

In the committee stage, the Government moved amendments to the bill to require the independent scientific audit of marine parks to be undertaken, and to allow the moratorium period to be shorter than the proposed five years if the scientific audit has been received, together with the Minister's written response. The Government amendments were agreed to. The Greens put forward two amendments to the Government amendments. The first amendment to specify the membership of the panel to oversee the scientific audit was negated. The second amendment to ensure that the written report of the scientific audit is made publicly available was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the House with the amendments, read a third time (Division 20:17) and forwarded to the Assembly for concurrence.

*Motions taken as formal business*

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

- (1) Professor Debra Picone AM (Ms Fazio);
- (2) Amnesty International (Ms Fazio);
- (3) Oral health (Ms Faehrmann);

- (4) 66<sup>th</sup> Birthday of Daw Aung San Suu Kyi (Dr Kaye);
- (5) Japanese tsunami (Mr Moselmane);
- (6) Chinese Australian Service Society (Mr Moselmane);
- (7) HMAS Sydney (1) Memorial Mast (Ms Fazio);
- (8) Annual St George Ball (Mr Moselmane);
- (9) Becharrie Lebanese Red Cross (Mr Moselmane);
- (10) Condolence motion – Begum Aliya Khatoon Siddiqui (Mr Moselmane);
- (11) Cancer Council NSW (Ms Ficarra);
- (12) Aboriginal heritage site in Newcastle (Mr Shoebridge);
- (13) 40th anniversary of the Green Bans (Mr Shoebridge);
- (14) Condolence motion – Death of Mr Bob Fenwick (Ms Fazio);
- (15) Protests in Syria (Dr Kaye).

### Orders for papers

**Note:** The Council has a common law power to order the Government to produce State papers.

- (1) Mental Health Inquiry process (Dr Kaye): The order relates to the operation of the group formed to monitor the impact of the changes to the Mental Health Inquiry process. Due: 5 July 2011.
- (2) Development of a KFC restaurant (Mr Shoebridge): The order relates to the development of the KFC restaurant at 227-231 Hunter St, Newcastle, including the former Palais site. Due: 7 July 2011.

### Petitions received

- (1) Magistrate Brian Maloney – 41 signatures (irregular, presented Mr Searle);
- (2) Confucius Institute – 51 signatures (presented Ms Ficarra); 4,046 signatures (presented Dr Kaye);
- (3) Battery Cage Egg Production – 248 signatures (presented Dr Kaye);
- (4) Unflued gas heaters – 1,282 signatures (irregular, presented Dr Kaye).

### Committee activities

#### *Committee reference*

**Social Issues Committee:** The Chair (Mr Blair) informed the House that on 21 June 2011, the Committee resolved to inquire into programs and support for children with additional or complex needs and their families during transition between stages of education.

#### *Committee membership*

The following changes to the membership of Council committees were reported:

**Procedure Committee:** Dr Kaye in place of Ms Faehrmann.

**General Purpose Standing Committee No. 1:** Mr Secord in place of Mr Roozendaal.

**General Purpose Standing Committee No. 3:** Ms Sharpe in place of Mr Foley and Mr Veitch in place of Ms Fazio.

**General Purpose Standing Committee No. 4:** Mr Searle in place of Ms Sharpe.

The following appointments of Council members to joint statutory, standing and select committees were agreed to:

**Committee on the Office of the Ombudsman and the Police Integrity Commission:** Ms Cusack, Mr Searle and Mrs Mitchell.

**Legislation Review Committee:** Dr Phelps, Mr Moselmane, Mr Shoebridge.

**Committee on the Independent Committee Against Corruption:** Mr Blair, Ms Voltz, Revd Mr Nile.

**Committee on the Health Care Complaints Commission:** Ms Cusack, Ms Westwood, Mr Green.

**Committee on Children and Young People:** Mr Blair, Ms Barham, Mr Donnelly.

**Joint Standing Committee on Electoral Matters:** Mr Khan, Dr Phelps, Mr Primrose, Ms Fazio, Mr Borsak.

**Joint Standing Committee on Road Safety:** Mr Secord, Mr Colless, Ms Faehrmann.

**Joint Standing Committee on the Office of the Valuer General:** Mr MacDonald, Mr Roozendaal.

**Joint Select Committee on the Parliamentary Budget Office:** Ms Fazio, Mr Roozendaal, Dr Kaye, Mrs Mitchell, Mrs Maclaren-Jones.

#### *Committee report tabled*

**Privileges Committee:** Report No. 55 entitled 'Citizen's Right of Reply (Mr Mike Rayner)', June 2011.

#### *Committee report debated*

**Social Issues Committee:** The House commenced the take-note debate on Report No. 44 entitled 'Services provided or funded by the Department of Ageing, Disability and Home Care', November 2011.

#### *Government responses*

The Deputy Leader of the Government advised that the Government will respond to committee reports tabled in the previous session of Parliament within six months of 26 March 2011, the date on which the Government took office.

### Reports tabled

**Independent Commission Against Corruption:** 'Investigation into the corrupt conduct of a Willoughby City Council Officer', June 2011.

## Adjournment debate

### Monday 20 June 2011

Community sport (Ms Voltz); Royal Flying Doctor Service (Mrs Mitchell); Appointment of Chris Eccles (Dr Kaye); St Vincent De Paul Society Winter Appeal (Mr Primrose); Climate Change (Dr Phelps); Synthetic cannabis (Mr Green).

### Tuesday 21 June 2011

Niccolo Machiavelli/African American civil rights quest deaths (Mr Khan); Welcome to Country (Mr Veitch); Old-growth forests (Ms Faehrmann); Sydney Korean Business Association (Ms Ficarra); Australian Services Union equal pay rally (Ms Westwood); Coal Seam Gas Lock the Gate Alliance (Mr Buckingham); Niccolo Machiavelli (Dr Phelps).

### Wednesday 22 June 2011

Young people using guns (Mr Secord); Water management (Mr Brown); Dry July/Lismore Base Hospital Our House Project (Mr Blair); NSW Parents Council 2011 Awards of Excellence (Mr Donnelly); Gun laws (Mr Borsak); Live animal export trade (Mr MacDonald); St Antonio da Padova Association (Ms Fazio); Australian Labor Party and Senator Steve Hutchins (Dr Phelps).

### Thursday 23 June 2011

Leaving Care Plans (Ms Barham); Rural health (Mrs Pavey); Tribute to Trevor Davies (Ms Sharpe); Indigenous youth in the criminal justice system (Mr Shoebridge); Solar Bonus Scheme (Ms Cusack); Religious freedoms (Mr Moselmane); Retirement of Kerry Clay and Kerry Girardin (Mr Colless).

## Feedback on *House in Review*

We welcome any comments you might have on this publication.

We're 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.



Lynn Lovelock  
Clerk of the Parliaments