



**NORFOLK ISLAND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
14th NILA HANSARD –16th APRIL 2014**

SPEAKER Good Morning Honourable Members, we commence with the Prayer of the Legislative Assembly.

PRAYER

Almighty God we humbly beseech Thee to vouchsafe Thy blessing upon this House, direct and prosper our deliberations to the advancement of Thy glory and the true welfare of the people of Norfolk Island, Amen.

LEAVE TO ALLOW NOTICE NO. 1

SPEAKER Honourable Members at the commencement I seek leave to allow so much of Standing Orders to be set aside to allow Notice No. 1 to be called on forthwith. Is leave granted. Leave is granted

APPOINTMENT OF PERSON TO ACT AS CLERK TO THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

MR SNELL Thank you Mr Speaker. I move that in accordance with Section 48 of the Legislative Assembly Act 1979 this House recommends that the Speaker appoint Sharyn Louise Quintal to be a person to act as Clerk to the Legislative Assembly during a vacancy in the office the Clerk or while the Clerk is absent from duty upon the terms and conditions determined by the Speaker.

SPEAKER Thank you Chief Minister.

MR SNELL Thank you Mr Speaker. It goes without saying and I'm sure all Members here will agree that we are very fortunate to have a staff member capable and willing to accept the responsibilities of this very important role, and I acknowledge Mr Speaker and thank Sharyn Quintal for accepting this role and recommend the Motion.

SPEAKER Thank you. Any debate. I put the question.

**QUESTION PUT
AGREED**

GIVING OF NOTICE

MS ADAMS Thank you Mr Speaker. I give notice of my intention to bring to the House at the May Sitting a Bill for a Act to amend the Immigration Act 1980

- to remove Section 28 (3) sunset clause for New Zealand citizens. This amendment is a requirement at Clause 19.3 of the June 2013 Funding Agreement.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

MR NOBBS Thank you Mr Speaker. It's a question for the Finance Minister. Minister there was some confusion at the last meeting in relation to the O3b project. Can you update the community, particularly in relation to the business plan.

MR SHERIDAN Thank you Mr Speaker. I intend to make a Statement in regards to o3b during Statement time if the question could wait until then.

MR NOBBS I've got another one for Minister Ward if I may. Has there been any progression in relation to the complaints related to the opening hours at the Waste Management Centre.

MR WARD Thank you Mr Speaker and thank you Mr Nobbs. Mr Nobbs the progress on that is part of the process that the CEO is working through to try and redefine the roles of some of the Administration staff and I don't want to pre-empt what he's doing there, but he is working through every option and trying to find a solution to what is a well recognised problem that we need a greater range of hours there. At this stage it is very much with the Service.

MR NOBBS I have one for Minister Adams. Minister Brigg's during his visit advised Members that access to Medicare card holders to local medical arrangements could not be even considered as the Hospital was not up to standard. What has subsequently happened in the time since the Minister's visit some two months ago to alleviate the problem.

MS ADAMS Thank you Mr Speaker. It was an issue and I think I might have reported at a meeting of Members on this. It was an issue that I raised with the ACHS Survey Team who were here, but they were not aware of the answer to that question. It's a matter of I'm having discussion with the Advisory Board and the Director of the Hospital to see how we can find something more helpful as a response around that question. I am actively pursuing that Mr Nobbs.

MR PORTER Thank you Mr Speaker. I note ??? policy option paper of the property based tax, that is municipal land rates and ?????? (Mr Porter's microphone not on) Could the Chief Minister or Minister for Finance advise ?? every endeavour to proceed to implementation as near to the milestone as possible.

MR SNELL Thank you Mr Speaker and Mr Porter for the question. The response to the question refers to a letter received from Minister Brigg's regarding several matters, one in particular was municipal rates, land taxes and the proposed Cascade Jetty extension project. Mr Speaker just o quote partly from the letter. " The Norfolk Island Government should continue to work on introducing measures to expand and normalize it's revenue base. He notes that there is a requirement under the Funding Agreement to implement a appropriate municipal rates regime by 1st July 2014 and that the Cascade Jetty extension project is dependent on satisfactorily meeting this requirement. Separately to this I expect the Norfolk Island Government to scope and

implement land taxes as a means of normalizing its tax base and improving its financial position". Prior to introducing municipal rates Minister Briggs has requested that I advise him of the model we wish to implement. Minister Briggs has extended the expectation that the municipal rates model will be progressive and aligned with broad Australian local government rating models. Once Minister Briggs has seen the specific municipal rates system which Mr Porter has referred to he will consider matters of implementation, including any phasing in arrangements.

MR PORTER Thank you Mr Speaker. A supplementary if I might. Will the Government commit to a progressive rate system as referred to in this report?

MR SNELL Thank you Mr Speaker and Mr Porter. We are considering, we will be considering the Land Valuation Bill 2012 when it is received and of course the results of the surveys, the household and business surveys when they have been implemented as well.

MR EVANS Thank you Mr Speaker. This is directed to the Minister for the Environment. Is it a fact that a parcel of land adjacent to the Waste Management Centre and the Airport has been leased or is being used for non Administration purposes and can the Minister please advise if a public tender process was conducted and if so, what conditions have been agreed upon.

MR WARD Thank you Mr Speaker and thank you Mr Evans for the question. Mr Evans I believe the land in question is an area within the Airport precinct close to the Waste Management Centre and I have had no notification or notice from the Service that there is any lease arrangement happening there. That is a matter for the Airport Manager who has previously advertised for Expressions of Interest to use various parts of the Airport for grazing purposes and I suspect it would be related to that but I actually haven't had notice of any recent leasing or rental arrangements.

MRS WARD Thank you Mr Speaker. My question is to the Chief Minister. Given that a month has passed since the Chief Minister advised the House that current budget constraints are preventing the Government and the Administration from meeting the milestones and that as a result the CEO has raised the need for, and I'll quote "milestone co-ordination capacity team assistance", will the Chief Minister provide an update on those discussions being held between the CEO and the Federal Department.

MR SNELL Thank you Mr Speaker and Mrs Ward for the question. I haven't the details in front of me. There have been discussions regarding this matter but I will endeavour to have something for Mrs Ward in due course but at this moment I don't have it. I'll take it On Notice.

MRS WARD Thank you Mr Speaker. Is the Chief Minister saying that the CEO has brought nothing to his attention which will assure him that all milestones will be met by the 30th June?

MR SNELL Thank you Mr Speaker and Mrs Ward for the question. The CEO has expressed his concern at a number of issues regarding the milestones Mr

Speaker and those issues are ongoing. I will endeavour to have a list of all those milestones and those that haven't been met, available to Melissa as soon as possible.

MR NOBBS One for the Minister for Finance. Mention was made at the last meeting of potential savings within the Administration's budget. Have you had the time to progress the suggestions made and if so, are there potential savings.

MR SHERIDAN Thank you Mr Speaker and thank you Mr Nobbs for the question. Mr Nobbs may have to remind me of the suggested savings that he's discussing but I know that at the last Sitting I mentioned that the deficit at the half year budget review was \$1.6m and I asked the Service to identify savings that they could withstand within the rest of the remainder of the financial year and they identified close to \$800,000. Apart from those savings I'm not aware of any other savings that have been identified that could be reduced this current financial year.

MR NOBBS One for Minister Ward. When can we expect the Headstone Bridge to be sealed.

MR WARD Thank you Mr Speaker and Mr Nobbs. I don't have a date for that Mr Nobbs. I could check with the Works Manager for you or take that On Notice if you prefer.

MR NOBBS Yep. One for Minister Adams if I may, Minister in charge of the Healthcare. Has there been any progress on a question asked previously, when does a person cease to become a member of the Healthcare insurance fund and if so, what was the answer.

MS ADAMS Thank you Mr Speaker and Mr Nobbs for the question. There's two components to the Healthcare system, there is the Medivac and the Healthcare system. The Medivac component, a member ceases to be eligible for a Medivac funding after having not paid their Healthcare levy for a prescribed period and I'm sorry off the top of my head I'm not sure whether it's one month or two months period, two levy periods, thank you. Non payment of your Healthcare levy component does not remove you from being a member of the fund. I'm going to take the rest On Notice because I'm having just a mental blank at the moment around that.

MR NOBBS Can I just follow up that (Mr Nobbs microphone not working).....insurance policy

MS ADAMS I'm not sure what you do but I'll take that On Notice.

MRS WARD Thank you Mr Speaker. A question for the Chief Minister. Is it a fact that the Norfolk Island Administration were invited to be included in the Commonwealth funded Administrator's apprenticeship and traineeship initiative and that the invitation was declined. If so, would the Chief Minister explain why.

MR SNELL Thank you Mr Speaker and Mrs Ward for the question. I don't believe the Administration declined. I think they had some issues and some concerns regarding the appropriation of monies regarding the apprenticeship and

MR WARD No there has been a preference by one operator to use the material that is based in the old quarry, a particular part of material that's stored there best suits his operation, and as far as I know either can apply for use of rock whatever rock stock pile Administration holds, and we've made some significant progress on a way forward for making rock available from Portion 44a and it will be up to each crushing operator here to, or anyone else for that matter to make application to access that rock they need for whatever purpose.

MRS WARD Thank you Mr Speaker. A question to Minister Adams, understanding that the question on the Notice Paper 56 may give the Minister room to answer this question, but it would appear that some in the community believe that if we move to a new health service delivery model in the aged care section of the Hospital will be closed down and that the elderly will be sent to live in Sydney. Is the Minister able to respond in a way that will allay the concerns of some in the community.

MS ADAMS Thank you Mr Speaker and thank you Mrs Ward for the question. That would be the very last thing that would possibly happen in this community. We are well known for looking after our aged. Thank you.

MR NOBBS Thank you. I have another one for the Minister for Finance. As Health Minister in the last Assembly and now finance Minister have you undertaken any financial modelling to support the previous Government preferred model of governance for Norfolk Island.

MR SHERIDAN Thank you Mr Speaker and Mr Nobbs. There was a paper completed by our Roadmap Advisor in the last Assembly Mr George Plant but all that identified was the savings that would be accomplished by the Federal Government, the Commonwealth taking over the Federal responsibilities that we currently, or the Norfolk Island Government currently manages. That was the paper that was completed in regards to the modelling of the preferred model of government. As your well aware the Norfolk Island Government administers three tiers of government, the Federal, State and local. The modelling that was done removed the Federal responsibilities from Norfolk Island and included possible transfer payments for areas such as health and social services was removed, health and education. Those transfer payments that we would be eligible to once taxation became the norm in Norfolk Island. So that was the only modelling that was completed.

MR NOBBS Just a supplementary Mr Speaker. In that report what was the suppositions utilized as far as the Commonwealth's contribution. Was it based on that available to States, self governing Territories or such places with municipal councils such as Christmas Island.

MR SHERIDAN Thank you Mr Speaker and thank you Mr Nobbs for the supplementary question. I believe that the assumptions were based on receiving the same benefits as a State or Territory would share with the Commonwealth.

MR PORTER Thank you Mr Speaker. We have received a copy of the Position Paper on Community Title, this would be to the Minister responsible. We have the paper on community title, when can we expect to see legislation before the House.

MR WARD Thank you Mr Speaker. I have received a bit of an update from the Legal Services Unit on this area and to recap firstly the first quarter covering July to September 2013 Norfolk was to provide a Position Paper which was done. For the third quarter January to March 2014 to provide the Department with a draft Bill regarding the introduction into Norfolk Island for Community Title land tenure. Norfolk Island Position Paper on Strata Community Title was prepared and provided as a first quarter deliverable. A draft Community Titles Bill 2014 and Community titles Regulations have been prepared but are being further developed. The Bill is based on the south Australian Community Titles Act 1996. This Act seems the least complicated of the various statutory developments in Australia. While compliance with the Funding Agreement is obviously important compliance is not an end in itself. Work continues to develop Community Titles legislation appropriate for Norfolk Island's circumstances. The South Australian Act was significantly amended with effect from 28th October 2013 i.e after the 2012 white paper and the 2013 Norfolk Island Governance Position Paper to provide increased consumer protection measures. The Draft Bill and Regulations are being further revised in light of these changes. As soon as is practicable I propose to release an exposure draft Bill and Regulations for community comment. I will keep the House informed.

MR PORTER A supplementary if I may. This may have to go to the Minister for Finance but it appears we'll fail to implement the legislation in accordance with the Funding 'Agreement and if so have the implications of not receiving those milestone payments been factored into our forward cash flow predictions.

MR SHERIDAN Thank you Mr Speaker. Yes some modelling has been done identifying the possibility of not receiving the full amount of not only for that outcome that you refer to but also to other outcomes within the Funding Agreement. We've identified a couple of scenarios but at this point in time the Service has made it very clear to me that they are quite comfortable in meeting all the milestones under the Funding Agreement. So we're working on the pretence that we will receive the full \$4.4m this financial year. It may come later in this calendar year but we are comfortable that we will eventually receive the full \$4.4m.

MRS WARD Thank you Mr Speaker. A question to the Chief Minister. Understanding that the Government has prepared a submission for the soon to be visit from the JSC, when will the Chief Minister be making that document publically available.

MR SNELL Thank you Mr Speaker and Mrs Ward for the question. We haven't set a date for its public release at this time, but it has to be submitted the JSC by the 17th of this month and we would hope that shortly after that it would be released to the public.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

No - 54 Mrs Ward to the Minister for Cultural Heritage and Community Services

MS ADAMS Thank you Mr Speaker and thank you Mrs Ward for the question. Mrs Ward's question reads, given that the Minister stated at the March sitting of the House that she was provided with a "volume of documentation" relating to the recruitment of the Norfolk Island Hospital Enterprise Director will the Minister advise

whether or not 1) the vote of the selection panel was unanimous 2) an opportunity was given to panel members to lodge a dissent in opinion 3) any of the panel members were critical of the process and if so how. Mr Speaker members of the selection panel all signed a non disclosure agreement as part of the selection process and by signing that agreement each member undertook, and i quote "to comply with the non disclosure agreement for all times during and after the selection process and appeals period". Accordingly it is not my intention nor would it be appropriate to respond to the specific questions asked by Mrs Ward other than to advise as follows; Subsection 19 (1) of the Norfolk Island Hospital Act 1985 - The Act provides "the Minister on the recommendation of the Advisory Board may appoint a person to be the Director of the Norfolk Island Hospital Enterprise". Subsection 19 (2) of the Act provides the Director holds office on such terms and conditions, if any in respect of matters not provided for by this Act as are determined by the Minister on advice of the Advisory Board. My letter dated 14 March 2014 from the Chair of the Hospital Advisory Board received by me on 17 March 2014 I was advised that at its Board Meeting on 28 February 2014 the Board "carried a Motion to accept the panel recommendation to appoint Mr David McCowan to be the new Director of the NIHE. The Board also recommends a review of the contract of employment to include key performance issues as detailed by the selection panel in the attached key performance indicators NIHE Director". I accepted the recommendation of the Advisory Board and in accordance with the provisions of the Norfolk Island Hospital Act 1985 I appointed Mr McCowan to the position of Director to the Norfolk Island Hospital Enterprise effective 31 March 2014. Thank you Mr Speaker.

MRS WARD Thank you Mr Speaker. If I may, with respect I appreciate the non disclosure agreement signed by people who sit on panels. The question was to the Minister to disclose that information, certainly not panel members. So I ask a question is it a fact that the Norfolk Island Administration recruitment procedure was used to fill the Hospital Director position and if so, will the Minister explain why no right of appeal was provided to unsuccessful applicants.

MS ADAMS Thank you Mr Speaker. The role played by the HR Unit of the Administration was purely procedural to act as a post office and an advertising agency. Certainly the actual processes under the HR is not what was used by the panel, the recruitment panel.

MRS WARD So the question is what documented process was used for recruitment of Director of the Hospital.

MS ADAMS I'm not sure what the question is, what actually Mrs Ward is asking Mr Speaker. Could you just clarify that.

MRS WARD What documented procurement process was used, which Human Resources recruitment procedure or process was used in this instance.

MS ADAMS Thank you Mr Speaker, I'll take that On Notice just to make sure that the answer I give is absolutely 100% correct.

Question No 55 - Mrs Ward to Minister for Cultural Heritage and Community Services.

MS WARD Thank you Mr Speaker and thank you Mrs Ward for the question. Mrs Ward asks, given that the Minister has indicated that the ACHS Hospital Accreditation Report has been received by her, when will the Report be made public. Mr Speaker what has been received recently by the Director of the Norfolk Island Hospital Enterprise is the Australian Council of Healthcare Standards, the ACHS Equip National Organization wide survey "not met report" and I quote from an email copied to me by the ACHS Customer Service Manager. " The ACHS is only releasing this survey report to NIHE as the member organization. It is a matter for the organization regarding further release of the report. It's very important for you to know that the survey process is not yet completed. The report is in draft format and is currently undergoing the ACHS review process, and a copy of the draft report will be forwarded to the organization within 3-4 weeks noting the Easter break. However the survey outcome and final report will be pending the organizations decision regarding an advanced completion survey". In short Mr Speaker the Director and I have received a report on matters yet to be met by the Hospital in the accreditation process over the next 90 days and the Director and his team at the Hospital are working towards meeting the not met items whilst acknowledging the very real funding constraints currently applying at the Hospital. Many of the urgent matters that have been identified in the " not met report" have already been resolved and the Hospital is seeking assistance from South East Sydney Local Health District on those matters that require their assistance. These not met issues, of course in no way effect the patient care that the community receives and are there to assist the Hospital in attaining healthcare standards that are applicable throughout Australia. So in short the final report is yet to be received so I'm unable to advise Mrs Ward when that will be made public. All that I have at this time is the "not met" aspects. Thank you.

MRS WARD Thank you Mr Speaker. Can the Minister give an indication to the House what are "not met" issues, particularly if they don't effect patient care, are they lengthy, is it simple, what is it and what will it cost.

MS ADAMS It's quite lengthy, no that hasn't been arrived at yet but I'm happy to come back to the House with that detail at the next Sitting and in the meantime let Members know outside of the Sitting of the House. Thank you Mr Speaker.

Question No 56 - Mrs Ward to the Minister for Cultural Heritage and Community Services.

MS ADAMS Thank you Mr Speaker and Mrs Ward for the question. The question reads; Given that there is an expectation in writing from the Australian Government will implement the Nexus Health Services Plan recommendations will the Minister answer the following. Mr Speaker in order to give context to the question from Mrs Ward I'll preface my response with the following. I believe Mrs Ward is referring to a letter to me from Minister Briggs received 10th march 2014 from which I quote "The Australian Government remains committed to working with you to improve health services on Norfolk Island, and to ensure they reflect the need for the community". In my response of 25 March 2014 to Minister Briggs which was copied to Members I supported his view that health services for Norfolk Island should reflect the needs of the community, and that in order to progress the recommendations from the reviews, including transition to a new model a thorough community engagement process is

required. I propose the appointment of an independent and appropriate and qualified facilitator to assist with the consultation process. I sought assistance from Minister Briggs to divert the \$35,000 unspent funds from the incomplete review of health legislation by Dr Tim Smythe towards engaging the Facilitator. Regrettably on 10 April 2014 Minister Briggs said he was not able to agree that request and the unspent funds are to be returned to the Commonwealth. These funds were returned yesterday. Honourable Members the draft Nexus Health Service Plan proposes some key steps in the implementation process, including the Hospital Advisory Board making recommendations on this Services Plan to the Norfolk Island Government and the Norfolk Island Government formally responding to the recommendations of the Services Plan and the Advisory Board. The Advisory Board continues to give consideration to the implications of the draft Nexus Report and I look forward to receiving their recommendations in the near future. However I need to draw attention yet again to the fact that the draft Health Services Plan by Nexus Consultants by their own admission does not purport to be a detailed to be a detailed services plan as they had significant resourcing and timing constraints that precluded a more comprehensive consultation process with the Norfolk Island Community, and I say not good enough. I have requested the Advisory Board and the Director to give consideration as to how we can progress the engagement of an independent and appropriately qualified Facilitator to undertake the overdue broad ranging community consultation process on the two Reports, and on the provision of health services generally and which reflect the needs of the community going forward. Just earlier before I continue, we heard a question Without Notice of concern within Members of this community in the aged care area, having a concern that they are eventually going to have to be moved offshore for aged care. They are the actual things that have got to be addressed within this community, it's the community's health service going forward, nobody else's, the community's health services going forward, and until they are asked in a meaningful way, we don't have that answer. So with that background I now respond to the specific questions from Mrs Ward and I'm sorry I can't give you much joy. In view of the fact that the answer to part 1 of the question is No, equally the response to Parts 2 and 3 cannot apply at this time. In respect of Part 4 of the question as stated earlier Minister Briggs has advised that the Australian Government is committed to working with Norfolk Island to continue to assist in providing health services. However what specific assistance will be provided by the Australian Government is not known at this stage. Thank you Mr Speaker. Mr Speaker what I omitted to do was to actually state what Mrs Ward was asking as Parts 1,2 and 3. Part 1) was has South Eastern Sydney Local Health District been approached about providing the role of the offshore provision of the island's health services, and if so what was their response. So in short the answer is "No" because that's premature and in view of the fact that the answer to Part 1) of the question is "No", Parts 2) and 3) do not apply. In respect of Part 4) as stated earlier in my response Minister Briggs has committed that the Australian Government will continue to assist in providing health services outside the direct representation on the Board. However how that assistance will be provided by the Australian Government in due course, is not known.

MR SPEAKER

You did note that response earlier.

MRS WARD

Thank you if I may a supplementary Mr Speaker because I note that as part of the Director position description under Key challenges and influences is that a health service plan for the Norfolk Island Hospital Enterprise needs

to be finalised and implemented by the end of 2013. I'm wondering if the Minister can explain what is happening in this area.

MS ADAMS Thank you Mr Speaker and thank you Mrs Ward. This is a discussion I think that you and I had outside of this forum and that is that I advised you that the actual KPI's attached to the Director's contract made sense of what didn't make sense in the original advertisement, because there was no way it could possibly have been achieved. Recruitment didn't happen until this year.

MRS WARD Have any other key elements within the position description been removed from the new Director's contract.

MS ADAMS Off the top of my head I'm going to say "No" Mr Speaker but I'll qualify that by having a check but that was the only one that I had influence around, and since it was a contract signed by myself and the Director, I'll just make absolutely sure on that but I'm confident that the answer is "No".

Question No 57 - Mrs Ward to Minister for Finance

MR SHERIDAN Thank you Mr Speaker. The question reads; Will the Minister provide the House with an update on the development strategies regarding the issues arising from excess photovoltaic electricity generation and what collaborative assistance has been sought from the Commonwealth. The response is Mr Speaker; The strategies in regard to the issues arising from excess photovoltaic electricity generation will be established from the paper provided to me only just last week by the Business Systems Analyst Miss Leslie Warren. This paper has provided 13 recommendations to me which will be considered when forming the strategies to deal with this issue. The paper referred to not just the issue of excess photovoltaic electricity generation and the solutions in relation to energy storage, nor the pricing structure as was the main intent of the terms of reference, but considered other matters as well. I would like to read from the executive summary a paragraph of which clearly outlines this and it reads; "Whilst the two clear areas of focus from the Minister were pricing and some technological solutions in relation to energy storage it is clear that any recommendations on pricing cannot stand alone without effort being placed into improvements in metering and time of day charging. Similarly a future energy policy and the development of an Expressions of Interest designed to obtain total solutions will be required rather than just one element". Mr Speaker as part of the work completed by Miss Leslie Warren an Expressions of Interest paper has been developed for the opportunity to develop a solution for solar PV over supply on Norfolk Island and related issues. This Expressions of Interest is currently being assessed to ensure that it is technically correct and assessing the Expressions of Interest against our requirements for technical feasibility and ensuring that the Norfolk Island Government and the Norfolk Island Administration is protected when assessing the financial and other impacts. It is intended that expert advice be sought on the Expressions of Interest before release. Mr Speaker the final part of the question relates to assistance sought from the Commonwealth and I presume this part of the question relates to the Funding Agreement milestone 18.4 - where the Norfolk Island Government shall with Commonwealth collaboration develop strategies regarding the issues arising from excess photovoltaic electricity generation. The assistance sought from the Commonwealth was in the areas of the Expressions of Interest for a long term solution

and the documentation of a 5-10 year energy policy. Two recommendations contained in the report Mr Speaker. A request was also made to access Commonwealth skills in constructing or assessing possible proposals, determining what would be a sustainable power purchasing agreement and models which may involve a third party. Departmental staff provided the offer of a teleconference which resulted in the Business Systems Analyst obtaining informal advice on the Expressions of Interest, procurement advice on having an independent technical oversight of the Expressions of Interest and technical oversight of the tender review panel and recommending the links to the websites.

MRS WARD If I may just for clarity, is the Minister saying that additional options, I'm talking about storage, that additional options will be considered other than simply battery storage, as was stated in a media release on the 3rd January this year.

MR SHERIDAN Yes thank you Mr Speaker and Mrs Ward for the supplementary. Yes the Expressions of Interest clearly is around identifying what would be the best solution and it may not necessarily just be battery storage.

Question No 58 - Mrs Ward to the Chief Minister

MR SNELL Thank you Mr Speaker. Question 58 from Mrs Ward to myself reads; Given that the Chief Minister stated in the March sitting of the House that the Commonwealth has suggested amendments to the Public Service Bill 2013 will the Chief Minister detail the amendments as they have been described by the Commonwealth. Mr Speaker on the 29th January 2014 I sent a letter to Minister Briggs, copied to the Administrator and the Chief Executive Officer of the Norfolk Island Administration on the Public Service Bill 2013, hence forth referred to as the Bill. Mr Speaker I have not received a response to my letter. The letter provides background and explains that the Bill was passed by the Norfolk Island legislative Assembly on the 29th May 2013 and at the Executive Council on 11th June 2013. It was referred for Commonwealth Minister's instructions. In October 2013 the Department by email to the Acting CEO provided a number of comments and recommendations regarding the Bill. As the Minister with responsibility for the Public Service I addressed those issues direct to the Minister in my January letter so that it may assist with the issuance of instructions on the Bill. Members will recall that the creation of the Bill was actually a milestone in the December 2012 Funding Agreement. Members may also recall it was a very long milestone. I will read the start of the milestone for clarity. The start of milestone 10 in Schedule 2 of the December 2012 Funding Agreement reads: " 10 - For the month of May Norfolk Island will undertake a framework of public sector reform that accommodates a new contemporary Public Service legislation supported by new employment conditions that include a cap on public sector redundancies. Specifically A) Public Sector Management Act 1) The Public Sector Management Act 2000 will be replaced with a similar Act founded on contemporary public sector management principles similar to that used by either the Commonwealth Public Service or one of the Mainland States or Territories". Mr Speaker I will stop there as the quote keeps going on with what principles should be included in the Act and it is quite lengthy Mr Speaker. Mr Speaker in accordance with milestones 10 (a) (i) it was determined by the Norfolk Island Government that we would base our new Public Service legislation on the Public Sector Employment and Management Act of the Northern Territory. Mr Speaker

action and I seek your leave Mr Speaker that the letter, a template of that letter be taken as read and incorporated into Hansard.

The Hon Jamie Briggs MP
Assistant Minister for
Infrastructure & Regional
Development.
Parliament House, ACT
Australian Government

The Hon Robin Adams MLA
Minister for Cultural
Heritage & Community
Services
Office of the Legislative Assembly
Norfolk Island Government

Dear Minister Briggs and Minister Adams,

In the recent letter to Norfolk Island residents from the Hon Jamie Briggs MP, Minister Briggs states; *"I would like to hear your ideas for the future of Norfolk Island; how we can better identify and promote economic opportunities; as well as your views on how best to deliver essential services and the best governance model for the future."*

Minister Adams, during the Norfolk Island Parliament sitting of 19 March 2014, spoke of a proposal and need for a commitment, expressing, *"....that before any further constitutional change (or any major governance change) occurs, that the people of this community should be first consulted through the referendum or plebiscite process"*.

We agree with both these statements.

It would seem that there is a 'meeting of the minds' in that both governments are recognising the need to provide clear information to the community before introducing major changes to governance or constitutional models.

We, the undersigned, welcome the opportunity to engage. However, it is unclear what we are being asked to respond to.

We request that the following three processes occur:

1. Both the Australian and Norfolk Island Governments, as a matter of urgency, work together on all proposed options for Norfolk Island's political and economic future.
2. Both the Australian and Norfolk Island Governments undertake the Economic, Social, and Environmental impact evaluation and modelling for each of the options for Norfolk Island's future and give the Norfolk Island people access to all information.
3. Allow the Norfolk Island people to have an opportunity to decide through referendum/plebiscite after appropriate consultation, before proceeding with ANY policy decision

Yours Sincerely

former Chief Minister and Minister of the Norfolk Island Government Mr Andre Nobbs. The purpose of the meeting was to afford the community the opportunity to identify and discuss their concerns and suggestions with regards to Norfolk Island's current situation and possible future options. A common theme throughout the meeting was the lack of information and data to inform this community and of equal importance to ensure a successful transition across governance, taxation and regulatory change. It was at that meeting that the community was offered the opportunity to use the template letter as a means of communicating their concerns to the Commonwealth and Norfolk Island Governments. At that meeting because the template letter was to be addressed to me as well as to Minister Briggs I gave an undertaking to those present that I would table their letters in the House. This I have done today. However in tabling the copies provided to me I am aware of signed letters yet to be dropped off. So this does not mean that the opportunity is closed to others, to also communicate with Minister Briggs and me this way should they choose to do so and further letters received will be tabled at the May sitting. I note the content of a letter to the community published in the Norfolk Islander from Mr Nobbs on 29 March in which he states that the template letter is couched in terms which are applicable to all residents, no matter how diverse their views may be on how our future should be crafted to all be able to request clarity and certainty around the future. Accordingly by signing the template letter the signatories are asking both our Governments, Australia and Norfolk Island 1) As a matter of urgency to work together on all proposed options for Norfolk Island's political and economic future 2) To undertake the economic, social and environmental impact evaluation and modelling for each of the options for Norfolk Island's future and give the Norfolk Island people access to all information and 3) Allow the Norfolk Island people to have opportunity to decide through Referendum Plebiscite after appropriate consultation before proceeding with any policy decision. Mr Speaker I wondered why the decision initially without looking at the letter, before I looked at the letter as why they would be writing to me. However it became clear that the letter has been directed to me because of my Adjournment debate in the House on 19 March when I gave notice of my intention to bring to this House at some future date a Motion for the calling of a Referendum or Plebiscite on Norfolk Island's future governance model. This intention Mr Speaker clearly aligns with my debate in this House on 8th May 2013 when the Chief Minister moved a Motion that I supported at that time to reaffirm the 13th Assembly 11 July 2012 Motion relative to the future governance model for Norfolk Island to entry into the Australian taxation and GST systems and other related matters, and I quote from my debate on that Motion. "In supporting my Chief Minister this morning that Members around this table be clearly aware that the time will arrive in the future when I will be moving for the community to be consulted at Referendum on constitutional changes being proposed and that before final decisions are taken on participation in the Australian taxation and social security systems that every effort will be made to ensure that there will be net benefit for Norfolk Island and it's community and there is appropriate consideration of local circumstances". As I said at the last sitting whether the Referendum or Plebiscite should be conducted by the Commonwealth or by the Norfolk Island Government or by another body from elsewhere such as the UN is of course a matter for future determination by this House and is a discussion for another day, however that discussion should not be denied. In the meantime Mr Speaker the letters tabled today from members of this community who question an opportunity to decide through Referendum or Plebiscite after appropriate consultation before proceeding with any policy decision is a very important first step towards commencing that future discussion. Thank you Mr Speaker.

MR SHERIDAN Mr Speaker may I ask that the Paper be noted.

MR SPEAKER The question is that the Paper be noted. Debate.

MR SHERIDAN Thank you Mr Speaker. I have some concerns in regards to what the Minister has just said in regards to this Paper and that it came from a portion of the community or from a member of the community and she was willing to table it, and she inferred that there may be others forthcoming and that she obviously would be willing to table those as well, and by tabling these letters Mr Speaker I think there is a certain inference that you support the content of the letter. There was no mention that Ms Adams did not support this statement or that she didn't support it, but I think just by nature that if members of the public write to the Minister's and ask that they be tabled, there has to be some assessment as to why that letter would wish to be tabled, that Statement would be wished to be tabled and the consequences of such tabling. I ask the Minister that if she's after comments from the community, now whether they are supportive in nature of her stance in relation to anything, not just the future governance of Norfolk Island, but if there were papers that took the alternate view and did not agree with her at all, would she be so willing as to table those papers as well. I just think it's a dangerous precedence that the Minister is setting here by stating that she will table any further papers that are presented to her from the community. Whilst we understand that the community do have concerns and rightly so because the Government has concerns too because we don't know exactly what the outcomes will be, but there are times where comments from the community should be kept more in house and then tabled in the parliament. I don't think it's necessarily correct and I think that the precedent the Minister is taking here could be a dangerous one to set.

MRS WARD Thank you Mr Speaker. Firstly I need to say in response to this is we all seek clarity. Every Member of this House and everybody in the community seeks clarity but I think what is confusing to members in the community is that they have been led to believe that this Government and the majority of this Assembly have agreed to a position and that was set out in the Motion which was reaffirmed and agreed by the 14th Government that you've already agreed to enter into the Australian taxation system. Minister Briggs came here. All these things were reaffirmed. So I'm not really clear now from Minister Adams whether she's sort of wanting to step back from that and break away from the other members of the Government and majority of this Assembly, because that is the impression, that's the perception that is being given loud and clear. So it may be in the Minister's best interest to come out and be very clear about that. Does she fully support the preferred model for self government, the integration into taxation, etc etc etc. All the points that are within that 3rd August, that original 3rd August Motion and I've got a copy here, I can dig it out. That would be helpful, because when the Minister threw onto the table in adjournment debate again at the last Sitting that she wanted the whole community to be consulted by Referendum, and I came in and said well the first thing that needs to happen is that the community needs to be reminded and understand of the current Governments preferred model and that was put in the paper. So the Minister needs to reaffirm that right now so that everybody is loud and clear and then the question is well what would you need a Referendum for. The Government is put in place to lead the community and that's what every Member of this House is trying to support them to do, to lead us to a sustainable future, and then when I read back through Hansard I saw the

Minister had said that the whole community and I'll read it, I'll quote it. This is Minister Adams at the last Sitting in adjournment debate. " I post to you Honourable Members until the community is consulted on its future by Plebiscite or by Referendum then the opportunities open to Norfolk Island in the 70's remains incomplete". Wow what does that mean. We have moved away from striving for full internal self government, clearly, and Minister Adams is shaking her head. Perhaps she doesn't agree. We have a problem, and I would like the Minister to clarify her position for the House and for the community. Thank you Mr Speaker.

MR NOBBS

I just want to pick up on a couple of points. Tim, Minister for Finance suggested there was a precedence here, it's been for ever and a day in this place people have been free to table papers from the community whether they agreed with them or not, and if he wants a precedence well I'll tell him but I'm not going through them now, because there's quite a few, where I have as a Minister put stuff on the table, including one which led to my demise as a Minister, not the rest of it but as a Minister, that I didn't agree with and so those things happen. Can I just say firstly that my view is really is that we don't use Referendums nearly enough on the island here. We get a lot of petitions and sometimes they then proceed onto a Referendum but they are the simplest and easiest way to get the community advised of what the thing is really and get their personal views because they have to sit in the box and tick the numbers and I'm a firm believer in Referendum, and I believe that there should be and there must be the opportunity for the community to provide through the ballot box their opinions on specific questions related to it. Now that's well and good but the big issue I feel with a Referendum is this, that both sides of the question involved and there is usually a for and against in every society, not just on Norfolk. Every society has a for and against. They should be available, the argument should be available to the community and that's great way of getting people to sit down and put things together. I'll give you a perfect example. We have this preferred model of governance. Well we heard this morning that very little has been done on the economic side of it. Now surely that should be done now, we should get into it. Forget about what they should have done or shouldn't have done in the last Assembly or the last 12 months. That's what we should do now, we're talking about a governance arrangement. We should have all the facts. What are we basing it on? Those are the questions and they are the questions that the community really want to know. They don't want to be snowed by these big words and the likes and governance arrangements and all this sort of thing. We need to get to the guts of it and that's what I'm saying and that's what I'm trying to do, that's what I believe will happen in all my submissions have been aimed at getting information and getting the people to follow. It's all right saying we're the leaders here and a lot of people that have sat around this table, long before you guys were on it probably except for my friend here the Chief Minister, and the Speaker have, they have had their two bobs worth and the likes on the subject, on all subjects. Some we made some blues on and others we haven't but I think that what we need to do, is, and I support the Minister. If she wants to table something that's up to her, Minister Adams and I firmly believe and I've said it all along and I think it was in my policy when I was elected t this place this time that we should have a Referendum on it and I know that my friend on my right here is probably looking up whatever I said, but the go is that has always been my ambition, to do that, to have a community Referendum on it, but we need all the information, and that's where we're lacking and that's where the community is confused. Thank you Mr Speaker.

MR PORTER Thank you Mr Speaker. Yes to pick up on Minister Adams' comment that I was at that meeting, it was a public meeting and I don't have a particular expressed view but, well I have a view but wanted to go along to the meeting and see what it was. It wasn't a large meeting and even in that meeting it appeared to be that people were divided on their opinion for the way forward. I have empathy with people who have concern with the lack of information but I agree with Mrs Ward in terms of the amount of information we have put out to the community and that it's the state of direction of this group and I have no problem of taking on board the correspondence that was generated from that meeting. I don't necessarily conform with it but it is an opportunity for those to bring it forward, but it wasn't an extensive group on the island and I guess in the long term to know whether this is a call from the majority of the community to have further consultation or to in fact have a referendum will be seen in the number of submissions that are tabled. Thank you.

MR SNELL Thank you Mr Speaker. I support Minister Adams in her endeavours to achieve consultation. Many around this table Mr Speaker have promoted from time to time the concerns of their constituents and I think Minister Adams is likewise doing that and I quote Mr Speaker, this is not new to this House. In December 2012 Minister Adams, and I reiterate, she stated " The Parliament is the voice of the people who elected, and it is to those people that the Parliament owes its allegiance and to who it should answer for its actions either at election time or through citizen initiated Referenda". Mr Speaker it's something that I've always been in support of and I certainly will, and I don't believe that what Mrs Adams is trying to do is detrimental to the process of this House. Thank you.

MS ADAMS Thank you Mr Speaker. Just in response so that I have clarity around what Minister Sheridan might have thought that I said. I wasn't talking about other documents, I was saying that the opportunity for people with a template letter have been told there are more coming, that they would also be tabled. I wasn't talking about any other document outside of that template letter. In case there was some misunderstanding there. If I may Mr Speaker just to repeat to answer Mrs Ward to state my position around the Motion that the 14th Assembly reaffirmed on 8th May 2013 I said quite clearly in supporting my Chief Minister this morning and I voted in favour of the Motion. The fact that I might be standing firmly with the Government in no way says that I would deny the people the right to agree or to disagree with my belief. That would be absolute arrogance on my part. I repeat there is no breaking away from this Government. I stand firmly with the Chief Minister and this Government on that Motion. Let that be clear, but I will not resolve from the right of this community at Referendum or Plebiscite to determine its future whether or not that agrees with what the Government of the day might be wanting.

MR SHERIDAN Thank you Mr Speaker. I'm glad the Minister clarified that it was only more copies of the template letter that she tabled that she would be willing to table. So that begs a question, would she be willing to table other letters from the community that come forward on any subject for that matter, and I may ask the Chief Minister at this time, and I'm confused like Mrs Ward is. I'm confused. Does he support the Government's direction on the model of government that we have agreed to in this House and we have provided to the Commonwealth, or will he stand with Ms Adams in regards to supporting a Plebiscite or Referendum on the matter. We have made a decision, this Government of what we support, what model of government.

Now the only reason why you would have a Referendum is whether or not you would want to change that, and I ask the Chief Minister, does he support the model of government that we have agreed to in this House or would he support a Referendum which would alter that.

MR SNELL Thank you Mr Speaker. In response to the question from Minister Sheridan, I support what has past and I support the previous decisions that have been made but it doesn't take away the point that the people of this island have the right to express their views and if it's done by Referendum of Plebiscite so be it. I don't take away that right from them to do so. Governments in the past have made errors in judgement and they have the right to be able to react accordingly and if it's by Plebiscite or Referendum, so be it. I stand by the decisions that have been made in the 13th and 14th Assembly's and I will do so, and I state publically that I have done so, and I still do so to this day, but I don't deny the people the right of Referendum on any subject regarding Norfolk Island.

MRS WARD Thank you Mr Speaker. Just some final words is that nobody is trying to deny the right or the ability of this community to express their view, I support that position, but it raises the question - what if there were a Referendum, and the answer was "No" that it was against the decision of this Government and the majority of Members. That's the question you need to think about. I think everybody laughs in the face at this to be honest because they know it's non binding, so there's \$5,000 or \$6,000 needed to be put in the budget to waist everybody's time. There is no other solution except loss of an airline, loss of half the Public Service. We all know, there's been \$50m pumped into this community. I can't even believe I'm even having to state these but I only do it because of my colleague Mr Ron Nobbs that somewhere along the line in the last 3 years there are clearly people, or there must be people who still don't get it, we're broke. Minister Briggs made a Statement in Federal Parliament, what more do people want. It's not about denying the community access to have a say at the Referendum, but think about the consequences, think about them. Decisions that have been made to date have been based on a Delloitts Access Economic Wellbeing Report, they've been based on Commonwealth Grants Commission Financial Capacity Update reports, they've been based on the Australian Continuous Improvement Group Public Service Review, they've been based on the Acell Tasman Economic Development Report, they've been based on revenue measure options, they've been based on policies to promote competition and investment in the island, and they are based on a preferred model of self government. They are based on ANAO reports and statements. What more do you need to understand. You have the lives of this community in your hands. I would hope that this Government wouldn't bow to a community who says "we don't want this" without having all the facts and figures in front of them, without understanding the detail as this Government should. It is their responsibility. Thank you Mr Speaker.

MR NOBBS Just a quick one Mr Speaker. I don't believe that the Government has all the answers at their fingertips despite what's said, because I asked a question this morning and we couldn't get an answer, a proper answer. It was where I believe we are, and we need to fill in the gaps, and until you fill in the gaps, how can you really make decisions, and I would think it would be, it's fine for the other mob that were in Canberra that think that the social side of it's the go and that's it, but we need to survive. Whether we're getting funding as a State of a Territory or even a God forbid a

particular area because there is little choice, for the financial dictates on this matter. But Norfolk Island has basically made its decisions. It made these decisions three plus years ago, it's now four years, made its decision that in the net interest, net benefit that Norfolk Island should progress this path, and there have been difficulties locally. We've all shared difficulties about that. There has been difficulties in understanding that, but as time has moved on and difficulties have continued to compound, there has been a greater realization that we must, and the Chief Minister in the life of this Assembly has acknowledged that. I compliment him on doing so. But it now remains for the Commonwealth to make its decision. We've made our decision, and walked to the doors of the Commonwealth but there can be no further progress until the Commonwealth makes a decision in terms of opening those doors for Norfolk Island to enter from its small pool to the Commonwealth's wider and more embracing pool. So that's the matter of the first, the getting of information, the distribution. There is not a great deal to tell about progress. Having said that, that there is not a great deal of progress the responsibility then rests upon the Norfolk Island Government to be batting and pushing to ensure that we do make progress, and I respectfully say there's not been enough of that. Therefore there is little to tell. Therefore there is a public meeting about not having much information. The Norfolk Island government needs to progress with the Commonwealth, the Roadmap arrangements, the entering into the range of things that I've already mentioned, the method of governance to be tidied. Although we've had a Minister visit the island, Minister Briggs, that was good, it didn't bring us much joy in terms of information, in terms of progressing I mean. We had some view from him, not all of them, commendable views from our prospective, but nevertheless there was that conversation, but to be quite frank there should have been conversation from the Norfolk Island Government before they got into power in the Australian scene so that there would be a continuity when they did get into government and have a continuity and be pressing them now that they are pursuing policy matters that have effect upon Norfolk Island. There needs to be greater effort on the part of the Norfolk Island Government to get Norfolk Island along this track. That's the second matter, the matter of the Government in Norfolk Island to negotiate further and to do it with some vigour. The third matter is the matter of Referendum. It's interesting about Referendum. It can't be denied that Referendum factors are necessary from time to time. It can't be denied that it's a part of the legislation that can be done today. It can be initiated by community members now. It can be initiated by the Legislative Assembly now, it can be initiated by the Commonwealth now. There are all of those factors that can be brought into play by the present legislation. But it's interesting. When we commenced in 1979, that was the result of a Royal Commission, the Nimmo Report. The recommendation of the Nimmo Report was that this matter then should be implemented but there should not be a Referendum. Everybody applauded that and it go ton the track. What I'm trying to say is that there is not always magic in thinking that a Referendum will provide you with a solution. It can't be denied, it can't be denied and it must be acknowledged that the views of the community are essential, but there also are times when governments need to decide in the widest interest of the community and regrettably it doesn't always mean that it is because everyone agrees, and this path that we're upon now, when it commenced and needed to commence is an example. People would have preferred not to, but now there is a greater realization that we must, and to be quite frank if all of the community had been behind it from day one, we might have got there a bit sooner, but the Governments need to take the decision and need to balance all the factors, and I'm not trying to say that it is unmindful of the community but the Government at the end of the day is responsible and is to be taken to account.

Therefore those things that I have mentioned earlier about the Norfolk Island Government recognizing what needs to be done and pursuing it with the Commonwealth to get it done should not wait for something like a Referendum. It must be done. If you want to at some time pursue that, I'm not trying to say that I would oppose it but I've got to acknowledge what Mr Nobbs said, you need to have all of the factors if your going to ask the community the for's and the against's and to be quite frank sometimes if you wait for the gathering of everything, see the Roadmap set out the principles and where you needed to travel but acknowledged that certain studies had to be done and you collated that information as you went along the track to confirm or adjust the path as you went along, and we've had various reports that have been able to acknowledge that, and now we're at the stage of understanding that and asking the Commonwealth equally to make a decision. Just like the Royal Commission at the end of the day, when all of those things fell into place, that's where it needed to go and you didn't have to necessarily have a Referendum, and that may lead people to think that I'm opposed to it, that's not the case, but it needs to be in context, it needs to be in context of where we are to go. So I don't see Referendum as the number one. I see pursuing the path that we all realize that we must travel is the number one and we need to pursue it more vigorously than we do so now. I'm happy to note the Paper that the Minister has put on the table this morning.

DEPUTY SPEAKER Thank you. Is there further debate.

MR WARD Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker. Throughout this reform process it's been identified that there will be winners and losers as the result of the reforms. At the end of the process it could be that it is appropriate to determine whether the community perceives that there is a net benefit. If we went to Referendum today I don't know what the outcome would be. We all know that there is a need for some very serious reforms. We all know and accept that. We as a Government here have had to certainly accept some measure which were quite alien to us, and I would really be very concerned about anybody trying to take away from the community or deny the community the opportunity for Referendum should the need be there for it. We will really have some serious decisions to make and this community must have a part in that process and what has been said about having the facts is so vitally true. We do need to know a lot more and there is certainly a role there for the Commonwealth to make information available to us and it's also up to us as individuals and as a Government to get as much information as we can out there on how the various systems work and what the impacts are likely to be. I would just urge that we look at the bigger picture or that we try to factor in what the benefits will be. We are going to be facing things like the land rates, possible land taxes, all of these sorts of things we have to look at not only in the context of can we afford it today would it be that these reforms will deliver us such an improvement in the economy that we can easily cope with these imposts, but we really need this information. I applaud the household and business income and expenditure survey and it will be an important tool for us to help put decisions forward to the people but we really must try and get as much information out there and I reiterate that, as all the other Members have said here today. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER Any further debate.

MR PORTER Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker. I'm not speaking against Referendum, merely a word of caution that in speaking of a Referendum we're not

giving a false hope to a sector of the community that doesn't want to appreciate the need, not desire, the need to move forward and that we shouldn't offer that false hope out and cloud our judgement in looking to move forward as a full community. Thank you.

MR SNELL Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker. I'd just like to comment on the words of Mr Buffett and his summation of the situation. He's correct except for the fact that probably the result of the 2013 election was a type of Referendum and the people at that time stated how they wished the Government to be considerate of the new reforms. However we have travelled down a path which we hope to have been the right path and I still believe it is the right path we're heading down and I acknowledge the words of the previous Chief Minister Mr Buffett. We have on many occasions and I thank my staff, prior to the election of the Commonwealth Government we wrote to both the Minister's and shadow Minister's, we made representations on many a front to try and determine what would be the policies, what would be the thoughts with the guidance to us, what the impacts, what's the information that will come to us regarding the agreements from the previous Australian Government. We have had very little as Mr Buffett has outlined. However we still pursue that path for more information, we still pursue the path for facts and figures and we sit in line I think with many others. The Australian Government has its own problems, many of them and maybe Norfolk Island doesn't rate very highly on their agenda, but we have written many letters, we have sought information. We know for example that probably they got sick of our letters because all correspondence now has to go through the Administrator to the various Minister's that we wish to deal with. Maybe that's all part of it, but nevertheless we do try and I thank my staff sincerely for all the efforts that they put in, in guiding me in this area. Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker.

MS ADAMS Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker. I would just like to go back to what I said on the 19th March, because perhaps this discussion is diverging away from what I was actually saying at the last Sitting, when saying there was a need for a Referendum or Plebiscite at the appropriate time. I am not suggesting today that it's today, or tomorrow or next month. Clearly I am talking about constitutional issues. I am talking about what to Norfolk Island is the closest at the moment it can come to a constitution and that is the Norfolk Island Act of 1979. In 2010 the Territories Law Reform Bill in my eyes virtually removed self government by its inclusion into Schedule 2. At that time there should have been a Referendum. I am saying that as we move forward we have this Government has agreed the previous Governments decision to propose a Territory model of governance, removal of Federal, back to where it would be argued by some, it belongs.. That's certainly not my view. A Territory model of governance has been put up to the Commonwealth and we continue to seek from the Commonwealth their agreement to that model of governance. The question I put on the table today is this. In the event that the Commonwealth does not agree that model of governance and perhaps chooses a lesser form of self government for Norfolk Island a further diminution of self government or in fact perhaps, and this is my reading of words being used by Minister Briggs during his visit, the removal of self government, will we around this table sit here and say nothing, or will we ask the people is that your wish. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER Is there any further debate. I put the question that the Motion be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED

DEPUTY SPEAKER Now I understand Mr Sheridan has the Traffic Amendment Regulations.

MR SHERIDAN Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker. I'd like to table the **Customs Amendment Regulations 2014** and also under Section 32 (b) of the Public Monies Act 1979 I'm required to table directions in regards to the transfer of expenditure between divisions. I therefore table the **virements for the part month of March and also part month of February** and also Mr Speaker I table the financial indicators for February 2014 which details any material departures from the budget also.

SPEAKER Thank you Minister Sheridan. Any further Papers for presentation this morning from further Ministers.

STATEMENTS

MR WARD Thank you Mr Speaker. I'd just like to make a Statement about **Portion 44a and the rock supply issue**. The rock stock pile at Portion 44a near the School has been of concern to me since commencing this Ministry as has the ensuring that the construction industry and government projects have assured rock supply into the future. To this end I have taken advice from the Planning Officer and am pleased to advise we are in a position to make stock pile rock available from 44a stockpile. This will address our short term raw rock needs. To address the longer term supply I have established a Working Group co-ordinated by Mr Dave Porter. This group will be developing an action plan based on the myriads of reports already done on this subject. Although we do not need a development application to access 44a we will impose stric controls along the lines of 1) that there will be no processing, jack hammering or breaking of rock on 44a, no rock activities of any kind are to be conducted. No rock braking equipment to be on site. 2) Rocks and material to be taken from the surface only. That works will be conducted in such a manner as to avoid causing undue noise or dust nuisance. Vehicles should be loaded in a way as to minimise airborne dust emissions. 3) That there will be no more than five consecutive days on site with the minimum of two non operational days before recommencement. That there be at least one week per calendar month non accessible. This is just to give neighbours in the area some relief from that activity. 5) Any damages to public infrastructure, fences, roads, drains etc as a result of operations, to be repaired at operators expense and they will be held liable and responsible. Defined hours will be ?? works must be conducted. The approval holder may only take rocks from the site between the hours of 8 and 4.30 from Monday to Friday. The approval holder is prohibited from taking rock from the site at all other times or at times when directed by the Executive Member or an authorised Officer to cease operations. The approval holder shall provide a lollipop man/woman at the pedestrian crossings at the School at Cascade Road and Colins Head Road whenever any of the approval holders trucks of 10 tonnes or more are passing by the School on the way to the site between the hours of 8.00am and 9.00am and between 2.30 and 3,00pm during School days, or no operations truck movements past the School during these times. The Manager of Public Works will have authority to make reasonable directions as may be needed from

time to time and that the operator shall provide proof of appropriate public liability insurance to be prescribed by the CEO. Mr Speaker there could be other controls as well, any others identified that those have been put together this morning as a ?? towards making this available without placing undue conditions against people living in the area, or posing anything on them that would be unreasonable. In other words we're trying to impose the same conditions we would impose with a DA but without the actual DA. Thank you.

MS ADAMS Thank you Mr Speaker. I have a Statement this morning on the **review of the KAVHA Conservation Management Plan**, it's an update. At the February Sitting of this House I issued a Statement to introduce the review of KAVHA 2008 Conservation Management Plan, commonly called the CMP and at the March Sitting I provided an update following the visit of heritage professionals to undertake the consultation and engagement filed work. A key part of the review of the 2008 CMP is to engage with the community of Norfolk Island and other key stake holders to understand the heritage values people attribute to the Kingston and Arthurs Vale Historic Area, their vision for its future and any issues or opportunities people feel need to be considered in shaping a new heritage management plan. The brief to the CMP review emphasised the importance of community engagement and Ms Chris Johnston of Context in Melbourne was appointed to lead this component of the project. I've now received a copy of the report on community engagement and communication dated 7 April 2014 which I now table. The Report is available at the web page www.kavha.gov.nf and I encourage all members of the community to have a look to see what the results of the consultation process has brought forward. The Report covers engagement and communication activities up to early 2014 and captures the key themes and messages provided by the more than 250 people who participated in person or online. The overall goal was to find as ?? to build confidence in the overall CMP review process thereby building engagement with and support for a new Heritage Management Plan. I extend my thanks and sincere congratulations to Ms Johnston and the project team for their work to date. The Report is comprehensive and the request for input from the community during the consultation phase resulted in the most feedback ever received to date relating to KAVHA. The Consultants have recommended there be further on island interaction with key stakeholders to ensure the many and diverse stakeholders are heard and included so that we can work towards mutual understanding and an achievable level of consensus, along with the commitment to afford looking strategic vision which is fundamental for ongoing conservation and management of the KAVHA site. Details of the additional interaction between 28 April and 3 May will be published shortly. That's when part of the team return to Norfolk Island. Thank you Mr Speaker.

MS ADAMS Thank you. Just a brief update if I could from our new **Director of the Hospital** who has been very prompt in progressing meetings with both Queensland Health and South East Sydney in the very near future, he will be away for a week in May where he's arranged meetings with representatives from the Australian College of Rural and Remote Medicine in Brisbane on Monday the 19th May. This is to discuss possible placement of senior rural and remote Registrars' to Norfolk Island thereby assisting with the recruitment of permanent medical staff. He has a meeting with Queensland Health which is being proactively followed on Monday the 19th May. He then fly's to Sydney where he has meetings with Gerri Marr as current Chief Executive and the Deputy Chief Executive Mark Sheppard at South East Sydney Local Health District. He is also trying to set up meetings with the NSW Rural Doctors

Network on the 22nd May for the recruitment of Medical Officers and allied health staff for Norfolk Island. He awaits confirmation on that last one. I have asked him also, if it is appropriate to arrange a meeting with ACHS whilst he's there. There's more that I can say but I think I might save it and put it in the Press Release. Thank you.

MR SHERIDAN Thank you Mr Speaker. I ran down to the office and got this one. Mr Speaker I'd just like to make a Statement on the **internet network for Norfolk Island**. As most people would be aware and has been reported in the press lately I'd like to make a Statement on the new telecommunications internet carrier for Norfolk Island. On the 28th March 2014 a multi year agreement was signed with the satellite company O3b Networks to provide high speed broadband data to Norfolk Island. O3b utilizes a constellation of low orbiting satellites to provide this service so that the round trip delay is so much less than that of the traditional geo station satellites of which is currently utilized. As the satellites that O3b uses are smaller, less expensive to build and launch the cost of the service is more affordable. Initial indications are that this service will be able to commence from September this year and I look forward to a great partnership with O3b moving forward. The Telecom Manager has stated "that Norfolk Telecom are delighted with this agreement and that the migration to O3b for internet traffic will allow Norfolk Telecom to significantly increase its bandwidth thus improving the data rates, internet speed and reduce internet delay times to our customers". Mr Speaker for the technically minded persons amongst us such results have shown that the satellite latency will improve from the current 750 millisecond down to 110 millisecond. This covered with an increase in bandwidth in the first year from 20-50meg will allow closer to real time application to be used for the first time on Norfolk Island. Business applications such as E-commerce, internet gaming, video on demand and E-learning will certainly benefit from this increased bandwidth and lower latency and the community are encouraged to take full advantage of this improvement in the service delivery. There is the ability if required for Norfolk Telecom to increase the bandwidth if the demand is there and the intention is that over the initial three year period that the bandwidth will increase to 100meg. The Cook Island's recently became live with O3b and they have reported that people are now experiencing instantaneous downloads, smoother Youtube clips, streaming live sport, movies, clear and crisp video calling and ultra fast browsing for the first time ever. Mr Speaker O3b refers to their product as "fibre from the sky", and offers not only product support but that also of customer support to allow for their customers to take and make full advantage of the provision of their service. O3b is planning to have 20 satellites in orbit providing service to 180 countries and are building gateways in Australia as well as other countries, but in Australia Perth and Dubbo. Norfolk Telecom, O3b and the Norfolk Island Government look forward to providing the best telecommunication service possible to the community of Norfolk Island. Mr Speaker at Questions Without Notice time I had a question from Mr Nobbs in regards to business plan for the utilization plan of O3b. I will say that the full business plan has not yet been developed because it was a bit premature you might say with an agreement being signed. The initial business plan that was put forward with the concept to go with O3b indicated that the price was significantly cheaper than our current carrier. The latency would be so much more reduced and therefore the service that would be provided would be a much better service. The business plan will now focus on what will the cost to the customer be for the provision its data and I'm pleased to say that we've only just yesterday had a request from a customer on island for a bulk purchase of up to 10meg of the 50meg available in this first year. Those details have to be worked through because it comes down to pricing and how those opportunities are

NOTICES**NORFOLK ISLAND HOSPITAL ACT 1985**

MS ADAMS Thank you Mr Speaker. I move that this House in accordance with Section 12 and 13 of the Norfolk Island Hospital Act 1985 resolve that: Gerrard Marr Chief Executive of South East Sydney Local Health District be appointed by the Minister as a member of the Norfolk Island Hospital Advisory Board for a term commencing on the date of gazettal of the appointment and ending on 23 August 2014. Honourable Members Mr Marr was appointed interim Chief Executive of the South East Sydney Local Health District with effect 24 February 2014 following the retirement of Mr Terry Clout from that position. The New South Wales Director General of Health Dr Mary Foley has greed the appointment of Mr Marr as a member of the Norfolk island Hospital Advisory Board thereby ensuring high level executive representation by South East Local Health District on the Board. With support of the Motion today Honourable Members I look forward to being able to welcome Mr Marr onto the Advisory Board.

SPEAKER Thank you Minister. The question is that this Motion be agreed to. Any further debate. I put that question.

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED

IMMIGRATION ACT 1980 - APPLICATION FOR GENERAL ENTRY PERMIT

MS ADAMS Thank you Mr Speaker. I move that for the purpose of Paragraph 17 a (1) e of the Immigration Act 1980 this legislative Assembly resolve that Michael William Adams and Gloria Leah Adams be authorized to make an application for a General Entry Permit under the Act.

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

MS ADAMS Thank you Mr Speaker. Mr and Mrs Adams who are citizens of the United States of America wish to live on Norfolk Island. The Motion before the House today is the first step only in a process that they will have to undertake to achieve their final goal. Section 17a of the Immigration Act requires that before a person can apply for a General Entry Permit under Section 18 and 19 of the Act they must meet one of the categories defined in Section 17a at the time of making their application. In the case of Mr and Mrs Adams they are seeking the approval by resolution of the legislative Assembly to make an application for a General Entry Permit under Section 17a (e) of the Act. In other words they are seeking approval to commence a process. If the House supports the Motion today Mr and Mrs Adams will be able to take the next step in the process to become long term residents of Norfolk Island and actually apply for a General Entry Permit. I am led to believe that one of those steps will be to seek approval of the Australian Foreign Investment Board to invest in Norfolk Island. I seek Members support for the Motion. Thank you Mr Speaker.

Australian long term resident Visa. Agreement to this Motion is actually Stage 2 of the process and another concern for me was why was this ruling not available before the process actually commenced from Stage 1, that's the application stage. The Immigration also implies there is no reason for more housing to be provided on Norfolk Island at this time. While I do not wish to get into an argument on this subject I would suggest at this time with a down turn in the building sector that the greatest value to the island economy is construction of new facilities. The reality as I understand it, a foreign person holds Norfolk Island immigration status still must hold an Australian Visa allowing multiple entry. A Visa must extend for a minimum duration of the time there on Norfolk Island plus 30 days. It is presumed that with the change in governance arrangements which is all changed in such things as the Australian temporary skilled worker etc will apply, but at the present time we have what we have. I don't believe that we should deal with this proposal at this stage until there is a ruling from the FIRB on whether it's applicable. Therefore I don't support the application at this stage. Thank you Mr Speaker.

MRS WARD Thank you Mr Speaker. I'd simply like to indicate my support for Minister Adams on bringing this Motion to the table, it's simply using the law as it stands to allow people who have indicated that they would like some type of permanency on the island. I think at this stage we are all about demonstrating that we are an open community, we are growing the population, and we have a mechanism whereby we can certainly welcome the people with the understanding that it's yet to go through a proper immigration process and it will. So the Minister will have my support today and I actually compliment her on bringing this Motion to the House. Thank you.

MR SHERIDAN Thank you Mr Speaker. It's not very often that I agree with Mr Nobbs but certainly today certain aspects of his discussion in regards to the ability of a foreign national you might say to purchase a pre-existing property on Norfolk Island and he's quite correct, in Australia if they have demonstrated that they have a long term Visa then the FIRB would most probably view that favourably. I'm with Mr Nobbs, I think the horse is before the cart here. There is the ability for these people to obtain a long term Visa which they need, a long term multi entry Visa to accommodate the GEP process, there has to be at the least 5 1/2 years or something like that. So if they have the ability to achieve that then they should have the ability to apply to the FIRB and get the ok to purchase a pre-existing house. That maybe is the crux of the matter in regards to the Motion. The Motion is about allowing them to apply for a GEP permit. They do have the ability to come here under our immigration guideline already under a Temporary Entry Permit. If they want to purchase a house they are quite able to do so. So it is a hard place to put a person because we're utilizing the avenues under the law as Mrs ward said, we're utilizing the law to effect to bypass the TEP system to allow them to go onto a GEP directly. Whilst I don't necessarily disagree with that and maybe some people should be able to go directly onto that, I think it's a dangerous precedence to set because we would have to view every GEP application from a Foreign National whether or not they wanted to purchase property here or not, that's the underlying other reasons. This is just the ability to apply to bypass the TEP system and go directly onto a GEP system. I think that the system is in place for a reason and that the system should be followed. Just because you show an intent that you want to stay here for a long period of time should not negate the requirement to go through that process. We have a lot of Foreign Nationals here on Norfolk Island who have been here for in excess of 8 or 10 years who most probably are still on a TEP because of the

way we administer our immigration. That doesn't affect their ability to stay here on Norfolk Island for long periods, it doesn't affect their ability to purchase property. So I don't believe this is about giving them or assisting them to purchase a house, it's about circumventing the normal immigration process and unfortunately I think I'm with Mr Nobbs I can't support it today Mr Speaker.

MR SNELL Thank you Mr Speaker. It's been raised by the past two Members that there is an uncertainty of process. I believe that the applicants have made the right indications to apply here to become GEP's on Norfolk Island. They have undertaken the necessary legal advice but to satisfy our concerns around the table this morning it may be necessary to have a adjournment of this matter to determine whether there is a necessary process that has to be followed for example whether the FIRB will accept the promise that there will be a GEP if they allow them to purchase a house or whatever. I think that this is all part of revised Immigration. I accept what Mrs Ward has had to say that the policy introduced now is to increase the population of Norfolk Island and hopefully the financial benefit with investment in Norfolk Island. Those are considerations. But maybe there is the cart before the horse principle and maybe we should look at whether the FIRB will prove their purchase if required here on Norfolk Island. It's a difficult one.

MRS WARD Thank you Mr Speaker. I think perhaps too much focus is being put on the Review Board in this instance. We have an immigration law and at Section 29 which is Residency by declaration a person who is a Foreign National and who is wanting to ultimately apply for residency must have been ordinarily resident in Norfolk Island and has so been resident for a period of at least 5 years. But if hypothetically the application were successful for a General Entry permit it's not to circumvent, certainly to fast track, yes. It's to say we understand the intent of the applicant's as Foreign Nationals or not when your policy objective is to grow the population, we need to be mindful of Section 74 where there is no racial discrimination on gender, race ok? So it's not whether somebody is black, white or brindle, it is that they are a person, Foreign National or not, but Foreign National's as we know must go through the GEP process. Interestingly if we just go back to the previous situation, if somebody were to buy a business then they could fast track immediate application for the GEP process. So this is nothing new. I think too much emphasis is on this purchasing a house business but hypothetically the point is Mr Speaker if these people were to be successful in obtaining a GEP then they would have to be resident, ordinarily resident for a period of 5 years before they were eligible to apply for residency. Thank you.

MR PORTER Thank you Mr Speaker. I agree with the previous speaker. The matter of advantage in dealing with the FIRB or in fact any other Australian legislation, that's a matter for those bodies. We don't have any ability to police that but in fact for our part, giving this approval is mainly due process. It's available to these people and it's available to anybody else should they wish to apply. I don't think we're setting a precedent and I believe every one of these matters would be dealt with on merit and the evidence given to us to date, and I agree with perhaps the unfortunate red herring of FIRB which I don't believe should pay a part in this decision made here by us this morning and therefore I support the Motion. Thank you.

MR SHERIDAN I just ask the Minister one question. If this Motion was not to pass today would that deny the applicant the ability to live on Norfolk Island.

MS ADAMS No, that's my understanding. The rules say they can apply for a TEP.

MR SHERIDAN That's right so it doesn't stop them.

MS ADAMS No

MRS WARD Mr Speaker if I may give some clarity because I happen to have the Immigration Act in front of me for the Minister perhaps and answering Minister Sheridan is that when an application is made for a Temporary Entry Permit the condition at 17 1 (e) is that the condition may be specified for a TEP relating to any matter that the Minister considers to be beneficial to the Norfolk Island. So if she wishes to remain true to the primary objective of the Government which is to grow the population then she may utilize that as well. Thank you.

MR NOBBS Just want to clarify a couple of things. We're taking a different step to one that's normally established, and to do that I believe that we need reasons. Mrs Ward says that we need to grow the population, yeah that's fine but this is the reason. We've got an application from the Immigration Agent on the island who specifies that the reason for the application is precisely to satisfy, they intend to reside on Norfolk Island, is to satisfy the FIRB conditions of purchasing a house. That's why I spoke it out. We need a reason, I need a reason if we're going to put a precedence like this in place. So we can't just say, hang on we don't need a reason, you need a reason, and that's mine, and that's why I brought it out and I've been through it and tried to gain some insight into it and I still don't support the application at this stage.

MS ADAMS Mr Speaker all I'm going to say at this stage is you know I am comfortable either way. If Members are looking for further time, to give more thought about it I will go along with that request if it's moved in the House. Equally I will be saying yes to the Motion.

MR NOBBS I move that debate be adjourned until the next day of Sitting.

SPEAKER Ok the question is that this matter be adjourned and made an Order of the Day for a subsequent day of Sitting. With that Motion I'm obliged to put it forward.

QUESTION PUT

Would the Deputy Clerk please call the House

Mr Buffett	No
Mr Porter	I'm confused. I'm not supporting the Motion
Mr Ward	Aye
Ms Adams	Aye
Mr Snell	No

Mr Nobbs	Aye
Mrs Ward	No
Mr Evans	Aye
Mr Sheridan	No

The Aye's 4 the No's 5. The Motion is not carried.

We continue on this Motion. The question before the House is that this Motion be agreed to as is proposed by Minister Adams. Any further debate. Then I put the question that the Motion by Ms Adams be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT

Would the Deputy Clerk please call the House

Mr Buffett	Aye
Mr Porter	Aye
Mr Ward	No
Ms Adams	Aye
Mr Snell	Aye
Mr Nobbs	No
Mrs Ward	Aye
Mr Evans	No
Mr Sheridan	No

The result of voting is the Ayes 5 the No's 4 the Motion is agreed.

EDUCATION ACT 1981 - ENROLMENT OF CHILDREN

MRS WARD Thank you Mr Speaker I move that this House requests the responsible Minister to take such action as may be required in order to allow immediate enrolment at the Norfolk Island Central School of any visiting child on a temporary enrolment basis subject to the Principal certifying that adequate resources and classroom positions are available.

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

MRS WARD Thank you Mr Speaker. I circulated a couple of days ago a summary paper to my colleagues so that they have some background as to where we're at on this question. It's a Motion which follows a Question On Notice that was put on the paper in the previous Sitting of this House, so I would hope that all Members would contribute to the debate. Mr Speaker to me it's unfortunate to have to place a Motion of this nature on the Notice Paper but I'm compelled to by the Minister's action and also by a set of valued which I hold and which are shared by the people i represent, a belief that all people deserve to be treated with dignity and respect and that the pursuit of justice, especially for those who are least able to defend themselves is my concern. Everyone has the right to procedural fairness and natural justice, and I do believe that my colleagues do hold the same values and will support me, in voting to support this Motion today, it's a vote which will effectively overturn what is basically an

undocumented policy, one that was made on the run, and one that was made in isolation. I'm asking my colleagues to join me to see that the law is upheld as it was intended and our Education law of course is in line with the fundamental principles of the United Nations Declaration and the rights of a child to access free education. The Education Act dictates that the child the ages of 6 and 15 years shall, unless the child is exempted from the provisions of this section attend either a Public School or a private school. I think we all understand that we have currently one Public School in place on Norfolk Island at the moment. What the Minister has done interestingly is to use the same section, which is Section 16 to exempt the children from attending the School, but she's done this without being requested to and under the Schedule there is no exemption form and without reason. I have asked the Minister to supply a statement of reasons to all Members but to date I don't believe that any of us have been provided with that statement of reasons. Mr Speaker what Minister Adams decision to deny access to education for visiting children does is makes me question three important issues pertained to our future, and that is human rights, economic growth and immigration, and I think the previous debate has just highlighted how close to the wire we run on attitudes to immigration and presenting an open face. It's important also for Members to know in relation to visiting children that in the past, visiting children have been welcomed with open arms at the Norfolk Island Central School, certainly for as long as I remember and it was always a novelty and a privilege when I was at School here at NICS to interact with the children who visited from away. It opened our eyes, and it gave us the opportunity to experience others differences and I want my children and the other children at Norfolk Island Central School to experience those opportunities and often there were times where the children were of grandparents who were resident on the island, others were simply from visiting specialist who were working or coming to conduct scientific research. This exclusion policy would mean that those children will be no longer provided the opportunity to attend the School in the way that happened in the past. I would like to touch on the economic impacts, the potential economic impacts of this policy Mr Speaker and it is to do with population growth. The economic effects of an automatic exemption policy need to be considered in terms of economic development. Growing a population is a key driver to economic development and we know that Minister Adams referred to that at length at the last Sitting. In fact the Minister very enthusiastically exemplified the effort that was currently under way to attract new people to the island in order to grow the population and to grow the economy and to make Norfolk Island more sustainable, and the previous debate has just exemplified commitment to that. So I welcome that work. I welcome the work the Minister in relation to that example and the work that has been done to date by various staff, by the Government Tourist Bureau Manager and by other private sector operators who are all about attempting to grow the population. That's what we're clearly about and is being done by those people is to encourage new faces, fresh ideas, capital investment and what is equally important in the economic picture is an employers ability to access staff, reliable staff. In fact that is a critical part of growing the economy, and many successful business people will tell you that their staff is their business. Now of course there is more work to be done in all those areas I've just mentioned but we are moving in that direction. I make an assumption here Mr Speaker and I'm going to be very clear about it. I'm assuming that this exemption or exclusion policy is to be continued and that each visiting child from now on will be exempt from attending the School. In other words they must not enrol at the School if they are a child of a Foreign National visitor and I make this point Mr Speaker because I do not want to be accused of suggesting that the Minister is singling out particular

children. That of course would be highly discriminatory, and so based on that assumption that this policy will remain in place I will continue. What the Minister's new policy raises is a question for the Immigration Officers. How will the Immigration Department deal with Foreign National families wanting to come to the island to visit to see if Norfolk Island is the place that they would like to move on a more permanent basis and as part of that process enrol their children on a temporary basis at the local School, which I have said Mr Speaker has been done for many many years without any fuss and I can certainly speak from experience as a mother that even when people are remotely thinking about relocation, and I can assure you Mr Speaker that I'm not but parents do seek out suitable education systems, and I'm sure that any other family or parent would do exactly the same thing. And so if we limit the access to our School facility then we are immediately limiting our chances to successfully attracting potential new immigrants to the island, and as I've said for what reason, that is unclear under the Minister's current policy. We know that there is space available at the School and we know that this Assembly supported the Chief Minister very recently in supporting, certainly in principal a campaign to attract families to the island. It should go without saying Mr Speaker that the average family on holiday does not seek to enrol their child at NICS. It goes without saying that children have come and gone from the island on their holiday without being forced into the School because the law says that Education is compulsory and if you don't and your caught the first offence is a dollar, and for any subsequent offences in respect of the same child it's four dollars. Education Minister's over the years have not needed to exempt visiting children. Yes the law says it's compulsory but who in their right mind suggest that the Police should roam the streets enforcing a go to School law on visitors. That would be simply too silly for words, and we know that. So that's an economic argument. I think that that has just not been thought through by the Minister. It would certainly help if the Minister consulted her colleagues before she created these undocumented policies and then we could have these discussions and thrash it out. The other issue to be addressed is the protection of basic human rights and in this case it's around the right of the child to access a free primary school education, and as I've said and Members know part of my value system forces me to uphold the principles of the United Nations Human Rights Convention including the right of a child to access education, and I do that on behalf of the people I represent who share my views, firstly on the power of education and secondly on the damage that can be done by not having one and by denying access to it, whether it is for a week or a month, for four months, access to education is a basic fundamental right Mr Speaker. It is the essence of modern civilization. It is universally recognized and it is usually honoured, and I've always been led to believe that the education of children has been proudly applied by the people of Pitcairn and their descendants for many many years and therefore you can imagine my puzzlement on hearing that Minister Adams had taken a very deliberate action to deny children the ability to access an education, particularly when these children had been past students of the School. I think I would ask Members to remember that this is a Motion about education, it's not about immigration, it's about education and I have put down the words of the Motion very carefully to reflect the concerns of some, reflect concerns that I think have been highlighted in a previous debate although it was a different situation but children as an expansion really around the same attitude. I think that I also need to put on the record Mr Speaker an added concern that has been drawn to my attention about this sudden change of policy and that is that it appears, there is a perception in the community, it appears to be racially motivated, and it has been put to me that if these children were from Pitcairn then this would not be happening. We also know that at the same time

previous weeks other children have been enrolled and welcomed into the School on a temporary basis. So I guess my feelings Mr Speaker are that if the Minister had left this one well alone, or at least consulted with her colleagues then this Motion wouldn't be on the table today, but I'll pause Mr Speaker at this stage and I'll wait for other Members to contribute and I hope that Minister Adams will take the time to explain to the community to give her statement of reasons as to why she's done this and perhaps even commit to reversing her decision. Thank you Mr Speaker.

MS ADAMS Thank you Mr Speaker I'll be brief. The Motion today is seeking a direction by the House for the responsible Minister to take such action as may be required to allow immediate enrolment at the Norfolk Island Central School of any visiting child on a temporary enrolment basis subject to the Principal certifying that adequate resources and classroom positions are available, Mr Speaker there are other considerations apart from adequate resources and classroom positions being available at the School that I as Minister with responsibility both for Education and Immigration need to take into account when considering this request from Mrs Ward. The Immigration Act 1980 provides for different categories of Entry Permits, Australian and New Zealand citizens are classified as unrestricted permit holders and therefore they are free to do as they please in Norfolk Island including being enrolled in School. Citizens of other countries are required under the Immigration Act 1980 to meet other conditions of entry into Norfolk Island including obtaining Australian multiple entry Visas. The decision made by me to not allow children at this time who have not been granted a Temporary Entry Permit or a General Entry permit and who are classified as visitors to attend the Norfolk Island Central School was made having regard to a number of factors but most importantly the need for those persons entering Norfolk Island and seeking to be enrolled at the School to have the appropriate immigration status and appropriate Australian Visas as required by the Immigration Act 1980. Mrs Ward perhaps in answer to whoever your constituents are who are thinking that I may be racially prejudiced in respect of the particular application, because what we're talking about, let's put cards on the table, we're talking about one particular application which I'm not going into any detail in this House today. But for the record let me quite clearly state that for me to be racially prejudiced would mean that I would deny my great grandmother who happened to be a negro, nothing to do with Pitcairn descendants but a negro. So let's put the facts on the table Mrs Ward. Thank you Mr Speaker. I will be in the hands of the House with this Motion. I will abstain. It's up to the House how they want to travel with this.

MR SHERIDAN Thank you Mr Speaker. Unfortunately in this position I support the Minister. It's in her role as the Minister for Immigration and Education that she's come to her conclusions. Now I'm not fully aware of all the facts in this case and I don't believe everybody around this table is except for Ms Adams and I agree that whilst under the Education Act it states that education is free and all children must attend School whatever you know must be provided with an education. There are standards and requirements that need to be met, not only for education but for immigration before you can access that immigration. Whilst our Education Act may be silent on the matter we do obtain our education from the NSW system and I was looking at the NSW guideline for enrolment of students in Government Schools and it's very clear there that they do set some standards for enrolment for non Australian citizens and they are quite clear that non Australian citizens on entering Australia must hold a valid Visa are subject to specific travel entry and residency conditions set out by

the Department of Immigration, and it states here that Education is compulsory for non Australian citizens between the ages of 6 and 15, holding a Visa, granting them permanent residency, and non Australian citizens holding a Temporary Visa are subject to specific enrolment conditions. Now it goes on to talk about visitor Visas and this is what we're really talking about at the moment because as far as I am aware these people are only under visitors Visa because they cannot obtain the appropriate Australian or Norfolk Island Visa to allow them to remain here on a more permanent basis. And it say here in the NSW policy Guidelines that a student on a visitor Visa may, may be able to enrol for a maximum period of 3 months which cannot be extended and those students must arrange their enrolment through the Department of School Education's International student Programme's. So there is a process you might say in NSW. I believe under our Act the Minister is quite right. There is a tie between the immigration and education and she has the ability under the Act to make a decision that she thinks is appropriate for people who do not have status on Norfolk Island. I think under the Immigration Act those people by rights should not even be here if they intend to remain permanently because if they intend to remain permanently those processes should be completed prior to entering Norfolk Island. So I don't intend to say too much on this Mr Speaker but just in that context I apologise to Mrs Ward because I know what she's attempting to do but I think that the people concerned have a certain obligation as well and I support the Minister in this instance.

MR NOBBS

Thank you Mr Speaker. The Motion I think just classifies visitors so I'm responding to visitors. I don't know the details of the particular case that your talking about in any great detail, but I just want to correct a misrepresentation I believe by Mrs Ward and that's increasing the population will drive the economy. I think the reverse is more appropriate and if you want an indication of that look at Norfolk Island in the last four or five years. Anyhow I'll get onto what I was meant to say Mr Speaker if I may. We've got an excellent School, it's been attended to myself. I might have been one of the failures but there you go, my grand kids have gone there and also it receives terrific support within the community which is a great thing. At the appropriate time I wish to move an amendment to the Motion and I will seek leave at that time Mr Speaker. The Motion really provides an opportunity to really look at the cost of education on Norfolk Island and I'm not throwing in the red herring, I think it's the answer. Don't get me wrong I fully support providing the opportunity for a child to receive the best education possible. However in debate at the last meeting on the budget I spoke of a particular need to look at areas where income had been reduced but expenditure remained the same. Whilst education is not an issue of income and expenditure the same principles could be applied. The School annual estimated costs for the current year is \$3,439,200. The School capacity, not its actual is set at 320 student which by my calculations is \$10,748 per student per year. It should be noted that the annual cost does not include cost in the Administration not actually shown under Education but absorbed by other Admin sections, and I'm not having a go at the cost of education, I'm just trying to put an argument forward. The current enrolment is believed to be 290 students. A reduction of about 10% on capacity. The annual cost remains the same at \$3,439,200 and 290 students it's \$11,859 per student per year. 10% reduction in cost estimates to follow the actual school enrolments will see a saving of \$340,000 per annum. This is a simple example where there can be shown some basic saving possibilities. In such a process certainly there are issues with it which are not insurmountable but \$349,000 is not an insignificant sum, it is 20% of the current Norfolk Island budget hole to be finalized in

debate by Tim later in the day or the Minister for Finance sorry Tim, later today. I understand the Commonwealth has made threats in relation to our ability to very the budget for such things as Education, Police and KAVHA. I feel that sustaining an objection in the face of equitable savings you would think would be difficult to sustain. I seek leave to move an amendment if I may Mr Speaker, that following the words "are available" added the following words "and an appropriate fee is established by the Minister responsible for Education to take account of the cost to provide education on Norfolk Island". Now before everybody falls off their chair at home I'm talking about a Motion

SPEAKER Mr Nobbs you will just have to repeat those words so that I have them all clearly.

MR NOBBS About falling off the chair. Sorry Mr Speaker I will. I've got it written down here. That may help you Mr Speaker. I'll repeat them. "An appropriate fee is established by the Minister responsible for Education to take account of the cost to provide education on Norfolk Island". That's what it says Madam Clerk? My reason is that I do not wish to see any child denied education but it is available from whence they came to visit us and the parents prefer not to accept that opportunity it's not our problem. Our system which has limitations should not be required to fill in the gap. Believe me it will still have limitations whether the Commonwealth is involved or not. The current Australian Government has the intestinal fortitude to demonstrate the fact it has real issues and like the old sow if she rolls around she's likely to squash some of the suckers. I'm all for encouraging family tourism. It is an area long overdue on Norfolk Island. However kids clubs and other activities for children should be provided by the commercial sector and not provided free by the community, hence my amendment as I do not support the Motion in its original form.

SPEAKER Mr Nobbs before I give leave in terms of this amendment I want to give opportunity for all Members to debate the original Motion then I'm happy to provide leave for the amendment and then for that t be debated and decided upon. So in terms of the original Motion still at this time.

MR SNELL Thank you Mr Speaker. I don't doubt that all of us around this table appreciate the honourable intentions of the Motion as put by Mrs Ward. However there are reservations regarding this and each application must be judged on its merits and this is one of them and there are circumstances within this that a lot of us don't have the opportunity or the knowledge of. Again Mr Speaker it is with some significant disappointment and sadness that I see this House being lobbied to intervene in and place pressure on administrative decisions making progress in regards to immigration matters as well as matters relating to the interpretation and implementation of the Education Act on Norfolk Island. As I understand. As I understand the Minister for Immigration and for Education has been requested to approve enrolment immediately at the Norfolk Island Central School any child between the age of 6 and 15 years on a temporary or permanent basis. As I understand this Motion if approved today would allow for all visiting children now on Norfolk Island to apply or is intended for only a select group of visitor children who are to receive the benefit of this lobbying. I stand by the previous Statement to the House by the Minister. Accordingly I believe a response has been sent to His Honour the Administrator in regards to his concerns on this matter. If children come under an

immigration permit which entitles the adult parent or guardian permit holder to work in Norfolk Island then I will certainly support that such children if between the ages of 6 and 15 should be enrolled by their parent or guardian at the School providing space and finance is available. The Motion here is unclear as to what periods of visits are to cause visiting children to enrol at the School or as to why the community of Norfolk Island should bare the cost of providing a temporary or permanent child minding facility for parents of visiting children without any contribution from visiting parents or guardians whatsoever. What happens if children are left here by a parent or guardian who departs the island perhaps on the basis that the parent or guardian does not wish the child's free Australian curriculum education on Norfolk Island interrupted. It is the Child Welfare Officer then to be required to care for such children. This is a matter demanding careful and proper consideration by this House of any changes which may be required to the Immigration Act and to the Education Act if it is desired to provide a Boarding School or visitors temporary school facility on Norfolk Island. Mr Speaker any proposals for legislative changes can certainly be sent to the Minister privately for consideration and discussion, and Mr Speaker I also reject any suggestion that any international conventions relating to children have been breached or overlooked in regard to this matter. This House should in fact recognise and applaud the work done by the Principal of the School as well as by the Immigration staff in seeking to have parents or guardians who decide to have their children enrolled at the School comply properly and fully with the requirements of the immigration law as well as with the requirements of the education law, that a parent or guardian delays in doing so is seemingly content for their children to remain as visitors is hardly the fault of the School, the Immigration Department or the Norfolk Island Government. Mr Speaker I do not support the Motion.

MR PORTER Thank you Mr Speaker. I'll preface by saying I'm acutely aware and support the desire to grow Norfolk's economy and mostly what I'll say is couched around those terms. The main thing I would say is we should be cautious that children don't become a pawn in someone else's war and that if we have difficulty with immigration law we should endeavour to amend or alter that legislation because conversely if this is an attempt at prohibition by stealth we must be very careful not to create a situation that we can be accused of discrimination and we may find ourselves in a position that is difficult to defend. I have no difficulty without knowing these children if our legislation needs to be upgraded or amended to take care of accounts of some of the previous speakers we should do that but not deny a child the right to education in the meantime. Thank you Mr Speaker.

MR WARD Thank you Mr Speaker. My thoughts about the question are in general, not referring to the specific case. I recognise the Members concern in bringing this here today and it's very easy to paint a very emotive case but firstly I believe we should not ?? Minister Adams' discretionary power in this matter. The Minister alone has all the facts to work with, nobody else has those same set of facts to deal with in any particular case. Secondly while I uphold procedural fairness and human rights I also uphold this island's right to conduct it's services diligently but we should be wary of becoming a soft touch or a charity for people coming in that perhaps could be seeking to take advantage. I'm not saying that this particular case that others have referred to is doing that, I'm certainly not implying that but it is something we need to be careful of. Much has been said about visitors but surely the oneous should be on parents or guardians of seeking to bring children into the island

that they get their immigration status right from the start and that's where I stand on the matter. Thank you Mr Speaker.

MR EVANS Thank you Mr Speaker. Certainly I sympathise with Mrs Wards intent on getting children an education. It's certainly something that's passionate with I think every Norfolk Islander as we know how important education is and exactly what she said, children coming into the Norfolk Island School has certainly enriched Norfolk kids and I'm sure the experience that overseas children get from the Norfolk Island Central School certainly enriches them through their lives, and I was quite willing to actually support Mrs Ward's Motion, but unfortunately not knowing the facts I thought it was some visitors that were here on the island for a little amount of time and hopefully we'd be able to see that we could actually accommodate those people and let their children come ours as we know education is compulsory. I must tend to lean and obviously voting no against a Motion just before regarding immigration. I think immigration is most important and unless these people get their immigration status correct in the first place unfortunately they miss out on those things, which I think Mr Porter may have said something that we can change things that will enable them to stay on the island within that time and try to clean up their immigration status they can use the privilege of the Norfolk Island Central School and have their education that is deserved by any child.

MS ADAMS Just to reaffirm what I said earlier Mr Speaker, this is a Motion of a direction to the Minister and I will abstain on the voting on this matter and look to the will of the House.

MRS WARD If I may Mr Speaker. I think it's pretty predictable that the debate has swung towards immigration which I have said very clearly, this is not. Mr Sheridan has got it, it's not that the Act, back to immigration is silent, it doesn't say that there is anything to stop a visiting person enrolling their child at the School, nothing. There are categories of prohibited immigrants, there is opportunity for the Minister to refuse to revoke, I'm trying to find the words, power to refuse and revoke and cancel permits. There is the power for the Minister to do that under the Act. That isn't what happened, and I'm not really singling out one case I'm trying to highlight the unintended consequences of taking this action at this time, that what I've tried to highlight. It's not just about one case. I'm not lobbying for one case. It's about future issues that may arise and the message it is sending that we are blocking. Of course I hear Members concerns around the cost. I would have to say, and I'll do it now before the Mr Nobbs may move his amendment but I can't support it and I don't know how any Member could because under the Education Act 1931 at Section 14 where it refers to School fees - "Fees shall not be charged for the education of pupils in any School". So I'm certainly not going to support an amendment that is in conflict with the law. It's been rightly said if there's problems with the law, amend the law, and there is an Education Review underway but as the law currently stands under the Education Act "Fees shall not be charged for the education of pupils in any public school" and that is what NICS is categorized as. Coming back to immigration because obviously it's the way people want to swing on this, it's not the intention but the Minister did have the opportunity to refuse, revoke or cancel the visitors permit. That didn't happen. A Visitors Permit was clearly granted and the Minister new in granting that, that it was open for four months. Actually to come back to the Immigration Act somebody is deemed as a visitor when they arrive that they are to be a visitor for 120 days, but I am

not getting down to a single case. That isn't what it's about. It's trying to get Members to see what the consequences of this action is about. I just come back to Mr Nobbs and other Members. It's not that I don't fully appreciate the want or the desire to ensure the standards are maintained, I think that was the word that was used. But the fact is there is space currently, there is space. Mr Nobbs has said that. This one to me when Minister Ward talks about the Minister's power to do such things - yes she does, she absolutely does and I think that this isn't just this issue for me, it's also that the Minister moved very recently to reinterpret the application fee schedule under the Immigration Act. So what I'm seeing is a pattern of barriers being erected or the legislation being reinterpreted to put barriers in place or to make what barriers there are higher, they are being increased, they are not being reduced. So to me it's about actions and the messages that those actions send at a time when we are trying to get ourselves onto a more sustainable footing. It is about sustainable and balanced growth, we know that, but it shouldn't be within a Minister's powers to create policy on the run without any consultation with Members. Chief Minister himself when he became Chief Minister, he said this will be an open and transparent Government and it's not what's happening. Yes the Minister has the power to do it but she should recognise that she will be held to account and her reaction will be questioned, There's another thing that I can't leave uncorrected and it's a statement from the Minister, Minister Adams made at the last Sitting which was the 19th March and she said and I quote " If the immigration status of the children changes, that is, they are granted a temporary entry permit, then enrolment at the Norfolk Island Central School can immediately occur". That 's a new thing as I've said. The law doesn't stipulate that. It's a new thing and she went on to say and this is where the Minister has ? misled the House and I'm going to quote. ". It was an issue that was satisfactorily dealt with pre the passage of the Immigration Amendment No 2 Bill last year where we had an Immigration Committee and the children of respective people coming to live on this Island was taken into consideration as part of the issuing of the permit processes. That's now been removed". Wrong Mr Speaker, wrong. The Immigration Committee did not see or assess or make recommendation of prospective people coming to live on the island until they got to the General Entry Permit stage. So in effect they may have been ordinarily resident on the island 4 years, 10 years, TEP's being extended continuously for many years. That can't go uncorrected or unrecorded. Like Minister Sheridan I went to the Australian Immigration system and the Australian enrolment system and yes he's absolutely right, well I found the same information about the children being enrolled on a temporary basis into the Schools until Immigration permits and situations were sorted. The fact of the matter here is Mr Speaker, and I don't know how much longer it's going to last to be honest the way we behave is to how much longer we are going to have control over our immigration regime. We are part of the Australian Citizenship Act but we are outside the Immigration Zone Act, call it whatever you like but it was something that the previous Government relinquished in agreeing to the Roadmap that the Migration Act would extend to Norfolk Island but at the moment it's not and so those same systems that apply in Australia under the Department of Immigration and Border Protection the control of migration and skilled immigration to Norfolk Island does not apply sorry to Australia does not apply to Norfolk Island. It happens to be one of our competitive advantages, if you want to see a growth in the population as an advantage. Mr Nobbs has put his case, made it very clear, he doesn't see that growing the population has anything to do with economic development, he actually thinks that the reverse will occur. Well at least he's honest. Under the Immigration Department and Border Protection, and this is the migrants of Australia,

the other question that rose in my mind was about well what are the values, what would we expect to ? if we don't have this 4,5,7 and skills set and skills select programme, we don't have that, right? We don't manage our skilled migration through great bureaucratic agencies but what, if I ask myself, what are the differences, what are we trying to do, I think the thing that we would want from new immigrants and foreign nationals, and this is no different to what is asked as I said under the Department of Immigration and Border Protection is that the communities values are respected, and I'm going to read what the Australian value statement says and the dot point and ask would ours be any different. The Australian values include, this is for foreign nationals coming to an Australian Territory. No 1) is the respect for the freedom and dignity of an individual equality of men and women, freedom of religion, commitment to the rule of law, support for parliamentary democracy, a spirit of ? that embraces mutual respect, tolerance, fair play, compassion for those in need and pursuit of the public good and equal opportunity for individuals regardless of their race, religion or ethnic background, and I believe Mr Speaker that there would be broad community agreement for those values to equally apply on Norfolk Island and use reference to values within the Immigration Act as would happen in Australia but the fact remains in this case, as an example, the Minister did not refuse the visitor permit. It exists, it applies and there is nothing under the law as it currently stands which would give the Executive Member, unless she can provide those reasons, to deny access to education for these children. Thank you Mr Speaker.

SPEAKER Mr Nobbs, did you now wish to address the matter of your proposed amendment.

MR NOBBS Yes I do Mr Speaker. I seek leave to move the following amendment, and it's to add after the words "are available" to add the following "and an appropriate fee is established by the Minister responsible for Education to take into account the cost to provide education on Norfolk Island".

SPEAKER Leave is granted.

MR NOBBS Thank you. That to me is a simple way out. We've heard these versions of the law coming from Mrs Ward here and may I say that her Motion actually doesn't take into account the current legal position anyhow. How do you establish a new policy around here, do you suddenly just throw an Act on the table? Or do you go through a Motion, the Motion process to actually change it. So to just discount this amendment out of hand. I mean the other eight of you might just do it out of hand also but to make statements such as she has in relation to this I find quite offensive and I understand that the situation is a visitor, any visiting children. All we've heard about is one particular case. We've heard about racial slurs, we've heard about everything else and I'm a bit sick of it and I can tell you, maybe they should get out one for Australia is what they expect of the people that come into Australia, and list the requirements, this is what you have to be, which they do in part, but they don't all over. But anyhow I'll move this amendment Mr Speaker if I may and leave it at that.

SPEAKER Is there any debate in respect of this amendment to the Motion.

MS ADAMS Thank you Mr Speaker. It's not strictly in relation to the amendment but I cannot allow

SPEAKER Well try and keep it so please Minister

MS ADAMS My understanding is that when you are debating the amendment you are also debating the principal Motion Mr Speaker and so I just want to put on the table to Mrs Ward that the facts you are putting before this House Mrs Ward in respect of a particular family, to which you are referring are incorrect. I will say no more but you are misleading the House on the facts. Thank you. I am not able to put those facts on the table Mrs Ward.

SPEAKER We can't have Members slinging accusations one at the other. If in fact Mrs Ward had made such imputations against you I will ask her to withdraw them, equally I ask you to withdraw the matter that you are accusing another Member of misleading the House, and then we just get on with the job.

MR NOBBS What Mr Speaker is ?? in relation to misleading the House because I was quite stunned when I heard that, and I was going to intervene but if that's what it's in relation to.

SPEAKER That's what I'm referring to. Are we withdrawing both of those imputations in respect of both matters from both parties?

MS ADAMS In the interests of the business of the House I will withdraw that matter and let my case rest on what I said.

MRS WARD In pursuit of progressing I withdraw Mr Speaker.

SPEAKER Now let's get on. We have an amendment in front of us and I will read the words so that we will just be clear about where we are progressing. After what is in front of us now Mr Nobbs had proposed further words "that an appropriate fee is established by the responsible Minister for Education to take account of the cost to provide education on Norfolk Island". Now is there any further debate in respect of the amendment.

MR PORTER Thank you Mr Speaker. I don't have a problem with recovering fees on a fee for service basis however I feel that it's legislation that should be proposed and debated and have passage through the House in orderly time and not be mixed in this matter which is simply trying to avoid that denial of education rights for some children currently on island. Thank you.

MR SHERIDAN Thank you Mr Speaker. I tend to agree with Mr Porter that putting this amendment to the Motion just clouds the issues that's been brought to the table and I am positive that the ability to charge for non Australian's and non New Zealander's I presume is what we're talking about would be fully covered under the Education Review that's currently underway. I would understand that that would be one of the issues that they would be discussing so I don't see the need for it at this time in this Motion.

MR SNELL Thank you Mr Speaker. I appreciate where Mr Nobbs is coming from and I appreciate the comments from Mr Porter but I consider that the matter is separate, it needs a whole raft of different considerations and public opinions and so on. It has a bearing on all of our education system here on the island and it requires more than we can do this afternoon. I will not support the amendment.

MR WARD Mr Speaker my concern would be that we really should check on the legal background, the points that Member Ward made about the education provisions as they stand about fees and not be introducing something that would be in conflict with that. We can't just take that interpretation at face value, although she does allude to having it in front of her so I'm not imputing that it's not correct but we should certainly establish the status of that provision and make sure we are acting in a sound way. So while I support exactly what Mr Nobbs is aiming for to be able to charge these people and that would be a fair answer to the problem, but we should certainly proceed on a more sound basis I think.

MR NOBBS I can count I withdraw.

SPEAKER Ok the matter is withdrawn. We have the original Motion in front of us now Members. I think we've exhausted debate in respect of it. I will put it to you Honourable Members. This is the original Motion that is on the table moved by Mrs Ward. The question is that this Motion be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT

Would the Deputy Clerk please call the House

Mr Buffett	Aye
Mr Porter	Aye
Mr Ward	No
Ms Adams	Abstain
Mr Snell	No
Mr Nobbs	No
Mrs Ward	Aye
Mr Evans	No
Mr Sheridan	No

The result of voting Honourable Members the Ayes 3 the No's 5 and 1 abstention, the No's have it. The Motion is not carried Honourable Members.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

It is 1.30 pm now. We still have some items on the Notice Paper. I intend to suspend for an hour. We will come back after lunch and continue with our paper. So Honourable Members we suspend and we return at 2,30p,

RESUMPTION OF SITTING

Honourable Members we reconvene after a suspension for lunch.

ABSENTEE LANDOWNERS LEVY AMENDMENT BILL 2014

MR SHERIDAN Thank you Mr Speaker. I present the Absentee Landowners Levy Amendment Bill 2014 and seek that the Bill be taken through all stages at this Sitting.

SPEAKER Thank you. Can I tackle the second part first. Is leave granted for this matter to proceed through all stages at this Sitting Honourable Members.

Aye

SPEAKER Thank you Leave is granted. Therefore we have the Bill as presented.

MR SHERIDAN Thank you Mr Speaker. As everybody would be aware I think it was only at the last Sitting we approved an Absentee Landowners Levy Amendment Bill which allowed for people who work offshore and have a principal place of residence on Norfolk Island and they have part of that family residing in that residence to be exempt under the Levy Act. Mr Speaker when that Bill was passed there was a slight oversight you might say in that when a paragraph was removed and one inserted they removed the couple of words at the start of the paragraph which then meant that the rest of the Subsections to that paragraph didn't make sense. So I'd just like to read the Explanatory Memorandum, it's very short. This Bill is intended to correct an oversight in the earlier Bill the Absentee Landowners Levy Amendment Bill 2014 where in the amendment of Section 3 (1) ie the opening words of the amended provision were inadvertently omitted. Sections 1,2,3 of this Bill are the usual provisions naming the Act, providing for its commencement upon gazettal of assent and describing the Act to be amended, and Section 4 amends the principal Act by inserting into the new paragraph 3(1) a the opening words "A person who". Mr Speaker it's purely a housekeeping issue and this is why i've requested that leave be granted for it to be passed through all stages at this time because there is no requirement for it to sit on the table for another month and I'll just leave this in the hands of the House. Thank you.

SPEAKER The question in front of us Honourable Members is the Bill be agreed to in principal. Any further debate. I put the question.

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED

SPEAKER Do you wish to dispense with the detail stage? We so dispense. I seek a final motion

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

SPEAKER Any debate. I put the question that the Bill be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED**ORDERS OF THE DAY****APPROPRIATION (NO. 2) BILL 2013-2014**
APPROPRIATION (NAMBIA 2) BILL 2013-2014

SPEAKER We are resuming debate on the question that the bill be agreed to in principal.

MR SHERIDAN Yes thank you Mr Speaker. I continue the debate on the requirement to appropriate additional expenditure for the Norfolk Island Administration to continue its operations for the financial year 2013/2014. Last month I detailed the requirement for an additional appropriation of \$1,103,449 to enable expenditure for the remaining of this financial year. This also allowed for revenue to be increased by \$334,920. This leaves a deficit of \$768,529 plus the original deficit of \$20,321 which totals \$788,529 which means that this amount must be funded from reserves. Mr Speaker I have already indicated where these additional costs are required including \$700,000 for the Norfolk Island Hospital Enterprise health care additional supplement of \$460,000 and this was compounded by the reduction in revenue of \$300,000 in Customs Duty. \$471,000 from the Airport due to passenger charge of \$10 not being implemented as well as other small matters. Mr Speaker there has been concern expressed to me as to if we have sufficient funds to fully satisfy this additional expenditure, especially considering that at this stage we have not obtained the full amount of funding from the Commonwealth for the first two quarters of the financial year. I am confident that the reserves in the Revenue Fund can accommodate this additional expenditure but it will impact on the reserves for the next financial year, but of course as is predicated on the full amount of emergency funding of \$4.4m being forthcoming from the Commonwealth. The CEO of the Administration has indicated that the Service should be able to satisfy all of the Funding Agreement milestones as detailed on the Funding Agreement of June 2013 as long as no additional requirements are interpreted from the milestones. Both the Administrator and the Commonwealth have expressed concerns that the appropriation expenditure budget has been predicated by the full receipt of \$4.4m to balance the budget and I can confirm that this was indeed the case. The original 12 month appropriation was passed by this House and assented to by the Administrator with the knowledge that the Commonwealth had provided assurance of \$4.4m essential service funding depending on the Funding Agreement conditions being met. This essential service funding was provided for use in the areas of Health, Education, Utilities, Police and Public Service salaries, and in the case that all the milestones are not met and therefore the full \$4.4m is not received from the Commonwealth then the delivery of these essential service areas for which the funding was provided may be impacted in some way. Mr Speaker this is certainly not the intent or want of the Norfolk Island Government. Mr Speaker we find ourselves in this predicament due to the revenues being received by the Administration being no longer able to provide for the full extent of services for which the Norfolk Island Government is required to deliver. This is the reason as to why the MOU and the Roadmap was signed up with the Commonwealth back in 2010/2011. Mr Speaker this has been confirmed by Minister Briggs the Assistant Minister for Infrastructure and Regional Development by his Ministerial statement to the Australian Parliament on the

27th March 2014 when tabling the ANAO's Financial Statements of Norfolk Island. Minister Briggs agreed that the situation has deteriorated and the challenges are increasingly more difficult. He also acknowledged that the costs of addressing the problems facing Norfolk Island may seem significant but the costs of not acting are even greater. He also acknowledged a Statement by the ANAO that without further Commonwealth support the Administration is not a going concern. I am pleased that Minister Briggs has made this Statement to the Australian Parliament and agrees that as a point of principle the Australian Government believes that Australians should be treated the same no matter where they live, and he has reiterated this Statement when referring to the boost that the Indian Ocean Territories during the budget update where the Indian Ocean Territories received a boost of \$7.4m to their 2013/14 budget of \$167m for operational and capital expenditure. Minister Briggs stated that the Australian Government recognises the unique needs of Australian Territories and the challenges posed by distance. Mr Speaker this is equally so on Norfolk Island where the challenges are extreme to the Norfolk Island Government administering complex national level services including Customs Immigration and Quarantine plus the other matters of Education, Social Services, Health and so on. On their own in the past until 2010 when the Government of the day realized that the small community of Norfolk Island could no longer deliver the needs of the community and requested the Commonwealth's assistance. Minister Briggs acknowledges that the infrastructure needs are beyond the ability of the Norfolk Island Government to fund and mentioned that the inability for the Norfolk Island Government to access funding programmes such as Roads to Recovery, equalization payments and local Government financial assistant grants have made the infrastructure backlog much more severe than for comparable remote communities across Australia. Mr Speaker I applaud the Minister for recognizing this fact that the Norfolk Island Government cannot at this time fund its obligations without assistance. I am also pleased that in reply to the Minister's Statement Mr Snowden stated that the Australian Opposition commended the Minister and agreed with the direction that the Government was heading. It was pleasing to hear that they will not stand in the way of the Australian Government in the reform process but are willing to assist and that they also believe that Australian's should be treated the same no matter where they live. Mr Snowden was of the opinion that the process should be expedited and that it was important to address the needs of the community of Norfolk Island and that the Minister's observations provided about those people who are missing out are ? reminders of what we need to do in this place as parliamentarians to make sure all Australians are treated fairly and equally. It was encouraging to hear that both sides of politics want to get the best possible outcome for the people of Norfolk Island. Mr Speaker this is encouraging debate coming from the Commonwealth as the Norfolk Island Government back in 2010 committed Norfolk Island entering into the Australian taxation and social services system and have endeavoured since that time to have the Minister take to the Prime Minister and his Cabinet a proposal that would see Australians living on Norfolk Island enjoying the opportunities that exist by participation. I urge as Mr Snowden has done for Minister Briggs to expedite the proposal to the Prime Minister and Cabinet so that both Governments can then start to discuss how the service delivery will be implemented and introduced into Norfolk Island. It is up to Minister Briggs and his ability to convince his colleagues that there is a desperate need to move forward so that Norfolk Island can continue on the reform path and bring certainty to its economy and residents, especially the children of Norfolk Island. Mr Speaker this has digressed a little from the Appropriation No 2 Bill but is of relevance because without the settlement to the model of governance for Norfolk Island and the

commencement of the participation into the Australian Taxation and Social Services Schemes the request for additional funding to fund essential services will continue at an increased rate and the deterioration of the Norfolk Island Government's finances and infrastructure will only get worse unless an agreement or funding is released to commence a programme of maintenance and upgrades which will see the request for additional funding reduced. Norfolk Islander's are very proud of their island and what they have achieved over the past 35 years but also understand that the outside world has caught up with them and that the demands that the community now place on the Government to deliver services are beyond its capabilities. Mr Speaker we can still be proud of Norfolk Island and its past achievements but now invite the Commonwealth to participate and be part of our future for the benefit of all. Mr Speaker just with those few words I would like to commend the Appropriation Bill to the House for the second time and seek their Support.

MR SNELL Thank you Mr Speaker. I'd like to commend Mr Sheridan on his endeavours in and his promotion of the Appropriation Bill. The difficulties that have been experienced in balancing and getting the funds necessary to make it balance at the 30th June particularly \$1.6m reducing down to \$800,000 and all I can do is compliment the Minister for his efforts. Thank you.

MRS WARD Thank you Mr Speaker if I may. I think we just have to be very clear that this appropriation is about projected increased deficit. My concern with this appropriation is that it's a demonstration to me that reality is still not being faced. I've argued this for the last three years and I think it's time that I take a stand on this issue. Yes there is an indication from Minister Briggs and both parties ??? support for Norfolk Island entering into the Federal taxation system, etc etc, we know all of that. Everybody is agreeing with that. But we also know that it's at least two years away and that what has been happening over the last three years and we will expect to continue in the interim is that the Commonwealth has funded our deficit. They have supplied emergency funds for essential services and my argument has always been even as far back as supporting the preferred model of self government that Norfolk would need some big changes that we need to get business out of government hands, so that means looking at divestment, it would mean reforming the Public Service, it would mean many changes, many things that we would have to demonstrate as a local Assembly or the Government would have to do. In June Minister Sheridan said in the House that for the GBE's where there was a history of loss making that during this year that they would be examined and considered. It goes back to the four questions I asked of Minister Sheridan last meeting and one was to provide all Members with the projected cash balance if we don't adequately meet the milestones, and I asked for a range of scenarios. The Minister is asking us to put, even though he tabled a February cash projection, he's asking us to put our blind faith in his belief that milestones will be met and therefore that cash would come through. The fact is we as Members have not received a cash projection beyond June and I would like to make a point that the Minister's continual use of the word "reserves" when talking about working cash, I feel is inappropriate and is inaccurate. I hear what Minister Sheridan is saying that it's the working cash but I think that it gives a false impression or a false sense of security to some to think that these are reserves. I mean we know that we don't have the cash available to pay entitlements for example, if a number of people needed to go or we needed redundancy packages. That's in my mind what I expected those funds would be reserved for and I said this at the last Sitting so that if people's positions needed to

be removed from the Service, that business was put back into the private sector that those people who are currently employed within the Service would be protected and that that cash would be available for that use. The Minister said at the last Sitting that he had not made a request to the Commonwealth for further funding so I'm assuming that that is still the case. So I make that point. The Minister is asking us to follow him blindly. The second point was that I wanted an assessment of the action taken to increase the efficiency of the Public Service across all areas and that is still not being forthcoming. We've not been provided with any indication of where efficiency gains have been identified over the past 10 months. What we've seen is a continual sort of tightening of recurrent expenditure in every area except as we've said in the, well most areas, majority of areas, except at the Hospital and I will come back to that in a moment. The other thing I asked was for a recognition by this Government and this is coming back to the history of the loss making GBE's. A real inkling, something that demonstrated to me that the Government understood the reality that we faced and that there was a need for a reduction in services not every service would deliver is essentially or that there is an essential need for it to be provided by the Government or the Administration. I hear Minister Sheridan's words where he day "yes it is a reality we face and we have two months until the next financial year appropriation", what I had expected from the Minister's statement of financial policy and objectives tabled in June that by now we would see some real indication of that and unfortunately I don't see that. As I say the Minister for Finance has been very open. He's openly described the challenges we face but how much support the Minister for Finance is receiving or will receive from his Ministerial colleagues or as he works towards the 2014/15 budget. As a member I have no idea because this has been played out behind closed doors and that's different to how it was done in, certainly Mr Speaker in the previous Government. Members were invited to participate. I understand we're in survival mode but unless there is a recognition of the need for real structural reform in this budget, what we see is a maintenance of this status quo and an expectation that the Federal Government will continue to fund an increase in deficit, and it has been said by a number of Federal Minister's including Minister Briggs that the Commonwealth will not fund deficit budgets. So I think there is a big red flag there that I think that if agreeing to this today and in a sense falling into this trap it's going to make the next couple of months for Minister Sheridan all the more difficult. The fourth point that I made at the last Sitting and the Minister has already referred to it is the O3b. The Minister, we did ask for a business case and the Minister spoke to that. Again there has been a lot of verbal advice. He certainly has my support to make what I see is an investment in the area of telecommunication but again the business case that Minister Sheridan keeps alluding to verbally we as Members have not been provided with any business case or policy papers. What I needed to be very sure of was that if I didn't support this appropriation that I wasn't blocking the supply and it's my understanding that if I voted against it, if for some reason it went down today that the Administration was not being blocked of its supply. In other words that the current Appropriation Act would remain in place. My response to this is I guess in part because part of the revenue that hasn't been realized is not anybody else's fault but our own. We knew that, we knew that there was some legislation that needed to go through the House and that the Commonwealth had to assent to it. I don't want to make a song and dance about those things Mr Speaker but it also is evident around the non meeting of the milestones. I've said it to Members the other day where I warned right at the beginning about the reduction of the corporate capacity within the Service to deliver on milestones. Again the Minister Sheridan and I are going to have a stand off, he's sure it's going to happen, I'm not confident. I think

that if we walk into this now and don't ask the Hospital, is certainly the major area here to contain their costs like everybody else then we're just heading into thicker more dangerous quicksand basically, unless of course I'm completely wrong Mr Speaker and the Commonwealth continues to fund an increasing deficit. Now if that had been their pattern I wouldn't bother saying this right now. I'd think ok they will cough up, we need ore money, we don't actually have to look at our own affairs and change anything, we can maintain the status quo. However what happened when we put in a request, the Government put in a request to the Federal Government at the beginning of this financial year for \$6.4m what was received was \$4.4m. So it's with those sorts of indications, messages coming from the Federal Government that I tread cautiously. I ask the Government and Members to tread cautiously because we don't have those guarantees that we're going to meet the milestones. We don't know when the cash reserves are going to run out. We don't have any indication of the efficiency gains that have been identified and quite frankly apart from Minister Sheridan I don't see that reality is being faced. I see with the Governments JSC submission which we have been provided with a copy of that there is still a reach to seek assistance from the SPC, South Pacific Commission. That's heading out into the Pacific, that's not moving back towards Australian programmes and grants and the Australian Economic Development Fund and set up. That's where we should be focussing our attention. A letter on the 5th November from the Administrator made it very clear to this Government that they were not a Sovereign Nation and they were not eligible for access to SPC programmes unyet there is a request in a submission to go to a JSC that that is still what they are aiming for. So I guess it's a collection of things that are going on behind the scenes. The votes around the question of immigration about our commitment as Members to be open and progressive and help ourselves and I think ironically the Chief Minister touched on this where he said "he felt that the last election was like a Referendum" and while the Chief Minister at the time, at the time, my political views and the Chief Minister's political views couldn't have been further apart. I thought at the very least well, if the community voted for these people who have blocked every progressive reform item we have put up if the community was prepared to dig deeper, and it was prepared to help itself, and so that was the glimmer of hope that I took from that. I mean subsequently of course the Chief Minister has back flipped on every single one of his policy items, campaign election promises, I understand that. I support, I sympathize, I support what he had to do, what he has done but the point that I'm holding on to is that the community still wants to help itself, it wants a Government that is not just going to assume a victim role and sit back and say "but it's the status quo, we can't do anything, we've just got to maintain it, and we've just got to keep putting out our hand to the Commonwealth to support an increase in deficit". You know Mr Speaker I've always argued that we can do more to help ourselves, and I think that today is the day that I'm going to make a statement by voting against this Appropriation Bill. Thank you.

SPEAKER Thank you. We will continue debate Honourable Members. Before we do that may I draw Members attention to the fact that Mr Andrew Fraser, Member for Coffs Harbour and Assistant Speaker in the NSW Parliament is in the Public Gallery this afternoon and I acknowledge and say welcome to him. Further debate on this matter.

MR SNELL Thank you Mr Speaker. I take on board some of the comments Mrs Ward has made and some of them have gone backwards and forward in and out, contradict each other I think, and really haven't said very much at all. One

thing she did, and she continues to refer to Mr Speaker is the SPC. I would like to remind Mrs Ward that Minister Briggs in his letter to me has agreed to my response for the request to be involved in the Secretariat Pacific Community and he has asked the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade to include Norfolk Island in any arrangements for the next meeting to observe proceeding as part of the Australian delegation. So that areas is not completely wiped and he must therefore recognize some of the importance of Norfolk Island being part of the South Pacific community. It's disappointing for her to keep referring to back flipped on promises, locked every progressive reform, the delivery of milestones which is not always the fault of this Government or the Officers in the Service that try to deliver all the milestones. Some of the milestones, goalposts have shifted, some of the areas have been approved and then more queries have come in after the, and I quoted from one this morning Mr Speaker. I hope the other Members around this table approve this appropriation, it's the only way to go. We have to acknowledge what has been done and I certainly support Minister Sheridan in his endeavours to provide the financial revenue that we require to the end of June.

MR NOBBS

Thank you Mr Speaker. I said at the last meeting that I'd support this budget paper. Now I just think that we need to have a little bit of reality here. I mean I haven't been in this place for a few years now. I've been here one year and we're still going on about the Commonwealth and that but it's all our fault. Now hang on, this is something, why do you think that the people here like my Dad, and his Father and what have you and Tim's relations, Lisle's and Teddy's and Ms Adams worked so hard and desperate to get self government, because they were faced with these sorts of issues that we're being faced with today, every single day of 50 odd years or whatever it was before self government. It's more than that because it's a hundred years this month actually that they approved a Bill to become an Act that Norfolk Island was assumed into Australia as an External Territory. Why do you think this was going on, and it doesn't just happen here, it happened in the Northern Territory. They were so frustrated with the whole Canberra attitude that they burst into self government like it was New Years Eve, it was terrific, the whole joint was jumping with it and they progressed it. I don't think they would have reached the status that they have now, well they might be going a bit bad after a few years of governance up there but I don't think they would have reached anywhere near the stage if they had been retained as a purely as an offshed of Canberra, which they were, and that's what we were before there was self government here. So the big issue really is, whatever happens you must hang onto your self government, you must hang on to the say. Have your own say in it. I can tell you it was dreadful here before self government and you can ask Mr Speaker and Lisle and what have you, it was the 1960's and it was dreadful. You just couldn't get anything done. The only thing we did achieve really was, with the co-operation of the Administrator and some Administrator that would co-operate with the place because he got something done. But if they were from another planet they call some of them, you got nothing done, and nothing. I just can't understand why we're carrying on and the Commonwealth is carrying on about little things in this funding document. That's my concern with it. We should get to the reality of it, we should be talking about things like, how can we get things going here, not just who hasn't done this and who hasn't dont that. I'm a bit sick of it actually and I tell you I'm putting in my two bobs worth before the Joint Standing Committee and I support the Government's submission, don't worry about that, but I'm attempting to put together a submission which I think will be positive. We need something positive. We don't need a concentration on the social issues. The social issues are important, they are hugely important but the social issues depend

just not going to go out there and cut services, and cut service delivery when we don't have a back up. I wish to place some of the business activities, set them up as a corporate body and they retain their funds, their earnings, so that they can reinvest in their primary activity. Minister Brigg's in his statement to the House last month made mention of that, he was saying that we've been negligent in that area by not allowing them to reinvest. Unfortunately it's been a long term practice that those funds that those business activities have generated have been pulled back into the Revenue Fund to support the activities of the Norfolk Island Government and the Administration in the service delivery to the community. If that hadn't been the case we would have been asking for dollars a long time before now. We may have had Telecom, we may have had Electricity, we may have had the Airport well off. We might have had the best Airport in the world. We might have had the best Telecommunications in the world and best Electricity, we may have storage and we may have some low charges, but it doesn't belie the fact that those funds that we've taken from those enterprises over the years has funded the deficit in the Revenue Fund. Now if those weren't there the process that we're walking through now of municipal rates, we're considering land taxation and all these other issues, they would have come to the fore many years ago because we would have needed to identify more local fund raising and maybe we should have. Maybe we've been negligent in this area because we haven't considered this in the past and we have taken from our business activities when we should have been reinvesting in them. I'm not going to go back into the past because that's happened but what we want to do is try and make the future positive. Unfortunately until we get into the Australian taxation system where we get the transfer payments and the equalization payments I don't see it changing any. We can cut out some services. We can close down the Tanalizing Plant, we can close down the forestry Section, we can close down Philatelic because those aren't essential services, but at the end of the day, we're not going to get \$7.4m that we're short next year. It's certainly not going to fund out investment shortfall in our infrastructure. So realistically until the model of government is formulated with the Commonwealth and our funding structure is permanently altered, we will not be able to get out of this method of funding our deficit and that is asking the Commonwealth to fund it. Now I've already written to the Commonwealth Minister some months ago, or early last month, month before requesting \$7.4m for next year, that's next year. We're talking about this year and the additional appropriation. This is to see the Administration undertake its activities for the rest of this financial year. At the moment as I said we need \$700,000 for the Norfolk Island Hospital Enterprise. They will be lucky to have funds to pay their next payroll. They will be very lucky to. They will have to hold off on paying some of their debts and whilst there is no more dollars available to them from their subsidy their creditors list and debtors list more likely is getting bigger and bigger. So we need to provide some relief. In our healthcare, again even with an increase of 54% up to \$300 per quarter for each person over the age of 18 it still will not cover the healthcare costs of this community. Our Medivac, our portion that we pay towards a Medivac, the monies raised will still not cover the medical evacuations. So what are we supposed to do? If we don't provide these funds, are we supposed to say there are no more Medivacs. People who are claiming benefits under Healthcare, sorry take an IOU. Sorry we can't do that. People who are seeking treatment at the Hospital would say no we've had to close down areas of the Hospital because we can no longer afford to care. We can't afford to pay the people who provide the care. We won't do that and I won't do that. I'm going to try and approve the appropriation to fund those services until the end of this year. Next year it's another ball game, and we'll most probably be going through

this all again next year, we most probably will be. Couple of people keep coming up about the O3b and the business case and it still hasn't sunk into them that the O3b is a replacement carrier for our current carrier for Telecommunications. There wasn't really a need to, we established a business case as to why it would be beneficial to go with O3b instead of Telecom New Zealand and that is lower latency, larger broadband, for a price which was virtually half. That is the business plan. That is the business plan why we chose to go with O3b. I don't know what else these people want. Do they want to see the details of how they intend to go out there and get business, yes that's a work in progress as I've mentioned, it's a work in progress. Again Mrs Ward keeps coming up about the SPC and I'm, in the past I haven't been a big supporter of SPC, I can see the benefits but we've been told in the past that we can't be a members, and that's fine, we accept that, and that's what we've been pushing in the past. But, the Chief Minister was right, he got a letter from Jamie Briggs and in it he says, " he recognizes the benefits of Norfolk Island participating in regional organizations as appropriate and subject to agreement of the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade would consider supporting Norfolk Island participating as part of the Australian delegation". It goes on to say " it would be on the clear understanding that any policy positions put forward by delegation members are cleared through the Head of the delegation, and it's quite, I was on this site only yesterday because I got sick and tired of this arguing about why we should be going there, we're not entitled to it and everything, this is only one part of our activities you might say to improve our resources, and on this site it's very clear where they say that the Pacific community is 26 members, they include the 22 Pacific Island countries and Territories served by SPC and they go on and name all of these countries plus Australia, France, New Zealand and the United States, ok they were the founding countries, and on it they provide a map and Norfolk Island is clearly included on that map, it's circled, it's highlighted. So it's very obvious that yes we may be able to gain some access through SPC for some activities here but we have to go through the right channels. We've been doing it wrong before. We go through the DFAT organization, put up a request, and they take it to SPC and it may come back that they can assist. I see some people shaking their heads, well let it fall off, some of them are nodding, some of them are shaking, but this is on top of our attempts to enter into the Australian taxation and therefore access to their grant system. Mrs Ward says we should be pushing our efforts towards Australia, well we have been for the last four years, trying to get into the taxation so that they can give us access to those grants. That doesn't mean that we isolate ourselves from all other avenues that's available to us to try and gain some assistance, and this is exactly what we're trying to do under SPC, and for that I support it. I support it in that endeavour. I've got something down here about the Chief Minister doing a back flip, I wonder how many point Mrs Ward was going to give him for his back flip but anyway. The School, again a comment was made about students at the School are 10% down on last year so therefore simplistic thinking \$3.4m we can save \$340,000, it's not that simple. It's not that simple. A School has to provide services and it takes a number of people to achieve these services. Just because you lose 2 out of each class which amounts to 30 people over the 13 classes up at the School, an average of 2 per class, 2 point something per class does that mean that you reduce the services, you can't because you have to provide the services to the other students. So you know it's very simple thinking to say, well if your numbers are down, 10% we're going to take 10% off your budget. It just doesn't happen, it's just not realistic and unfortunately that's some thinking down here, sometimes it's a bit simple thinking, bit simplistic and there's a lot of other issues behind making a decision than just saying let's cut that out, and we'll save ourselves \$40,000 or \$340,000 it's just not

that easy. So Mr Speaker I think I've talked enough. If anybody else wants to have a go before I move the final Motion feel welcome but I encourage Members to support the Appropriation Bill and we'll be back in this position next month hopefully when we have the budget for the following year.

MR WARD

Mr Speaker I'm finding that we still have the same old myths going around. Just last week I was approached in town by a business man who brought in here probably right at the height good times here and this person I now know has certainly found it hard to continue to function the business he brought into. He was putting to me the issues how he saw it, that the Public Service, this bulky Public Service was the cause of Norfolk's demise, that the previous Norfolk Island Government should have paired it down long ago and all these sort of things, but when you actually separate out your GBE's your statutory bodies and look at what's left, your core administration is a very small operation and a small part of our overall budget. If you have these GBE's separated out you would still be paying through the services you buy from those GBE's for those people's wages and basically they would still be costing in the same way. Having them attached to the Public Service as they currently are is not adding to the costs, and it's certainly not adding to the costs of running the island. Our spiralling health costs are the major factor that has put us where we are today, along with the spiralling costs of Policing and Education. They are costs we don't have control over, we all know this, but that is the reality of it, and of course as these pressures are put pressure on people here and the pool has got smaller, people have left for greener pastures that has intensified the problem. We all know the issues and we all know this is why as has been identified that Lisle back flipped. Certainly working with Lisle this last year I know he hasn't back flipped, he's accepted the changes that are a very necessary thing. Whether all of the changes that are mooted for us are exactly the right ones, only time will tell, but we just have to work forward, try and progress along the path we have, and do the best we can with what we have to work with. If we take or knock out even a dozen more jobs from the Administration, calculate that at \$30,000 \$35,000 per job, take that out of the community, there's money circulating in this community, you'll simply be hastening the decline. I think the cautious approach that this Government has taken is the only one we could have taken under the circumstances and I'll defend that to the enth degree. Thank you Mr Speaker.

MS ADAMS
all for me.

Thank you Mr Speaker. I'll be brief. Mr Ward said it

SPEAKER

Then I'll move on.

MS ADAMS

I of course will be supporting the Appropriation Bill and as I listen around this table talking about reducing services, cutting costs, we sat here on the 15th February with Minister Briggs, he was seated where Mr Nobbs is sitting today and Minister Briggs said to us all here, taxation and social services are not a silver bullet, the answer lies in building the economy and I asked him how, and I'm still asking how? That is our answer, build the economy. I am no economist, I don't have that answer, but that's what we have to do. As Minister Ward has just said, every service you cut, more jobs gone, more people off island, smaller pool, smaller pool, smaller pool. I mean its not rocket science. How do we build this economy? How do we build this economy? That's the only question we should be asking. How do we rebuild this economy? Build the tourist industry up,, that's obviously one start. How do

you do that? That's another question, but look in the JSC submission, we've made suggestions there as to possible alternatives of how to build the economy of this island but it's all going to depend on the Commonwealth of Australia and the JSC agreeing those possibilities. They are out there, but it takes more than us. We need a partnership that's willing to do it with us. That's all I want to say thank you Mr Speaker.

MRS WARD Thank you Mr Speaker and I'm glad that Minister Sheridan and reacted as he did to some of the points that I'd made and Minister Adams. What we've clearly got here is a very different view around the table on what actually the role of the Government is in providing service ok? So there are some services which I believe should be run by Government and there are others that shouldn't. I come back to the question I raised about the loss making GBE's and I will ask Minister Sheridan if he could just clarify one point when he talks about we don't have a backup. So I sense this real continued resistance to change, resistance to structural reform of that budget. Oh Minister Sheridan you have my sympathy coming through the next couple of months and perhaps you should pull my colleague Mr Nobbs and myself into the table, but what I want clarified is when you say we don't have a backup, is whether your talking about GBE revenue, and that's certainly not what I'm talking about, or a backup for under wages, wages and salaries and so the backup in terms of job security. I think they are really important points that we need to understand as we move forward. If I can just clarify one point about the business case with the O3b. All I was asking for and I think Mr Nobbs was the same was that everything you've said was in writing, in other words that you gave enough respect to Members to provide to them, not the detail, but everything you said verbally, but that was provided by the Service, Telecom, CEO as a paper before Members, because it's not just about a replacement service, you are also asking for some funding to support and get that set up. You see your asking for some funds to invest, you have our support. Mr Speaker my apologies through you. The Minister has our support, what we're asking for is enough respect from the Government to be provided with that in writing, a simple paper. So sorry got it through my thick head, just asking for it in writing. I'm also glad that the JSC was raised by Minister Sheridan because obviously how he envisages and the Chief Minister raises as well, is yes there has certainly been support from Minister Briggs, that he was willing to see into it that Norfolk Island could attend I think as a delegate was the word, sorry the SPC. That has my full support, that Norfolk Island, you know that is certainly take advantage of that opportunity to go and get work certainly, but my clear understanding is that we are not a Pacific nation. We do not actually receive I think it's called OzAid, I think they've changed the name but basically foreign aid. We are a Territory of Australia under the Australian Constitution. So while I understand that there will be some advantages by attending these meetings and networking with these people, my very clear understanding is that we are not recipients under the programmes. So thank you Minister Sheridan for coming out, but yes you may just be able to for clarification, when you say, we don't have a backup, what that actually means, because you are going to hit the same problem next months. Thank you Mr Speaker.

MR NOBBS Thank you. At risk of being called a simpleton once again, I just wanted to say that one of the things that Minister Adams said were quite right. I support that wholly as you know that if we can fix our economy, that's it, we can do it. Let's take a simple approach to the SPC thing is this. They need us as a backup in the SPC arrangements. We would be a huge advantage for these blokes in there, then they wouldn't have to go in there wielding their cheque books and big noting

themselves, I mean this is the go. They need us as much as we need them in those forums. So I don't think it's a big deal actually and I can quite see why Minister Briggs would agree to it because there are distinct advantages for Australia to have their own particular, same as it's an embarrassment to them that we are in the state that we are in now. That is an embarrassment, well it should be. We're far enough away so they probably forget us, but the thing is I support Minister for Finance in his endeavours but I still believe that you have to get down into each of these items and not just leave it to the Service and the CEO to go through it. I think that the Minister needs to acquaint himself with all the issues and surely as he points out \$340,000 I said at the time, that there were issues in that but if you can save \$100,000 that's not bad and there must be ways of doing it, and if you can get the people, they'll find it, they'll come up with ideas. The people on the ground will come up with ideas how you can save money.

SPEAKER Is there any further debate before I call upon Minister Sheridan to finalize this matter.

MR SHERIDAN Thank you Mr Speaker. I'd just like to say a couple of comments. Budget formulation like I said the process just commenced and discussions with the CEO and the Deputy CEO, it had been decided that the same process as last year would continue and whilst the Members around this table might feel that they don't get the chance to participate, all the Ministers, I have put the Minister's on notice that they need to be looking at their areas and putting forward anything that they need within their areas, and equally with the Administration they have told me that not all of their Managers will actually get to discuss their you might say their budget line items, The main budget Manager's will but there are a lot of Section line Manager's you might say, they may run a Section but they are more like a Foreman. Those people may not get the opportunity. I will discuss it with the CEO and see whether or not there can be an opportunity for members to participate but at the end of the day it is about the CEO formulating a budget for the Service that he manages. It's about his management of his entity. We provide the funds, and this is where the separation comes. We don't spend the money. We provide the appropriation for it, they spend the money. A backup, when I was talking about backup it was in regards to the business enterprise, if we stood them up there as separate entities and they maintained their funds, they didn't pass on the full revenue to the Revenue Fund we would be short. Instead of asking for \$7.4m next year we'd be asking for \$9.9m. We just don't have a back up to full that \$2.5m that we would be short. That's what I was referring to as a backup. We would have to then find another \$2.5m within the community somewhere to fund the revenue that the business activities are putting away as profit. Unfortunately we just can't do that in this climate. It's just not sensible. I'd love to do it, I really would love to do it and that's how they should be set up eventually but until we get the Deloitte's assessment of our GBE's and that's why we're talking about loss makers, and in most of the loss makers are the smaller ones. We're talking about areas like the Tanalizing Plant, maybe the Post Office, the Museums, places like that that need support all the time. They are very difficult to, some of them can be done by private enterprise and that might be the way that it will happen eventually. I just see us being 12 months behind the ape ball with this Deloitte's projects not coming to fruition through this financial year. Mr Speaker I think that must be about it from me, and if there's no further comment from the floor.

SPEAKER If there is no further debate. I'll put the question to the House which is that the Bill be agreed to in principal.

Department to consult with the Norfolk Island Government regarding the proposal from the Council of Elders for Cultural office of the island. Furthermore Minister Crean acknowledges the determination of the Council of Elders and the future agreement between both Governments should continue, a joint commitment to the preservation of the island's traditions and cultural heritage, Honourable Members the Motion before the House today seeks the support of the House to do no more or no less than for me, as Minister with responsibility for Cultural Heritage in the Norfolk Island Government to enter into dialogue with the Commonwealth, the Council of Elders, and other key community stakeholders to continue the joint commitment of the Australian and Norfolk Island Governments to preserve the island's traditions and cultural heritage which includes progression of the overarching cultural strategy laid down in the Norfolk Island Cultural Strategic Plan 2014 - 2018. I commend the Motion to the House Mr Speaker.

SPEAKER Thank you Minister Adams. Debate Honourable Members.

MRS WARD Thank you Mr Speaker. I have taken a lot of time to look at the document, the people who have drawn this together as individuals and the people who have drawn this together have my utmost respect. What I did ask, I raised at the last meeting was why in terms of governance history stopped at 2008? Why there was not a record of the activity of government up to 2014? It might be easiest if I just read out a letter, an email that I sent to the Minister in response, because I need to know whether there is going to be a completion, you know whether this document is going to be completed and also that I find the document a little confusing and I think that the way it was introduced by the Minister has probably added to that confusion is that when we talk about a Cultural Strategic Plan I'm not sure whether it's just the Pitcairn Descendant's heritage and culture which is specific and that's sort of Page 1 through to 12 or whether it intends to include, I'll say every Settlement. So on Page 13 for example, so between 1 and 12 it's very specific to the Pitcairn heritage and then on Page 13 there is the first mention of a different Settlement which is Foundation Day. On page 14 there's a definition of culture which is certainly expanded to encompass everybody, a diverse range of cultural facilities and there is mention of KAVHA which of course has multi layered heritage and the Sirius of course, various Settlements are acknowledged within the document, and then at Page 16 sort of three pages of expansive recognition of other Settlements and cultures and influences being recognised and acknowledged and then at Page 16 it narrows down again. Then at the end it talks about a unique people being identified that the most tangible element was the language and that's at Page 18, and of course with such a mesh and a meld of Cultures and Settlements and very multi cultural. So I think that the intent of the document is to be expansive and all embracing. I think that that is the intent of the document and it has my support in that sense. I think where the confusion has arisen and you would have heard it in my response to Minister Adams when she introduced the document, was to talk about and make a statement that Norfolk Island is first and foremost the home of the descendants of the Settlers from Pitcairn Island, and I was only half listening I must be honest Mr Speaker when it happened, but something sort of went twang in the back of my head, and I thought well hang on is this Cultural Strategy all embracing or is it just about the culture of the Descendants of Pitcairn Island, and to be honest Mr Speaker I don't mind which way it is but we need to be very clear on the intent and we need to be honest in the delivery of what it's about. So Let's just say for a moment that it is expansive because I thought that was the approach that most people

in the community wanted to take on Norfolk Island and it's reflected in the Norfolk Island Plan I think really is the only place, although it was transferred or copied mirrored in the Accommodation Act recently where it said that whilst recognising that Norfolk Island is first and foremost home to its residents, and then it goes on about talking about development and consistent with protection of natural environment and all those sensitivities around those areas. My response was to say "well hang on a minute" and it was compounded by going home after the meeting and receiving a couple of phone calls and a couple of emails which said - thank you for saying what you've said, and I've sort of said well "thank you ok". They are people who not only long term residents and were offended by the phrase used by the Minister, sort of the exclusionary comment that "first and foremost it's a homeland of the Descendants". If your talking about a Cultural strategy your all inclusive, where do we sit? These are people who's families who, you know one is very long term, anyway I won't go into details, but people were upset. So I had to wait for Hansard and see what it was and it appears to have been similar to my gut reaction, is that the first and foremost home to its residents is a documented recognized, all embracing, all inclusive statement. So while there is no denying that Norfolk is the homeland of the Descendants of Pitcairn Island I think we need to be very careful about segregating a particular group of people. A comment made to me by an elderly person of Pitcairn descent was "I thought we'd got over this us and them" and they felt like we were being taken backwards. I said that last sitting. I don't think that's the intention of the Minister when she put this up. It is certainly not the intention of this Cultural Strategy, this Cultural Strategic Plan, let me make that very very clear. I don't believe that's the intention of this Plan. So yes while there is a recognition, at no time were descendants singled out. I did try to attempt to get the Minister to clarify that but of course she came back repeating it and saying there is a recognition of the fact that Norfolk's first and foremost is the homeland of the Descendants. So I guess in a way while there is a recognition what is the accepted community view is documented within the Plan. So coming back to the Motion and this is what I've written to the Minister because the question is really not to endorse the Cultural Strategic Plan, it is to support the support to engage with others, and as previously stated I do support the vision. I do not support at this time the creation of another level within Administration namely a Cultural Officer, or a Cultural Department. I think we've had enough debate today to understand why now is not the time and I don't support a direct line between the Minister and the Officers. That's a matter of principle and probably something we should talk about more but not in this debate. I am certainly supportive of existing already being used and encouraged where Norfolk Island cultural aspects can be promoted. The examples of that are at the School where language is already promoted and used and in the Curriculum as a language other than English. Cultural promotion at the Norfolk Island government Tourist Bureau and Museums conservation, always argued for adequate funding for preservation of areas that are important to Norfolk Island but across the board in terms of cultural heritage, and seeking access to relevant Commonwealth Grants. So they are just examples of where cultural items across the board are being pursued and promoted and protected. Those sort of things certainly continue to have my support and I've pointed out to the Minister that the P&C Association which I'm currently a member of supported the creation of a Sub Committee to promote the Norfolk Studies and the School last year. So the majority of the Action Plan has my support but not those ones that are creating new levels of bureaucracy. At a personal level I support the idea that every major event is attended by the Council of Elders. You should be members of the Descendant's of the First Fleeter's, and who ever else may be represented in a cultural aspect of Norfolk

Island. So the question of recognition I think we understand is another huge debate, separate issue for another day. So I hope the Minister and that she has some idea of my position. Thank you Mr Speaker.

MS ADAMS Thank you Mr Speaker I'll be brief. I thank Mrs Ward for the comments. As soon as Hansard is available I'll give an undertaking that I will give that Hansard to the Council of Elders, it's really their document, and ask them to give clarity around the issues that have been addressed. I'm very happy to do that, and anybody else who wants to enter into the list. Thank you.

MR NOBBS I think we've had enough racism here for today but I can just recall as a young person here that was the way it was. I mean all the older people referred to the island as being home of the Descendants of the Pitcairn people and that was it and that was even in the Council's in the 60's and the like so I can quite understand where it comes from, and to tell you the truth there was a bloke that was born here that I grew up with and he was me best mate and he's now dead, but he said that he would never be a Norfolk Islander as long as he went into the ground. So I mean as long as he was alive he would never be a Norfolk Islander. So I mean there you go. You can take it the way you like it. I don't believe in racism. I believe everybody is equal but everybody has got a home. I went out on one trip with an old aboriginal and he showed me his home was under this wattle tree, that's where he was born, and that's his home and that's his country. So I take the issue that this, if your born here and your of Pitcairn descent, well this is my home, and that's all about it, and whether you like it or not, well it's too bad, but it is. So if they suggest it there in the document, I didn't actually see it myself but I'm quite surprised because when I came back here in the 90's it was the home of the residents, it had changed by then. So I mean that's the simplest little thing, being simplistic I will take it on notice but that's the way it is. The thing is I'm very pleased, I'm on the Infrastructure and Business Development Committee, there was a recommendation of that Committee and I'm wrapt that we've got something up, so that's good.

MR SNELL Thank you Mr Speaker. I want to reiterate the words of Mr Nobbs and give support to the Minister for bringing this to our attention and it certainly gets my support and thanks to the members of the founders of this document, it's a lot of work the Strategy and they need congratulations on doing it. Why do we keep denying that Norfolk Island is first and foremost the home of the Descendants of the Pitcairn Settlers, but it's nothing to be ashamed of and I certainly take pride in it, I'm a descendant from those people, and always will be. Thank you.

SPEAKER No further debate. Then I put the question that that Motion be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT
AGREED
MRS WARD ABSTAINED

SPEAKER The Motion is carried Honourable Members.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES THIRD QUARTERLY REPORT OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE AND BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

MR NOBBS Thank you Mr Speaker. It's a fairly simple Motion. It's that this House agree that the third quarter Report of the Infrastructure and Business Development Report tabled on 19 February 2014 be passed to the Norfolk Island Government for its progression. As I've said in the past I've seen reports just be tabled and just sit here and we believe if we can move it from this place to the Government that the action will then commence on it, whatever they see appropriate, but at least it's not just sitting here and that's the simple facts.

SPEAKER Thank you Mr Nobbs. Any debate. I put the question that the Motion be agreed.

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED

FIXING OF THE NEXT SITTING DAY

MR NOBBS Thank you Mr Speaker. I move that this House at its rising adjourn until Wednesday 21 May 2014 at 10.00am

SPEAKER Thank you . Is there any debate, I put the question that that Motion be agreed.

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED

ADJOURNMENT

MR EVANS Thank you Mr Speaker. I move that this House do now adjourn.

SPEAKER The question is that the House do now adjourn. Is there any adjournment debate Honourable Members.

MRS WARD Thank you Mr Speaker. Just a few words about a document that Mr Porter referred to earlier in the Sitting in Questions Without Notice and it's a Policy Options Paper for the Norfolk Island Government around property based taxed, municipal land rates and land tax, and I'm sure most of us took some time to have a look at it last night. I will just make a couple of references because it's getting close to budget time and it's put up as a response to a meeting of milestones under the Funding Agreement. What concerns me and I've expressed this at the last Sitting and the Sitting before so it will come as no surprise to anybody is my concern around what I'm referring to is an interim measure, an interim municipal rates system which is not based on valuation. It is called a levy based system, so it's an extension of a levy system and I can see while some equity is attempting to be put onto it it's based on land use and not on valuation, even though the first paragraph says, it's all I can find in terms of terms of reference for this document is "the purpose of this Policy Options Paper is to provide an update to the Norfolk Island Government on policy options for municipal land

rates and land tax for Norfolk Island. The Policy Options Paper is in response to a Ministerial from the Chief Minister requiring that the existing property based tax working group within the Administration will use this information (valuations) to provide recommendations on a rating system". Now we all know that we still, even though we have a Land Valuation Act now we don't have valuations, and this is what I believe the interim measure is about, is trying to meet a milestone, but to me it is beyond the Funding Agreement and this is really why I'm putting this on the record. It's described as a unique model and when I refer to Minister Briggs, the Australian Government's expectations is, a municipal rate model will be progressive and aligned with broader Australian local Government rating models and that once I have, (this is Minister Briggs) seen the specific municipal rate system proposed by Norfolk Island I will consider matters for implementation including any phasing arrangements. I'll certainly be interested to see if Minister Briggs feels that a system based on land use rather than valuation is progressive. I'm going to point to one last point in this document, it says" the proposed levy based system is not considered the most effective model by the members of this Working Group who have worked on this within the Administration". May I pause to pay compliments to the Working Group because the document does go and do a lot of good work. However the members agreed that in the interest of moving forward and meeting the requirements of the Commonwealth and Norfolk Island Government's, so meeting the expectations or the requirements under the Funding Agreement of both Government's a proposed rating model achieves most of the stated aims of a municipal land rates strategy. When you go to a table you can see very clearly on Page 20 there's a choice between municipal land rates based on land valuation and one that is not based on land valuation, and there's a whole lot of advantages to a system based on land valuation, one being that the system is transparent and demonstrates equity and fairness, and when you come across to this interim measure being put up by the Government, well been suggested, been suggested to be fair, this levy system, that the system is complicated and can be seen as lacking transparency, but that it provides an opportunity for the Norfolk Island government to implement a system of municipal land rates that better suits the Norfolk Island community. Well I can tell you that's open to debate, that something that is an expansion of a levy system is in the interest of the community rather than value based. What is concerning me also about this when I ask Members or the Government why, why why are you pursuing an interim system, there is apparently been a verbal, a verbal, verbal advice provided by the Executive Director of the Federal Department, the Local Government and Territories which has said that we can carry on with this unique model based on the, yes this unique model. I guess my very firm point is that any interim measure that is not based on valuation is not acceptable, and my only comfort can be gained or some comfort is by the fact that Minister Briggs will be looking at this. He has requested a copy of the proposed model and that he will consider the matters of implementation. So whether the Minister accepts it as progressive is yet to be seen. I understand that the Government feels pressured, but I just would like it noted yet again it is beyond the time line and the framework which the Funding Agreement sets out. This is going off on some interim measure because the senior Public Servant from the Department has indicated verbal advice that that was ok. Thank you Mr Speaker

SPEAKER
Adjournment debate.

Thank you Mrs Ward. Any further participation in the

MR PORTER Thank you Mr Speaker. Having had many years experience in revenue raising through rating in a previous life I appreciate that there's a lot of work to be done. I commend this Report because we have to start somewhere. It's amply identified in the Report that the option of value based rating is not immediately available, in the interests of advancing our necessity to raise extra funds, we've just now been speaking of the appropriation budget, we're talking about the challenges that will be faced by the Minister for Finance in the new budget year that we wouldn't be looking at every opportunity to broaden our income base. As I said it's well explained in this document that the interim measure is perhaps the best to serve Norfolk at this point in time. As I said from previous experience I was in a Council that had to create a new rating regime because of an amalgamation but that was still based on over 100 years of previous revenue raising through rates of the amalgamated Councils. You have to admire this group who have gone with very few resources and fame up with what I believe is a credible interim measure, and that was my interest in the earlier part of today's meeting, to seek an assurance from the Chief Minister that this is only an interim measure and that we definitely intend to migrate to a value based system in time when that opportunity at the first opportunity arises. I'm confident that we've been given that assurance and that I feel that we must do something, and this document represents that best plan at this point in time. Thank you Mr Speaker.

SPEAKER Any further debate in the Adjournment debate.

MR SNELL Mr Speaker I should refer to Minister Brigg's letter of the 10th December 2013 where he stated specifically that "consistent that the Funding Agreement the Government implement appropriate land tax and municipal rates regimes from 1st July 2014". Mr Speaker it has been brought to my attention of course that neither the Cabinet nor the Legislative Assembly would ratify such a requirement without the necessary political process being undertaken to seek broader communities support for an appropriate model with appropriate protections and this model that has been put forward here is one in the absence of the strategy for the implementation such as land valuation and the surveys that were also agreed to at the time. It's a long way to go with this Report but as Mr Porter has said, it's a starting point.

SPEAKER Thank you Chief Minister. Have we concluded. I think we have. The question before us is that the House do now adjourn.

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED

SPEAKER Honourable Members this House stands adjourned until Wednesday the 21st may at 10.00 am