



when will a development application be lodged and will the Minister please explain as accurately as possible where the facility is to be constructed, what it will comprise and when it is planned to begin construction. Mr Buffett I've given Mr Buffett a copy of my question so he should be able to follow that.

MR I. BUFFETT

Thank you Mr Speaker and I thank Ms Nicholas for doing that. Mr Speaker let me respond as follows. In respect of the first part of Ms Nicholas' question I propose to provide some background on this project to explain the answers to these questions. The answers basically are that Commonwealth funding is available for the development of the waste transfer station. The Norfolk Island Government is required to contribute towards the project to receive the grant. There is a time limit on the availability of the funds and extension has already been provided by the Commonwealth Government. The proposed cost of the facility is estimated to be in the vicinity of \$395,000 of which Norfolk Island will contribute \$220,000 and the project has been delayed and modified to some extent as explained as follows. In 1999 Norfolk Island successfully applied for a grant of \$250,000 under the Commonwealth Coast and Clean Seas Programme. The primary aim of that grant was to acquire equipment such as a modern burning facility to improve waste disposal on the island and ultimately the quality of the marine environment around the island. In 2000 the Norfolk Island Government commissioned a waste management and audit study of the island to develop and improved waste management strategy. The Consultants, the CRC for waste management and pollution control and Anne Prince Consulting visited Norfolk Island in January of 2002 and presented their findings to the then Norfolk Island Legislative Assembly and to various community groups. The key piece of equipment recommended in the waste management strategy at that time was a clinical waste gasifier, a high tech burning facility used to date in other isolated communities for disposal of Hospital waste. The Consultants recommended that a feasibility study be commissioned to determine whether the gasifier would be suitable for Norfolk Island based on the island's waste stream. The feasibility study was undertaken by the manufacturers of the equipment Bio-mass Energy Services and Technology Pty Ltd known as BEST and completed in September of 2001. The study concluded that the technology feasible for Norfolk and the findings were presented to the Norfolk Island Legislative Assembly. A quote of \$279,700 was provided to supply and install the gasifier at the Bottom Tip. Concern about the gasifier technology was expressed in some sections of the community and it was decided that more research on the technology and on composting options would be undertaken. Under the grant agreement the agreed for the implementation of the new waste management system was initially 31<sup>st</sup> of January 2002. This programme and level of funding has been revised with the agreement with the agreement of Environment Australia and now provides for total Commonwealth contribution of \$175,000 and given the complexities in selecting major new equipment for burning or composting it is now proposed to develop a waste transfer station with facilities for receiving, sorting and some processing of waste. Burning in the cage and the pits will continue at the Top and Bottom tips until an acceptable alternative method of burning is identified. Mr Speaker research is progressing also on appropriate composting options. The project including construction and commissioning of the waste transfer station must be completed by 30<sup>th</sup> of September 2002. Mr Speaker Ms Nicholas also asked when will the development application be lodged and will the Minister please explain as accurately as possible where the facility is to be constructed, what it will comprise and when is beginning of construction planned. Mr Speaker it is expected that a Category 1 application will be submitted by the end of this week. The proposed site for the facility is a site that is currently used for stockpiling and burning of green waste at the Airport next to the Road Maintenance Depot. The site is currently identified as Special Use Development Area in the Norfolk Island Plan of 1996 and Public Works which under the Norfolk Island Plan of 1996 includes rubbish disposal facilities are permissible with consent in the Special

Uses Area. Mr Speaker the planning application will address Stage 1 of the transfer station which will include a drop off area, receptacles for sorting various components of the waste stream on delivery at the centre, basic processing equipment such as a can crusher, a revolve centre where reusable goods can be recycled and an area for delivery, shipping and storing of green waste and office and staff amenities. Mr Speaker the site includes a large outdoor area which is proposed to be used for composting at a later stage. With the exception of the chipping of the green waste all operations planned in Stage 1 will be under cover. Burning of green waste at the site will cease and there will be no burning of any materials at that site. Burnable material will be transported at regular intervals throughout the day by Tip Staff to the Headstone Tips. It is intended that public access to the burning sites at the Tips, that's the existing Tips once this is in place will be restricted to maintain quality control over burning operations. It is intended that construction of the waste management centre will commence as soon as planning approval is achieved.

MS NICHOLAS Mr Speaker, a minor supplementary if I may. Mention was made of chipping of green waste. My observation is that the dumping of green waste at that Tip has been of extraordinary quantity. Do we have the equipment available to carry out chipping at that site efficiently.

MR I. BUFFETT Mr Speaker that is the effectiveness of the chipping arrangements we have on Norfolk I believe that given a proper management of that site and the proper management of the green waste that is delivered to that site, that is for this community to undertake some care in what they do, and not include plastics, baby's bottles and bathtubs and other issues in their green waste, we believe that the equipment is currently available on island that will possibly handle the initial green waste that is delivered to that site. Mr Speaker further on, depending on what we do with the composting arrangements there may be the need to look at acquisition of other equipment to carry out that particular process.

MR BROWN Mr Speaker could I direct some further questions to the Minister for Land and the Environment. Now the Minister has just mentioned a figure of \$175,000 as a Commonwealth contribution. Has that figure reduced from an earlier figure.

MR I. BUFFETT In short Mr Speaker, yes.

MR BROWN Can the Minister please explain the circumstances of that reduction and in particular can he assure the House that the reduction has not occurred as a result of inactivity on the part of our Administration.

MR I. BUFETT Mr Speaker I can't at this particular point give a definitive answer to the second part of Mr Brown's question regarding inactivity but I understand there's been some rearrangements and discussions with the Commonwealth in what is to be provided in terms of the funding and in complying with the time frames for the delivery and use of that particular funding, but I will certainly take that on and provide Mr Brown a written answer and inform this House fully at its next sitting in respect of that second part of that issue Mr Brown.

MR BROWN Mr Speaker a further question to the Minister for Land and the Environment. Bearing in mind the Minister's statement that public access to the existing Tips will be reduced or abolished, I think the Minister said reduced, precisely where will the public dispose of refuse which is other than green waste, and in the event that all such refuse is to be initially disposed of at the Airport will the Minister

advise what consultation has taken place with authorities and the Airlines about plans to in affect put a standard Tip and the Norfolk Island Airport.

MR I. BUFFETT Perhaps the first issue Mr Speaker, it won't be a standard tip if the standard tip definition is an open situation like you have at Headstone. In the statement I made what has been explained is that the whole operation will be under cover, that is there will be a large transfer centre and we will be seeking to have that operated on the basis of sorting the material when it gets there, placing them into their various components, looking at the question of recycling certain aspects of that, and as I've mentioned earlier burning will not occur there. So in terms of I guess aviation matters and affecting it through smoke and/or dust it is anticipated that will be minimised in terms of the transit centre that we intend to place at that particular spot. Mr Speaker definitively saying whether the aviation or CASA Air Services Australia has commented on that, I'm not fully aware if they have or have not but certainly as part of the planning process I will ensure that they have the opportunity to do that and look at the proposals that are proposed for that particular site.

MR NOBBS Thank you. I ask the Minister for Tourism has he made any recent appointments to the Tourist Bureau and if not, when did he last make appointments to the Tourist Bureau and has he any plans for appointments to be made in the immediate future.

MR SMITH Yes Mr Speaker. Yes I have made a recent appointment of Mr Leslie Quintal to the Tourist Board and I publicly acknowledge Leslie for accepting a position on the Board. At the end of this month Bob Goldsworthy who is the current Chair of the Tourist Board has indicated that he will not be pursuing any more time on the Board as Ray Sills who is another member of the Board who's time expires at the end of this month. He's actually left the island so he is effectively no longer on the Board. I have some names of people who have expressed a willingness to be part of the Tourist Board. That was actually going to be discussed yesterday but we had other issues that put that right out of my mind, but I intend to discuss that with Members in the next day or so that I need to get a couple more people onto the Board before, certainly before the end of the month, and have some people who have offered, and even though the Tourist Board can be contentious when tourism is not what, or the level of tourism is not up to what people expect in the community, these people have put their names forward quite willingly. So I'll be sharing those with Members. It's not a matter that needs to be done by a Motion in the House but I like to keep Members informed with appointments to Boards for their comments.

MR NOBBS A supplementary. What's happened to the proposal to advertise when various Board vacancies occur and when was there a last advertisement put in for a vacancy at the Tourist Bureau.

MR SMITH Mr Speaker it might have slipped Mr Nobbs' mind that earlier this year, I think it was a proposal by the Chief Minister that we advertise twice a year for all Boards for people who would like to put their names forward to be part of any of the Boards that we have, and that was done. I can't remember exactly what month it was but it certainly was done and that's where a lot of the names have come from, from people in the community who have put their names forward to be on the Tourist Board.

MR NOBBS Do you propose to advise those unsuccessful people who have put their names forward that you didn't select that this is what's happened or are you going to leave them in limbo.

MR SMITH Mr Speaker that would be necessary because there is more people who have applied to be particularly on the Tourist Board and it would be a good sensible thing to do.

MR BROWN Mr Speaker I direct this question to the Minister for Community Services and Tourism in relation to his responsibility for the Public Service. Is the Minister aware of a newsletter issue No. 2 June 2002, recently published within the Administration of Norfolk Island. If so, is the Minister aware of several articles which can only be described as foul within that newsletter, what action does the Minister propose to take to bring to an end this insult to the public and waste of public funds.

MR SMITH Mr Speaker yes I am aware of that circulation, that I think it's a second edition of a newsletter that has come from the public Service. It was as I understand it, it was a replacement of Rob Tull which used to come from the CEO. I understand that this is now something that comes from members of the Public Service, although there are some interesting articles in there. Certainly some Members yesterday including Mr Brown expressed concern of the tone of some of the articles and have instructed me to take the issue up with the Chief Executive Officer to make sure that it is in keeping with what should come out of the Public Service.

MR BROWN I direct a further question to the Minister for Community Services and Tourism. What action does the Minister propose to take to ensure that the Public Service acknowledges and promptly responds to correspondence which is sent to it.

MR SMITH Mr Speaker there is a system that has been operating for some years about correspondence between the Government and the Administration and it's called the Ministerial system which if a Executive Member writes to the Public Service that Ministerial is generally tracked both ways and signed off at each point of contact. However I'm not too sure if this is where Mr Brown is coming from, often some correspondence doesn't get replied to from either end as quickly as what it should and I suppose that's inevitable with the amount of correspondence that does pass between both the New Military Barracks and the Old Military Barracks.

MR BROWN I thank the Minister for that response but the question was directed to communications from the public and the Minister may be aware that the public is becoming very concerned at an apparent total black hole within the Administration which causes correspondence disappear into that black hole and seemingly never reappear.

MR SMITH Is there a question in that.

MR BROWN Yes what do you propose to do about it.

MR SMITH Mr Speaker if that is occurring that certainly needs to be rectified and maybe Mr Brown afterwards can point me in the direction of where some of those difficult areas may be because if people are writing to the Public Service, the Administration and not getting replies that needs to be rectified.

MR NOBBS Thank you. I have a question for the Minister with responsibility for the KAVHA area. Minister have you had the opportunity since the meeting with landholders within the KAVHA area some weeks ago to familiarise yourself with the actual boundaries of KAVHA.

MR GARDNER I'm familiar Mr Speaker with the boundaries of KAVHA as established by KAVHA.

MR NOBBS Supplementary if I may. Are you aware that the boundaries of KAVHA for the purposes of registration under the Australian Heritage Act and the Memorandum of Understanding between the Norfolk Island and Commonwealth Governments as to management of the area, are substantially different.

MR GARDNER I'm not aware of that Mr Speaker.

MR NOBBS Would the Minister ascertain which description should have precedence and be accepted as the boundaries for KAVHA and I ask him what he would then do to rectify the plan showing the KAVHA as attached to the Norfolk Island Plan in 1996 and again with the proposed new Plan show KAVHA as following the boundaries not of the Memorandum of Understanding but as per the Heritage Registration and as I said they are substantially different.

MR GARDNER My understanding is that the National Heritage Registration would have precedence over the Memorandum of Understanding. I would certainly need to clarify that however and certainly if Mr Nobbs is prepared to provide me with that documentation I shall endeavour to clarify those points for him.

MS NICHOLAS Thank you Mr Speaker. This was addressed to the Chief Minister. During his recent visit to Norfolk Island in discussions with members of the community and with members of this Assembly Federal Minister Wilson Tuckey encouraged the Norfolk Island Government to begin formulating legislation which could lead the way out of the present troubled insurance dilemmas faced by small communities and community organisations. Was any assistance offered with structuring such legislation and is the Chief Minister pursuing the concept whether or not that assistance has been offered.

MR GARDNER Yes on all counts Mr Speaker. To reply more fully to Ms Nicholas' question Minister Tuckey on his visit did undertake to refer papers and documents explaining the NSW strategy for their proposed legislative arrangements dealing with public liability issues. It is the Minister's view that the NSW model would be appropriate for us to mirror our own legislation upon. I had as Members are aware, previously and made it in the House Mr Speaker that I had sought advice from the Federal Attorney General's Department whilst attending the Standing Committee for Attorney General's in Sydney in March and sought that advice on the outcomes of the national forum that was then proposed to be held to address the growing concerns over public liability insurance. In the interim period I've received advice from the Official Secretary Mr Owen Walsh on the outcomes of that national forum which suggested in part the development of model legislation across all States and Territories. The offer Mr Speaker to provide assistance in this areas is welcomed and appreciated in an effort to alleviate the concerns over the public liability insurance issue.

MR BROWN Thank you Mr Speaker. I direct this question to the Minister for Finance, it relates to the Post Office. Can the Minister advise whether it is now the case that local mail is being sorted within a period of less than 10 to 14 days and if not when does the Minister propose to provide the Post Office staff with sufficient resources to enable mail to travel the distance of 6 or 7 feet between the post box and the boxes to which it is delivered.

MR DONALDSON Thank you Mr Speaker. That's a follow on from a question at an earlier meeting. I did make enquiries after that one and I was informed

any problems that had been occurring with local mail were now rectified or in the main rectified, there was no material delay in the processing of local mail. As to the second part of the question, as to resources, there is a proposal in the pipeline which has been spoken of but hasn't come through as a written proposal yet to allow overtime at the Post Office at the weekends for about 3 hours on a Sunday to allow for the sorting of international mail that arrives during the weekend. This would relieve the Post Office staff of some of their work they have to do in normal working hours. That hasn't had a yes or no answer yet but it's still an early phase proposal.

MR BROWN Further question to the Minister for Finance. Instead of needing to pay overtime has the Minister looked at the opportunities for varying working hours which exist within the Public Service structure.

MR DONALDSON Thank you Mr Speaker. No I haven't looked at it but I would imagine that will be part of the proposal. There is a written proposal on the way for a restructuring of the work practices within the Post Office and one of the items was overtime at the weekends. I'm sure that won't be in isolation, there will be other measures there that will make the Post Office more efficient.

MR NOBBS Thank you. I ask the Minister for Environment or the Minister with responsibility for Intergovernmental relations. Is there a proposal by the Australian Government to establish a marine reserve off Norfolk Island within the EEZ and if so has there been a Norfolk Island Government response to the proposal.

MR GARDNER Mr Speaker I'm aware of one communication from the Commonwealth that has planned to identify a sea mount and my understanding is, and I stand to be corrected on this, somewhere to the North West of Norfolk Island approximately 140 miles off shore, and to establish that as a marine park. However I think Mr Speaker in light of the understanding that the talking about the marine environment I think I should defer to my colleague the Minister for the Environment on that question. I think he's been dealing with it.

MR I. BUFFETT Yes Mr Speaker the short answer is yes there has been a proposal from the Commonwealth. My understanding is that in fact I circulated that to Norfolk Island Fisheries consultative Committee. The matter is one that we wanted or we were seeking some further information on and Mr Speaker I haven't received any further correspondence from the Commonwealth in respect of that proposal. Mr Speaker the matter is one that is currently under discussions as part and parcel for a range of issues regarding fisheries around Norfolk, not that the area that is proposed to be created as a marine reserve by the Commonwealth is in the so called Norfolk Island Box but there have been some comments made by some of the fisher people in Norfolk regarding that proposal. Mr Speaker I will see what the latest developments in that particular issue is from the Commonwealth and certainly advise Mr Nobbs and the rest of the Members of this House when I get that definitive information.

MR NOBBS Just to the Minister for the Environment. Can he advise what the fate of I think it's Professor Zan's report on the fisheries and the marine environment of Norfolk Island, what is the fate of that report.

MR I. BUFFETT Yes certainly Mr Speaker. That report as Members will know if they watch the local newspaper I've called for submissions made the report available to the Norfolk Island representatives of the Consultative Committee on Fishery. I have been pressing them for an answer for at least 2 months in respect of that. There are a number of outstanding issues in respect of that fisheries and in particular that report generally and Mr Speaker it's with some delight that I can advise

Mr Nobbs and this House that I in fact on Tuesday of this week I received a response, a letter from the Secretary of the Norfolk Island Fisheries Consultative Committee and in response to that particular report. There have been others received. Mr Speaker what I would be intending to do is to now elevate that matter of fishery now that I have received that report because there is some outstanding matters this Assembly really needs to address and those issues are simply this. That the Norfolk Island Fisheries Consultative Committee in particular the local representatives have been pressing the Commonwealth to allow more local management in respect of that area and there have been a number of issues sitting in that arena for in excess of we months. Mr Speaker upon taking Executive portfolio I then reactivated that particular issue, for 2 reasons. Firstly that the matter has been there for so long, secondly there has been a new Minister following the Federal elections now responsible for Fisheries and that, in discussions with Senator MacDonald who is the new Minister responsible he is eager to find out what in fact the Norfolk Island community wants in respect of that. So in respect of the Zan Report that was the baseline study that was requested, it's been there, it's been for comment, we need to co-ordinate those issues and most importantly Mr Speaker we need to really assess what it is this local community wants in respect of their Fishery.

MR BROWN Thank you Mr Speaker I direct this question to the Minister for Community Services and Tourism and I do so on behalf of Mrs Jack Mr Speaker. Minister on the 5<sup>th</sup> of June Mrs Jack asked a question in relation to relocation expenses of Teachers and whether the allowances for those expenses were identical to those applied in other areas of the Administration. Have you had time to look into that question and are you able to provide a response.

MR SMITH Mr Speaker no I haven't at this point in time. I certainly haven't forgotten about it and I'll get a response to Mrs Jack probably as early as this week.

MR NOBBS One for the Minister for Finance. What is the current status of the proposed increase to the base wage within the Employment Act which was approved last year in which you stated ?? and you were bringing in of Regulations.

MR DONALDSON Thank you Mr Speaker. There have been amendments to the Employment Act. They went to EXCO about a month ago. It has been referred to the Minister in Canberra for his assent to the Act itself. It's a Schedule 3 matter. I understand the base wage was \$7, there was a proposal in the 9<sup>th</sup> Assembly to increase it up to \$10, that was not accepted and a medium of \$8-50 was proposed and I think that's where it stands at the moment. As soon as we get the assent to the amendments to the Employment Act we'll be moving forward with that and the base wage which I understand to be \$8-50.

MR BROWN I direct this question to the Minister for Finance and it relates to a document entitled Focus 2002. Minister is it a fact that you circulated this document to Members on the 27<sup>th</sup> of May 2002, is it a fact that the document includes the words from rhetoric to reality and if the rhetoric has ended and the reality has begun can you advise Members of the progress of the Focus 2002 document.

MR DONALDSON That's not entirely consistent with my memory of what's happened. I received a document from the Service which had a heading on it and the heading included quite a bit of high level language if you want to call it with terms like, from rhetoric to reality to it. I deleted those words from it, I'm not sure how Mr Brown got a copy of that document because the one I had was I suppose the word

might be downgraded to exclude that sort of language. Whether or not it was circulated on the whatever day in May, is it May or June.

MR BROWN

27<sup>th</sup> of May

MR DONALDSON I can't comment on that. But for the second part of the question, what progress has been made. I did say at the last meeting and I think the meeting before that we had commenced and we have commenced, there has been a plan put in place to conduct the Focus 2002 review. The review is all about economic sustainability for the future of Norfolk Island. I did address a meeting of the Chamber of Commerce about a week ago and spoke on the budget and the Focus 2002 issue. Just to give you some idea of the work that has been done and it's work behind the scenes that needs to be done to get this thing up and running to get it in a position where we can present it to the public. There has been a plan put as to how we'll approach the project. The first thing is the establishment of a Project Management Team. That will be myself, the CEO, one or two other Executive Members or MLA's from this House and two or three members from the community. That Project Management Team will then develop the guiding principles for the Focus 2002, it will more specifically define the scope of the review and it will appoint work teams. Those work teams will be given specific tasks, such as gathering in the base information that's already available on the income and expenditure patterns of Norfolk Island, having a look at where we can improve efficiency in the delivery of services by the Government of Norfolk Island, having a look at the Social Services issues on Norfolk Island, having a look at what needs to be done in infrastructure areas on Norfolk Island and those work teams will report back to the Project Management Team with their recommendations and really that's about all I can say on that at the moment. There has been a lot of work done behind the scenes and we're about to unleash this on the public in the next week.

MS NICHOLAS

A supplementary if I may Mr Speaker on that issue and address it to the Minister for Finance. Is it correct to say that the rhetoric has progressed but the reality has not.

MR DONALDSON

Thank you Mr Speaker. No I don't think that's correct. The rhetoric is a term I don't like to use. The whole reality of the situation has progressed. There has to be a planning stage that prepares the ground for the actual public consultation and the public exposure of the Focus 2002 review. That behind the scenes work has been progressing, it's necessary work, it takes time to do and it is an integral part of our overall project. So to refer to it as rhetoric is really a bit degrading I believe.

MS NICHOLAS

Is the Minister for Finance in a position to announce the Project Management Team.

MR DONALDSON

No I gave some indication before that the Project Management Team would be made up by myself the CEO, one or two Members from the MLA's and two or three members from the community representing various factions there. The names have not yet been determined, the actual people have not yet been determined as to who they will be.

MR NOBBS

I ask the Minister for Finance would he please advise when he will be tabling details of Government funded travel for the last quarter of 2001 and for the first quarter of 2002, that's the calendar years as promised a couple of meetings ago.

MR DONALDSON Thank you Mr Speaker. I have on Questions On Notice today a listing of all travel expenses incurred by Members of the Assembly and by Administration staff. It doesn't quite cover the period Mr Nobbs refers to it covers the period that this Government has been in, this 10<sup>th</sup> legislative Assembly has been in office, from the 1<sup>st</sup> of

MR BROWN Thank you Mr Speaker. I direct a further question to the Minister for Finance in relation to Focus 2002. Bearing in mind the Minister's assurance that rhetoric is now a thing of the past and that reality is a thing of the present will the Minister please provide written reports to Members on a weekly basis of progress with his Focus 2002 exercise and will the Minister please provide detailed reports to this House at each monthly meeting.

MR DONALDSON Thank you Mr Speaker. Yes most certainly. That is part of the process of Focus 2002. Mr Brown asked for weekly reports, I should hope they will be weekly. There might be occasions when they are fortnightly but they will be as needed.

MR BROWN Mr Speaker bearing in mind the reason for Focus 2002 and bearing in mind that successive Legislative Assembly's have not managed to resolve the problems unyet the Minister proposes to appoint Members of the Assembly and of the Service again to try to resolve the problem can the Minister advise when the regular reports will commence.

MR DONALDSON Thank you Mr Speaker. I can only answer that by as soon as they are available they will commence, hopefully that will be almost immediately, as soon as the Project Management team is appointed, that will be the first report to the House to say who they are, that will be the first report to the public to say who they are and from that point on as information unfolds it will be reported back.

MR BROWN Mr Speaker I'm concerned at the possibility that very little would happen. Could I again ask the Minister if he will undertake to provide a weekly report to Members of the House in and a detailed monthly report at each of our monthly meetings.

MR DONALDSON Thank you Mr Speaker. Yes I'll undertake that. We actually do have a MLA's meeting every Monday and I'll undertake to put that on the Agenda for each Monday to discuss it with MLA's who are here. That could be in the form of either a verbal report or a written report. If it's of any substance at all it will be a written report, if it's only of a very minor nature it might be in the nature of a verbal report.

MR NOBBS Thank you. I ask the Minister for the Environment, I've asked in the past questions in relation to the OTR or other than rock. Can he please advise if material classified as OTR or other than rock during the Cascade crushing operation and rejected as rock during crushing operation and stacked at various locations on the island has now been in fact designated as rock.

MR I. BUFFETT Mr Speaker basically the same response as in place. Mr Speaker there is some dispute between the Administration, the contractors or the Project Managers and the contractors in respect of that cliff project of which a central aspect of it is the question of OTR or rocks. Mr Speaker I am not in a position at this particular point to definitively answer Mr Nobbs' question.

MR NOBBS Just a supplementary. Can he advise what's actually happening. Is the crushing operation finished gee I don't know last August I think, can he tell me what's actually happening. Is there legal action being taken, if the Government's in a legal situation. I know that there are some constraints but surely as we're paying for it we should know what's going on.

MR I. BUFFETT Mr Speaker in short yes. There is some action taking place in respect of arbitration and in respect of some potential legal action in relation to that particular aspect of the project.

MR NOBBS Mr Speaker I just ask is it contemplated that a full judicial inquiry will be undertaken into the issue of OTR.

MR I. BUFFETT Mr Speaker I guess in short that probably will be the end result of the actions that are in place. It's being dealt with by the judiciary. If Mr Nobbs is talking about a separate inquiry apart from the actions that have been filed for arbitration or in the Court then that is a separate issue. Mr Speaker if that is the wish then I will certainly entertain Mr Nobbs suggestion but at this particular point I have no urgings by any of the Members or this House to have a separate judicial inquiry if that is a correct term to be used, into the operation of the Cascade Cliff Project and in particular OTR.

MR NOBBS Just a supplementary to that. Is it correct that the charge for rock has been increased because of the OTR issue and what will be the impact on the repayment of the loan if that it's proved that the OTR is actually OTR.

MR I. BUFFETT Mr Speaker I would not want to speculate on those things. There's a couple of issues involved in that and I will take that On Notice and provide Mr Nobbs as detailed an answer in respect of those issues because a couple of matter arise resulting from that question that he's asked and I'll provide that to him for the next sitting in respect of that particular question.

MR NOBBS I ask the Minister for Finance what additional funding has the present Government handed to the Electricity Undertaking by not adjusting the tariff, the electricity tariff to reflect the cost of diesel for the first 2 quarters of the calendar year 2002.

MR DONALDSON Thank you Mr Speaker. There has been a slight increase in diesel and I'm advised there will be another increase in diesel of a bit over 1c per litre as from the 1<sup>st</sup> of July. The last increase that happened I think was in the April quarter or the March quarter rather, increased of generation costs of the Airport by \$1600 a month and this was not passed onto the consumer in an increased tariff. I've also got a recommendation just in the last few days from the Service that the next increase which takes it up to about 58c a litre that the Administration pays for diesel can also be absorbed by the Electricity Undertaking without increasing the tariff of electricity.

MR NOBBS Will he please advise about the first quarter, the first quarter of 2002, what happened then because I asked for the first 2 quarters, that's from December or the 1<sup>st</sup> of January to the 30<sup>th</sup> of March and the 30<sup>th</sup> of March to the 30<sup>th</sup> of June. Can he advise what actually happened in the first quarter.

MR DONALDSON Thank you Mr Speaker. I haven't got the figures in front of me but my recollection is that the tariff has been at 34c for quite a while so there has been no increase in the tariff side or the revenue side of the Electricity Undertaking. As to the price movements in diesel I don't know what they were for the first quarter but

if Mr Nobbs would like to give me that On Notice or maybe even speak to me between meetings I can obtain that information.

MR NOBBS Just another one for the Minister for Finance obviously. What progress has been made in the proposed adjustments to the Powerhouse building to conform with recommendations made by the noise expert brought to the island last year.

MR DONALDSON Thank you Mr Speaker. There is a proposal in this years budget for the Government Business Undertaking which is Electricity and there's \$60,000 provided to soundproof the Airport Powerhouse. This sound proofing takes a form of insulation, just sound insulation in the walls and the roof of the building. It is a major job and it's going to cost at least \$60,000 and it's hoped that this will deaden the noise that emanates from the Powerhouse.

MR NOBBS Just another one for the Minister for Finance. Is it correct that the replacement millennium tent, following settlement of the insurance claim is now formally an Administration asset.

MR DONALDSON Thank you Mr Speaker. Yes it's my understanding from discussions I had with Administration Officers in the last month or so that the tent is now on the Administration asset register and recognised as being an Administration asset. There is the other side of it as to any outstanding debt on the original tent, I can't answer that, I don't know.

MR NOBBS I'm wondering if I may, how is it proposed that the tent will now be managed into the future and is it proposed to increase the hire rate for the tent and are the two smaller tents subject to the same management arrangements.

MR DONALDSON Thank you Mr Speaker. I'll just add a little bit to the last answer. I'm not sure if Members are aware that we did obtain insurance for the original millennium tent. Those funds have been received, I think it was something in the vicinity of \$70,000 odd but please don't hold me to that figure. As for the management processes for the new tent I can't specifically answer it. I know it's controlled by the Works Depot and you book it through the Administration and pay a fee. I'm not sure how that fee has been structured, I'm not sure who actually you see in the Administration to do it but once again I'd be happy to take that On Notice.

MR NOBBS Is anybody in the Government paid the outstanding funds from the insurance to, and also thanked Miss Hain for her generous support to the millennium tent project.

MR DONALDSON Thank you Mr Speaker. No that's the issue I alluded to in my previous answer that I'm not sure what the situation is, what the overhang is from the original tent that was destroyed and where the insurance money has gone but I will. If you like I'll take that part of it On Notice and report back.

MR NOBBS I'd appreciate that.

#### **PREENTATION OF PAPERS**

MR DONALDSON Could I answer a question that I was given On Notice, took On Notice but hasn't been put on the Notice Paper and it's to do with the

MR SPEAKER The only questions that are On Notice are those that are on the Notice Paper. However I can give you an opportunity at Statement time of course Mr Donaldson for you to respond there.

MR DONALDSON Thank you Mr Speaker.

MR SMITH Mr Speaker I would like to table the Inbound Passenger Statistics for May 2002 and move that they be noted.

MR SPEAKER The question is that those Papers be noted.

MR SMITH Mr Speaker I'll speak briefly to these today because we have the discussion on tourism coming up later on in the meeting but generally our numbers for the month of May were 2,602 as a total visitor arrivals compared to 3,691 in the previous year. The biggest downturn was out of the Queensland area where last year there was 1,051 in the month of May, this year 570. The overall visitor days for May was 19,190 which is also down on the 24,240 of the year before and in the year before that was 21,749. So 21,000, 24,000 and 19,000 days in the month of May. Thank you Mr Speaker.

MR BROWN Mr Speaker that decline in visitor numbers compared to last year works out to something in the region of 29%. That's a huge decline Mr Speaker especially when taken in the context of a marketplace in which previous Assembly's and previous Government's have increased the number of beds available in the marketplace by about 30%. It means that during May the average accommodation house has had to struggle with an occupancy little more than 50% of their average occupancy of last year and I continue to try to impress on Members the significance of this problem. I don't know how many people have sat down and actually worked out the significance of it but this is a massive problem which needs proper attention. We need to ensure that the Tourist Bureau does not go back to days of having favourites and others that are not favourites. Everyone must be treated equally, everyone must be given a fair go and this Government has a very burdensome responsibility as a result of having caused a 30% increase in the number of beds available which has to be tackled.

MR SMITH Mr Speaker I hear what Mr Brown is saying although it should be mentioned that also besides the accommodation people feeling the affects of more accommodation around there's certainly other businesses in the commercial sector that would certainly be feeling the pinch in that situation, but it needs to be pointed out that if we look at the number of aircraft which is a thing I've focussed on over the last few meetings the number of aircraft out of Sydney was 13 with a total number of passengers on those aeroplanes at 1400. That's well over 100 passengers per flight. I can't remember exactly what the restricted number is on Norfolk Jet's aircraft I think it's 129 or something like that passengers. So these aircraft are fairly full and Greg acknowledges that, Greg Prechelt. The difficulty is when we run a campaign such as is currently being run, which has cost well over \$100,000 I wonder whether the limitations that the aircraft has or the airline has to provide extra seats whether we may not be actually achieving much by running these campaigns while the capacity is what it is. As I recorded in the last sitting of the House I'd had a good discussion with Norfolk Jet about this particular situation and other issues that are related to it. Norfolk Jet is certainly aware of the difficulties and are looking at ways that when we get into our next peak, normal peak season which is September that they may be able to provided extra capacity. Of course there is also the proposal from Grant Cardenow who made a presentation at the Chamber of Commerce last week I think it was in relation to his proposal to commence an airline from Norfolk Island using Boeing 737 aircraft, which

brings me to a point that I might just mention that I was told last night that it was rumoured or said that I had approached this man and said that I don't want another airline to be flying here. I think the rumour was ridiculous and I just make mention of it at this point in time. I think we should all be looking for whatever we can do in the airline situation to improve our visitor numbers, but certainly appreciate what Mr Brown is saying with the extra accommodation that people have chosen to take up. There was an opportunity given back in '95 '96 or whenever it was that the deregulation was discussed and many people did take advantage of that and that's probably made it a little more difficult for existing operators who have been around a long time, particularly in a situation where we have full aircraft out of Australia and not having the ability to add the extra passengers that would make everybody happy.

MR NOBBS Thank you Mr Speaker. I'm a little concerned about what's happening with the tourism now and I would ask Mr Smith or the Chief Minister to please advise us in relation to the second airline what discussions have actually occurred between the Government at a Government level in relation to this proposed new airline. As Mr Smith said and I couldn't make it actually to the Chamber of Commerce the other night but the responses from that are somewhat unclear, unclear responses I've had to questions in relation to it and it needs to be clarified as to what's going on because we have responsibility for the Airport, we're in the process of an upgrade, I understand it's still going on, I forgot to ask a question whether it was still going on, and we need to know precisely what's happening and if it's being spoken of in the public arena has it been spoken of at Government level.

MR GARDNER Maybe if I could respond to the first part of Mr Nobbs' statement come question in relation to the discussions that have been held with the Norfolk Island Government over the establishment of another airline for Norfolk Island. The only thing that I am able to report on that Mr Speaker is that both the Minister for Tourism and myself did meet with Mr Cardenow very early in the term of this Legislative Assembly with Mr Cardenow and his wife to discuss the possibility of the establishment of another airline, basically without prejudice discussions that just outlined I think an idea that Mr Cardenow had and we've been awaiting since then more detailed information on it which was promised to us at that meeting but to date hasn't eventuated.

MR I. BUFFETT Mr Speaker just let me quickly clarify one issue. The two Ministers may have spoken of them but the Government as a whole if that is meant to include all 4 Executives, I'm not aware or may have been absent when that particular meeting was called.

MR GARDNER Maybe to clarify that. I did say the discussions were without prejudice Mr Speaker, they were basically an information session. There was no, as far as I'm aware or from what I can glean from those discussions any binding agreements or any undertakings given one way or the other. It was simply just to provide a briefing to the Minister for Tourism and myself as the Chief Minister.

MR SMITH Yes while we are on that discussion, I certainly have had subsequent meetings with Mr Cardenow and his wife in relation to what they proposed. At the last meeting which I think I reported to the Members quite some time ago that I had asked for a written proposal so that we'd be aware exactly what's happening and that's where the matter sits at this particular point in time all indications were at the Chamber of Commerce meeting from Mr Cardenow that there had been a suggestion that a September start up date was what was being proposed but that appears that that time may have slipped while he's getting things organised.



suffering and as the Minister said it's not only the tourist accommodation proprietors that are suffering, they are suffering an additional burden because of the fact that there's now extra beds but a 29% downturn which we saw in April and in May is certainly going to be causing havoc within the commercial sector generally and whether or not the Minister for Finance has noticed it yet, it's going to be causing havoc within the finances of the Administration. Thank you.

MR SMITH

Mr Speaker I don't know how much I can say about it but Greg Prechelt was not, as I understand it, wasn't talking about using an Air Nauru aircraft to provide his additional services. I may have that wrong or maybe Mr Brown has better information than me on that but I understood that it was going to be another aeroplane that was being used and possibly it could even be QANTAS aeroplanes that may be being used for additional services when they have their current aircraft freed up a little bit, which I believe is happening right now. I'm not too sure how far the Government should be involved in telling an airline for example Norfolk Jet or Air New Zealand how they should be running their operations and I don't think Mr Brown was suggesting that I do that but if I was in the business of carrying passengers I would be making the first moves in providing the ability to be able to carry passengers. I think that Norfolk Jet itself really needs to assess where it's going and as I've said on frequent occasions Greg and I do have some fairly good discussions about where we are going, for example last year there was a push from people within the community and also within the airline that the Government wasn't getting behind Norfolk Jet which wasn't correct but in a discussion with Greg I eventually said well it's your airline, what do you want to do with it, you've got to stand on your own two feet with it, not in those words Mr Speaker but along those lines which he appreciated and took into account and has worked very hard at providing the services that they can with the aircraft that they've got, but just as importantly it doesn't matter which airline I guess is where Mr Brown is correct that we've got to ensure that whoever is operating the route, or any of the routes satisfies the demand in Norfolk Island and that's something that we will be talking about in the Unity 2005 discussion later on in this sitting. It certainly concerns me, it concerns me when we've run 2 campaigns almost in the last 6 months to the tune of around about \$300,000 which the Tourist Bureau has contributed large amounts to, 50 to \$70,000 on each occasion and the first one certainly was a very worthwhile campaign because it raised passenger numbers at that particular time or raised the interest in Norfolk Island I should say and did provide for and probably still is providing for the passenger loadings we're getting now. The current campaign which I reported in the last sitting which had just commenced hadn't had the immediate response that normally happens but I understand that that's now changing and bookings are beginning to show as a result of that particular campaign. I was talking to Mike Perkins yesterday who is the Norfolk Island representative for Norfolk Jet who kindly came down and talked to me about some issues and said that the Melbourne market which is where the Wednesday service originates is responding very well almost to the point that Norfolk Jet may consider running that as a direct service out of Melbourne if the numbers stack up and then Norfolk Jet could possibly operate a different service on the Wednesday direct out of Sydney and of course that would be good news to people who want to travel on short stay holidays rather than the restricted the way it is now. If there's a full aircraft out of Melbourne, passengers out of Sydney don't have quite the opportunity to come to Norfolk Island particularly at the lower fares that are offered by Norfolk Jet. It's something that I keep a close eye on all the time because of the concern and we talk about this almost on a monthly basis, well we do talk about it on a monthly basis. I watch with interest what does happen with the proposed Endeavour Air because of course that certainly may have impact one way or the other in Norfolk Island's tourism.

MR NOBBS Thank you Mr Speaker. I just fairly quickly, I've been concerned for some time in relation to the expenditure of funds from the Tourist Bureau and what gauges they actually have because as the Minister just alluded to an increase in passengers following the so many hundred thousand dollars expended around Christmas and in the post Christmas period and I really I question whether it was the \$200,000 or whether it was in fact the AIDS epidemic of verbally that went on in the Australian Press and on the air and also in the papers what impact that had. I would have thought that, we seem to get far more cover by that than those adds in the paper and on the TV and the like, and that's what my concern is, how do we really, what mechanisms have we in place to test the validity of the response to publicity campaigns that we actually have at the present time because we're putting a lot of money in there and all we seem to say is, oh well it's the result of you know the numbers on the planes are a result of that campaign, but as I just said with the, and there was a huge amount of press and the like which a lot of people on the island don't seem to realise over the AIDS scare or whatever you like to call it, and I'm just wondering whether that was the trigger or not and whether the Tourist Bureau has in place anything to test that type of hypothesis.

MR SPEAKER Further debate. No further debate. The question before us is the Paper be noted.

QUESTION PUT  
QUESTION AGREED

MR DONALDSON Thank you Mr Speaker. Mr Speaker I table the Financial Indicators for the 11 months ended 31<sup>st</sup> of May 2002 and move that the Paper be noted.

MR SPEAKER The question is that the Paper be noted.

MR DONALDSON Thank you Mr Speaker. Mr Speaker the Financial Indicators covering the first 11 months of this year show a slightly better financial situation than budget predictions but it's only a slightly better situation. Income is virtually right on target, it's actually \$38,000 above the budget and you can't even measure that in fractions of a percent because the total budget is about \$12m. Expenditure on the other hand is \$695,000 below budget and if this trend continues for the final month of the year then the deficit for the year will be approximately \$350,000. However there are some major commitments provided in the budget which if incurred in the final month of the year will contribute to the deficit, possibly by an amount of another \$474,000 and I'll just read through those funds. There's \$190,000 provided for the IT data base, that's the computer data base in the Administration. The likelihood is not all of that will be spent. I think speaking with Officers the other day about a quarter of it might be spent before the end of the year so there's a major saving there. There's \$31,000 in training and development that hasn't been spent and I'm not sure how much of that will be spent between now and the last month of the year but I doubt very much if all of it will be spent. There's \$140,000 for a school building, if that's commenced and a commitment is made and a liability incurred before the end of the year that money will be preserved and spent next year but it will come out of this year's budget. There's \$10,000 for business development that hasn't been spent, there's \$10,000 for revenue based investigation that hasn't been spent and there's \$93,000 in Roads that hasn't been spent and as I said before all those add up to \$474,000. The predicted budget on the current trends is \$350,000 so take the worse case scenario that the \$474 and the \$350 and you've got about \$824,000 deficit but my prediction is and it's very dangerous to make these predictions is that we won't achieve that degree of deficit, and really that concludes my Statement.

MR NOBBS I just inquiring if there is going to be a clamp put on, curtailing of expenditure for the last month or so, what measures are being taken as being an inclination in Public Services elsewhere, and I say elsewhere to expend all the funds in the last few weeks of the financial year and I wonder whether there is a possibility of that occurring here or are they taking the same situation as they have in the past of curtailing the expenditure specifically in the last 6 or 8 weeks.

MR DONALDSON Thank you Mr Speaker. If I could speak to that one. There is an awareness of the problem that Mr Nobbs refers to and there has been instructions issued within the Public Service not to Christmas shop with available funds towards the end of the year. There has also been an instruction given by the CEO quite some time ago for her to approve major items of expenditure. There is an awareness in the Public Service of the need not to spend the money just because it's there.

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Further debate. The question before us Honourable Members is that the Paper be noted.

QUESTION PUT  
QUESTION AGREED

MR DONALDSON Thank you Mr Speaker. I have a further Paper to table on virements that I've made in the last few months. Mr Speaker Section 32 (b) of the Public Monies Act requires that I table in the House any virements made between votes. Accordingly I table a list of virements comprising transfers between votes made necessary by 1) the half yearly budget review and by subsequent identification of savings or requirements for additional funding in various subdivisions of the Revenue Fund. Such virements Mr Speaker are an internal re-allocation of expenditure and do not result in increasing or decreasing the total amount of appropriation for the year. Mr Speaker I seek guidance from the Chair, do I table them now or move that

MR SPEAKER Table them thank you.

MR BROWN I move that the Paper be noted.

MR SPEAKER The question is that that Paper be noted.

MR BROWN Mr Speaker I don't recall a list of virements having being tables previously during the life of this Assembly and if that's the case could the Minister advise whether this list is just for the last month or is it going back for some months and in the event that it's going back for some months I wonder what's gone wrong that it hasn't been tabled on time.

MR DONALDSON Thank you Mr Speaker. On the list I've tabled there is a date column on the table and it says the date I actually signed the virement. Most of them were done on the 20<sup>th</sup> of February and they were the result of the half yearly review which went to this House so there was knowledge within this House as what the virements were. There is a further requirement within the Public Monies Act that virements be tabled within 2 sitting days of the actual virement being made. I've failed to comply with that by a couple of sitting days. The balance of the virements that have been made happened in May or June and they've complied with the 2 sitting day rule. If you like I could read out the virements or maybe just have them on the table for information for those concerned.

MR SPEAKER  
that the Paper be noted.

Any further debate on this matter. The question is

QUESTION PUT  
QUESTION AGREED

MR DONALDSON Thank you Mr Speaker. This Paper is to do with Customs exemptions approved under the Customs Act 1913. Mr Speaker Section 2 (b) subsection 2 of the Customs Act 1913 makes provision for the Executive Member to exempt goods from duty where duty is payable is less than \$200. Section 2 (b) of the Act provides that where the Executive Member has exercised this power he shall lay a copy of the exemption on the table of the Legislative Assembly, I so table those exemptions.

MR SPEAKER Thank you.

### STATEMENTS

MR DONALDSON Thank you Mr Speaker. At a previous meeting I was asked to reintroduce the policy of tabling details of Administration Officers and Legislative Assembly Members travel expenses. I agreed to do so and accordingly I table details covering the period 1<sup>st</sup> Of December 2001 to the 30<sup>th</sup> of April 2002.

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Further Statements.

MR SMITH Mr Speaker just a couple of short Statements Mr Speaker. The first one is in relation to a road or roads, I do try and keep Members and the community up to date where our roads programme is. It's just intended Mr Speaker to commence a reseal of the airport end of Taylors Road within this current financial year which means within June. The commencement will of course be subject to weather over the next few weeks and it doesn't look very promising at this point in time. Mr Speaker many roads are in need of resealing and whilst that is recognised it is important that this section of road be brought up to an appropriate standard as it is a heavily used section due to the location of the airport. I understand that the work will be carried out fairly quickly but nevertheless there will be inconvenience caused to all road users. Mr Speaker a second Statement

MR NOBBS Can I move that the Statement be noted please Mr Speaker.

MR SPEAKER I understand that maybe you are half way through that Mr Smith

MR SMITH No.

MR SPEAKER Fine, the question is that the Statement be noted.

MR NOBBS It's just a query. I understood we had a roads programme in place and that J.E Road was well up on the list and I'm just wondering what has happened to I think it's J.E Road, well it's going up to join onto Red Road anyhow I think it's J.E off the top of me head. What's happened to that particular programme that we'd heard so much about in the past, why have we jumped to the Taylor's Road now.

MR SMITH Mr Speaker I can respond to that. J.E Road is the next one to be done, this is only a reseal of the Taylors Road one which was part of the plan that Taylors Road be done. It's not considered part of the Burnt Pine Upgrade like we started out to expect back in 1997 or whenever it was we started that upgrade, but there's also becoming a difficulty with the amount of crushed rock that's available for roads and that may impact on the J.E. road upgrade because that is intended to be a reconstruction of that road and it's a fairly big job.

MR SPEAKER Further debate. The question is that the Statement be noted.

QUESTION PUT  
QUESTION AGREED

MR SMITH Mr Speaker I'd like to make a Statement which I was going to use in adjournment debate but in case I forgot, for the past 10 years Margaret Meadows has been at the head of VL2NI. Now Margaret is well know on the island and has contributed much to the involvement of our Radio Station and the community and Margaret has actually resigned from the position and she's going to be leaving the island sometime in July I think it is. Margaret has sat through most of the meetings of the Legislative Assembly throughout the years, probably not something that people envy having to sit here and turn the microphones on and off and you can't leave until the meeting is finished. Margaret has been very much involved in community matters with VL2NI and these are words of appreciation for what Margaret has done and to wish her well in the future.

MR NOBBS Can I move that the Statement be noted.

MR SPEAKER Question is that that Statement be noted.

MR NOBBS Thank you Mr Speaker. I intended moving in the adjournment debate a similar talk I guess on Margaret. I'd just like to add my appreciation for assistance apart from in this Chamber as when I was acting in another role but my weekly trips to the Radio Station and the like and I was very appreciative of what she did at that time and also during the various elections. She's always been very helpful and put herself out consistently to assist those candidates who put their names up and wished to make statements and the like over the years. I wish her well and I look forward to meeting up with her sometime in the future.

HERE HERE

MR SPEAKER Further contributions. The question Honourable Members is that the Statement be noted.

QUESTION PUT  
QUESTION AGREED

**NOTICE NO. 1 – INQUIRY INTO EFFECTIVENESS AND MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE NORFOLK ISLAND HOSPITAL ENTERPRISE**

MR NOBBS Thank you Mr Speaker. Mr speaker I move the Motion in my name on the Notice Paper.

MR SPEAKER Thank you. The question before us Honourable Members is that the Motion be agreed to.

MR NOBBS

Thank you Mr Speaker. The Motion Mr Speaker starts off in the initial stages that this Assembly take note of the Petition in relation to the dispute between the Norfolk Island Hospital Enterprise and Dr Damien Foong presented at the Legislative Assembly meeting on the 5<sup>th</sup> of June last. This Motion is in response to that Petition. As you are aware at the last meeting I attempted to have Standing Orders set aside so that we could discuss the Petition. It was defeated 5 to 4 and so I left it at that stage with a view to bringing on at this meeting a Motion and put it on the Notice Paper so everybody was fairly clear what was going on. The trigger obviously to the Motion is the Petition of which there was something like 629 I think signatories to it, a fairly significant amount of signatories from the community. As I said at the last Assembly and I'll say it again that I take particular note of Petitions and also of Referendums, I think they are a great thing for a small community. I think they should be a process built into our legislation which provides that the Assembly must take note of the views of those types of expressions by the community and as far as I'm concerned we should debate the situation as far as the Petition was concerned. However the Petition was in 2 parts, it was in relation by memory to reinstatement of the Doctor and the second part was to initiate an independent inquiry. In Point 1 in my Motion Mr Speaker it's clear that the Assembly note the separate legal action by Dr Foong is to be heard in the Supreme Court on 1 July next seeking a lifting of his suspension pending outcome of inquiries currently in progress concerning contractual and other issues. That will be I think Mr Speaker left to the Court and I will not speak further on that particular Supreme Court action which is set down I understand for 10.00am on the 1<sup>st</sup> of July and we would hope that there will be a reasonably quick resolution to the issue. The second part is to initiate an independent inquiry into the Norfolk Island Hospital with particular reference to the a) the effectiveness of legislative and management arrangements as they currently apply at the Norfolk Island Hospital Enterprise and the adequacy otherwise of the Hospital Enterprise, the Director, the Hospital Board and the Executive Member in their oversight action or conduct in engagement, suspension or termination of Medical or Hospital staff over the recent 6 months. The second part reflects the second part of the Petition. What has happened previously is there has been some concern and it goes back a couple of years as to where we are actually going with the Hospital and how appropriate the provisions are within the Hospital Act. Two years ago and in the last Assembly and that was the proposal to investigate how we should best manage the Hospital, it was put up as a, and the provision of Hospital services on the island was put up as a particular project which was to be looked at. The Minister at the time through the Griffith University initiated a review of the Hospital and the Hospital Act and the arrangements for health provision on the island. This report took some time in coming forward. Eventually it came forward at about the same time I think it was, we received a, or we had been subject to an inquiry by the Commonwealth Government's Joint Standing Committee on Capital Territory and also other Territories. We were subject to an inquiry in relation to health provision on the island and it subsequently came out, the report was put out by, in the pink and in the red. These two particular reports have provided us with a, prior to the Minister's with a reasonable grounding to commence a review of where we're going with the Hospital Act and the provision of health services on the island. This Motion will effectively kick that along because I do believe there is a need for an independent inquiry in relation to this particular area. The Norfolk Island Hospital is administered by the Norfolk Island Hospital Board and a Director and then you've got your various staff coming down from that. There has been some confusion for some time as to the actual responsibilities of the Hospital Board and the Director and the likes. There has been a need to clarify in my mind the actual roles. The roles of the Hospital Board at the present time have some fairly strong powers, and it's been suggested that maybe, and I say maybe we should look at providing a Board with less powers and more of a advisory role. The selection of the Hospital Board members has been by the Assembly

but through the Minister which has overtaken what was a previous arrangement, some time ago I must admit from memory that members of the Hospital Board were elected. I've given the whole issue of the Hospital Board some fairly serious thought and I think that the community needs to come up with a view as to what they really want in that particular area, because we can go from either a Hospital Board which is, we can have no Board at all as one provisions. We can have no Board at all, we can have an arrangement then where the Director is responsible to the Assembly in a similar arrangement as you have with the CEO and the Public Service Board or we may have the Director responsible to the CEO is then responsible to the Assembly. We can then have a Board which is purely advisory or it can have various powers even to the extent of the powers that it has at this particular point in time, once we clarify who's got what powers. We can then look at where we're going with the Board as to whether it should be elected totally or appointed totally or somewhere in between. Now those are specific issues that I believe the community has to have a very serious input and that's why I'm saying an independent inquiry away from this organisation would be great. Now that's only one particular aspect but it's an example of what I think is needed in that particular area and I think that to, that this independent inquiry would be fairly affective and would do the job that I would hope it would do. I don't want to overlap my second Motion on this or get into any comments on the proposed Court case but I think it's essential, and it was a request from the people through the Petition, that the second part, that's B, the adequacy or otherwise of the Hospital Enterprise, the Director, the Hospital Board or the Executive Member in the oversight actions and conduct in engagements, suspension or termination of Medical or Hospital staff over the recent 6 months. I believe that reflects what was required. I know that Members have some concerns with that. We had a discussion yesterday as your well aware Mr Speaker. I gave my views at that particular point in time. I know that some Members are concerned about that and it's possible impact on the 1 July sitting of the Supreme Court but I put it in there MR Speaker because I believe that the inquiry and the Supreme Court case actually run in tandem, they won't be independent. I mean the inquiry would take account of what actually happens on 1 July and that will be, they can, I mean I mean I'm not telling them to but I think they will take account of what happens on the 1 July, so they are actually running in tandem, and it's most important that we look at those particular aspects as well because we're requested to by 629 people on the Petition, and whilst there may be some confusion, and it was mentioned I think at the last meeting that the Petition was signed for the reinstatement side of things and not the others, I can't accept that. People are not stupid. The third part is to provide adequate support to the inquiry and I think that's a basic requirement. At this stage Mr Speaker I'll leave it to the other Members to comment and I'll leave it at that for the time being if I may, thank you.

MR I. BUFFETT

Thank you Mr Speaker. Mr Speaker I understand what Mr Nobbs' Motion is attempting to do and perhaps I would have a little bit more sympathetic attitude in supporting the Motion if we were to comprehend perhaps a small amendment. Mr Speaker what this particular Motion, in particular 2 B was to slow down these issues, particularly to this 10<sup>th</sup> Assembly. Now Mr Speaker I will be asking and Mr Nobbs may well agree for an amendment to Part 2 B where it reads, recent 6 months, because I think a lot of these issues, if we're really listening to what Mr Nobbs is talking about goes back a long way before the last 6 months, and if it doesn't then it's particular to a specific incident. Mr Speaker I would be moving that the words, all the words appearing after "the" in 2 B and those words being "recent 6 months" be removed and replaced with "over the last 18 months", because mr Speaker it seems to me that these issues go way beyond the 6 months and that will have some bearing on I believe some of the discussions that are to follow and some of the discussions that may well arise in a future Motion that sits on this particular Paper. Mr Speaker I so move if it's in my power to do so to amend, or seek to have an amendment that the words "recent 6 months" be removed and replaced with "over the last 18 months".

MR SPEAKER Is leave granted for that amendment.

AYE

MR SPEAKER Any further debate. We have a Motion and an amendment in front of us Honourable Members. Debate.

MR SMITH Are we speaking to the amendment Mr Speaker.

MR SPEAKER Technically yes. We will need to dispose of the amendment first.

MR SMITH I will talk to the amendment. I support what Mr Buffett is proposing here with this amendment because I agree that it's not only the last 6 months, actually it's not only the last 18 months. You could almost say you could take this back over 5 or 6 years because the Hospital situations have been interesting over that period of time in all different areas, but I can see the sense with the 18 months proposal that's before us because if we get into going back too far it's going to be rather an expensive inquiry. But I need to say that I don't have any difficulty with an assessment or an inquiry done into the Hospital Enterprise as proposed by Mr Nobbs, because that's a question that always comes up. It's the difficulties that the previous Minister to me had, probably the previous Minister me had and probably the previous Minister again had difficulties with the current arrangements, and as Mr Buffett has said if we extend that time back a little bit it takes it away from what looks like one single issue which is currently in Police hands and also in the hands of the Court. This way it might be more effective and more worthwhile taking it back as far as 18 months. It probably needs to be longer but 18 months probably covers it for the moment. Thank you Mr Speaker.

MR NOBBS Mr Speaker we are taking note of the Petition in relation and I recognise and we have and people have fallen on their swords fairly effectively in the past in relation to the Hospital exercise, but I believe that to take account of what the people said in their Petition that we should look at, and I didn't want to hone in, and there are more than this issue as far as staffing at the Hospital, the one that we're talking, the particular Doctor at the Hospital, and that's why I've said in the recent 6 months and I stick by that because I believe it's a reflection on, it's a reflection of what was requested in the Petition.

MR GARDNER Thank you. I take on board what Mr Nobbs says about the reflection of the Petition Mr Speaker. If that's the case I'm disappointed that we're sort of going to play on the edges of the problems experienced at the Hospital. I for one can talk from my previous experiences as Minister for Health in the perennial problems that are faced not only in the management and the delivery of health services but right across the board at the Hospital. What was attempted as Mr Nobbs has said by the various inquiries I guess into the provision of health services on Norfolk Island both by Griffith University and the Joint Standing Committee of the National Capital and External Territories inquiry into the provision of health services on Norfolk Island was to try and provide all the answers to all of these problems and have a long hard look at it and then make recommendations for whatever changes were necessary, whether we had a new Hospital, whether we had a new legislative governance structures, governance and structure measures, a whole range of things. To my knowledge there hasn't been as yet any response to the Griffith University report, the Joint Standing Committee report, in the pink and in the red has basically identified those matters as being matters for the Norfolk Island Hospital Enterprise of deal with. If Mr Nobbs is I guess attempting to contain any inquiry into the 6 months which is relating to the action



That was the commencement or approximate time of commencement of proposed changes in how we manage human resources issues, how we changed recruitment processes, how we looked at things slightly differently. Now Mr Speaker that may or may well not have had a significant affect on some of the issues that we're now facing that's the subject of this particular Petition, and Mr Speaker let me also say that I don't believe these things are restricted to the recent 6 months because for those who have seen and heard, for those who have managed to get their words in, despite the subduedicy rulings there is the relevance of the contracts that were prepared in respect of this particular issue. There obviously have been some change in how things were managed. There's obviously been some change in how the whole human resource issue at that particular Enterprise may have been managed, and therefore Mr Speaker they are critical elements in what we're talking about, well they surely form part and parcel of what we're talking about here and therefore I don't believe they would originate in the last 6 months, but more particularly I believe we may find some of the genesis of that if we go back 18 months, hence my proposal for the amendment.

MR SPEAKER Further debate. No further debate. Honourable Members the question before us is that the amendment be agreed to and just to reiterate it, it is 2 B looking at your Paper. The last line, part of the line there which says 'the recent 6 months' is to be deleted and replaced by "over the last 18 months". That's the amendment as I understand it. I put the question to you. The question is that the amendment be agreed to.

#### QUESTION PUT

MR SPEAKER Would the Clerk please call the House.

MR D. BUFFETT	AYE
MR GARDNER	AYE
MR DONALDSON	AYE
MR I. BUFFETT	AYE
MR NOBBS	NO
MS NICHOLAS	AYE
MR SMITH	AYE
MR BROWN	ABSTAIN

MR SPEAKER The result of voting Honourable Members, the Aye's 6 the No's 1 with one abstention, the Aye's have it. The amendment is agreed. Further debate Honourable Members.

MR GARDNER If it's appropriate Mr Speaker I'd like to seek leave to move an amendment to 2 A as I indicated earlier.

MR SPEAKER Is leave granted  
AYE

MR GARDNER Thank you Mr Speaker. As I said previously my amendment would effectively change Para 2 A in the Motion and after the words "arrangements" insert "and practices undertaken and as they currently apply to the Norfolk Island Hospital Enterprise". Mr Speaker that's in response to Mr Nobbs' attempt as in his own words he said, to try and effectively look at all of the issues at the Norfolk Island Hospital and I support him in that but I think we also need to look at practices, and including practices that looks at all of the activities at the Hospital other than and not just the legislative and management arrangements, but all of the practices at the Norfolk Island Hospital Enterprise.

MR SPEAKER Just to clarify please Chief Minister. The words that you seek to have inserted are “and practices undertaken and as they currently apply” after the words arrangements in 2 A. Thank you debate.

MR NOBBS Mr Speaker I've got no problems at all with that accept I don't know what practices we're talking about but anyhow you can have it as broad as you like, this particular inquiry. I've got no problems at all with it and I'll support it.

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Further debate. No further debate. Honourable Members the question is that the amendment be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT  
QUESTION AGREED

MR SPEAKER We have 2 agreed amendments Honourable Members. Further debate. If we are at the conclusion of the debate on this question I

MR GARDNER I have some questions and I guess best asked of Mr Nobbs in relation to this. I see he's looking at an independent inquiry, please for our benefit and the benefit of the listening public if he could explain to us his thoughts on the makeup of that independent inquiry, the persons that should be involved in it and I guess some indicative time frames for a report back to this House on that inquiry if that's possible.

MR NOBBS Thank you. I was looking at being independent of probably of this group and obviously of the Hospital Board and the likes and the Doctors and what have you. The actual composition I hadn't given it a lot of thought. I thought maybe we could look at 3 Magistrates doing it and leaving it as that. There will be a need for quite a deal of public consultation in relation to it. I would say that there would be no substantive report before about October, that's my view, but there would be some prior reports before that time. But I mean I think the final report would, you'd have to give them at least 3 months to look at it effectively. They would then be in a position to call witnesses and do whatever they like but I think it should be independent of this organisation but it's up to the Members to look at it.

MR SMITH Madame Deputy Speaker I had a question in relation to the inquiry as proposed. One of the interesting things with this and Maybe Mr Nobbs can point me in the direction, I'll go back to the question that I was going to ask. I assume that an inquiry would wait until the Police inquiry and the Supreme Court issue would be settled before such an inquiry started because I wouldn't imagine that you could actually start your own independent inquiry when it spells out that there is in the Motion that it's about the engagement, suspension or termination of Medical staff which one presumes from reading that that it's in relation to the issues that are before the Court and the Police at this particular time. I'm assuming Mr Nobbs is going to adjust the Motion so that will reflect that that when that is over that that will be commenced. It would be quite silly of the Legislative Assembly to be putting an inquiry in place to look into a matters that are before the judiciary and the Police. The other interesting part about the Motion and although I support what is being proposed here as I said earlier in having an inquiry into the Hospital because that, as other Members have already stated, there has been difficulties with the Hospital for some years, and even though this part of this Motion is probably reflected in the next Notice on the Paper that, I understand and I need it answered I suppose that the Petition was actually drawn up by a Member of the Assembly. Now if that's the case do we get into the business of designing Petitions to achieve our own aims within the confines of the Parliament.

MR BROWN Point of Order. Madame Deputy Clerk it that comment was meant to be disparaging of a Member then it is contrary to Standing Orders and should be withdrawn.

MR SMITH Madame Deputy Speaker I was asking a question. I was asking whether the Petition was written by a Member of the Assembly and I went on to say is that something that really that the Parliament should be dealing with where we can, say it was me for example I decided that something I didn't like that Mr Brown was doing. Can I then put together a Petition, go out into the community, get a result that I might want and bring it back in and say that the community has spoken on this, and be able to use that in that sense. It's a question that we need to ask ourselves as Members of the Legislative Assembly.

MR BROWN Madame Deputy Speaker there is a Point of Order.

MADAME DEPUTY SPEAKER Indeed and I thank Mr Smith for elucidating on his response. Mr Brown I don't see that there is a Point of Order.

MR SMITH I guess really what I'm looking for is answers to those questions from the Member who has proposed this, mainly the one about I assume this inquiry would take place after other issues have been settled by the Court and by the Police.

MR D. BUFFETT May I firstly almost make an aside in terms of the matter that has just been mentioned. If I might draw Mr Smith's attention because he asked the question, maybe it would be useful for some people to make some response. The rules in the Standing Orders that cover Petitions makes it clear that a Member of the Assembly cannot gather a Petition on his own account or her own account. Maybe that would be helpful to Mr Smith to know that. The Motion that's in front of us. It's a Motion about an inquiry into the Hospital. My contribution is brief but I would like to make it, and the Motion is in 2 parts. Firstly it notes that there is a Supreme Court action that's in progress and of course the subdudicy convention quite properly prevents elaboration on that part and therefore I say no more.. The second parts asks for initiation of an independent inquiry into the Hospital and it gives some details to where that coverage might be, and this request as has already been mentioned follows a Petition to this Assembly lodged at the last sitting and it was a Petition with over 600 signatures. It's therefore a serious request over 600 people who are in the community, not all of them residents I might say but nevertheless all who had a bearing upon the matter of that related to the Petition, and of course it is a significant matter and we do need to give it proper weight and make an appropriate response. Without doubt Madame Deputy Speaker there has been, and there continues to be serious difficulties at the Hospital. Some of them are quite longstanding, some of them may be more recent, and I certainly consider that a review is needed. In considering how we go about such a review we do need to balance, balance some equally important surrounding factors. Firstly there's a Court action in progress that's been mentioned which may or may not touch upon this review, and secondly there is a Police inquiry and it too may or may not touch upon this matter, but both of these matters must proceed without our interference, without our interference, without our influence. They must maintain their own integrity. Our representation as a legislature can and will be judged on how well we order our affairs to ensure that we don't encroach unwanted and unwarranted into a judicial and a Police area that operationally must be kept separate. So where does that bring me to this inquiry. An inquiry, yes and I applaud it, but only after the Police and the judicial matters have been concluded. So if you ask me to support a Motion today whilst these Police and judicial matters are still on foot I would need to decline, but if you ask me when they have concluded I'll support it.



talking about a particular Doctor, we're not talking about a particular Nurse with this Motion we're looking at the whole gambit. I mean since we established the 3 Doctor principle at the Hospital we're looking at the processes or I imagine that's what the inquiry is going to be looking at, the processes that were set up, the different contracts that were entered into, consistency of applications and contracts and bits and pieces, the arrangements with the termination of Dentists for example and nurses and other staff at the Hospital, so it's right across the board. We're not targeting a specific person or a specific event. That's certainly my understanding of it and I have to agree with what Mr Nobbs says that if it's proposed that the Magistrates are taking those things on board I think they are going to be able to take into account any subdued principles or whatever when undertaking their review. So I have no difficulty. I agree it needs to get up and started and needs to look at it without fear or favour.

MR I. BUFFETT Thank you Madame Deputy Speaker. Just a couple of issues. Firstly this particular Motion doesn't propose a date or time for the starting of the inquiry, that's the first issue. Secondly we've got some given dates that we know things are going to be happening on, the 1<sup>st</sup> of July for example. The third issue is if we create this thing immediately there could be some conflict in the need to have access to a lot of the issues that both of these, the inquiry, the Courts whatever else is dabbling in this particular issue may be needing to look at. Madame Deputy Speaker I would have thought a way through this particular issue is yes we in principle agree to this particular Motion. Madame Deputy Speaker I am not by saying this agreeing that the people Mr Nobbs might be recommending should be the people on the inquiry and we all have some views when we start looking at these sorts of issues of the type of people and the expertise you might need when you start putting an inquiry of this nature or committee of inquiry of this nature into place, and perhaps to give us the time to do that, in other words to give some thought as to who might be one the committee, to allow some processes to take place, for example the 1<sup>st</sup> of July and some other time to run and secondly so as not to create a hindrance by immediately setting this thing up to some of the administrative and procedural stuff that Courts need to go through, but perhaps a way to do this is to agree that yes this will happen, by agreeing the Motion, to adjourn the matter to the sitting in July which would be about if I refresh my memory Madame Deputy Speaker about this 17<sup>th</sup>, 18<sup>th</sup>, 19<sup>th</sup> July sometime around that particular time and that gives us I think the necessary time to consider these issues and most importantly, most importantly for this Assembly, this Assembly to put together some terms of reference that this inquiry is going to work to because we're all going to have to give some thought to that, and Madame Deputy Speaker if that be the case I so move that the matter be adjourned and made an Order of the Day for the next sitting.

MADAME DEPUTY SPEAKER Thank you Mr Buffett. I put the question. The question is that the matter be adjourned and made an Order of the Day until the next day of sitting. So

#### QUESTION PUT

MADAME DEPUTY SPEAKER Do you wish the House called Mr Nobbs.

MR NOBBS Certainly. Madame Deputy Speaker. The greatest cop out in history

MR D. BUFFETT	AYE
MR GARDNER	AYE
MR DONALDSON	AYE
MR I. BUFFETT	AYE
MR NOBBS	NO

MS NICHOLAS                    AYE  
MR SMITH                        AYE  
MR BROWN                       ABSTAIN

MADAME DEPUTY SPEAKER    Thank you. The Ayes 6, the No's 1, and abstentions 1. The Motion is carried. Looking at the clock Honourable Members. Is it your wish that we should suspend for..

MR SMITH                        I vote we suspend until 2.00pm

MADAME DEPUTY SPEAKER    Is that a general feeling. Is it your wish that I call the House on the matter of suspension.

NO

MADAME DEPUTY SPEAKER    Thank you. The House stands suspended until

MR GARDNER                    Thank you Madame Deputy Speaker. I'm just wondering if it's possible with a couple of minutes to go until 12.30pm if I may take the opportunity

MR I. BUFFETT                 Point of Order. With all due respect Madame Deputy Speaker I thought we had taken the vote on the suspension of the House.

MADAME DEPUTY SPEAKER    Yes I must admit I agree.

MR GARDNER                    That's fine. I'll leave it until the adjournment debate thank you Madame Deputy Speaker.

MADAME DEPUTY SPEAKER    Thank you Chief Minister. The House stands suspended until 2.00pm.

MR SPEAKER                    Honourable Members we reconvene after lunch.. We are at Notices and we are at Notice No. 2.

## **NOTICE NO. 2 – SUSPENSION OF MINISTER WITH RESPONSIBILITY FOR HEALTH**

MR NOBBS                        Thank you Mr Speaker. I move the Motion for Notice No. 2 which is in my name on the Notice Paper.

MR SPEAKER                    Thank you. The question is that that Motion be agreed to.

MR NOBBS                        Thank you Mr Speaker. I didn't do this lightly to provide a Motion to the House. It was my doing and of nobody else's really, although there has been some considerable talk in the community in the relation to the performance of Mr Smith in relation to not only the Hospital issues but others. At our meeting yesterday we spoke of what was to be brought before us today in the current meeting. I thought that mine was a fairly straight forward Motion but it appears that there was some confusion in the use of the terminology in relation to the responsibility for Health. If the title is incorrect and we need to provide a specific title of I think it's Community Services and Tourism at the present time I would be pleased to move that as an amendment but I think most people know what I really mean in relation to that point. However if I may Mr Speaker just digress for 2 seconds to clarify an issue that



have been on the periphery of the Hospital issue for some 3 months, I'm embarrassed by that and what has really come out, because as I said following the presentation of the Petition to this House I've attempted to put together a chain of events that occurred in relation to Mr Smith and his reporting to us the issues as far as the Legislative Assembly meetings, Monday meetings. Each Monday we have a meeting of the Legislative Assembly and some reporting is done at that time and it goes back to the 8<sup>th</sup> of April from memory the first inkling of the problem arose and subsequent to that we've had situations where the Minister has advised us in relation to that that he has not, doesn't want to become involved, he wants to leave it up to the Board to make decisions and these sorts of issues. In fact at the last Assembly meeting he inferred that he didn't know anything about some particular item or other but it was referred to him by the Legal Service and that may have been so but may I say to you this that since the resignation of the previous Chairman of the Hospital Board and that was in February of this year, towards the end of February I understand from what I can gather that Mr Smith has not only attended Hospital Board meetings, he's acted as Chairman, and there seems to have been quite a number of occasions where he was heavily involved in the debate on various issues including the issue that I can't talk about. So that's why I'm really concerned that I feel as I told Members yesterday completely betrayed by what was going on because I was out telling the community well I don't know what's going on, all I've been told is this, this and this and it's nowhere near actually what was happening. So without being dragged into a situation where I can't talk on that particular subject may I say that as far as the Health issue is concerned I have real problems with the performance of the Minister in that particular area. I found that his attitude was quite odd and contrary to what I would expect that a Minister who has responsibility under the Parliamentary system, he's responsible for that particular area, the action that he took. I would say that quite clearly on that that the Minister was up to his ears as I said yesterday in the whole issue yet he wanted us to think that he was leaving it up to the Board as I've said already and I thought that he's not only attempted to set up me he's tried to set up the Members of the Assembly and he's also

MR SPEAKER

Point of Order Mr Nobbs. I would ask you to rephrase.

MR NOBBS

I believe he's let the Assembly be thought to be less than adequate in this whole operation and I find that difficult to understand why we cannot be told when the Minister is actually appointed by this particular group. As to his other areas of responsibility I have some grave difficulties and I've said before as far as the Public Service is concerned we had a situation at the May meeting where, when we were talking about the Hospital issue we had the Minister saying that there was some sort of separation of powers between the judiciary, I assumed he meant my colleague on my right here who is a Lawyer and the Legislature, which is this place here but yet he's been going around and, as I pointed out before talking directly to and meeting in what I understand as some sort of formal arrangement with members of the Public Service without senior Officers present. Now that to me is a complete and utter no no in our particular arrangements. I don't mind them talking informally at some social gathering or others, but within working time I believe that it's quite a different story, and therefore I have grave difficulties with him continuing in that sort of arrangement. Now this going off on you know trips, I mean he's gone away on a trip just recently as far as the Assembly is concerned to talk to Ministers and what have you in both Australia in Queensland actually. There appears to have been no representative from the Service with him and I find that difficult to understand how a Minister, unless he's at a social setup, if he's talking formally on particular issues as part of the Government how he can do that without a member of the Service present. On the issue of the Tourist Bureau, I've got grave difficulties. We had the word comes to mind that starts with S but I can't repeat it here with the previous Manager of the Tourist Bureau. There was allegations

made of going feral and goodness knows what and he may of I don't know but the situation is this that the major point that I have is that it took so long to, we were told that the matter was being clarified, that it was going to be cleared up very quickly, it wasn't, it took weeks. We even got to the stage where the Minister advised Members that he had, was assured that there would be advertisements put in the paper and they were going to be put in the paper and it was some 3 or 4 weeks later before the position was actually advertised, and this was at a time when we are having a serious downturn as was mentioned this morning, it's still continuing we know that and that's where I just can't, I believe personally that he's not able to handle his job. Now I was going to say in relation to the responsibility for Health issue if you want it changed you can call it to the responsibility for everything if you like because that's what he has been loaded up with, I'll admit that, that there is a very heavy load on the particular person but he didn't have to take it, and the talk about shedding this and shedding that has been going on for weeks and weeks and nothing has happened all right, so that's why I've moved against him, on those 3 particular areas and as far as the second part of the Motion is concerned is to allocate those Executive responsibilities currently with the Executive Member to the remaining 3 Executive Members as they see appropriate. Now bearing in mind that we're looking here at a suspension arrangement as far as the Executive Member is concerned, there's been discussion whether we can actually afford the current management arrangements or the management arrangements that have been put in place within the Public Service, and there has been strong talk of this in the last week or two and because money is a bit short and people are saying well they are costing us a squillion and that's it. May I say to you this, and I've said it before and I'll say it again, there are four senior positions within the Public Service. There is the CEO there are 3 Executive Directors. What was in place before was the CAO and 3 other Senior positions which equate to those 3 positions, maybe not directly but indirectly to what we had in the past, they are Project Manager positions. The cost of those is not a great deal more for this present, I think the salary situation was just a few thousand dollars variation between one and the other, that's from my memory when I had some responsibility for that particular area. So the situation is this what we did have before we had, when I, 2 years ago we had a CAO, we had one Programme Manager in position, another Programme Manager doing 2 jobs and the 3 Project Manager position was doing a job in full time job himself and in part of the Programme Manager's job and the rest of that position was done by the CAO at the time. It's interesting that 2 of those guys are in the Assembly at the present time. The situation was extremely difficult for the people concerned and there was a real push to try and establish a more appropriate arrangement in place and I believe that that's been established and I want to say that at little cost, little additional cost apart from recruitment and those sort of issues. So the financial problems within the Administration aren't in relation to that, but nobody said anything about the financial situation in relation to the Legislative Assembly. Do we really need four Ministers. Having put a couple of years into this and under fairly difficult situation for three quarters of that, and I think that my colleague will bear this out, it was difficult times, I believe now that with the management structure in place we can show the island that we can prune back to 3 Ministers, and I'm not saying that's the excuse for George getting the rump. What I'm saying is this, that don't tell me that the 3 Minister's can't handle those particular jobs that they have, that's all I'm saying. That's not the reason for wishing to put Minister Smith back with us, in the backbench. And so I've got no problem in that allocating those Executive responsibilities to the 3 other Executive Members. They should have the support within the Service and I believe they have and they should use it. So Mr Speaker I move this with some regret I move the Motion but I do feel that I've had extreme difficulty with the handling by Minister Smith in this particular Assembly and I'm not going back because I had his support and he had mine in the last Assembly, but I have now. I've got real concerns and that's why I move the Motion. Thank you.

MR SMITH Mr Speaker I didn't intend to say very much. I needed to see what Mr Nobbs was going to say. I might like to take this opportunity to clarify a couple of things. One in relation to the Health issues as Mr Nobbs has raised that in relation to the Board, the Hospital Board. Earlier this year we did have 2 resignations from the Hospital Board, one of those was the Chairperson and left the Board without 2 members. Mr Nobbs will recall that I had raised the issue at an informal meeting of Members in saying that I'd like to replace those people. Mr Nobbs was one of the people, was one of the Members that said no, we don't need to do that, probably without the forethought of the fact that the Board still needed to operate. I did attend Hospital Board meetings. When I inherited the Board there was a lot of issues that were carried over from the last Assembly, the previous Minister, the previous Director of the Hospital. There was a lot of unhappiness in that area. I found that by attending the Board's it did help, with the full Board did help to a degree at that particular point in time. I was I suppose surprised, really surprised when the Chairperson resigned for her own reasons. It was shortly after that that the issue that Ron keeps referring to in today's meeting actually came before the Board. Now I was of the understanding with the legislation that certainly the Executive Member or an Executive Member can't be a member of the Board, I was fully aware of that but it was made clear to me at the last sitting of the House by Mr Brown that a Board meeting has to be called by the Chairperson. Now obviously that hasn't happened for possibly for some years in all cases but I was attending and while I was there the other members of the Board, or the remaining members did not want to Chair the meetings, probably due to some of the stuff that had gone on in previous months and they asked me if I would Chair the meetings which I did. The Act doesn't say that I can't Chair the meeting, it does say that the members in the absence of the Chairperson, the members should appoint somebody to do that. Now if I had been more aware about that I certainly wouldn't have carried that out. Mr Nobbs has raised the issue about me being heavily involved. Mr Nobbs for some reason seems to have access to the minutes of the Board meetings, which I actually don't. I'd like him to share them with me so I could actually see what happened in those meetings. If he's going to use and quote issues relating to the Hospital Board he might like to show how I tried to Chair the Board in a sense that they don't get themselves into a difficult situation. He also stated that in the informal meetings that Members of the Assembly have once a week that I didn't report the issues. What he is referring to is the issue that he's been trying to raise all day but there's a matter of some

MR BROWN Point of Order. Mr Speaker in the event that the Minister is attempting to cast an aspersion of any kind on Mr Nobbs it is inappropriate and contrary to the Standing Orders and should be immediately withdrawn.

MR SPEAKER Yes I didn't interpret that that was what he was doing but maybe I should ask you to be careful about that Mr Smith so that there is not that interpretation.

MR SMITH I would certainly be careful and I wasn't trying to cast aspersions and I'm trying to just give the picture of, the other side of the picture, what Mr Nobbs has raised this afternoon, that issues were raised around the table here at the informal meetings of Members on different occasions with that particular issue. One of the things that's changed down here with this Assembly Mr Speaker is that most of the Members are down here almost every day, every working day, certainly the Executive's are. It's very pleasant to find that Ms Nicholas and Mrs Jack are here and yourself Mr Speaker an awful lot more than we had in the past Assembly, in the 8<sup>th</sup> Assembly and we share information around here, perhaps not as often as we should but I find it very refreshing to be able to pop up and talk to not only the Executives but other Members that are down here about issues and I find that helpful and it possibly,

possibly does create a situation where when we get to Members meetings there may be some things that I think I've spoken to Members about and perhaps the Hospital is one of those where Mr Nobbs has missed out on some of the information that's been going on, but when it comes down to it with the Hospital, it's run by the Board. Now this happens all the time, if you get involved in the Board, you get told you're not supposed to be involved in the Board, if you're not involved in the Board you get accused of not being involved in issues, but it's well known, Mr Nobbs will know the Hospital Act, probably back to front that the Hospital is run by the Director and under the Board and the Executive Members sits with the responsibility for the whole thing in the end and Mr Nobbs has raised an issue with that, fair enough. If I shouldn't have sat in on those meetings, shouldn't have chaired them so be it. The Public Service that Mr Nobbs was pointing out, the separation of powers issue that I asked as a question in relation to what was being raised by a Member and he refers that to the fact that I've held meetings with members of the Public Service without any management were there. That could be said to be true as far as the Executive management of the Public Service is concerned, that was my choice that I have no difficulty in talking to members of the Public Service. I've pretty well always done that where ever possible, whether it be within the areas of my responsibility or otherwise. I'm quite sure I'm not the first Minister to actually do that. Maybe Mr Nobbs has a different view about how the Public Service communicates with the Government. Likewise for travelling and when I went to Queensland without an Officer the meetings I had had been Officer discussions, certainly with the Education issue when I spoke to Anna Bligh the Minister for Education and she was aware of the issue and we were confirming that. Mr Nobbs has trouble with the Tourist Bureau and the General Manager position. Once again employment of the people in the Tourist Bureau is a Board matter. The Board is the employer. I will only get involved where I did recently as Mr Nobbs is well aware of an issue where I might have had to step in, which I didn't have to. There's been some sort of suggestion in what Mr Nobbs is saying that I have put a hold on the advertising on the position. I really can't understand where the reasoning for that would be, I really don't understand that but if I haven't mentioned it before in the House I certainly have at informal meetings that after the departure of the General Manager the Chairman of the Board came into see me about the Bureau in general and what was intended to have happened with the Bureau. There was proposals that had been that he was floating around. One was and including not going through the selection process and just picking up one of the applicants for the position from last year considering that Greg Howe had only been employed late last year. He wanted to run that past me. The fact that with the advertisement I had said to the Chair of the Board, as we did last year with the advertising for the position for the General Manager that the Assembly was of a view that we should be recruiting locally wherever we could, where there was appropriate people but that was up to the Board to deal with that. If they went the other way it may have been necessary in the finish. I'm really looking for any other meat that's in this thing here, but look Mr Speaker I understand where Mr Nobbs is coming from. It's true that we've shown support for each other in adverse times particularly with Mr Brown when he's moved 2 or 3 Motions on me in the past similar to this and vice versa, but when it comes down to it I do have a lot of portfolio's, they are portfolio's that people are really interested in. You've got the Hospital, you've got Tourism, you do have the Public Service and all the other ones that come with it. They are sometimes contentious. Sometimes the issues that come out of them don't emanate from this end of the difficulties, they emanate from the other end, for example the Hospital. As Minister you've got to use your judgement of where things are going with them, with the Hospital issue that's been around that was being dealt with appropriately. I didn't have any options to step in and direct otherwise because an allegation had been made and that was being dealt with the way that it should have been. With the Tourist Bureau the issue really with the Tourist Bureau is not about who works up there, it's about Tourism and it's about what's keeping Norfolk Island alive financially. It concerns me as much or

probably more than some Members or some members of the community I mean because of the way it has gone over the last 12 months. I'm sure that the Board, the Airlines, the Government have all been trying to do the best they can to increase our visitor numbers up to what they were previously, now that's not easy or it hasn't been easy. I think there is a light at the end of the tunnel with that. But sure people could be critical of me because people have always been critical of me with the portfolio's I deal with and that's ok. I believe that I do the best I can in what I do. That may not be enough for some people but there's Members around the table that have that option to Move such a Motion as Mr Nobbs has moved here today. If he feels unhappy with it unhappy with the way I deal with my portfolio's well let him move the Motion. As I said just a little while ago that there's a lot of portfolio's. In the past Tourism has been a portfolio run by one Minister. You have Health which was run exclusively by an Executive Member, Education which is a large portfolio. I have the Public Service, I don't think that's been an independent portfolio for a while but I do have quite a list of things. I'm quite happy working with them but when I do I really need to do it with the support of the Members around the table. Now I don't expect that for every single issue. I certainly don't expect it to be done the other way though Mr Speaker. If I and whoever is serving in any of the portfolio's I've got are doing what they believe is the right thing and the best way they can do it they shouldn't be chastised though me which is what is being suggested here of the way that the portfolio's are handled. However I'd show my willingness as I did yesterday and as I have done in recent times as other Members of the Executive have that if we were to move some of the portfolio's out of my responsibility it's no skin off my nose. If there's a feeling generally that the load is possibly too much for one Executive Member I have said on occasions that I'm quite happy with what I've got. Sometimes it might take a little longer to do things because they are busy portfolio's. In fact when it comes down to it it makes no difference to me whether I'm an Executive Member or not. I put myself to an election because I want to do what I can for Norfolk Island. I think I have things to offer. It's not the end of the world for me being an Executive Member, it's an honour. It's an honour being in the Legislative Assembly. If Members don't think that I'm performing properly they have every right to do what Mr Nobbs has done here today although he's talking of suspension of me as Minister. I think what he said yesterday it's really termination of me as Minister and I think he kind of confirmed that this afternoon when he said that you don't need 4 Executive Members. Now that's his view. I think that's kind of living in the past. I recall when there was 6 Executive Members of one Assembly.

MR SMITH

Thank you Mr Speaker, I recall when there was six executive members of one Assembly. Most of them have been four. I know that in the last Assembly Mr Nobbs might have considered that he didn't need all the executive members that he had around him at that time but if you look at what occurred and how much was achieved in Mr Nobbs' portfolios at that time it would be interesting to make a comparison of what has been achieved by Ron as executive member compared to the things I deal with in where the achievements can be marked in what I've done. I've been an executive member in almost ten out of the twelve years I've been on the Assembly. I don't always have the answers. I make mistakes but what I do do, is I try and do my best. I would be very happy to offload some of the portfolios. For one reason being like in the health area, if the issue is being focussed at me and not where the proper processes are taking place and if another executive member were to pick up that portfolio it might take some pressure off some of the people who are involved and being dragged through the mud over the last couple of months. I would be very happy. May be another executive member wouldn't want to take on a portfolio that have such issues in it. I always try to take on the issues whatever they may be, and I'll always say if I'm wrong about something but I don't back away from it. That's what we are here for and that's all I need to say at this moment

MS NICHOLAS

Mr Speaker, I'm going to take a couple of steps back in time. Immediately following this Assembly's election late in December last this group of people here today, Mrs Jack included, met in committee rooms to elect a government from amongst themselves. Four people were chosen by ballot. The meeting was adjourned and those four people went off to decide between themselves which of them would carry which portfolio, who would have responsibility for what. I emphasise that the decisions were made by them and them alone, not by this Assembly as a whole, non executives had nothing to do with it once the government was elected, that is the four Executives. That point is significant because it was up to them to create portfolio appropriate to their qualifications or interests. Graeme Donaldson, fairly obviously took on or perhaps was allocated Finance as the major part of his responsibilities – but let's not forget that he also has responsibility for a string of others as well – the Airport, Customs, GBE's, (the government business enterprises), and Licensing among others. The Chief Minister and Minister for Intergovernment Relations has Immigration, Gaming, Legal Matters, Sport & Recreation, Self Government and Strategic Planning as well as his responsibilities with Intergovernment relations. The Minister for Land and The Environment, Mr Ivens Buffett, has the obvious ones as in his title plus Agriculture & Horticulture, Fishing, Waste Management, Parks and Forestry, and others. The Minister for Community Services and Tourism has all the high profile issues to deal with – Tourism, the Hospital and Health, Social Welfare, Education and the Public Service. These are the humanities – these are the issues which face most of us, in one way or another, every day of our lives here on Norfolk Island. I do not seek to make excuses for George Smith. I think he was landed with a bundle of Ministerial responsibilities too great for any one person. Mr Nobbs acknowledged, just a few minutes ago, that we ended up with, to quote him from just a few moments ago, the Minister with responsibility for everything. What is it that we expected of him, what is it that he has failed to do and how has he failed us – has he in fact failed us? The problems at the hospital began a long time ago, well before this Assembly came into being. Problems with the Board, problems with Doctors, What was the Minister to do? Was he to sack the Board? How would the community as a whole have viewed the situation then? The Board comprises people who come forward, who are willing to serve the community, they give their time freely and without complaint – they do what they think is right. Who is to cast the first stone? Who among us can do anything other than what we believe is right? Mr Nobbs has mentioned the chairing of the board at the Hospital. The Minister has acknowledged his error in doing so and has spoken of the events which led up to this occurrence. Mr Speaker – I supported the decision, as did most Members of this Assembly, to suspend one of the Doctors pending police investigation. Most people under police investigation are expected to step aside from their positions, there's nothing new or even unusual about that. I don't resile from that decision. There are complications which arise, partly because people on Norfolk are so used to seeing "their doctor", they forget that this is a Public Hospital system and that the Doctors are not in private practice, able to see patients privately, with all that that means. All patient's files at the Norfolk Island Hospital are available to all the doctors and probably to the Hospital Director as well, I've not sought an opinion on that particular issue and it's probably a fine line anyway. However, I digress, relieve the Minister for Community Services and Tourism of some of his load. He's talking about that. , Don't try to remove him. The people of Norfolk Island elected George and elected him very firmly and that should not be forgotten in the heat of the moment. Let Mr Ivens Buffett take on Tourism, pecuniary interest do I hear you say? What better man to take the task upon himself, what is good for Mr Buffett in terms of Tourism should benefit all on Norfolk Island. Let The Chief Minister take on the Public Service and the Hospital, he's done it before, he should have no problems picking up the reins again. He's retained an interest. Let the Minister for Finance take on Social Welfare, he shouldered that responsibility whilst a member of the Public Service, he shouldn't have a problem with it now. That leaves Mr Smith with Education, which is his main

love and vote base, Police, Emergency Services, Disaster Management, Broadcasting and TV, Community and Culture, Civil Works, and Museums, in the formal listing of things Mr Speaker, needless to say I do not support this motion as it stand. I do seek a reshuffle not an execution and for the reasons I have given above I could not support the motion as it presently stands. Thank you

MR NOBBS Thank you, Mr Speaker. I really should have followed Mr Smith because there's a couple of issues that need clarifying in what he said. The Minister referred to the appointment of the Hospital Board and that most of the members told him to do nothing. That's not quite correct. He was told that what should happen is he should come back with some recommendations on how the hospital should be managed with particular reference to the Board but that hasn't happened and I spoke to Mr Smith about that last Thursday before I put this motion in when I mentioned to him what I intended doing. I intended doing something but at that point I wasn't too sure but I knew I was going to do something. I spoke to him about it and gave him the opportunity. I said do you want to stand down now or there'll be some movement against you and at that time he conceded that he hadn't done that but he had all these problems with the board and that sort of got over the top of thing. fine. I accepted that but I don't accept that we told him to do nothing. Again, there was a reference a few minutes ago to having access to the minutes and I must have all the minutes. I haven't got all the minutes at all but he should have because the Act actually says that within seven days the minutes should be with the Minister, the same as the Act that says the Chairman of the board must call the meetings of the board. these are things in the Act and they are where I haven't really pointed the finger but they are areas where there are real concerns where the responsible Minister is unaware or unable to accept what he's supposed to be doing, thank you Mr Speaker

MR DONALDSON Thank you Mr Speaker. We are talking to the motion on the paper that talks about suspending the executive member for health. Like the Executive Member for Health I read that as terminate his appointment and that's quite clear that's what the motion says. Just like Chloe, backtracking a little bit, it was recognised last December when the portfolios were allocated to the four Ministers, that George had a particularly heavy workload. It's actually got worse than that. It's become an extremely heavy workload in three of those areas. There's been an extraordinarily heavy workload in public service issues; and we all know the problems there, we won't go into them. there's been particular problems in the Tourist Bureau and we've spoken of them and I won't elaborate on that and the matter before us now is really what has brought this matter to a head, is the hospital issues. I believe that has created over and above the workload that's normally attached to his portfolio, quite a burden for George to do. In judging a person's performance as an executive member it should be recognised that it's very difficult in the early stages to recognise which problems are actually going to grow into major problems and which problems are going to remain small ones to be dealt with. By the effluxion of time or by a simple decision by the Management Team. it is very easy to be wise with hindsight and I think we should be careful at this stage of our proceedings to be wise or to take too much wisdom from hindsight. I further believe that where there's a Management Board or Team in place they've been given the responsibility to run the organisation. They should be able to do so with a minimum amount of outside interference, partiular political interference. they've been given a task to do, let them do it. I believe it's wrong for the executive member to have input in the day to day management issues of an organisation. We've seen that too often in the past. the Management Team is appointed to carry out the management of that organisation and is accountable for their actions. They must answer for their performance. the question of whether, where and more particularly when an executive member should become involved in an issue to do with management is a matter of judgement for that partiular executive member to exercise on that

particular issue. There's some guidance given by legislation as to what the executive member's roles are and I'm talking here about appointing members to a Board; signing instruments, and in the Immigration Act, signing Declarations of Residency. They are the roles of the executive member. On the matter of performance by the Minister I believe that the Minister has acted without fear or favour in all matters that he's attended to in the six and a half months of this particular Assembly. I believe he's dealt with all matters in the utmost of good faith. There may have been a different response or a different reaction to various problems as they arise had I or any other Minister or member been in that position to make that decision but I reiterate myself when I say that I believe George has acted in good faith and made the right decision in the circumstances. In fact he's been guided by legal advice in some of these decisions which may even be contrary to what his conscience tells him. Just in summary I do not support the motion to suspend the executive member, I do however, support a reshuffle of portfolios so that the burden is shared more evenly amongst the executive members. I don't support reducing the executive members down to three. I think there's a better argument for increasing it to five but I'm not going to put that at the moment, thank you

MR BROWN

Mr Speaker this is a pathetic debate. We're not talking about a popularity quest. It doesn't matter whether George is popular or not. It doesn't matter whether as Ms Nicholas said, his power base is at the school and he loves it. That's not what we are here about. This isn't a social welfare issue. It doesn't matter if George has poor job prospects in the event that he loses his executive office and to such extent that any member is bearing that prospect in mind it is an inappropriate consideration. There's no doubt that the Minister for Community Services and Tourism is a nice man and that he is pleasant company. I think in most cases he means well. But what we are talking about is competence and accountability. We're talking about whether the community is getting value for its money. We're talking about whether the \$38000 or so which is paid to the Minister can be better spent. I will accept that the availability and competence of advice that is provided to executive members is often of poor quality. But that means that our executive members have to possess sufficient knowledge and skill to know when they are out of their depth. And when the ability of their advisers is in fact inadequate. Those skills are not necessarily possessed by a nice person. I acknowledge that the present Minister has been in this place for many years. He's told us that he's been in fact a Minister for ten of the last twelve years. Out of the present Members that would probably make him the third longest serving. Interestingly, the two longest serving, the two most experienced are not executive members. But the question is not whether the Minister has been here for twelve years and been a Minister for ten. The question is, does he have the training, the experience and the other necessary attributes to justify continuing to hold his position. The question is whether his performance to date is such that we should say, yes that job is satisfactory. I don't propose to comment on the tourist Bureau Manager fiasco other than to say that it was a fiasco because I'm providing legal advice to the previous Manager. That matter will in due course come to an end but I doubt that it will shower credit on the Minister for Community Services and Tourism when it does. The Minister has told us that he's fully aware that the executive member cannot be a Board member. Notwithstanding having been fully aware of that he allowed quite a debacle to occur. On something like the 26<sup>th</sup> February, the previous chairman resigned, no new chairman was appointed. The Act is clear. A meeting of the Board can only be convened by the chairman. The Act is clear and the Minister has acknowledged that the executive member cannot be a Board member and yet meeting after meeting was unlawfully convened and was unlawfully chaired by the executive member. We've been told that the Act doesn't say that the executive member can't chair a meeting...

MR SMITH

Point of Order Mr Speaker. I'm just wondering if this is subjudice. Mr Brown might be able to tell us whether these issues, and I don't

know, whether these are issues that may possibly be raised in the Supreme Court. If they're not I have no difficulty with them but if they are I would appreciate him saying so

SPEAKER Yes, Mr Brown I'm not privy to any detail of the court case but I am really not interpreting that they would normally form part but that's not necessarily for me to judge

MR SMITH Hmm. I'm just looking to Mr Brown because I've heard, but I haven't seen what has gone before the Supreme court in relation to what Mr Brown is raising

SPEAKER Yes, Mr Brown maybe I should just point out to you the subjudice convention and you might be mindful of that in the presentation that you are making

MR BROWN Thank you Mr Speaker I'll certainly be mindful of that. the Minister has told us that he doesn't have access to minutes of board meetings and yet, as Mr Nobbs has stated, the Act clearly requires that the minutes be provided to him within seven days of a meeting. Now the Minister has demonstrated that he has inadequate knowledge of that portfolio to manage it. We've been told that the Hospital it run by the Board and the director but the minister is there in order to provide accountability. If the Board and the director go off the rails it is the role of the Minister to pull things back in line. I don't think that that can be avoided by just saying oh well I've got to step back and let them muck it up as they wish. The Minister has told us that he's not the first executive member to talk to members of the Service in the absence of an Executive Director or Chief Executive Officer. I would say that he is the first executive member to do that under the new Public Sector Management Act and I would suggest that in terms of appropriate public sector management the Minister has again let the team down. I don't know what arrangements have applied to the Minister's travelling allowances, the details of travel expenditure tabled today, the 19<sup>th</sup> June provides detail only up until the 26<sup>th</sup> April and that's unfortunate. But I'm sure that the Minister is well aware that if he is travelling on a mixture of public and private business it is not appropriate for him to have the public purse fund his trip. The Minister denies having put on hold the Tourist Bureau Manager's job. Well time will tell what in fact occurred there. The Minister has told us, I do the best I can. that may not be enough for some people. I make mistakes. I try to do my best. I'm sure that he does Mr Speaker but the point is that our community deserves to have the very best possible person in the job not someone who makes mistakes, does his best and eventually owns up if he's mucked something up. Ms Nicholas has told us that the Minister has all of the high profile issues. Well I would like to suggest Mr Speaker that he's turned them into high profile issues because he's mucked them up. There are no shortage of high profile issues in the portfolios of other Minister's but other Ministers do not have the total debacles which seem to be littering the portfolio of the Minister for Community Services and Tourism. Ms Nicholas has said that the Minister has a bundle too great for any one person. Well I find that difficult to accept. If you look at the four lists, that is, the lists, that is, the lists of each of our Ministers, if competently handled, I don't think they are out of balance. There are substantial issues in each portfolio but it isn't fair on the community for us to say let's find all of the substantial issues, let George give them to the other Ministers so that all he's got left is Kindergarten, Museums, Broadcasting and TV. And once we've made life easy for George, he'll be able to continue to earn his \$38000 per year and all will be happy. some will think that I'm being particularly course and unkind in making that comment Mr Speaker but we are dealing with public money and we are dealing with the Governance of Norfolk Island at a time when things are not going well. At a time when tourism is in an absolute trough, the Hospital is a disaster zone and the Public Service can't be described as anything other than a disaster zone

either. Ms Nicholas has told us, and these are her words, that most people under investigation are expected to stand aside. People are only expected to stand aside if an investigation relates to carrying out the duties of their position. And Ms Nicholas should get to understand that very very quickly. She's told us that patient files are available to all doctors and the director. she should go and read the Commonwealth Privacy Act which applies to Norfolk Island and the various protocols which apply with it. Mr speaker I'll accept that Ms Nicholas was in this place something like twenty years ago, but the world does change over twenty years and I don't appreciate her coming here and preaching to me about what is right and what is wrong, about what's appropriate for doctors and directors to look at in a patient's confidential files and about who should stand aside and who shouldn't unless she makes a real effort to ascertain what the facts are. Ms Nicholas has said that the Minister for Land and the Environment should take tourism because what's good for him is good for Norfolk Island. Now I accept that he would do a damn good job in tourism but by Jove I can remember other people being criticised in the past for having had the slightest interest in any partiucular subject matter but it's good enough for Ms Nicholas to come on twenty years later and say take notice of all of that, give it all to Toon. Not criticising Toon. I think too that he would do a good job but the thinking could do with improvement. I can understand where Mr Nobbs is coming from. The community is not getting value for its money. The Assembly is having no credit done to it. The first Gardner Government is left looking foolish and that is unfair and one of the reasons for that being unfair is one that I've mentioned a number of times in this place. That is, that our Chief Minister is left shaking hands at the airport or making speeches on the radio with two hands tied behind his back and chains tying his ankles together because he doesn't have the power to discipline his ministers. He doesn't have the power to nominate his Ministers' he doesn't have the power to sack them. he doesn't have the power to put new people in their place and it's time that he did because if you are going to hold him accountable, he's got to have those powers. Mr Speaker as I said, I can understand where Mr Nobbs is coming from and I certainly sympathise with him. I would like to float a slightly different idea though. I would like to float the idea that instead of just dealing with the situation of the Minister for Community Services and Tourism, we look at the overall composition of the government. Now when we were elected, some six months ago or a little longer in fact Mr Speaker, my recollection is that we agreed that at a stage, perhaps six months down the track we would review those who hold executive office and we would review the allocation of portfolio responsibilities. I believe it's an appropriate time to do that and I will at an appropriate stage during the meeting seek leave to move the following amendment and that is that all words after "that this House" be deleted and the following inserted in their place "resolves, 1. that all executive offices held at this date be declared vacant effective from 10 am on Wednesday 3 July 2002; 2. that the House meet on 10 am on Wednesday 3 July 2002 and select the persons who shall thenceforth be appointed to executive office and if necessary the number and titles of such offices; and 3. that His Honour the Administrator be advised accordingly". I believe it is time for a reshuffle but it should be a total reshuffle. It shouldn't be just how do we rearrange the deck chairs among the existing Ministers. We should look at how each of the exciting Ministers have performed; we should look at the tasks ahead of us for the remaining two and a half years of this Assembly, we should look at how those tasks should be grouped between the various Ministers and we should make a new selection,. Now it may be that we should select four of the present four executives. I know that someone such as Ms Nicholas would say well, the only thing that counts is how many votes you got so she would say, one, two, three, four, but I don't think that's appropriate either. We owe the community more than that. We ought to give the community the very est possible government that we can select from among the members of this present Assembly and if we are not prepared to do that then I think that we've let everyone down, thank you

MR GARDNER Thank you Mr Speaker again I've listened with great interest to the different members around the table as I did yesterday and made some brief remarks yesterday in relation to this matter. I guess the most disappointing thing is that something like this was sprung upon us only in recent days and that we've only had a single opportunity as an Assembly to sit down and work our way through the matters. I see Ms Nicholas raising her eyebrows in concern. yes, there have been questions asked by a lot of Members around this table about performance of different members at different times, not just the Minister in question, but about myself in different areas, about Minister for Land and Environment to do with the Norfolk Island Plan, about various Members and the opportunity has always been there and there's been a lot of discussion that I'm aware of, of just how one rectifies some of those difficulties. This is one of those proposals to resolve one of those issues, that's come from Mr Nobbs and I applaud him for that because it's important that members are given the opportunity and take the opportunity to raise those issues. Hopefully it would have been done within the confines of our informal discussions before having to be made so public and to a degree with discussed that at some length yesterday, but were unable to resolve it. there have been proposals and again I've listened with interest about divesting the Minister of some of his portfolio responsibility. I guess the questions are which ones and I'll be the first one to say look, I don't mind if you want to give me something else, whether it be Health or the Public Service or whatever it may be I'll be quite happy to take those on. I'm not going to walk away from those sort of responsibilities but I guess the most important question in relation to this is in the wording of the motion which effectively that it reduces the executive membership to three members. that's completely unworkable. that's not a responsible resolution to problems that are out there. In actual fact I think the more minds you have working on something the greater to opportunity is that you are going to end up with a successful resolution that it going to benefit the community as a whole. I think Mr Nobbs in his opening address had mentioned some words about reporting to members of the Legislative Assembly and it can be particularly difficult in trying to assess exactly which piece of paper you need to circulate to members to make sure that they are kept fully informed. it's damned difficult because sometimes you think you've done it. You're not certain. You talk about something in this forum and at our informal meetings and members sort of look at you sideways as if to say what the blazes is this bloke talking about and you think you've gone and circulated it or provided that information to all members of the Assembly. it doesn't always happen that way. I guess the question is what's enough, what is needed and the other big question is, if you want to know something, why not ask the question. Because all too often, I know it's all too easy, I've sat on the non executive benches too at different times and I've been critical myself for not spoon feeding me enough but not I guess in years gone by been man enough to just ask the question. I want to know a little bit more about this, can you provide me with some more detail and when those questions have been asked and it appears as though Mr Nobbs I think was saying that the Minister was probably being misleading in some of the information that he's provided to members. Well that's fair enough. Get stuck into the Minister. Give him hell for it. but we want to see the examples. I want to see where that is that the Minister has gone so wrong that he's been accused of misleading us. Now I don't know too much about what happened at the Hospital. I've seen a couple of memos that have been sent to different people but I'm certainly not up to speed with every event that's occurred at the Hospital. I'm not up to speed with every event that's occurred in the Public Service. I'm not up to speed with every event that's occurred at the Tourist Bureau. In fact, most members looked a little bit sideways at me when I said I was still confused over matters that were occurring at the Tourist Bureau. I still remain so. I'm not a hundred percent certain of what's happened. But I was prepared to accept the feeling of the members around the table that they were satisfied with the outcomes of whatever had happened at the Tourist Bureau because I'm a busy person myself. I haven't got time to go around chasing those things. Maybe that's

irresponsible of me for not wanting to chase them and find out the facts totally for myself but when I see that there's eight other members of the Assembly nodding their heads in agreement, that they've fully understood what's going on, sometimes I tend to accept that as being good enough and maybe that's a criticism of me for not pursuing those matters as far as I can. Mr Speaker some criticism was levelled at the Minister for his meetings with members of the public service. Mr Speaker if he's going to be hung and dried on that you've got to hang and dry me on that one too because as part of my duties and I've always considered it as part of my duties as an executive member of this Assembly is that I have to face the day to day workings with the public Service in a whole host of areas, in all of those areas that I have responsibility for in my portfolio responsibilities for including immigration and I meet not only with the Corporate Management Group and the Executive Directors that are responsible for those portfolios but also the officers, aside from having those Corporate Management Group people or the Executive Directors in on the meetings and that's whether I'm dealing with gaming or development of the Offshore Finance Centre or Immigration or any of those companies, Legal Aid. You have to work with the officers because quite frankly, I'll be quite blunt, and it's not meant to be a criticism of the people who are sitting in those Corporate Management Group responsibilities but I've found it particularly difficult in these last six months to be able to operate my portfolios as I've operated portfolios in the past, simply because there's some choke that's going on somewhere, I don't know where it is, but there's some choke going on with the quality and the service delivery and the support service delivery that comes from the Service. Now as I said that's not meant to be critical of anyone within the Service or anyone within the Management Group, it's just a fact. It's something that I'm living with in this last six and a half months of trying to find out why the advice isn't forthcoming as it used to be. That's something that I've accepted as being part of the change process that we are going through and part of that change process I don't think allows us to cut back to three executive members simply because of the choking effect that's going on. One of the reasons that we were going through the Management changes within the Public Service was to provide for a more efficient delivery of that advice and services to government so that government would more effectively and efficiently develop policy and provide for Norfolk Island. That hasn't occurred as yet. I'll be quite honest about that. In my mind it hasn't occurred. There's a failing there. We'll be looking at that and I think when we get our teeth into looking at the various reports that are emanating from the Public Service Board and those sort of things, this Assembly as a whole and not just the Minister are going to have to make some pretty hard decisions about where we go in the future. I think Mr Nobbs raised some questions about the cost of the new structure that we have in place. We are going to have to address that and see if there is something that firstly we can afford and something that we want to continue with in light of some of the difficulties that have been encountered, not only by me but certainly by my other colleagues and members of the Legislative Assembly. I've already said that I don't support trimming the executive back to three. I think I'm safe in saying that all the executive members spend a full week on the whole working on the jobs that they've been given to work on and I think that I can also safely say that each of us would very much appreciate having another forty hours in each week to be able to really get our teeth into and resolve a lot of the issues that we face. Now again, a lot of that is dependent upon and tied to the structural change. It is also very dependent and tied to the level of service that we are provided and the support that we are provided as executive members because this is probably the only government so to speak in the whole of Australia where executive members don't have their own dedicated staff in each of their portfolio responsibilities who are drafting letters, doing research and all those other sorts of support services that are provided in other governments. A lot of that is the responsibility of the executive member and in most cases that I'm aware of the executive members undertake a great deal of that work. We are provided with a support staff of one Research Assistant to Government, who does an outstanding job,

I'll be quite clear about that, an outstanding job, but that is one person covering all of these portfolio responsibilities and providing research assistance to government and also providing research assistance on must be closing in on two hundred pieces of legislation that the four executive members have responsibility for. Mr Brown referred to the powers of the Chief Minister and speaking as the Chief Minister, it is frustrating being the Chief Minister where you don't have the authority, the responsibility, the power whatever the words are to drag a Minister into line. Sure, we can talk as executive members and we can make recommendations to each other but those powers that are similar to other Governments in other parts of Australia and elsewhere are not there with the Chief Minister on Norfolk Island. Now I'm not saying that we should lumber up the office of the Chief Minister with those powers because once you start to do your mathematics and you make one single change and you get one person offside because they are not performing, you may well find that's the last thing that you do because the numbers suddenly start to swing the other way and then suddenly you no longer the Chief Minister or the Chief Minister needs to look for something else. I know Mr Brown did mention yesterday well in fact by making that decision you might find you get one person offside but you get 3 others on side. I don't know but I don't know what the answer to that is, but it is difficult, it is frustrating and those difficulties and frustration's I think Mr Brown certainly would be aware with some of my recent correspondence to him on various matters both as a Member of the Assembly and as a member of the community. He would be fully aware of those frustration's that arise from time to time and so would my colleagues when I've been critical at response times as far as communications are concerned. I'm not jumping up and down about that with the Minister in question because I don't think in his particular instance that I have any major criticism in that area at all. In fact the frustration's that I've found with the correspondence and responding from queries from different people have fallen into other portfolio responsibilities and from time to time I've discussed those both with the Minister for Land and Environment and the Minister for Finance about response times and things and I appreciate too that they are very busy people and normally 9 times out of 10 they are very quick to respond and rectify those problems and certainly I appreciate that. But I just needed to point out that it is frustrating sitting in that position knowing that there is little that you can do and relying principally on the full membership of the Legislative Assembly when they see a problem to address it. Mr Brown's proposal, looking at the overall composition of the Government, I'll go back to when I was first elected to the Legislative Assembly as a green horn I guess. I still am in a lot of instances a bit of a green horn when it comes to this job but I remember one of the very first things I said after the election in the room next door when the 8<sup>th</sup> Legislative Assembly were going through the throes of deciding who was going to be an Executive Member, I said at that time I wasn't prepared to put my hand up because I believe that there was a learning curve that you had to go through so that you could understand the workings of the Assembly and the Parliament, and I said at that time to all of those Executive Members who had been nominated as Executive Members it is important that you remember that we'll be watching your performance, if we're not happy with it, it is our duty, all of us to bring that to the attention of the House and the other Members if they are dissatisfied with the performance of the Executive Members, one or all and to do something about it, and that we should review that on a regular basis. Well that didn't happen back in the 8<sup>th</sup> Legislative Assembly, we talked about it, I know it was raised again at the beginning at the 9<sup>th</sup> and certainly at the beginning of this and I've always been supportive of that. If there is a difficulty and it can be identified that somebody is failing in that duty well do something about it. I guess I hesitate on declaring all of the positions open but I'm really at the mercy of the Legislative Assembly on that question if that's what Members want to do, certainly I'm not going to stand in the way of that happening. But if it can be identified where the failings are in each of the Executive portfolio's and in each of the Executive Members, by all means tell us so that we can address those things. Happy to support that. Mr Speaker I'm unable to support

this Motion purely at this stage on the fact that it will reduce the Executive membership to 3. If the idea is to suspend I think the words, not quite the right word, I think what we're looking at here doing with the wording of this Motion is to sack and not replace and that's what should have been said, that is the intent of the Motion and unfortunately I am unable to support it.

MR I. BUFFETT Thank you Mr Speaker. Perhaps I could preface the short words that I need to say by expressing disappointment at the situation that we find ourselves in because whilst we have been elected for some 7 months we elected on the last day of November, December we got some of the housekeeping issues done and then we started to affectively do things over January, February and here we are let's say 6 months, I'm a little bit disappointed. Mr Speaker I am a little bit also disappointed because I am still personally convinced that this particular Motion in particular Notice No. 2 has arisen out of a certain amount of emotion that has been created by Notice No. 1. Now I say that and I won't say it anymore and Mr Speaker what that does is I think it shows just a little bit of immaturity I believe on behalf of all of us that we have got ourselves into a situation in this Assembly

MR BROWN Point of Order Mr Speaker. To such extent as the Minister has suggested that Members are immature that is a personal reflection and is inappropriate and contrary to the Standing Orders.

MR I. BUFFETT I withdraw the word immature Mr Speaker and I apologise if Mr Brown was offended. Mr Speaker I am as I said a little bit disappointed for this reason, that I clearly recall was made quite clear, when the Executive portfolio's were allocated that we said yes, well I certainly did and my recollection is the other Executive Members said after six months we would be quite prepared to have a look at those and see how well or unwell we were handling these issues. But what we've got is we've got an attempt to look at them, charged with emotions, charged with personal emotion, charged with perhaps whipped up emotion if one wants to use those words and it's tied to something that will probably mean not a proper result from the looking at it but more in emotive result and knee jerk action result to those things. Mr Speaker from the Executive portfolio's that I hold I'm quite prepared for people to have a look at it, but let's have a look at in within context of what we're all trying to do. Mr Speaker shortly in this Notice Paper we are going to be look at an Appropriation Bill that's probably the most telling so far in the 22 year history of this Norfolk Island Government. We had a Royal Commission in 1997 that looked at our financial and our administrative capacity to keep on governing this place. Mr Speaker we had a Government that ran, the last Assembly ran for 2.2 years and so I guess the report card of the whole of the Assembly's I really question, and here we are 6 months into this one and we seem to be back into it again. I don't aspire to that and I'm fairly convinced that the majority of the community would wish us to do things slightly differently. Mr Speaker I think there is a better way of doing this if in fact there is a need to relieve Minister Smith of some of the duties. Mr Speaker I also agree with Mr Brown I'm not too sure that Mr Smith has such an overpowering Executive portfolio. Mr Smith has some of the areas that were clearly governed or were capable of being dealt with by the various Boards and Authorities that were put in place and I think when we 4 Executives as Ms Nicholas referred to went away and looked at those we certainly, I certainly believed that they could have run fairly well and they could have, and Mr Smith would have been able to manage portfolio with those Boards functioning, well history has shown otherwise. I'm not too absolutely convinced that it's all Mr Smith's fault that that has happened. I think some of the problems have been inherited, some have been inherited from the previous Assembly and the previous Boards that were in place, some of it certainly may be ascribed to Mr Smith but I don't believe, I don't believe that at this particular stage of this 10<sup>th</sup> Assembly life it warrants a dismissal or suspension. Now let's not fool ourselves, the word

suspend is the word that's used. I am convinced that if Mr Nobbs wanted to put the word dismissed he would have, it is absolutely not a mistake because my understanding is the Commonwealth Interpretation Act provides that the Administrator may suspend. So I don't think it's an accident that the word suspend is there and therefore I think that also shows that it's clearly connected as I've mentioned before with the emotive matters that have arisen in respect of the first Notice that we've arrived at and that perhaps having put that second Notice there the thing escalated to the situation we find ourselves in discussing today. I find it disappointing. Mr Speaker, 2 issues. I will not be supporting the amendments by Mr Brown for this reason. I think that we as a total Assembly can look at this issue without going formerly into this situation and look at the question of reallocating if necessary, executive portfolio's and I personally would have no difficulty with that. Mr Speaker I will certainly not be supporting the substantive matter on this Notice Paper No. 2 to have Mr Smith suspended. Thank you.

MR NOBBS I take particular offence the statement that this results from whipped up emotions. I find that quite abhorrent actually. I told you Members at the start of this that it was no pleasure in doing this. I mean it's only the second time we've had such a Motion in my time in the Assembly and I take it with fairly deep resolve to actually do that and it wasn't as Mr I. Buffett has alluded to about whipped up emotions. It's as I said I've been, I feel as though I've been hurt by the activities. One was in relation to the Tourist Bureau Manager and there were accusations made that I had some sort of meetings with this guy and goodness know what all which is a complete and utter joke because I met him in a professional capacity with the idea of organising some sporting teams but anyhow I liked the guy and I supported him. It was badly handled, it was pathetic and if it's to do with the Dr situation it's bad because I mean even Mr Smith said at the last meeting that without getting into this issue once again, that there had been a briefing to the Executives by the Director of the Hospital. This has never come out that I can remember in any MLA's meeting and it definitely wasn't recorded in the minutes. I mean so there's a heap going on and that's why I feel in this particular case, and as I say I took no part of it really until the actual Petition was provided so I mean I find it difficult to support somebody who I don't believe has been telling us the whole lot, the whole truth if that's the words that, or the facts are I should say not truth. I think George is a fairly truthful sort of a guy actually. I think he wouldn't deliberately tell a lie but I mean there has been some problems in relation to the 2 particular issues and there's definitely been as far as the Public Service is concerned. We've spoken about this before and the role is that the Assembly provides policy to the CEO and the CEO carry's it out and if there is a problem we deal with her. Now I know from time to time there is times when Minister's do meet directly with relevant Officers particularly in Statutory positions and I know that the CEO and the CAO in the case of the previous incumbent were well aware of these sorts of thing but you don't go generally talking on a formal basis throughout the Service and not involving or even telling the Executive group what's going on, and that's my position. So if that's whipped up emotion well it must be Buffett emotion because it ain't Nobbs emotion I can tell you that.

MR BROWN Mr Speaker I seek leave to move an amendment to the Motion to the following affect that all words after "House first appearing" be deleted and the following words inserted in their place, "resolves 1) that all Executive Officers held at this date be declared vacant, affective from 10.00am on Wednesday

MR SPEAKER Mr Brown I'm trying to record this

MR BROWN I will provide it to you in writing Mr Speaker. "Affective from 10.00am on Wednesday, 3 July 2002 2) that the House move at 10.00am on Wednesday 3 July 2002 to select the persons who shall hence forth be

appointed to Executive Office and if necessary the number and titles of such Officers and 3) that His Honour the Administrator be advised accordingly.

MR SPEAKER Is leave granted for that amendment Honourable Members.

AYE

MR BROWN Mr Speaker I challenge the Executive Members in particular to support the amendment because in my view this would give effect to discussions which we had at the very commencement of this Assembly. This amendment would not involve the sacking of any Member, it simply would acknowledge that it is time for a review. I think that time is here, I think the community deserves that review having regard to the massive extent to which our financial situation and our tourism situation have deteriorated during the 6 months of this Assembly and particularly having regard to the fact that for the next 12 months very little funding is proposed to be allocated towards maintenance of the island's infrastructure be it roads, buildings or whatever, and I urge all Members to support that amendment.

MR SMITH Mr Speaker I don't know if it's just coincidental but 3 July seems to ring a bell that a certain Supreme Court case probably would not be operating on the 1<sup>st</sup> and the 2<sup>nd</sup> as I understand it. It's been said throughout this debate it's nothing to do with the previous Motion that we dealt with this morning but it's becoming fairly obvious I mean,

MR BROWN Point of Order. Again this is a personal reflection on a Member, it is highly disorderly and it is contrary to the Standing Orders.

MR SPEAKER Could you just point to the area Mr Brown.

MR BROWN Mr Smith is suggesting that I have for some improper reason selected the 3<sup>rd</sup> of July as the date included in my amendment and he has suggested that that is because a particular Court case is to commence on the 1<sup>st</sup> of July.

MR SPEAKER I understand what you are saying to me Mr Brown. I've got to say that I didn't interpret that. If it was different I invite somebody to say so to me but I didn't interpret it that that was Mr Smith's intent.

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Speaker. In fact earlier

MR SPEAKER But maybe we should just tackle that for a moment. If in fact there is a prospective case there all aside of what has just been said in the last couple of minutes is the 10 July a better proposal.

MR BROWN Mr Speaker the only reason I proposed 3 July is I expect I'll be away next Wednesday. I have no difficulty with whatever the date may be, 3 or 10 doesn't worry me.

MR SMITH Mr Speaker Mr Nobbs said right at the beginning of this debate this is something that he's reluctantly or regrettably I think his words were brought about by himself but after the high pitched effort that we've had from Mr Brown about this issue I wonder where John is coming from. He's touched on some shallow water here about how I am a nice bloke, I didn't think I should write that down because I didn't believe what that's about but that I'd have poor job prospects, means well, no

value for money, in other words Members might have to feel sorry for me if they sack me and I wouldn't be able to get a job, he might be right but that's not the Assembly's difficulty that's my own. But it's almost like the words have been changed from the last proposed sacking which was Ron in the last Assembly, the same high pitched approach, words very similar, incompetent was being suggested in that particular case but I just wanted to say I appreciate what everybody has said around the table here today Mr Speaker because we, no matter how much of the emotional stuff comes out from, certainly from 2 of the Members here today about this issue our whole goal with Norfolk Island and being in the Assembly is to lead this island to where it should be going. There is nothing worse than people who continually bag things like has been said in this debate that Tourism is deteriorating to a, I can't even remember what the low point it was that was mentioned. We're supposed to be leading the community Mr Speaker with all these things. If there is difficulties within the Government or within the Assembly sure we've got to talk about that but let's not make Norfolk Island look like it's in dire straits because of this sort of stuff that comes up every time. This Assembly has been going for over 22 years and we still have the same old debates going on.

MR BROWN Point of Order. Mr Speaker I draw your attention to Standing Orders 63 and 163 in relation to the question of relevance and digression.

MR SPEAKER Yes Mr Brown I can see the relevance and I don't see that at this stage there is digressions from the point in front of us.

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Speaker. I won't pursue that line much further but Mr Brown has to give me, and I'm only picking on Mr Brown because he's raised some of these issues. Every door that I open with my Ministerial portfolio's, just about every door that I open there's a Mr Brown standing behind it, the Tourist Bureau, the Hospital, Education, you name it, Roads. It's not surprising that this portfolio is difficult when he sits right next me and I think we get on fairly well but when some issue comes up I open the door and there's Mr Brown

MR BROWN Mr Speaker it's not surprising that I know more than Mr Smith does about his portfolio.

MR SMITH Thank you. But however I agree with what the Chief Minister said. There is no point in throwing all the portfolio's up in the air just to try and extricate me if that's what Mr Brown was suggesting. We should just be able to do it by Motion, if the Motion fails it fails, if it gets up well I go and look for a job and I don't support the amendments that have been proposed by MR Brown nor do I support the original Motion.

MR GARDNER Thank you Mr Speaker. I don't support the Motion in that I see that there is another way that this can be handled. We could sit here for the next 8 or 10 hours and we could go through each individual portfolio responsibility and we could try and match it up with a member or we could leave it until the 3<sup>rd</sup> of July and do that or what we could do is that we could get on with the business, we could go through what we agreed to do when we were elected back in the end of November, we can have discussions amongst ourselves to see whether we are still comfortable with Members, if we're not well we can propose a Motion to change those portfolio's around in whichever area of responsibility they fall, and or/also the personalities that are attached to each of those portfolio responsibilities. That's an easy thing to do and it can be done by Motion at the next sitting of the House and I'd be more supportive of doing that. Going away and having some constructive debate about it, see whether there are any difficulties in and expand on the difficulties that have already been raised in Mr Smith's portfolio's but explore any difficulties that exist in the other portfolio's and with

the other people that have responsibility for those portfolio's. I have no difficulty in doing that. As far as I guess the burden that exists in Mr Smith's portfolio's I don't think I've hears too many Members say that he's incompetent and he can't do the job, they have raised issues with some of the portfolio's and maybe that's something that we need to go away with and consider, and as I've said before I'm happy to consider if it's going to assist in resolving this, at looking at divesting Mr Smith of some of them. I tend to agree with some other Members around the table that we don't just want to go and make it a soft option portfolio for Mr Smith. That would be totally inappropriate. But if we believe that that is a loaded portfolio, a couple of Members have said it's not then maybe that's something that we need to address in the overall review of the whole proposal. I'm happy to go away and talk with Members and talk with the Executive about resolving that and give an undertaking that we either run with something at the July meeting or we don't. It's as simple as that.

MR NOBBS Thank you Mr Speaker. I understand where Mr Brown is coming from but I really can't support if John, sorry about that because I've got a Motion on the books here which I believe is a fair Motion and it's got support by myself and also some within the community for a change and I know what your trying to say but I can't support it, support your amendment and I will stick to the Motion whether I go down 7-1 or whatever it is or whatever that's not the point. The issue is that I've raised the issue, I appreciate the discussion that's gone on around the table here and there's been a few things rattled I think and maybe something good will come out of it if you don't want to support it here on the day, but it hasn't gone away regardless of the vote, it ain't gone away. Thank you.

MR SPEAKER Further debate Honourable Members. Honourable Members what we have in front of us is Mr Brown's amendment to the Motion.

MR BROWN Mr Speaker could I simply assist the Chief Minister by telling him that in the event that he has not understood or in the event that I have not been clear in what I have said I indeed feel that the present Minister for Community Services and Tourism is inadequately holding, is inadequately dealing with his portfolio and he is with the greatest of respect incompetent in the job. But having said that could I move that the question be put, that is the question of my amendment.

MR SPEAKER Honourable Members the question is in front of us that the amendment to the Motion, that is Mr Brown's amendment to the Motion be agreed to.

#### QUESTION PUT

MR SPEAKER Mr Brown I could call the House. Would you like me to do that[.

MR BROWN Yes please

MR D. BUFFETT	NO
MR GARDNER	NO
MR DONALDSON	NO
MR I. BUFFETT	NO
MR NOBBS	NO
MS NICHOLAS	NO
MR SMITH	NO
MR BROWN	AYE

MR SPEAKER The result of voting Honourable Members the Aye's 1 and the No's 7, the No's have it.

MR NOBBS I move that the question be put.

MR SPEAKER The question is that the question be put.

AYE

MR SPEAKER I will put the question which is the basic Motion Honourable Members, Mr Nobbs' basic Motion. The question is that this Motion be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT

MR SPEAKER Would the Clerk please call the House.

MR D. BUFFETT	NO
MR GARDNER	NO
MR DONALDSON	NO
MR I. BUFFETT	NO
MR NOBBS	AYE
MS NICHOLAS	NO
MR SMITH	NO
MR BROWN	AYE

MR SPEAKER Result of voting Honourable Members, the Aye's 2 the No's 6, the Motion is not carried Honourable Members.

### **NOTICE NO. 3 – CUSTOME ACT 1913 – EXEMPTION FROM PAYMENT OF CUSTOMS DUTY**

MR DONALDSON Thank you Mr Speaker. This is a Motion dealing with the exemption of Customs Duty on a particular import to the island and I move that under Section 24 (b) of the Customs Act 1913 this House recommends the Administrator that the goods specified in the first column of the Schedule imported by the person specified opposite and under conditions mentioned in the 2<sup>nd</sup> column of the Schedule be exempted from Duty. By way of further explanation the Schedule's are column 1, the description of the goods, there's 3 coils of wire for the fishing crane's on the jetty's, the amount of duty applicable to those one's is \$244-48. Column 2 is headed the Importer and the conditions. The importer of the coils of wire is the Norfolk Island Fishing Club and the conditions are nil.

MR SPEAKER Thank you. The question Honourable Members is that Motion be agreed to,

MR DONALDSON Thank you Mr Speaker. It's a practice that importation's of community service type materials are often exempted from Duty. I believe there is a track record on this one that previous importations of Fishing Club material for community benefit has been exempted from Duty. The amount of duty is \$244-48 and I move that the exemption be granted.

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Debate.

MR BROWN Mr Speaker I normally have trouble with Motions of this type. I think that saving \$230 odd of Duty is probably going to cost the community closer to \$1,000 by the time all the necessary paper work is done, but Mr Donaldson has told us, not today, he told us yesterday that these goods once imported will in fact become the property of the Administration. Now if that is the case I have no difficulty in supporting it because clearly had the goods been imported by the Administration itself they would have been free of Duty in that case.

MR NOBBS I think another reason for this is that the crane is used for safety purposes. Thank you.

MR SPEAKER Further debate. No further debate. The question is that the Motion be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT  
QUESTION AGREED

### **ORDER OF THE DAY NO. 1 – APPROPRIATION BILL 2002**

MR DONALDSON Thank you Mr Speaker. I'll be very brief in what I've got to say. The Appropriation Bill 2002 was dealt with at our meeting on the 5<sup>th</sup> of June this year. It was adjourned and made an Order of the Day for a subsequent day of sitting. Members will in the mean time had time to consider the Appropriation Bill and may at this time wish to comment further on it or even make amendments to it. I advise that I have no proposed amendments but before moving that the Bill be agreed to, give other Members the opportunity to comment.

MR BROWN Mr Speaker this is a pathetic Bill, it is the most pathetic effort of preparing a budget that I have seen in all of the years that I have been in this place. Nevertheless I quite accept that can't all be shooted? home to the present Minister. The degree of support that has been provided to him has been inadequate, notwithstanding that the previous Chief Minister commenced this budget process prior to the last election. It's ironic that 4 Minister's believe they are all doing a wonderful job unyet they serve up to us a budget of this nature. But having said that there has to be supply by the 30<sup>th</sup> of June or the business of Government has to grind to an immediate holt. I have no faith whatsoever in the fancy Focus 2002 document which has been provided to us and it's interesting Mr Speaker the Minister said to me, where in the devil did you get that draft of the document from, the one with the words from rhetoric to reality. Well the Minister may have forgotten that he circulated it with a Memorandum containing his signature to all Members of the Assembly on the 27<sup>th</sup> of May, and here we are the 19<sup>th</sup> of June, there doesn't seem to have been anything happening a yet. So I say 2 things Mr Speaker. I'm bound to support the budget because there has to be supply. I have no faith whatsoever in the Focus 2002 document and I certainly hope that the Minister will do far more about progressing this document than he has done to date about a Motion passed by the membership of this House very early this year calling in him to prepare a report in relation to the possibility of reducing or abolishing the FIL. Thank you.

MR NOBBS Thank you Mr Speaker. It is a budget which we've been told is required. I have difficulties with the press I guess that's been put out or the persona or belief or whatever you like that we're \$2m below what we should be. I have grave difficulty because in the preparation of budgets, and I've just not been involved in budgets here for something like 40 years or something, there is always, a lot of Public Service budgets in that there's always \$2m or more over because it's the nature of the beast and I was one of them in the herd for a long time but you always put in more than

you want, then you might really end up with what you really want and it will be cut, and that's it, and that happens all the time, in every Public Service budget, that's what happens. The problems here are and I've said it before that we haven't created what is an infrastructure budget, in fact I don't think there is even a list of what's really required and that is something that is needed and this Government needs to look at it, as to what do we really need. I mean there's talk about undergrounding the electricity supply around the Airport and that's something that will be necessary otherwise we'll have to re-route the current supply line sown through what was Pullis' place. Now that's an issues that's been around for I don't know, 10 years I guess and those are the issues that and the things been kept going all this time. There's talk this time that we are going to go underground for X amount of dollars, well we haven't really started, there was a little start about 3 or 4 years ago. I mean progressively we should be able to do a lot of things here but I don't think that the people, I think that the people of the island will accept that there is a need to probably tighten our belts a bit and put a bit more out to the island's infrastructure in particular but they are really concerned and I say again, people have been concerned and I believe they still are concerned to ensure that whatever funds are raised and whatever funds come into the coffers down here that they are expended properly, and that's it, and whilst we may say we're tightening our belts and we are \$2m bucks under what we really need I think that I don't believe that we are as bare boned as we are, and I appreciate what was said this morning by the Minister for Finance in relation to the current financial year. It looks as though there won't be as bad off as it was proposed in the first place, or at the half way mark anyhow of the year. So that's great and it does show that the Service is tightening their belts a bit and that's great and I commend them for that but I do believe that there are areas that we should look at to see whether those services can be done more effectively, whether we should actually provide that service, and I'm not saying put people out in the street because there are other areas where we are low on activity and there's always the movement of people either to other jobs on the island or overseas. I think that we should look at a lot of the areas that we may not be doing them effectively, look again at them, look very closely at them, be prepared to look objectively at them, not stand back and say oh you know they are just having a go at me. Nobody is going have a go at anybody, all we need is to ensure the community that we are doing the job as efficiently and as effectively as we possibly can, and I was really disturbed to find that there's \$30,000 in the training account that hasn't been expended but there you go. After all the talk of training in the last Assembly and what was going to happen, we've got money in there that hasn't been expended and I find that very difficult. However I accept the Minister that you had a difficult task, I'll support this but we really need to get into grips and to look at the actual infrastructure side of it, put money aside. Don't be frightened to start up an infrastructure account, put money into that and let's get on with it. The other side of it really is that I was disappointed that and I speak from the DAA working group side of things that we are unable to fund counsellors but I'm looking at other avenue for funding and hopefully there may be some light at the end of the tunnel if we get some co-operation other than through the budget arrangements, because I feel that they are an essential component and that's all I've got to say. I will support the budget, there's no problems with that but I would really like to say that we're short, everybody needs extra money, but I don't believe it's a complete and utter disaster at this particular point in time. Thank you.

MR DONALDSON

Yes just to respond to a couple of those items. I know we talked at length about this last meeting, let me say there is no joy at all in presenting a budget like this. It's been thrust upon the whole community by necessity, we haven't taken care of our infrastructure requirements over the last number of years, we haven't addressed the problem of raising revenue over the last number of years. It has now come to a situation where we simply have to curtail expenditure to balance the books. We can't get to the situation where we spend more than we earn, there isn't that



as an Assembly and with the community. Mr Speaker Mr Donaldson touched on issues that go beyond this particular budget and may change the way we govern ourselves. I don't aspire to that at this particular time but certainly when we do have these discussions we've got to understand our position in all of that and I think this is perhaps one of the first times we've found ourselves in this situation and I would urge the community, the people who will be responsible for carriage of Focus 2002 and to any other person who may wish to contribute to continue what I call the way of life in Norfolk Island and that's both constitutionally environmentally the way we govern ourselves and all the other things that go to make Norfolk Island. This is your opportunity. We are not here to get rubbished because the Minister for Finance has produced a budget that looks sparse. The Minister for Finance hasn't addressed this Assembly, nor has he addressed the rest of the community on what the Government Business Enterprise budgets are going to be doing for the next twelve months. There won't be of course stagnation's, nothings going to happen, you won't see electricity turned off I don't believe, you won't hear the phones go dead, you are not going to see other services that are provided by the GBE's cease forthwith because we've produced a budget. That is the revenue fund budget. There will be an opportune time for the Minister for Finance to address the issues that are contained in the GBE's so once again, I don't aspire that it's a doom and gloom situation. I believe it's an opportunity for this Tenth Assembly and for this community to address the issues that will take us forward both for the rest of the life of this Tenth Assembly and hopefully some indication of where we are heading for the next twenty two years of self government

MR GARDNER Thank you Mr Speaker I'll just be brief. Some comment has been made about the quality of the budget. I don't think there are too many around the table who are particularly proud of the budget save for the fact that we have given a very clear undertaking to the community that we are serious about addressing the shortfalls in it. As far as an executive member and I know my colleagues are in the same boat, there are a number of claims that we ourselves have made in the lead up to the presentation of this budget and all of those claims certainly haven't been successful and I'll just draw members attention to a couple in my area, one of them was the Immigration Task Force where the funds have been cut from that, the Legal Services Unit staffing where the extra bids haven't been provided in that area for extra staffing and the requirements for those extra staffing are valid in light of the increasing litigation around the place and also the need not only within the service but also within the Legislative Assembly for members to be able to gain appropriate legal advise on matters but also the extra staffing sought would have been valid for advancing the justice package and other legislation to deal with other government priorities however, those decisions have been made by the Assembly as a whole that we need to tighten our belt in all those areas. I respect and appreciate that and what I'm setting about doing in my own portfolio responsibilities namely with the Legal Services Unit and the Immigration Task force, Gaming, Offshore Finance Centre and all of those is to make do with what we've got and try to achieve the best we can whilst the Focus 2002 is worked through. Certainly as the executive member with responsibility for these matters, I will be making further bids further along in the year subject of course to funds being available so that we are able to complete some of these projects that we've kicked into motion. Just some very brief comments that I missed at the last Sitting of the House in relation to that is that there's things in here under the Legal Branch for example of ex gratia payment to tourist accommodation. My understanding is that those claims may well be in excess of a million dollars but we've gone and established a figure in there that relates to the legislation set up for those ex gratia payments of \$41700 so there is potentially some greater impacts out there than has been initiated by this document that people should be aware of. One disappointing thing that I in the past was pretty hot on when I held the portfolio for health was the immunisation programme for school children and I know certainly over the last two or

three years, provision has been made for that programme, I'm not sure exactly the status of that at the moment maybe the Minister for health may be able to shed some light on that but I notice that that has been discontinued in the budget. That's disappointing unless there is sufficient funds left this year to carry us through into the next financial year and I guess the other surprising one to me as the Minister for Sport is to still see in this final budget document the figure of \$6000 for sports promotion in this financial year. I understand from the budget process that we've gone through that the sports promotion side of things had been looked upon as something outside of what was absolutely required in the tightest of budgets but I see that the \$6000 is still there and I'm still not clear exactly how that's come in but if it is to the benefit of sporting people on the Island they need to count their blessings because I think it's fortunate that that money has been retained even though I still don't have a clear understanding of how it's appeared in the document. I guess, not meaning to re-empt debate on another matter this afternoon but I turn to page eight of the schedule dated 4 June 2002 and I see the Burnt Pine Upgrade. We will be talking about Unity 2005 later on today and one of the matters in that document is about presenting ourselves well. Our front door appearance and that refers to the Burnt Pine upgrade. We've made no provision for that but certainly I hope that the Minister responsible for that at the appropriate time will make some bid against subject to finances in the next few months to try and finalise that project so that we do comply as best we can with Unity 2005 of course, subject to us endorsing that document later on this afternoon. That's all I have to say thank you

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Speaker, just to pick up on what the Chief Minister was saying. Yes, I certainly will be making additional bids for extra funding in a lot of my areas and of course, a lot of areas in the revenue fund do fall into my areas of executive responsibility including ones outside of the Administration, like the Tourist Bureau which has \$600000 provided here at this point as a starting figure and I certainly had discussion not only with the Minister but with the government about increasing that number to an appropriate level for tourism marketing but I appreciate what the Minister has been saying that this is basically an interim budget and he expects to have additional revenue streams talked about as he said earlier in his debate in a very short time so yes, as far as what the Chief Minister was saying, there's certainly a requirement for more funds to be made available to some of those areas like roads, the Tourist Bureau etc

SPEAKER The question is that the Bill be agreed to and I'll put that question Honourable Members

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. Do you wish to dispense with the detail stage. Okay then. Then if we could have a final motion please Mr Donaldson

MR DONALDSON Thank you Mr Speaker, I move that the Bill be agreed to

SPEAKER Thank you. Any final debate. The question is that the Bill be agreed to

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

The Bill in its final form is agreed to thank you

**TOURISM – FUTURE DIRECTION**

We are resuming debate from the 15<sup>th</sup> May 2002 on the question that the motion be agreed to and Mr Nobbs you have the call to resume

**MR NOBBS** Thank you. At the completion of the last debate, before the motion to make it an Order of the Day for this day of sitting I finished off by saying that the Minister should start really pounding the pavement in relation to our present problems. could I go back a step if I may. I believe that we should separate the current trough from the future and that's why I'm suggesting that the Minister should really start pounding the pavements in relation to our present problem but also to come back to the next meeting with a strategy which will show how we can update the Unity 2005 document to suit the changes that have occurred and he should bring that back to the next meeting and I then moved to make it an Order of the Day for today. Prior to that the discussion was that that is the type of arrangement that we should put in place so I will hand it over to the Minister for Tourism for him to tell me what's happened since that time, thank you

**MR SMITH** Thank you Mr Speaker, I'm quite happy to pick up the debate at this point. What we were discussing at that sitting was the marketing strategy which is Unity 2005 which is the blueprint for how we approach tourism which was developed following a conference that we had in 1992 and this document became a blueprint as a result of the issues that were raised at that early time. it took some time to get it together but it was put together very well. Though there might have been a misunderstanding that that document hadn't been updated but it certainly has been over the years. I haven't the latest with me but there was the Marketing Business plan 1998/99 and 99/2000 and the other one is 20001/2002 Marketing Business Plan. those documents may not be in all members hands but that is certainly the update of the strategy. I wonder how members would feel, because this document is already what is being used by the Tourist Bureau so it's not extremely important that we agree or not agree today, but we have two things coming up, Norfolk Jet Express has indicated that they are going to have an on Island seminar in relation to tourism and the airlines and the Australian Market at the end of this month I think it is and also the Tourist Bureau is having their Tourism Symposium in mid to late August so it might be sensible to wait until both those events have occurred to see what comes out of those before we either agree with the motion or not and I would be prepared if Members indicated that way that I would move an adjournment so that it would stay on the table until either one or both of those events have taken place

**SPEAKER** Thank you. Further debate

**MR BROWN** Mr Speaker although I believe that it is important for us to tell the community whether or not we are still supporting the goal of 340000 bed nights by 2005, Mr Smith has told us that that is the direction in which the Bureau is presently heading in at any event and he has then said to us what do you think about adjourning the further debate on this until the two meetings have been held during the next couple of months. I don't have a difficulty in supporting an adjournment until that time on the basis that it's not going to set anything back in the meanwhile, thank you

**MS NICHOLAS** Mr Speaker, I shall be very brief on this one Mr Speaker. Obviously the occasion presents to be brief. Essentially I support and have continued to support the 340,000 bed night figure. On the present average stay of 7.36 nights this gives something like 46,000 visitors. I must say that if that can be closer to a 45,000 maximum I'd be happier but that essentially means persuading people to stay longer and that's probably swimming against the flow these days, never mind I can have

my Utopian dream. I think that's a level which more suits Norfolk in terms of people numbers and the impact upon our infrastructure and our consciousness. That's one of the things that I think was manifesting itself up around that 40,000 mark. The Unity 2005 document has been under scrutiny a number of times, not the least being with the issue of a Marketing and Business Plan for the years that the Minister Mr Smith has just mentioned. Those documents were prepared by Norfolk Island Tourism being the Bureau and have, in each instance taken account of changing circumstances within the industry. The changes in airlines and in the deregulation of the industry itself. Those reports have been based on the principles of Unity 2005 and I was made aware of their existence only yesterday and have spent today's lunch break taking a closer look at the documents themselves. I had hoped to be able to precis them and make some suggestions in respect of their incorporation into the Minister's motion. They are totally comprehensive and it has proven impossible to simply give a potted version of the contents. But again I have every reason to believe that they are documents referred to by Tourist Bureau members and I rest easier in that knowledge. But essentially the principles of Unity 2005 hold good today and if that can be brought up to today I would be happier so an adjournment would be perfect from my point of view, thank you Mr Speaker

MR I BUFFETT Thank you Mr Speaker. I would support the adjournment of this matter pending what's going to happen as we went from not much being done in the way of symposiums to one a month I think from now on until at least the end of August September but so be it. In mentioning the Marketing and Business Plans it needs to be noted that the Marketing and Business Plan as we see here, takes us to this year, to the year 2002 so one would assume that if we accepted Unity 2005 there is somewhere in the system within the Tourist Bureau, the process of updating or presenting and preparing the Marketing Business Plan from the year 2002 to 2005. Now Perhaps anything that results from what we do in terms of an Assembly in supporting the bed numbers if that's what we finally do following the symposiums and what comes from those symposiums might well frame the next Marketing and Business Plan and perhaps that's the time that we need to have significant input in what that might look like and there fore I support the adjournment

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Speaker, based on what's just been said I would like to move the adjournment

SPEAKER The question is that this matter be adjourned and made an Order of the Day for a subsequent day of sitting

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

That matter is so adjourned

### **NORFOLK ISLAND PLAN**

We are resuming debate from the 15<sup>th</sup> May 2002 and the question in front of us is that the amendment proposed by Mr Nobbs be agreed to. Resuming debate, Mr Buffett you have the call to resume

MR I BUFFETT Thank you very much Mr Speaker. If I might be permitted what I would like to do with this particular motion is to further adjourn the matter for a couple of reasons. Firstly we've had some resource problems in the legal area of the Administration; we've had some resource problems in preparing some and co-ordinating some of the responses we got to both the proposed motion by Mr Nobbs



some assistance and views on how it should be set out and the like; they then went away and prepared the documents for circulation to the various points and what have you, whatever went on and it was interesting that a member of the House made some accusation about the people ending up in court if they signed the Petition which was mentioned by my colleague Mr Brown at the last meeting. At that time I understand that they sought further legal advice from another person and it was clarified as I would expect and so the matter proceeded from there. No member of this House actually drew up the Petition and I don't think anybody signed it although as I said earlier, last year there were members of this House who actually signed Petitions and so I'll leave it at that Mr Speaker

SPEAKER

Mr Brown did you want...

MR BROWN

Thank you Mr Speaker. Just to make a personal explanation along the lines of that just made by Mr Nobbs, I indeed assisted the initiators of that Petition in putting their words together. I make no apology for that and I don't need to. Mr Speaker as most members will be aware there is nothing that would prevent a member in fact drafting a Petition and taking it around himself. The prohibition as you are well aware Mr Speaker is that such a member cannot present the Petition to the House himself. He would have to arrange for another member to do that. But I indeed assisted, just as I have on a number of other occasions, I am always happy to help people to put a document into a wording which will be acceptable to the House or to the Administrator by way of referendum if that be the case. There is nothing wrong with that and I have no hesitation in telling all members and the community that I was very pleased to help, thank you

MR GARDNER

Thank you Mr Speaker. If I could I would like to seek leave to table a document in the House, that document being the Norfolk Island Annual Report 2002/2001

SPEAKER

leave is granted

MR GARDNER

Thank you Mr Speaker. In tabling this Norfolk Island Annual Report for the year ended 30 June 2001 I would like to if I could read into Hansard, the letter on the inside cover from the Chief Executive Officer to myself as Chief Minister in relation to the Report. "Dear Chief Minister, it is with much pleasure that I submit the 2000/2001 Annual Report for the Administration of Norfolk Island. The year has also seen the development of a revised organisational structure that created the new positions of Chief Executive Officer, Executive Director Corporate Support and Business Development, Executive Director Environment and Infrastructure; and Executive Director Community Services and Tourism. For the period covered by this Report the Administration was headed by Ivens F Buffett as Chief Executive Officer. The establishment of the Corporate Management Group consisting of the Chief Executive Officer and the newly created Executive Director positions had not at that time been implemented. The broad range of activities covered by the Norfolk Island Administration and achievements during the year are clearly indicated throughout the report, however, would like to take this opportunity to draw attention to the following achievements. Adoption of the Public Sector Management Act; adoption of a new Human Resource Policy; Agreement to progress the Norfolk Island Commonwealth Land Initiative. I would like to take this opportunity to thank our Administration Team for their commitment and work throughout the year. Accordingly I present the report for tabling in the Legislative Assembly following which it will be made available to the public. Yours sincerely, Robyn Murdoch, Chief Executive officer". Mr Speaker, this report basically gives a snapshot of what Norfolk Island is all about and I table it

SPEAKER  
adjournment debate?

Thank you Chief Minister. Further participation in

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

Therefore Honourable Members this House stands adjourned until Wednesday 17 July 2002, at 10.00 am.

