



**NORFOLK ISLAND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
14TH LANI HANSARD – 15 APRIL 2015**

MR SPEAKER 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.

SPEAKER Thank you Honourable Members, if you would be more comfortable without your jackets this morning, please feel free. Honourable Members I firstly ask if there are condolences. Mr Evans.

CONDOLENCES

MR EVANS Thank you Mr Speaker. Mr Speaker it is with regret that this House records the passing of Noreen Elizabeth Anderson who was born on Norfolk Island in July 1936. She was the eldest daughter of Polly and David Lass Edward. Through her mother she was a direct descendant of Fletcher Christian, famous for his leading role in the mutiny on the Bounty. Her father was of Scottish heritage. Shortly after the birth of the birth of their second daughter, Lesley, Polly passed away. Both girls were raised in a Christian environment by their grandparents Alec and Lizzy Carr. Noreen was education on Norfolk Island and gained her immediate certificate in 1951. After finishing school she worked as shop assistant, she gave up this employment to homecare her aging grandparents and in 1961 she married her long-time boyfriend, Leo Skeet Anderson. They brought a home in Cascade near her grandparents and raised their family. Noreen developed renal problems in 1968 and had to travel to Sydney every two years to the Royal Prince Alfred Hospital for check ups. When both grandparents passed away the family moved to Sydney on the insistence of mainland specialists. They purchased their home in Croydon and it quickly became a home away from home for many Norfolk Islanders needed accommodation and medical treatment in Sydney. For the last 36 years Noreen was cared for by the wonderful Doctors and Nurses at the RPA. Noreen's greatest love was her family, garden, home and many friends that she and Skeet had helped since the move to Sydney. To Skeet, their daughters, their extended family and many friends, this House extends its deepest sympathy, may she rest in peace. Thank you Mr Speaker.

SPEAKER Thank you Mr Evans. Honourable Members as a mark of respect I invite you all to stand in your place for a period of silence.

PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS

SPEAKER Thank you Honourable Members. Honourable Members do we have this morning any petitions?

NOTICES

SPEAKER Do we have this morning any notices?

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

SPEAKER Questions without notice this morning. Questions without notice, Mrs Ward.

MRS WARD Mr Speaker if I may I have a series of questions all relating to the same topic which is the upcoming referendum and they are addressed to the Chief Minister. Is it a fact that the Chief Minister wrote a letter to His Honour the Administrator requesting to revoke the appointment of the current Returning Officer and to appoint a new person to that position, and if so, on what date was that letter sent. Is it a fact that His Honour the Administrator provided a response which contained questions to the Chief Minister, and if so, will the Chief Minister read those questions and table any related correspondence?

MR SNELL Yes, thank you Mr Speaker, thank you Mrs Ward for the question. The letter that I wrote to His Honour the Administrator is dated the 23rd of March 2015 and if it pleases the Members I would like to read into Hansard the contents of that letter. 'The Hon. Gary Hardgrave, His Honour the Administrator, Office of the Administrator, Kingston, Norfolk Island. Your Honour, Appointment Of Returning Officer. There is a requirement to appoint a Returning Officer. Ms Yvon French, the person holding the appointment under section 11 of the *Legislative Assembly Act 1979* is currently off-island. I have consulted my ministerial colleagues and we recommend that you revoke the appointment of Ms French and appoint Mr David Rodgers as the Returning Officer in accordance with section 11 of the *Legislative Assembly Act 1979*. If you agree with this recommendation would you please sign the attached Instrument of Revocation and Appointment and return both originals to Mrs Jan Keeping, Legal Clerk, Administration of Norfolk Island. The Statutory Appointments Register shows that Mr David Rodgers has successfully held the position of Returning Officer during the following periods: 26/07/1979 – 28/02/1982; 04/01/1990 – 31/3/1998; 20/09/2004 – 21/06/2005. To assist you to consider the recommendation, I have attached Mr Rodgers' Curriculum Vitae, a summary of all Returning Officers since 1979 showing David's significant contribution, his register of interests and the position statement for the position of Returning Officer. Yours sincerely'. Mr Speaker I table that document. And the second part of Mrs Ward's question Mr Speaker, I received from the Administrator by hand, by his Deputy at 3.50pm on the 27th of March the following letter. 'The Hon. Lisle Snell, Chief Minister, Old Military Barracks, Kingston, Territory of Norfolk Island, 2899. Mr Dear Lisle, re Appointment of Returning Officer.'

SPEAKER Chief Minister I know that you have had some questions without notice and it is obvious that you have had some preparation in terms of responding, but I'm drawing attention to Standing Order 72A. 72A refers to advice in this House to identifying individuals and identifying conditions of service. I do understand that this was a proposal, it may not be a proposal that continues to be on foot. But the Standing Order does refer to a person who is proposed to be an Officer or a Statutory Holder. That does not mean that you should not respond to the questions, but I do draw attention to the fact, that there is a process to follow before that happens.

MR SNELL So Mr Speaker, may I seek clarification, this is the reading of a letter received from His Honour the Administrator.

SPEAKER I understand that Chief Minister.

MR SNELL Do you wish me not to continue with the?

SPEAKER I want to draw your attention to Standing Order 72A which has a prelude to you discussing those matters or bringing those matters to public attention. 72A, it isn't a matter of putting Standing Orders aside, it is a matter of complying with the existing Standing Orders.

MR SNELL Thank you Mr Speaker. Well I seek your advice as to whether to continue with this?

SPEAKER My ruling would be that you need to comply with 72A, which is, and I will read it to you. No Member may refer to the conditions of service or

conduct of a name or an identifiable officer unless the House has, on motion, duly moved without notice voted to exclude strangers and suspend broadcast of its proceedings.

MS ADAMS I so move Mr Speaker.

SPEAKER Thank you. I will put that motion to you Honourable Members as is required by Standing Orders.

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED

The aye's have it. Therefore Honourable Members I will seek to exclude strangers and suspend broadcast, this matter may then proceed in this House. Thank you Chief Minister we will pause whilst that happens. Chief Minister thank you, you continue to have the call Chief Minister.

MR SNELL Thank you Mr Speaker. I return to the letter received from His Honour received on the 27th of March re Appointment of Returning Officer. Continue. 'I refer to your letter of 23rd of March indicating there is a requirement to appoint a Returning Officer. In order to give proper consideration to your request I would appreciate it if you could provide the following: 1. Advice from the current Returning Officer on her availability and whether she has been consulted and agrees with the revocation of her appointment; 2. The basis on which you are recommending that it be revoked; 3. The process which was undertaken in the identification and selection of the proposed candidate and the criteria applied; and the current state of the Norfolk Island electoral roll including when it was last updated and by whom. This matter should have been anticipated and addressed long before now, especially in light of discussions on the Legislative Assembly over many months. It would also be of concern to me if, as a result of not addressing this issue earlier, the Norfolk Island electoral roll had not been properly maintained for some time. On the broader issue of the proposed referendum I would also seek your advice on the budget implications for the referendum. Including the expected cost and how this will be met (noting amendments to the budget must be agreed by the Commonwealth). I will endeavour to respond to your request as quickly as possible, however I consider it unreasonable to be asked to respond in such a short time frame in light of the circumstances outlined above. In the absence of information which will allow me to make a fully information decision. Yours sincerely, the Hon. Gary Hardgrave'. Mr Speaker I table a copy of that letter.

SPEAKER Thank you Chief Minister. Mrs Ward. Is this a continuation of that matter?

MRS WARD It is a supplementary if the Chief Minister would.

SPEAKER Yes, then we will continue in this mode at this moment.

MRS WARD Yes, thank you Mr Speaker, it is how the Chief Minister responded to those questions, or whether in fact the Chief Minister responded to those questions and if he could share with us that correspondence as well and those answers.

MR SNELL Thank you Mr Speaker. Thank you Mrs Ward. Yes there has been response. I will at this time read the letter of response, even though there was an earlier letter on the 30th of March to just acknowledge receipt of the letter from His Honour on the 27th that indicated to His Honour that we were acknowledging and would provide some further detail. Mr Speaker the letter of 9 April reads as follows. To 'The Hon. Gary Hardgrave, Administrator, Administrator's Office, New Military Barracks, Kingston, Norfolk Island 2899. Your Honour, Appointment of Returning Officer. Thank you for your letter dated 27 March 2015, which was in response to my letter to you of 23 March 2015. My letter of 23 March 2015 recommended that you revoke Ms Yvon French's appointment as Returning Officer and appoint Mr David Rodgers. I have consulted my Ministerial colleagues and we wish to withdraw that recommendation at this time. I would be grateful therefore if you would arrange for the unsigned instruments to be immediately returned to me. I am

pleased to advise Ms French will be travelling to the island to undertake the duties required by the Returning Officer for the upcoming referendum. As you can appreciate there are time frames to adhere to which will ensure the polling day for the referendum is 8 May 2015; the date determined and published in the Government Gazette on 27 March 2015. We regret any inconvenience the original recommendation and this withdrawal may have caused yourself or your office. Since 1995 the practice has been held that the Immigration Officer is also the Returning Officer. Due to delays with the Funding Agreement and Budget approval the Administration of Norfolk Island could not recruit the Immigration Officer until recently. Once appointed Mr Rodgers was identified as the person best placed and most experienced to undertake this role. Historically, matters such as the appointment of a Returning Officer have been more straightforward and without delay. The Legislative Assembly Vote has \$3,000 available in Election Expenses, which is normally utilised for election and/or referendum expenses such as the printing of papers etcetera. Costs associated with the Returning Officer's remuneration will be taken from the Consultancy Vote of the Legislative Assembly. On such a significant matter as proposing to remove self-government on Norfolk Island by abolishing the Legislative Assembly of Norfolk Island I would have hoped that the Commonwealth Minister would have initiated a referendum under section 4 of the *Referendum Act 1964* (Norfolk Island) to ascertain the exact opinion of electors on Norfolk Island as part of his consultation process. I trust this answers your concerns as this democratic process of a referendum progresses. Yours sincerely, Lisle D. Snell, Chief Minister and Minister for Tourism'. Mr Speaker I also table that letter for Hansard.

SPEAKER Thank you Chief Minister. Is that matter concluded as I want to go back on the air and allow strangers to return to the House.

MRS WARD I have a question that I believe relates to process rather than an officer of may have been involved. The question are aimed at, it is a difficult one, because I deliberately didn't name the officer, the Chief Minister chose.

SPEAKER Yes, I understand that, I understand that. If that had occurred right at the beginning I would have made the call earlier, but there we are.

MRS WARD It is a simple question of the Government, why the Chief Minister on the 8th of April withdrew the request.

SPEAKER Let's handle that now. Chief Minister.

MR SNELL Mr Speaker if I may. Mr Speaker I will at this time point out that there seems to be a high degree of concern by the Commonwealth on the intended referendum to be held on May the 8th. We have heard the Administrator recently on radio trying to raise questions over the Returning Officer by saying the appointment process was sloppy and now we see questions raised in this Assembly about the Returning Officer and the roll. These are trying to imply through inference that the referendum process is questionable. Mr Speaker let me assure the Assembly and the people of Norfolk Island on the integrity of the process of the Returning Officer and the roll. One has to ask what are they so concerned about the people of Norfolk Island having the right to express their view that referendum. Mr Speaker the real question is not the referendum process but if the Commonwealth will abide by the result. If the majority of voters on May 8th express their wish to be consulted by referendum or plebiscite on a future governance model before such changes are acted on by the Australian Parliament, that is the question that should be answered by the Commonwealth and answered now. I do appreciate Mr Speaker that there are other questions and I thank Mrs Ward for bringing those to my attention and if necessary and if requested to further continue I will clarify some of those questions, if Mrs Ward wishes.

MRS WARD Mr Speaker if the Chief Minister would just answer the question, that is why he withdrew the request to revoke the appointment of the Returning Officer on the 8th of April?

MR SNELL The simple answer to that Mr Speaker is the very fact that we were able to have Ms French to return to the island as Returning Officer and the process was followed in conjunction and consultation with the Legal Services Department.

SPEAKER Thank you Chief Minister. Mrs Ward anything further.

MRS WARD I have to say the question on behalf of the community, is who has been responsible for the making of the electoral roll since the Returning Officer left as an employee of the Norfolk Island Administration?

MR SNELL Thank you Mr Speaker. Thank you Mrs Ward for the question. The electoral roll can not be amended or altered in anyway except by the Returning Officer, so it has remained as such.

MRS WARD And so the question is, have any enrolment applications been made during the time that the Returning Officer has been off the island (unclear on tape).

SPEAKER Thank you Mrs Ward, Chief Minister.

MR SNELL Thank you for the question, yes, I can confirm that there have been 18 applications during the period of 16th of October 2014 to the 9th of April 2015.

MRS WARD So is it a fact that those applications have been dealt with remotely by the Returning Officer?

MR SNELL I am lead to be assured Mr Speaker that all matters have been attended to and the electoral roll is now current.

SPEAKER Thank you. Any further questions of this nature?

MRS WARD Just one. Will the Chief Minister explain why in the Gazette Notice that was published in the paper there were two names?

MR SNELL Thank you Mr Speaker. Yes, as indicated by Mrs Ward, Ms French was incorrectly stated as Yvon Adams in the instrument and there have been previous instruments regarding her in both her maiden name and the Adams, the surname of her previous partner at that time. When Ms French raised this point with Crown Counsel, Crown Counsel advised to manually amend the instrument of her delegation and scan, email and post the instrument back to him. In the preparation of the special Gazette in the Legal Services Unit, the first amended surname reference was inadvertently overlooked, (the amendment was very small), in brackets from the Legal Services, this transcription error though was not detected until after the special Gazette had been published, but it bears no real significance, it is trivial according to the Legal Services Unit.

MRS WARD Mr Speaker, it is how long has the Returning Officer been working remotely?

MR SNELL The Returning Officer had been employed by us for a period, since the 27th of March when the instrument was signed by her.

MRS WARD If I may, a supplementary, I am seeking the period of time that the Returning Officer was not (unclear on tape).

MR SNELL I can only take that on notice, but from information previously given to the House, I would expect that to be 16th of October 2014, but I would need to clarify that Mr Speaker.

SPEAKER Honourable Members if there is nothing further on this subject which is the one that we have closed our session on, I will revert to our normal process. Minister Adams you were seeking something.

MS ADAMS Yes Mr Speaker, when broadcasting has resumed and when strangers are admitted I proposed to move a motion in respect of the papers tabled.

SPEAKER Okay, thank you, anything further in that context?

MR NOBBS Is this going into Hansard?

MS ADAMS Yes.

SPEAKER Depending on how you want to handle that, that may or may not be available.

MR WARD There is really nothing controversial about it. In the interests of transparency it should be available.

MS ADAMS 72A is to remove the possibility of the distortion in the hearing, so that people could only get the facts as they are recorded in the written word, and that was what I was going to say when I note the papers.

SPEAKER Well that may add some clarity when we come to that stage. Anything further on this? Okay, Madam Clerk I wonder if you would alert the broadcasting people and the strangers. We will just pause whilst all of that happens.

SPEAKER Honourable Members we have resumed our broadcasting process, and the public gallery has now been re-opened, we are continuing with questions without notice. Minister Adams you had a matter to raise.

MS ADAMS Thank you Mr Speaker, I move that the letters which were tabled by the Chief Minister be taken as read and included into Hansard and move that those letters noted

SPEAKER Thank you. I put that question to you Honourable Members.

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED

They aye's have it, that matter is so noted. Thank you, continuing questions, you have another matter?

MS ADAMS In the moving that it be noted it was my intention to make clear to the listening public that as you so rightly pointed out Mr Speaker when you drew attention to the need of Standing Order 72A to be invoked, Standing Order 72 requiring that when an officer, the conduct of a named officer, or an identifiable officer is in questions or in reflections of this House, that this House shall, on motion duly moved without notice, exclude strangers and suspend broadcasts of its proceedings. That is in no way intended for this House to be hiding anything behind closed doors, the Standing Order was put in place in the beginning so that there could be no distortion in the speaking and understanding by the listening public as to actually what was said, and so the listening public have the ability when Hansard is produced to read, unless the House orders otherwise, they will be able to read verbatim what was said in this House so that there can be no distortion and no accusation that things were said that weren't said. Thank you Mr Speaker.

SPEAKER Thank you. Continuing questions without notice. Further questions without notice. Mr Porter.

MR PORTER Thank you Mr Speaker. My question is to the Minister for Finance. Given that we have only some three months to run in the current Funding

Agreement, can the Minister advise if he intends to inform this House of his method to complete the Governments obligations for the remainder of the financial year, given that it would appear that we will not receive in the order of some \$3-3.5million of Commonwealth funding.

MR SHERIDAN Thank you Mr Speaker and Mr Porter for the question. The question of the remaining funds for this financial year is a difficult one, because as we are all well aware, the \$7.5million in deficit funding that had been allocated by the Commonwealth will most probably not appear on our books. At the current time it appears of that \$7.5million we may get \$3,150,000. Which means that there is some \$4million shortfall, just over. Mr Speaker appropriation at the start of the year was \$38.175million and it is estimated at this point in time that we require some \$36.985million to see the year out. We have adjusted the budget in various areas, but at this point in time, the work sheets, we're still \$1.3million short of funding to enable our books to be squared off. To have a balanced budget you might say. This is what the service and myself are trying to identify where this \$1.3million can be saved in the next ten weeks. It will be very difficult and I don't expect that it will be found, the only way that it can be found is by cancelling programs, cancelling activities, and when I say activities I mean everyday activities which I don't think is really necessary Mr Speaker, but it will mean that we will most probably have a deficit budget at the end of this year. Time will tell. We are still in the process of that. But it is mainly decisions that have been made in this House as to the negative stance on the budget at this point in time. Members do have some areas of saving, I and the service would like to hear from them, but Mr Speaker it is a very difficult task considering that we have less than three months to run to try and identify a further \$1.3million in savings.

SPEAKER Thank you, further questions?

MR PORTER Thank you Mr Speaker. My question is to the Chief Minister. Will the Government provide to this House a fully funded financial plan for the 2015-16 financial year if it is their intention to pursue an alternative governance model to that proposed by the Commonwealth and further will that plan be available prior to any proposed referendum?

SPEAKER Thank you Mr Speaker and thank you Mr Porter for the question. The Norfolk Island Governments preferred model of self-government is well known both to this House and to the Commonwealth. It is our preferred model of government, we have put into place the financial framework for the continuation of the budget as indicated by the Finance Minister but at this time there is no other form of self-government other than the Norfolk Island's preferred model of self-government.

MR NOBBS Thank you Mr Speaker. I have a question for the Minister for the Environment in relation to the Marine Reserves around Norfolk Island. The group I understand is winding up, the group that is assessing these management plans are currently winding up I understand. Will they, as it was proposed by yourself and other people on the island here, will they be visiting the island to talk with the locals on the future of this particular area, particularly those outside the box.

MR WARD Thank you Mr Speaker and thank you Mr Nobbs for the question. Mr Nobbs other than a courtesy note from the review team thanking me for my input at their session in Sydney I have not heard anything further from them. As to whether they're planning to come here, they wouldn't actually have to advise me that they are as a courtesy, one would expect they would let me know, but to date I have not heard anything of that nature to indicate that they are coming to the island. Nothing to confirm that their original interest expressed in the session in Sydney.

MR NOBBS I have another question that relates to KAVHA. I have been asked where have the geese gone?

MS ADAMS Thank you Mr Speaker and thank you Mr Nobbs for the question. What answer would you like?

MR NOBBS The truth would be nice.

MS ADAMS Look I'll take it on notice and make some enquiries around the common thank you Mr Nobbs because I have absolutely no idea where the geese have gone. But I have to say Mr Nobbs that I have been asking that question myself. It is absolutely obvious that the number of geese that are on the common in Kingston have been drastically reduced, but I can't tell you why. But I will make an enquiry.

MR NOBBS One for the Minister for the Environment, although KAVHA is a key area. Is it proposed that the Taala bird cull will commence or has it been put in the too hard basket?

MR WARD Thank you Mr Speaker. Thank you Mr Nobbs for that question, as you know, a lot of focus has been on the Taala bird issue, there has been an agreement with National Parks that control measures will be implemented on Phillip Island. I have raised some issues with the service to do with dealing with the Taala birds at this end as well. That is still a matter in progress.

SPEAKER Further Mr Nobbs?

MR NOBBS I will if there is nobody else that wants a go. One for the Minister for Roads. Can you explain to the public why the roads are not receiving the attention they would expect, particularly as we are coming into the winter?

MR WARD Thank you Mr Speaker and thank you Mr Nobbs for the question. The main issue with roads at the moment is that there is a technical issue with the supply of rock material, in that it takes a certain component out of the gravel for the size chip that is needed and you end up with a lot of other product produced in that refining process, which means that unless there is a market for these other products, you are creating a severe imbalance which is quite a difficulty for both rock producers on the island to overcome. In normal times where there is a diverse range of activity happening and demand for different types of rock product, it's easier for them to accommodate the demand for the size chip that the Administration needs, but without the range of demand coming from other areas, the normal range of demand, it's very hard for them to meet supply on the one size of chip that is needed.

MR NOBBS One for the Minister for Finance. Minister the future of fuel supplies on the island. Has that been clarified as yet? Is it finalised or what's happened?

MR SHERIDAN Thank you Mr Speaker and Mr Nobbs for the question. No, the tender process for the fuel contract is still ongoing and I do have some advice that, and I know that I have previously reported to this House that it should have been completed by this time, but the service believe that by the end of this week they should have the tender documents ready for review by the Tender Committee and the Commonwealth by Monday, 20 April. So that's all I can inform the House about at this time.

SPEAKER Further questions without notice, Mrs Ward.

MRS WARD Thank you Mr Speaker. My question is to the Chief Minister and in relation to the Norfolk Island Governments model of modified self-government or territory model. Given that the Australian Government does not favour, in fact has rejected this model and is therefore unwilling to fund the Norfolk Island Governments preferred territory model. Does the Norfolk Island Government intend to fund that in some other way?

MR SNELL Thank you Mr Speaker and thank you Mrs Ward for the question. We have had no negotiation or consultation with the Australian Government but I do take the implication that they Norfolk Island preferred model of self-government has been rejected as it hasn't been discussed. Therefore I can only assume that it has been rejected.

But as to the financing of Norfolk Island's preferred model of self-government. That would have to be negotiated and discussed, not only with the Commonwealth but also the Members of this House and I would have thought that the funding arrangements that are in place now, that some of those will remain, particularly as we are now debarred from the Australian GST and the equalisation payments that we would need to retain a form of GST here on Norfolk Island or some form of personal local income tax type arrangements to fund the preferred model of self-government.

MR NOBBS Thank you. This is for the Chief Minister I guess, there has been a very public disciplinary process going on in the Administration for the past maybe six weeks has this been resolved in recent times?

SPEAKER Mr Nobbs earlier in this sitting I had to draw attention to 72A, I'm not calling anybody to account on this at this moment, but I am just drawing your attention to the matter again, so that you in fact don't either venture into that area, you just might take some care.

MR NOBBS I tried to be very careful, but I understand what you are saying and I would hate to have clear everybody out yet again. It was a very public display and people ask me has it been resolved, and that's all I ask, I don't need circumstance.

MR SNELL Thank you Mr Speaker, thank you Mr Nobbs for the question. It is my understanding that progress has been made on the issues and they hope to have it resolved by the end of this week.

MR NOBBS One of the Minister for the Environment, the Commonwealth Government was doing a survey on bugs and the likes over the last couple of years, as this been finalised as yet? Is there a full report available?

MR WARD Thank you Mr Speaker and thank you Mr Nobbs for the question. I think the material you are referring to is the Norfolk Island Quarantine Survey which was a Commonwealth funded project, the report was due at the end of March, but that would be going to the Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development rather than directly to us. In time we would expect to get to see that document and the material behind it. But at this stage no we don't have it.

MR NOBBS Just a supplementary. The psyllids exercise which commenced and I don't know whether it is proceeding or not, is it proceeding a or has it fixed itself up more or less?

MR WARD Thank you Mr Speaker, thank you Mr Nobbs. Certainly the psyllid issue hasn't fixed itself up, the density of the investigation around the island varies, there are some areas where it is quite intensive, other areas are barely affected. The reality is that we now know that it is over cliff faces and in some very difficult terrain to deal with. The initial funding allocation to do a control on the psyllid was inadequate. Prices were sought from specialists in New Zealand who have experience in dealing with this issue and the funding that was available at the time was nowhere near sufficient to undertake the project as it was originally framed. The issue is not dead by any means, there's a group coming over in the near future, in fact they put out a press release in the last few days in the mainland press, indicating that they are coming here to do some studies here on the psyllid and that research should be of great use to us as well as to Australia, that's how the research has been framed. That it is of value to mainland Australia to have the knowledge in our to deal with this issue in our type of climate and at least one of the people involved in this research work was somebody involved in the Norfolk Island Quarantine Survey that you refer to, a Mr Andrew Gerring, who many people here will remember him and know.

MR NOBBS Just a final question for the Chief Minister. Chief Minister I understand that the contractual arrangements with Air New Zealand will be drawing to a close in March next year. Has there been any contact with Air New Zealand in relation to a

future, or has the Commonwealth indicated as to what will be the position in the future with Air New Zealand.

MR SNELL Thank you Mr Speaker, thank you Mr Nobbs for the question. The matter has been raised with visiting Air New Zealand officials here on Norfolk Island as to the extent and the application of future contracts, but this is a Commonwealth matter and no further information has been provided to the Government on whether they contract will be extended or whether there will be a call for new contracts.

MR EVANS Thank you Mr Speaker, probably this is a question that is probably going to both the Minister for the Environment and Culture, as most people know on Norfolk Island, but probably nowhere else in the world, the collection of Whalebird Eggs, a yearly tradition with our island people, it's been going for 159 years, it is only just recently due to the fact that in the last four or five years our main collection area of Phillip Island has been decimated by the Tarla Bird which unfortunately due to advice from local people was not adhered to by certain people who could have had control of that nest or the hatchery you could say, and now that we have seen the full switch of the main population of the Whalebird go to the Duncombe Bay region which is within the National Parks. Could the Ministers give some sort of assurance to the people of Norfolk Island that do enjoy this food source, that look forward to it every year, it has become part of our culture and our traditions as I alluded to before, that they would give the public some assurance that despite us losing self-governance that they will be passionate enough to hopefully we will continue that despite the fact that the birds will be laying in National Park, and as we have known in other parts of the world, as soon as the birds go into a National Park, they are not allowed to be harvested. So if we could have some assurance, whether they take this on notice, Mr Speaker, it is a great concern from the Norfolk Island people that a tradition like that will be lost should we lose our self-governance.

MR WARD Thank you Mr Speaker and thank you Mr Evans for the question. Mr Evans this is a concern along with many others that people have with the proposed change of governance arrangements here and the list of concerns that people are having are growing by the day. There are just so many areas that will be affected and we, as you know, can not bind the actions of a future Government, in whatever form that Government takes, we can certainly put on record on what value people hold on things like this. Emphasising the value of these cultural activities, but we really don't have the power to bind a future Government in anyway, in this case unfortunately.

MR EVANS I have several others Mr Speaker, and probably my whole intention of asking these questions is so that they will go in Hansard and they can be known to the public that these questions have been asked, there is some great fear that when we have an Advisory Council, that the advice from the Advisory Council may go to whoever has the power to stop these sorts of practices. But there is great fear that within the community that if we do go into the transition of an Advisory Council that a lot of our practices, our traditions will be lost. And I suppose this goes to the Minister for Sports, and I have said they are probably just for Hansard as the Minister for the Environment alluded to, it is very hard for any Minister to be able to answer these questions which will be completely out of our hands should our self-government be lost. I know some our very passionate and hopefully to the Minister for Sports, he has been proud, and I think a lot of other islanders are proud that he has represented Norfolk Island, but also once we lose self-government, the possibility of Norfolk Island not being able to participate in the South Pacific Games and also the Commonwealth Games that are held very dearly within the sporting community here on Norfolk Island.

MR SHERIDAN Thank you Mr Speaker and thank you Mr Evans for the question. If I just respond to the sporting part of Mr Evans' question, all indications that I am aware of at this point in time, is that Norfolk Island's association with international sporting bodies such as the Commonwealth Games, South Pacific Games, World Bowls for the Bowling fraternity, will not change. They're members in their own right, those sporting associations, they're members in their own right to those international sporting organisations

and the governance issue should not affect their representation in those areas. Politics and sport are a world apart, as it should be.

MR EVANS As I said Mr Speaker, just for Hansard, great concern within our fishing community as to whether fishing licences and that type of thing, especially bag limits I suppose, it is something as islanders that we are proud of that over the last few years we have introduced self-imposed limits which have seen the fishing stocks come up to a very commendable level, where we are proud to say as islanders when we talk about fishing, that we don't go fishing we actually go catching because our stocks are at a great stage. And so I suppose these things are just the community wants to know that hopefully these sort of questions will be asked if we do lose our self-government whether all these things will be able to be brought up and I suppose there is a fear because, as we have seen in the past, when things have been sort of dealt with by certain bodies, the whole truth is contorted and even to a fact it's been turned around to the completely opposite. So there is a lot of fear within the community that you know once we go into this Advisory stage that none of the things that concern this community are going to be construed back to the Parliament of Australia that these are concerns for our people. These are just things that I wanted to bring up. So it's probably just a question as I said that can not be answered at this time, but hopefully in Hansard these will go down and hopefully be able to be questions that will be able to be asked of the Commonwealth and the Australian Parliament and even the Australian people.

SPEAKER Fishing licence matters, Minister Ward.

MR WARD Thank you Mr Speaker, thank you Mr Evans. Mr Evans this questions really relates more to the temperate east review that was previously referred to by Mr Nobbs and it really comes down to, in the immediate, in the immediate term, comes down to the outcomes of this current review. From the feedback that I had from the members of that panel. I didn't ascertain to be any changes, any significant changes, coming down as a result of that review. In the longer time perhaps as issues emerge, five, ten years down the track perhaps, and there is no longer a Norfolk Government there to influence what happens, then perhaps you would have the situation that you are referring to, where there could be a real loss of control, and a bureaucratic ruling from afar that may not be totally appropriate for our circumstances.

MR EVANS One other matter. Thank you Mr Speaker, sorry Mr Speaker. To the Minister for the Environment. Our slaughtering practices that are practiced on Norfolk Island, and we have people come to Norfolk Island for the fact that we have great beef which is due to the conditions that they enjoy. But I certainly know, from having worked in the industry myself, and just recent visits by people who have worked in that environment, stating that the practices that we do practice now mainly due to the fact that we can still do that, because Norfolk Island enjoys an environment of disease free as far as our ground. Certain visitors that have just recently visited the island have said that the way that we slaughter our animals would certainly in no way should any sort of jurisdiction in NSW, Queensland or whatever, those practices be continued in anyway. So that is certainly a concern within the cattle industry which as far as internal revenue goes.

SPEAKER Is there a question Mr Evans?

MR EVANS It's like I said Mr Speaker, just in Hansard and whether the Minister can probably just touch on it lightly and just say that hopefully these practices may continue, but if these jurisdictions come in and take over those sort of things, these things will be lost, and to a huge cost, in Lord Howe Island, they did til about 15-20 years ago, kill their own cattle, and that was quickly stopped once NSW legislation came in. Like I said, just for Hansard probably, if the Minister wants to allude to it, but I just wanted to record that these questions have been asked and hopefully they will be continued and through Hansard they are recorded in some way that they are concerns within the community.

MR WARD Thank you Mr Speaker and thank you Mr Evans for the question. Again Mr Evans I think you could say that this could be added to the long list of

concerns people do have here, it would certainly be a retrograde step for us here if the slaughtering of local stock couldn't occur it would be a massive negative impact for us. Economically and as you say for having that local food production available, it would really be a very negative thing and it certainly should be on record that it's not seen as a progressive step to go away from that local production. As to what the NSW regulations are, whether it would be practical for us to adopt those, or the island, I'm not saying us as this body, obviously it's not us, but whether the island could adopt the standards and requirements of the NSW regulations I don't know, I haven't researched that. But to lose our local beef production would certainly be a major blow.

MR EVANS Thank you Mr Speaker and I thank the Ministers for answering the awkward way that I asked those questions, thank you Mr Speaker for your time.

SPEAKER Thank you, further questions without notice Honourable Members, I think we have then concluded questions without notice. Thank you Honourable Members.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

SPEAKER We are at presentation of papers. Firstly tabling of regulations. Minister Sheridan.

MR SHERIDAN Thank you Mr Speaker. In accordance with section 41 of the Interpretation Act 1979 I table the **Employment Amendment Regulations 2014**.

MR SNELL Thank you Mr Speaker. I would like to table the **Norfolk Island Government Tourist Bureau General Manager's six monthly report**. And Mr Speaker I would like to table the Norfolk Island Government Tourist Bureau Review of the Norfolk Island Government Tourist Bureau Action Plans deliverables and measurement for 2013-2015 and it refers to the Norfolk Island Tourism Strategic Plan 2013 – 2023. Mr Speaker if I may, page 30, attachment A of the Norfolk Island Tourism Strategic Plan 2013-2023 outlines an overview of the Norfolk Island Government Tourist Bureau action plans, deliverables and measurements for 2013-2015. This report provides an update on the progress of those actions and goals to date. Mr Speaker there has been an increase in visitor numbers over the period of July to February of this year there has been a seven per cent increase. And just as a record for Hansard, and the period 2014 the total inbound seats on aircraft for regular passenger traffic was 39,824 the total inbound passengers was 29,185, total inbound load factor was 73.3 per cent. The total inbound visitors to Norfolk Island was 25,251. The airline load factors are now at a level in many months where the percentage growth in line with the strategic projections will not be realised. To achieve this growth from 2015 onwards will either require significant changes to the patterns of seasonability and/or additional flights for those months. Since 2013 the Norfolk Island Government Tourist Bureau has submitted the budget requirements with separate line times for Australia and New Zealand to ensure the budgets are in line with available capacity and acknowledge the importance of both markets this allows the budget to be adjusted for changes in capacity, importance, growth and outcomes. It has also allowed us to achieve growth in both markets simultaneously as per the table I wish to refer to. Example, the Australian inbound load factor is 73 or close enough to 74 per cent. New Zealand inbound load factor of 69 per cent. For the years 2012 until 2015 the focus has been on overall growth in all months. From 2015 the focus for growth will particularly focus on the low season months as these are the months with the most available capacity. Programs which have included additional advertising focuses on special events programs for the low season months have seen some success ensuring the lower seasons are successful will require the commitment and input of all stakeholders. Throughout the Norfolk Island Governments responsibilities there has been a collective effort to build the available collateral surrounding a range of different experimental travel opportunities. In the new brochure released on the 15th of January this is highlighted by the format including a focus on history, culture, nature, food, touring, lifestyle, shopping and events and how a visitor can experience those elements. These elements also form the travel agent distribution presentation. Mr Speaker

the Norfolk Island Government Tourist Bureau has embraced social media for both building awareness and advertising, substantial investment has been made in upskilling staff within the Visitors Information Centre, resources and content for the development of this medium. The main social media channel for Norfolk Island Tourism is the facebook page, it has been determined that this is currently the best medium for us to focus on to engage with. This platform allows us to build an audience as well as directly promote posts to targeted audience. This is particularly useful of course in NICHE marketing. The Norfolk Island has significantly increased the amount of media coverage from both New Zealand and Australia through a sustained sponsored media familiarisation program over the last three years. Due to budget restraints for larger destination advertising this program is key to communication with both broad and niche market segments to build awareness and market perception. I table also that document for hansard.

SPEAKER Thank you Chief Minister. Further papers

MR WARD Thank you Mr Speaker. Mr Speaker in accordance with section 41 of the Interpretation Act 1979 I table the **Draft Community Title Regulations 2014.**

MR SHERIDAN Thank you Mr Speaker I have a couple more here. Mr Speaker I would like to table a bill as an **exposure draft**. If it is appropriate at this time. The title of the Bill is the **Child Welfare (Further Protection) Amendment Bill 2015**. And Mr Speaker if I could just read a paragraph from the Explanatory Memo which explains as to why this is necessary. It states Mr Speaker that this Bill seeks to amend an update several aspects of Norfolk Island law concerning the employment of children in order to give effect to national and international expectations on how children are protected by the law. The Bill attempts to give effect to this by amending the Child Welfare Act 2009, to make provisions concerning the employment of children. To amend the Employment Act 1988 to conform with the new provisions concerning child welfare and the Criminal Act 2007 to ensure that its provisions unambiguously include the employment of persons under the age of 18 years for the purposes of sexual services. Mr Speaker this has come about by, every year the United States Department of Labor issues a report, an international report in regards to findings on the worst forms of child labour. Norfolk Island unfortunately gets a mention every year that it doesn't comply in certain areas and those areas are in the main, minimum age for work, minimum age for hazardous work and list of hazardous occupations prohibited for children. And going back to 2012 some correspondence with the Department and the US Embassy in Canberra indicate that it is a requirement for the Department of Labor to report on this issue every year and the US Trade and Development Act requires that countries who fulfil commitments to eliminate the worst forms of child labour to be eligible for certain US trade preference programs and requires the US Secretary of Labor to report on this Congress annually. So as you can see Mr Speaker this is something that the United States reports on annually and it does have some ramifications with it. So this bill, so even though I'm tabling it as an exposure draft I hope to progress it next month and that's the reason why it came under my portfolio of employment. It's more you might say in regards to child welfare, but it also does touch on the school leaving age, where it intends to raise it to 17 years of age and the Minister for Education has asked that I leave it on the table as an exposure draft so this can be more fully considered in her area with discussions with her associates with regards to that one particular issue, but there may be others that the other Ministers may wish to review upon Mr Speaker.

MR SHERIDAN Mr Speaker I table the following **licences** under the **Bookmakers and Betting Exchange Act 1988**, I table the following licences. Punta Co. Ltd, Fantasy Games Co. Ltd and Owner Wars Co. Ltd and Mr Speaker as detailed in the March sitting the authority is developing good business as this jurisdiction continues to grow its reputation. Mr Speaker in accordance with section 19 of the Goods and Services Tax Act 2007 I'm required to table the quarterly report of the GST operations and I therefore table that report. Also Mr Speaker under section 32(B) of the Public Moneys Act 1979 I am required to table directions in regards to the transfer of expenditure between divisions, I therefore table the virements for the period 23 March through 9 April 2015 and also Mr Speaker I table the Financial Indicators for the Administration of Norfolk Island for the month

of February as well as the financial statements for the entity of the Norfolk Island Hospital Enterprise for the month of February. As well as the financial statements for the Norfolk Island Government Tourist Bureau for the month of February and the quarter ending March 2015.

MR SHERIDAN Just one short report Mr Speaker. I won't read this out, I have emailed this out to Members earlier this morning, whether they have seen it or not. It's just a short report on the unleaded petrol shortage during February 2015. I won't read that into Hansard but if I could table it as read and included into Hansard it would be appreciated.

Report on the Unleaded Petrol Shortage of February 2015

Sequence of Events

The tanker Heracles arrived at Norfolk Island 24 January, 2015. On 27 January, 2015 Ball Bay fuel stock durations were:-Unleaded Petrol - 1.84 weeks; Diesel - 9.90 weeks; and Jet-A1- 9.65 weeks. In order to maximise fuel deliveries, tankers are scheduled to arrive at Norfolk Island with stocks of the trigger fuel (the first one that will run out) at 3-4 weeks. This method maximises the quantity that can be delivered, and spreads transportation and insurance costs over the maximum volume of fuel. In the past 20 years there have been only 4-5 instances when the weather has caused fuel outages. In January, the stock level of ULP was below the normal due to some minor issues with the ordering/shipping process. On 29 January, as the unfavourable weather was predicted to continue for at least a week and other islands were also low on petrol supplies, the tanker sailed to service those islands. That decision was vindicated as the poor weather at Norfolk Island continued for the next two weeks. Rationing was introduced at 11.00am, 28 January in anticipation of the tanker's sailing; and to minimise the opportunity for panic-buying. A replacement tanker, Sara Theresa, was immediately ordered from Fiji. When the weather forecast indicated there was no possibility of discharge for many days, to minimise demurrage charges the tanker was ordered to turn back at 11.30am 10 February. That decision was also vindicated as the poor weather at Norfolk Island continued for many days. As the next tanker was not able to reach Norfolk Island until 25-28 February, 2015; plans that had been drafted to import drummed petrol were activated. 20,000 litres was booked on Norfolk Guardian V117, as this was the quantity that would be available by the scheduled sailing date, and 100,000 litres on Southern Tiare V130. Service Stations ran out of petrol 12 February, 2015. The Administration of Norfolk Island (ANI) held minimal supplies for emergency purposes. Norfolk Guardian V117 was scheduled to sail from Auckland 13 February. At the request of ANI departure was delayed until 16 February, which allowed 24,800 litres of drummed fuel to be loaded. A supply problem had not allowed the fuel to be loaded by 13 February. The decision was taken to reduce the value of rationing vouchers from \$50 to \$30 until the arrival of the Southern Tiare V130. Norfolk Guardian V117 unloaded 19 February and the drums were immediately decanted and 6,000 litres supplied to each of the three service stations. ANI emergency supplies were topped up and the balance of the 24,800 litres was delivered to service stations. Southern Tiare V130 arrived 24 February and decanting continued until all drummed fuel was sold to service stations. The tanker Heracles V185 took advantage of a small window of favourable weather conditions and was able to discharge 26 February 2015; rationing ceased at 8.30am that day.

Financial Costs. The two aborted tankers incurred demurrage costs of \$329,000. ANI was fortunate that Natjola Pty Ltd was able to organise for ExxonMobil to absorb those charges. The drummed fuel cost was \$134,000 higher than the cost of a similar amount of tanker fuel. This cost was recovered by increasing the wholesale price by \$0.20 per litre for the drummed fuel and then adding \$0.06 per litre to the cost of all fuels arriving on Heracles V185.

Pricing The wholesale price of unleaded petrol was \$2.17 per litre prior to the shortage period. The drummed fuel was sold at a wholesale price of \$2.37 per litre; and the fuel from Heracles V185 is wholesaling at \$2.03 per litre (including the 6 cents carried over from the drummed fuel). Retail prices moved from \$2.63 per litre prior to the shortage, to \$2.85 per litre for the drummed fuel; and are now \$2.50 per litre.

Emergency Fuel The Works Depot and Airport Mechanical Workshop stocks were maintained as emergency stocks for the period of the shortage.

Amounts of 15 litres were sold to those with specific needs such as on-call St John volunteers, meals-on-wheels volunteers and elderly folk.

Fuel – hire cars and businesses Car hirers were able to fill their cars prior to departure as per their contract whilst stocks were available at service stations. Later, cars were supplied with 15 litres from airport stocks to ensure visitors were not severely disadvantaged.

Every attempt was made to reduce the impact of the fuel shortage on businesses/individuals whose livelihood required the use of petrol, with provisions made in the rationing process.

Additional Information This report is a abridged account of a month-long process that consumed a large amount of time and resources. Additional detail is available in the five Media Releases from the Minister for Finance; and in the ANI file on this matter. Employees of Natjola, ExxonMobil, Burnt Pine Fuel, the Administration of Norfolk Island and Service Stations all contributed greatly to minimising the impacts of this shortage on the Norfolk Island community.

SPEAKER Did you want that as a paper or as a statement?

MR SHERIDAN Just as a paper thank you Mr Speaker.

SPEAKER That's tabled as an additional paper. Thank you Minister Sheridan. Any further papers this morning Honourable Members? Papers are concluded.

STATEMENTS

SPEAKER Chief Minister. Statements, are there any statements of an official nature?

MR SNELL Thank you Mr Speaker. Mr Speaker I wish to thank the members of the community who provided feedback to the draft **Norfolk Island Strategic Vision: Auwas (Our) 'Framework for the Future'**. There were forty-seven Community Feedback forms either emailed or collected. Mr Speaker, the Community Feedback forms are yet to be fully analysed by the Government but it is proposed that this will occur with a view to finalizing the Strategic Vision. Mr Speaker the Strategic Vision: 'Framework for the Future' builds upon the extensive work of this government over the last two years and addresses the core requirements whatever the model of governance applies. This document is presented at a time when politically significant changes may alter outcomes. Nevertheless, we are committed to providing a model of government that meets the needs of our community. To help inform the development of this Strategic Vision, the Government has had regard to numerous reports, surveys, strategies and Government submissions. Norfolk Island has tremendous assets, is a place with outstanding natural environment, has a strong sense of community, with standards of education and healthcare to be proud of. Our economic development has been constrained by two main factors in recent times, the global financial crisis which impacted on our main industry tourism and the lack of an all-weather harbour facility. We endorse the recognition by the Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia in the Norfolk Island Act 1979 that "...the residents of Norfolk Island include descendants of the settlers from Pitcairn Island: ...and recognizes the special relationship of the said descendants with Norfolk Island and their desire to preserve their traditions and culture." We remain committed Mr Speaker to responsible management of the government enterprises and seek to deliver value for money from existing resources, while delivering the infrastructure and services that are needed for the future. None of us underestimate the challenges that lie ahead, but we are all committed to delivering quality services and a strong and secure economic future for Norfolk Island. Thank you, Mr Speaker, I table that.

MR SNELL Thank you Mr Speaker. Mr Speaker I take this opportunity to reiterate the Norfolk Island Government's position in relation to the **legislation that the Assistant Minister Briggs introduced to the House of Representatives on 26 March 2015**. And some may recognize this from the media release this weekend – but it is important I say these words again here in the House today. The Norfolk Island Government welcomes the introduction of the Australian Commonwealth social security and taxation systems including Medicare and the PBS system. This has been a promise to the Norfolk Island community since 2010. The Norfolk Island Government unreservedly rejects the proposal to remove self-government from the island and abolish the Legislative Assembly,

the Norfolk Island community's elected representative body. We continue to maintain that our preferred model for a territory style of self-government is the most economical, practical and best positioned solution. Mr Speaker there are a number of issues regarding the proposed governance reform by the Commonwealth. The terms of reference for interim Advisory group as indicated in the Commonwealth's fact sheets, the Regional Council to be established in July 2016 could have more broader functions than that of a mainland local Council. Therefore the terms of reference for the interim Advisory group are important to identify the scope and functions of that group to develop that broader function. To this extent my office will today contact the Office of the Administrator for the Terms of Reference. The Government is also seeking a meeting with the current Commonwealth Officials on Norfolk Island to raise matters of policy implementation such as: given that mainland employment laws including minimum wages and conditions may eventually apply to Norfolk Island under the Australian Government will consult to ensure a smooth transition to mainland employment laws. It will also seem appropriate that the same should apply to the introduction of taxation and not a blanket application from 1st July 2016. The introduction of the Australian pension and aged qualification, there needs to be the introduction of the high Australian age qualification similar to the methodology adopted by the Commonwealth in applying the age increase in Australia. We are seeking a meeting with those Commonwealth officials to raise those concerns. Mr Speaker, I was pleased to accept an invitation to speak at the community gathering on 12 April. I am advised that there were 339 people that recorded their presence on the attendance sheets at that meeting - a very considerable turnout especially given the rain and the need for the change of venue at short notice. Mr Speaker it was clear from that meeting by show of hands and the numerous conversations that I had with people at the gathering that they support a form of self-government being retained on Norfolk Island. Just for posterity I table the community gathering flyer and read some of the words from the flyer, which aren't many Mr Speaker. 'When: Sunday 12th April at 4pm. Are we in favour of reform – YES! Does a united community have the capacity to bring about change – YES! Is Democracy and Self-Government our sovereign right as a people – YES! Do you want a chance as a community to stand united for reform whilst retaining a form of self-government for Norfolk Island – YES! Join us at the community gathering and help create a true and honest message to the Australian Parliament, the Australian people and people of the world on how Norfolk Island is being treated and misrepresented by the Commonwealth Government of Australia.' I commend the community members that convened the gathering for a positive and well organized event. Mr Speaker, I also take this opportunity to remind the community that polling day is 8 May 2015 for the referendum on the question, the question reads, 'Should the people of Norfolk Island have the right to freely determine their political status, social and cultural development, and be consulted at referendum or plebiscite on the future model of governance for Norfolk Island before such changes are acted on by the Australian Parliament?' The community will also be aware that the Speaker in his 27 March notice in the Government Gazette is calling for for and against statements on the question and these must be submitted to the Speaker no later than 5pm today. Thank you Mr Speaker.

SPEAKER Thank you Chief Minister. Any further statements?

MRS WARD Mr Speaker may I move that the statement be noted.

SPEAKER The question is that the statement be noted. Mrs Ward.

MRS WARD Thank you Mr Speaker. I would just like to put on record at this time, because it is an interesting time in our history and it should be well recorded that there are Members in this House whose first and foremost concern is obtaining a model of government that meets the needs of the community. And therefore the Australian Government announcement is welcomed, we appreciate that we will be able to transition towards an appropriate and affordable model of Government, it is appreciated that the Australian Government is to assume responsibility for funding and delivery of not only national services but also state level services. Most importantly around health and education which we no longer have the capacity to deliver. Both in terms of laws and creation legislation, updating of legislation, but also funding from within this community which has a small population. The changes do mean that the Norfolk Island Legislative Assembly

will be disbanded at a point in the near future because simply, this governance model has fewer responsibility as a result of the decision, and the result of that is that we will create a Norfolk Island Regional Council based on NSW local Government legislation. But I would also state at this time Mr Speaker that people who welcome and support the land mark decision of the Australian Government also have concerns around the transitioning and implementation of what is a very complex reform package, this is just a first tranche of Commonwealth legislation extending to the island, it is not the full range of Commonwealth laws, it is the legislation that is related to the introduction of the taxation and the social security and healthcare. Which is what this Government and Legislative Assembly and community have been asking for since 2010 and working towards that through a reform process in partnership with the Australian Government. So certainly the consideration of grandfathering around transition arrangements and we have spoken about taxation and superannuation, many other areas, the other side of that coin is the accreditation and regulations standards, these are all issues that will be worked through with co-operation and certainly with the creation of the Advisory Council. Mr Speaker I am very pleased that you have accepted the invitation to be on, the voice of the community and its concerns around sporting, fishing, traditional traditions, whalebird collection, slaughtering practices and the enhancement of local food production on the island, will be carried by you and the other members of the Advisory Council. Thank you.

SPEAKER The question is that the statement be noted. Any further debate, Mr Nobbs.

MR NOBBS Thank you Mr Speaker, I like many other people on the island are very concerned particularly in the way that this proposal by the Commonwealth Government has been handled, not only in the consultation stage but in the actual implementation stage to date. What my concern really is, the community were understood that the Legislative Assembly was calling for a distinct and proper result in relation to the impact of these changes on the community.

MEMBER(S) Hear hear.

MR NOBBS This has not occurred. The CIE Report states largely on the social factors involved in it actually welfare in particular. It doesn't deal with all the impacts by any means and this is what I am very concerned about. If people want just plain social services and the dole and those sort of things, and the dole in particular, are not really available openly here on the island as it is on the mainland for sure, it is a wonderful thing, but what impact will that have on a community as small and as isolated as this one in the future when our economy is so fickle. We have at the present time an economy which is based on tourism, which wherever it operates, tourism is a very fickle industry and it's particularly shown in the last few years here it's fickleness I guess you can say. So I, like others, are very concerned about it, there have been some untruths, I mean I will give you a perfect example, it's claimed that we have never paid income tax full stop. The statement is, really, that we have never paid income tax directly to the Commonwealth, I know in my earlier times here Mr Speaker, I worked in the late 50's and was employed with a few other guys to do a job, it was actually to clean the drain, from down Emily Bay up to Watermill Dam, to my boundary up there actually I guess. We were employed to do it. We were offered, we were paid 14 pounds to do the job, and when I asked the Official Secretary, who was the Commonwealth appointee on the island, 2IC to the Administrator at the time, as the Commonwealth was running the place, what was the basis of paying us this money, he said it is the base wage, I said yeah fair enough, but how do you work that out, well he said that's the Australian base wage, which I knew was 16 pounds at the time, for that particular job for the particular time and the work we were doing, less income tax. I have subsequently chased this up and because I went away as you know Mr Speaker in the mid 60's and then 70's people were being employed, before self-government on the basis of a wage by the Commonwealth Public Service less income tax. And this seems to have been in place until about 1981 when the Norfolk Island Government was in place by this stage and the tying of Commonwealth salaries to Norfolk Island salaries of Commonwealth salaries less income tax was suspended and arbitration role was put in place by the Government as you will probably recall Mr Speaker as you were heavily involved in it. As far as I can gather from

that stage, the increases in salaries have been on the basis of a percentage of a base, and the base in 1981 was the same as the Commonwealth less tax paid that was in place at the time. My personal opinion when looking at the figures is that the salaries today of the Administration has been skewed significantly below that of the Australian equivalent less income tax. Why I say this Mr Speaker, because during the time that the Commonwealth was running the place from 1914, I assume it has been in place since then, I can't find it, but I now it has been in place since the war to self-government and also in this period now to when we were receiving Commonwealth assistance to prop us up so they speak, the funds have been used, the savings to the Commonwealth, in us not paying tax has been quite significant.

MEMBER(S) Hear hear.

MR NOBBS And I would say, to add to that, the people who paid income tax didn't pay it to Australia if you know what I mean, the recipients of this money, and it appears to have been extended this base wage to the private sector as well. There is a significant amount that has been saved. That's something that I find quite abhorrent that the Minister is so ill informed on. The second thing is in relation to tax, Norfolk Island has been the brunt of some fairly rugged I suppose you call it, allegations of being tax dodgers and the like and having been in that position, I know what it's like. This is in relation to the tax evasion that occurred from about the early 1960's to about 1980, somewhere round about there, where Australian companies registered offices on Norfolk Island, had Directors, registered their companies here with the Government, the Commonwealth was in charge at this time remember, they registered their companies here, they paid a registration fees to the Administration, that's the Commonwealth, which also went into the coffers of saving the money that the Commonwealth would normally have needed to have managed the island.

MEMBER(S) Hear hear.

MR NOBBS Now those are two significant. It was all done on the basis of the Commonwealth being in control of the island and it finished when the greed of some people got the better of them and Commonwealth Government of the day decided that they would take some action. But until that time, for about I guess 20 years nearly, the Commonwealth losses in taxation was quite substantial I understand but their gains in registration here were also quite substantial too. So Mr Speaker there are a lot of things that need clearing up. We have not had the real opportunity to deal with these particular issues, we are treated with disdain my I say, in relation to the way we do things. I can't believe what these people, some people are saying, and I can quite understand how the community can be very angry and I know that even though people believe that this may be the best way out, they, as Mrs Ward has said, they have got real concerns. Now surely the Minister who has been here once, for one day, and sat in this Chamber Mr Speaker, about where the Chief Minister is sitting, and I was sitting were Mrs Ward, and I asked him would he be prepared to come back to Norfolk Island and address a public meeting and gain the views of the Norfolk Island people or was that sort of thing not done in this modern era of politics. The Minister responded that he felt that he dealt with this sort of thing and attended public meetings in his electorate every few weeks and he would have problem coming back to Norfolk Island and listening to the people. We ain't seen him since, as can be said in a good way, and that was early last year and I have written to the Minister reminding him of this, and saying how disappointed, I thought we were on a good thing, but I am disappointed that this sort of thing has not happened and there have been misleading statements and I don't know how the thing could have got to that stage, I am so angry about it all, that I believe in his statements to the, and I won't go farther than just making mention of it, in his statements in relation as he introduced the Norfolk Island and those other multitude of Acts that he intends to amend, I believe that he has played one of the worst things in the world, I'm sorry but I really am cheesed off with this, and that's in relation to what we used to call the race card. He played it big time and I am furious about it, because I had thought that in the last 40 years or so that was wiped from Australian politics and I would suggest that people read and look at the contradictions and the race card in its glory, if you may wish to say, in the documents attached to the bill. That Minister Briggs has put into Parliament. Thank you Mr Speaker.

SPEAKER Thank you Mr Nobbs. The question is that the statement be noted, Minister Adams, then Mrs Ward.

MS ADAMS Thank you Mr Speaker. Just to continue on from Mr Nobbs, let us also yet again bed down into the record, when we are talking about Norfolk Island not paying its way, Norfolk Island has, since 1979, up until today, continued to administer Federal, State and Local responsibilities, and yes since 2010 in order to continue to administer Federal, State and Local territory responsibilities, we have been required to have some deficit funding from the Commonwealth, but let us remember since 1979 no other state or territory in Australia has administered Federal responsibilities and funded Federal responsibilities let's get the facts right on the table once and for all. I am tired at being told that we can't manage, we can't do this, we can't do that, we have done it Mr Speaker! Since 1979 until 2011 when we received the first deficit funding to assist Norfolk Island following the global financial crisis and the loss of 12,000 visitors per annum to this community, had to go to the Commonwealth cap in hand and ask for some assistance. We have paid our way Mr Speaker, we have paid our way more than any other Australian state or territory has in Australia because we have funded the Commonwealth's responsibilities in Norfolk Island. Thank you Mr Speaker.

MR WARD Thank you Mr Speaker. Mr Speaker under the Road Map reforms your Government, the previous Assembly, negotiated with the Commonwealth Government in 2010, you were assured that the reform process was about strengthening self-government, not abolishing it. As I understand it, that was the basis in which you signed the Territories Law Reform Bill which gave them the authority do and make the change that they are pushing through today.

MEMBER(S) Hear hear.

MR WARD This debate is not about being anti-Australian, it is absolutely not about being anti-Australian, or for that matter about being anti-Commonwealth, but there is some serious issues that we need to deal with with the Commonwealth. We have had a campaign of stealth against the island, sanctions by stealth for some time. And those stealthy or subtle moves against the island have certainly made it hard for us to balance the books and drive this island forward in the way we should have. And I will example a few here Mr Speaker, controlling and impeding our access to the Economic Zone around the island and while they say there's not much fishing activity happening out there at the moment, the past two decades or so the Commonwealth has many many billions of dollars from the EEZ. The extreme gagging clauses that were put into the first Funding Agreement, Mr Speaker I think one day those will come back to be an embarrassment to Australia.

MEMBER(S) Hear hear.

MR WARD Mr Speaker the underwriting of an Airline that is unwilling to meet the needs of the island, and blocking out competition from others keen to fill the need, is also another impediment, it is stealthy, and it looks good, oh we are propping up your airline, we are underwriting an airline for you. They're doing that, there's a real bottle neck there that was identified earlier in the material that the Chief Minister put forward. And finally, telling would be investors to go away until they have sorted the island out. We have an investor here who is willing to undertake a very large project in this island, they were told to go away until this island is sorted out. Mr Speaker, I am probably getting too angry, so I think I might leave it at that at this stage rather than embarrassing myself, but you get the gist of where I am at. Thank you.

SPEAKER Thank you Mr Ward. Further debate Honourable Members. Mrs Ward, you did have an opportunity, I just want to see if there is anybody else who has not had an opportunity first. Mr Porter.

MR PORTER Thank you Mr Speaker. I speak in support of the statement by Mrs Ward and further to my questions earlier this morning, the model we currently we

have, and the one proposed by our Government is not affordable nor sustainable. The airline underwriting, we are saying that there are many others that wanted to do it. I think our deficit in operating the airline ourselves when no one else seemed to want it, was something in the order of \$12million per year, so I don't know where all these other airlines are, they certainly weren't around prior to the Air New Zealand contract. And top up funding for the essential services which would not operate without that funding. And our unfunded depreciation, which I must say, has accumulated over many years and not just since the GFC, if you are looking at in the order of \$50million. I agree that the devil is in the detail and that as such we need to pursue the opportunity to promote the best outcomes for Norfolk Island under the best model that seems to be on the table at the moment.

MR SHERIDAN Thank you Mr Speaker, I really wasn't going to say anything, but the last speaker just referred to, in his last few words, of best model that's on the table, I think it's the only model! It's the only model that the Commonwealth is willing to accommodate unfortunately and yes we must realise that under our current framework that the Norfolk Island Government can not continue to fund all its expectations, that is why in 2010 we approached the Commonwealth to sign the MOU to alter, alter, the governance arrangements and this meant that the Commonwealth would take back their responsibilities that as, Minister Adams has said, we have been funding for the last 30-35 years. This would relieve some pressure on the Norfolk Island Government's finances. But territory model of self-governance that the Norfolk Island Government put forward always depended on a relationship with Australia, always depended on a relationship with the Commonwealth, to assist us with the finances through transfer payments for undertaking the responsibilities that we currently do now and that we had intended to continue, and that is specifically health and education. There was a comment before by a speaker that we can't manage those anymore. Yes we could Mr Speaker if we had access and we agreed back in 2010, we agreed to enter into the taxation system so that we could receive the benefits that come with taxation.

MEMBER(S) Hear hear.

MR SHERIDAN And then the Norfolk Island Government would have been able to manage its own arrangements, its own financial accountability you might say. It would have had the funds. This is where the Commonwealth has never engaged us in any dialogue in regards to our preferred model of self-governance, they have just ignored it, they have either ignored it, or they have done some sums and it doesn't suit their purpose. As many speakers around this table have alluded to today, I think Minister Briggs has been misled, he has been provided misinformation to build a case that the Department, the Commonwealth Department of Territories have been on about for many a year, and that is to remove the self-government from Norfolk Island and bring us into the fold you might say as a Regional Council as all other small populations within Australia are. Now that's fine, but what they forget is that Norfolk Island had a Government and it's not really up to a Federal Minister to remove that Government, that's up to the people of Norfolk Island and as it has been referred to today, I think by the Chief Minister, it is a shame that the Federal Minister has not invoked the clause under the Referendum Act to ask that specific question as part of his information gathering. If the Commonwealth had sat down with the Norfolk Island Government and worked through the issues on our model, and of course, it wasn't set in concrete, initially GST was to remain, we can see the benefits of GST being removed, very flexible, beneficial for the economy of Norfolk Island, beneficial for our finances that that be removed. But I also think it is beneficial to the Commonwealth not to impact GST on Norfolk Island because then in some way they would have to find some method of equalisation payments coming back to Norfolk, I think that's why in the main that they specifically say that GST will not be extended to Norfolk Island, because they would be in a very difficult position, as we see now with the bun fight that is going on now with Australian politics about the dispersal of GST revenue between the states, you know when it gets down to when a state like WA receives less than 30 per cent of the GST they produce for the Australian Government to distribute, maybe it does need a review. But Norfolk Island is a small issue and they would not entertain that issue with GST, so that is the reason why that hasn't been extended to Norfolk Island. But as I said before, if they had sat down with the Norfolk Island Government and discussed the model to work out where our intentions were, how we

the Australian Government, it has gone one from about segregation and isolation to one that is about being about very inclusive and I don't think that that shift in policy will remove the pride and the strength and the character and the traditions and the culture of the people of Norfolk Island, particularly those of Pitcairn descent. What is probably important to finish off with Mr Speaker and I don't mean to cause any offense by this statement, but I don't actually feel that I need to see the Assistant Minister Briggs on the island, what I recognise is that he has sent experts in the area of taxation, human services, which of course includes access to Medicare and PBS. What is important, is he has sent the officers and they are here as we speak, there was a full day of sessions yesterday, there is another full day of sessions today and there are opportunities for face to face individual private meetings on Thursday, and I understand that if those sessions were full, and they are not, from my experience, and Mr Speaker you and I both attended sessions yesterday, which were interesting, the people will be back, there will be return visits, this was just of many visits between now and July 2016. So over the next 12 or so months. It is important for these people who are the service delivery arm of these departments to understand the specific needs and requirements of this community as we transition, so it is very important for people to attend at this stage if they can and to ask specific questions and raise specific concerns, because as we have found, as you know yesterday Mr Speaker, the officers are not able to answer any, every question at this stage, but they are certainly able to take that back and push it up the line so to speak and the pecking order and there are policy partners in the Commonwealth Departments that are relevant to the extension of taxation, social security and healthcare measures at this stage. So that is my input at this stage Mr Speaker, I don't intend to get down to the bat the rat of who said what, and who is right and who is not, but there is confusion and concern in the community, because what the behaviour from both sides of the camp is doing, is creating angst that shouldn't occur, they are not knowing who to believe, it is in my view irresponsible behaviour to enter into that at this stage and I will not do that. Thank you Mr Speaker.

MR WARD Thank you Mr Speaker I would just like to put on record that this Government has tried to engage with the Australian Government and the Departmental officers that guide the Assistant Minister. We have been up against a wall of prejudice and hostility that commenced with the former Administrator publically chastising the Chief Minister Elect before this Government was even sworn into office. There has been Commonwealth report after report about Norfolk Island each tending to draw from earlier ones and building an every uglier picture. Certainly on reading those reports I can see why there is such hostility from the Commonwealth to the Island. But when one digs a little deeper you get to realise how misleading these reports are. There is a total lack of balance there. More often than not enquiries have been influenced by people with vested interests, settlers who were brought in without doing their homework or those who felt the Government owed them something, a job or whatever. The current Norfolk Island Government came to office seeking refinement to the Road Map for reform process that had been commenced under the Thirteenth Assembly, a mandate that was clearly given to us in the 2013 election. Instead of engaging constructively with us, the wall of prejudice and bias was raised, we like the Assembly before us, were played along until the highly secret Norfolk Reform team was formed and could deliver the package now before us. The reform process now outlined by the Australian Government while appearing to offer some positives, does also carry some very real threats to this community and as I referred to that list this morning, that list is growing daily. Thank you Mr Speaker.

MR SNELL Thank you Mr Speaker if I could give the final remarks on the subject and I appreciate the input.

SPEAKER It may not be Chief Minister, I am just contemplating whether I would like to say something, but you please proceed at this stage.

MR SNELL Thank you Mr Speaker. Mr Speaker, former speakers have mentioned around the table today, the misinformation given to the Assistant Minister Briggs on a number of occasions concerning the reforms about Norfolk Island and I hope that it pleases the Member that I may be able to relate to one of them. For example, Minister Briggs' letter to residents of the 19th of March, the first paragraph read 'confirm the reforms being delivered by the Australian Government which will guarantee a more prosperous

future for Norfolk Island.' Such a statement is reprehensible. In as much that it is something that can not be met and worse that Minister Briggs would know that he can not deliver, Governments are not about making promises or giving guarantees. Even if Minister Briggs had the authority to give any guarantee, which I don't believe he has, he alone can not bind the Government. It is these types of misinformation Mr Speaker that causes concern within the community. There are other concerns. Former Treasurer, the Hon. Peter Costello has stated in the news of late that Australia is in danger of taxing itself into poverty. The Road Map Adviser, that incumbent that was employed some years ago, expressed to me his disappointment, prior to him leaving the service in that the negotiations he was continuing with with the Commonwealth in the Road Map process, he was deeply disappointed, and he wrote for me, what was called an indignation strategy, he complained bitterly that a response by the decision of the Commonwealth not to extend the Australian GST and the transfer payment system to Norfolk Island, which was a requirement to fund the Road Map at that time. Mr Speaker, it has been said on a number of occasions, that the period between March 2013 has been a challenging one for the Government and this Assembly. We have been faced with a change of Government Federally, ongoing Funding Agreement negotiations with the Commonwealth, the Joint Standing Committee's process and the report of the Deloitte's process and reports have all been taken into consideration. During that period this Government has participated in those processes in a positive and co-operative manner. In our submissions to the Joint Standing Committee we outlined our position on economic development which at the time of the Joint Standing Committee visit Norfolk Island was the main focus of their work. We sought the right to respond to the question of governance when it was introduced by Neil Pope's submission to the Joint Standing Committee in the dying period of their public submissions process which was denied. We have formally responded to the Joint Standing Committee final report, once again outlining our commitment to our preferred model for territory self-governance and economic development for Norfolk Island. We have had robust negotiation during the period leading up to the signing of the Funding Agreement to secure essential Commonwealth funding, and we have, and will continue to introduce legislative requirements as outlined by that agreement. We have participated in the Deloitte's process and as I speak they will be returning to Norfolk Island for more discussions. We have at that time costed our preferred model for territory self-governance and are continuing to seek engagement with the Federal Minister on a co-operative way forward in delivering governance reform to Norfolk Island. Regrettably it appears that those words have been made on deaf ears. This Government Mr Speaker has at all times put the overall interests of Norfolk Island at the forefront of our representations to the Commonwealth in the most transparent manner. We have and our continuing to call on the Commonwealth to embrace us, and this community of Norfolk Island, in a transparent engagement that will enable the necessary clarity of their model of governance on Norfolk Island to be available for consideration in the Governments reform process for Norfolk Island. Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER

Thank you Chief Minister. Further debate? Mr Buffett.

MR BUFFETT

If I may, thank you Mr Deputy Speaker, I have got to say that it wasn't my plan to speak today either, a couple of others have mentioned that, and therefore what I say may well be disjointed, but nevertheless I think it's an opportunity that I should take. Mr Deputy Speaker, the principle issue that Norfolk Island faced four, five, six years, was that of money. It was a financial issue that lead us to recognise that we were facing a very serious and difficult situation. We were not able to meet our annual needs in terms of providing services to the Norfolk Island community and because of the shape of the Commonwealth piece of legislation, the Norfolk Island Act, we were first compelled to approach the Commonwealth, the Norfolk Island Act doesn't allow us to go anywhere else for money. I'm getting black looks from one of the Members across the table, and I state that the reality is that the Norfolk Island Act does not allow us to go elsewhere for borrowing of funds until we first approach the Commonwealth, and that is a fact, and that is a fact, I emphasise it again, I notice now that the Member is nodding her head in agreement to that. I'm getting more interjections! But I don't think they're able to prove otherwise that that I have said, so a very difficult situation, and I say compelled to seek assistance. And we have had assistance over the past four years, not an easy situation to be in. But it wasn't just a matter of doing that, Norfolk Island needed, and indeed did, say to itself, well how do we

move forward to solve this difficulty and get over this hump and achieve long-term sustainability. So at that time we had two general aims, one was to achieve long-term sustainability and the other was to survive in the meantime. Our survival in the meantime was to have Federal funding on an annual basis and I have just said, and others have said, that has happened over the past four years. The long-term sustainability was even more difficult, it meant that we erected a Road Map that identified various issues that had to be addressed and those issues had to be addressed by both Norfolk Island, its Government, and the Federal authorities, the Federal Government, and it must be said that Norfolk Island addressed its issues, they were issues for example about accountability, transparency, addressing monopolies, widening the immigration spread, a range of factors which we addressed, difficult though they were I might say, we addressed them. The Commonwealth didn't, let's be blunt about it. The Commonwealth did not. They didn't deliver in terms of commencing the taxation regime, and that's four years ago, and nor did it do so in terms of welfare arrangements which equally they made a commitment about. So we received nothing in terms of the Commonwealth meeting their commitments. Within the Road Map arrangement was an assessment as to how we would have a democratic process, a governance issue, and we too addressed that issue, we had a public meeting upon it, we had motions of resolutions of this Assembly, both in the last Assembly and in this Assembly. So it is not new, it has been around for some time. I don't need to at this stage to repeat what that process was about governance, but we made a proposal, put it to the Commonwealth and of course met with deafly silence. All of those issues that were around at that time weren't easy ones for this community and what it has led to in this community is a great deal of instability and uncertainty and therefore loss of business, loss of job opportunities, people going offshore, no longer able to stay in their homeland. All of those things in that period of four or five years. Huge difficulties, they all just twirl and twirl and we go deeper and deeper into the mud. Well as I say, we had a plan, we continue to have a plan from my perspective about how we should move forward. The difficulty that we have faced is, that we have had a stream of people in the bureaucracies in various spheres who have come to us, but none of the decision takers. We have one visit from Minister Briggs, we all recall that, that has been mentioned by earlier speakers. But there was none of this detail on the table at that time to discuss with him and so we have been subjected to the civil servants who have a brief from the decision takers to come here and walk through issues with us, we have the Administrator who has a brief, who has walked through issues with us. But in fact we have not had the opportunity to eyeball, face-to-face, have discussions across the table about the real issues that need to be talked through about our proposals as opposed to their proposals and it's only that sort of discussion that will give real satisfaction to all of the players about the issues. Now that difficulty has multiplied with what I would call unedifying action, hostile attitudes, action by both parties I've got to say, both sides of the table, but actions from afar, sniping from afar, difficulties from afar, not things that are discussed across the table and you won't get good results when you are that far apart. It is as simple as that. That has added to all of those other difficulties that I have mentioned. Now that one issue of money, the financial issue, that single issue changed on the 19th of March. On the 19th of March we received the Commonwealths response, taken four years, five years maybe, for them to make such a response, but we got a response and the content of that response, some content were things that we had asked for, that must be said at the outset. There was agreement to the taxation regime, there was agreement to the social welfare scheme for example, but the real blow was that they would take away the elected group within Norfolk Island, that has the responsibility that we exercise now. In that model that I mentioned that was the subject of a public meeting, resolution of Assembly last, resolution of this Assembly present, it basically said this, this is in brief terms and you will know it, but I mention it just in the context of this address. That Norfolk Island would have responsibilities that cover the local government sphere at the other end of the spectrum that would normally rest in the three tiers of Government that would normally rest with the Commonwealth would migrate to the Commonwealth and they would be responsible for deliver and for the cost of it. Our model says and those things that are state or territory responsibilities would equally be retained in the Norfolk Island sphere and have accountability and responsibility in this Assembly but it would, just as in other places in the Commonwealth sphere would receive assistance funding for a great deal of services delivered there, for example in education, for example in health services. That's what happens elsewhere when people are part of that pool. The Commonwealth have decided

that that shouldn't be the case. That the Commonwealth should have responsibility for those middle distance arrangements which are the state or territory functions, but of course we know that they don't perform those functions, and so they have said that they will farm those out to a state to perform on behalf of the Commonwealth. You will note that I said on the behalf of the Commonwealth and they have identified in the main they will ask NSW to deliver that. There is nothing wrong with NSW, let's be clear about that, the problem is that that erects the second difficulty, the first was money and the difficulty now erected by the Commonwealth indicator of that model is a question of democracy and I will explain what I mean about that difficulty. The tiers of Government, local Government will be handled by Norfolk Island, the Commonwealth said they would erect a local municipal regional council. So that is not the democratic risk, that's not the democratic risk. In the Commonwealth's sphere it has equally said, that it would place Norfolk Island in a Commonwealth electorate, one of those Canberra ones I understand it. Now that too doesn't present a democratic difficulty Norfolk Island would be represented in that context. Look at the middle bit. The middle bit says that Norfolk Island you will not have an elected representative process to deliver those functions they will be in the sphere of another state, NSW for example, Norfolk Island is not in a state electorate, Norfolk Island can not be place constitutionally within a state electorate, so a state would be administering those functions but accountable to the Commonwealth and not accountable to the Norfolk Island community for which it is responsible to deliver the services. That's where the lack of democracy lies in this context and we need to identify that and we need to challenge that.

MEMBER(S)

Hear hear.

MR BUFFETT

It must be made clear as to where the detail is. That is the difficulty that we face. Now who is best to do that? Norfolk Island to whom there is a responsibility for the delivery of the service is best to deliver that service, but I need to be clear, responsible for delivery of it. That doesn't mean that they might physically do it. Let me give you an example, education is in that particular sphere, we are talking about education, we are talking about police, we are talking about health services, hospital services and the like. They are the functions that lie within the state or territory tier of government. Norfolk Island has run all of them of course, and paid for all of them and still does to this date, except with the intervention of the Commonwealth over the past four years. Education we have never done it ourselves, we have bought a package from NSW and we have paid for that package. We have done that for 100 plus years, that is not new to us. And the package that we buy has provided a superb educational service to the Norfolk Island community.

MEMBER(S)

Hear hear.

MR BUFFETT

There can be no doubt about that. There is little thought that we would probably want to change that, that's not necessarily on the books. So that arrangement is likely to remain. But the Commonwealth want to pick up the running of it, or the responsibility of it. Whereas we have shown for the past x number of years that we have the capacity, not the financial capacity now I've got to say, although we did until four years ago, but the capacity to ensure that there is the standard delivered to the Norfolk Island community. Now you can make that example known in a number of other spheres, and what I am endeavouring to describe is, that that responsibility should continue to remain in Norfolk Island and this Legislative Assembly should remain so that it has the capacity to represent the Norfolk Island community in the delivery of that service within Norfolk Island. And that is the area where democracy is at risk. So financial aspect, and we have been through that for quite some time, but from the 19th of March another difficult situation of democracy, so it has moved from a single issue of difficulty to a double issue of difficulty and our responsibility now, notwithstanding that there are some time frames about how this is to be handled, we need to get about addressing, with the right people in the right place those difficulties. There are officers on the island at present, I think there is some seven of them, I have been to the session, not every session, there are four sessions as I understand it, I have been to two and I plan to be at the other two this afternoon and this evening. They are well conducted, but it needs to be said that they are not people who are able to answer all of the queries that are around, but they acknowledge that also, so there is still a long way to go for Norfolk

Island people to know exactly where they would stand in those proposals. But bear in mind that those people are here because that part of the package is what we have asked for and which the Commonwealth have agreed to. So we should be mindful that that is meeting our needs as well as the Commonwealth needs, and we should take advantage of them being here and continuation of their services in various ways, they readily acknowledge also that it's not exactly clear how they are going to move in every direction from here on. But they are making evaluations about doing that. But again, Mr Deputy Speaker I say this. Now two issues in front of us, one the financial issue, but we have a model to address that, from the 19th of March we have a second issue, democracy and we should equally address that. The time frame is short, we can't be dilly dallying we must be getting about it. Thank you for hearing my contribution.

MRS WARD

Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker. Mr Speaker on the floor has raised very well, and without fault the story as it has been and the current situation and the sticking point being the delivery of the state level services and the point that I, where I arrived at the position that I have taken was actually at the end of doing the education review and I have said this before in the House but I think it's a time to repeat it, just very briefly, was that because of our exclusion and our isolation our children were not being delivered the same funding opportunities or services or programs in relation to education and in fact there was an administrative firewall in place and that is something that when we speak to the Commonwealth we need to ensure is removed, because in fact we will still be a territory, we are not integrating into NSW and so we shouldn't make an automatic assumption that our school will be a DEC school, but if the intent, and I believe it is, the intent of the Australian Government policy is all around inclusiveness and so where NICS is now affiliated, administrative firewall goes as well, our children receive all the same funding rights they will through the taxation and the delivery of the state level services as well. Now the states under the amending legislation are not obliged, are not obliged to deliver those services, so what we are having to come back to do, is ensuring that the people at the table, and it will be the Advisory Council at this time, negotiate on behalf of the community the very best deal that they can for the community and ensure that the pieces of legislation that relate to the extension of services around education are picked up in the first tranche of NSW legislation that needs to be examined and adopted, copied by the Commonwealth and extended out here. So that is just one area, health is a complex area as well which we haven't had that relationship until Minister Sheridan was progressive enough to push with the past, before it was Owen Walsh who was the Administrator at the time, and Marie Bahir and raised the seriousness of our situation and our capacity or incapacity or difficulty with delivering health services was identified. And as the concept of the whole mental health issue awareness was raised around that, profile was raised, disabilities, children with disabilities, access to services, all these things were starting to come to light, as it was no longer acceptable in a community to just shove those under the table and say that what we deliver is enough, in fact the gap was starting to widen beyond an acceptable level, was my opinion, and the opinion of many in the community and that the Norfolk Island Government with its limited resources was simply not able to fund the needs of the community and that was particularly in the areas of disability and mental health. So I do appreciate Mr Speakers point around not being able to have direct input or a vote into NSW, so we will not be in the NSW electorate, but who will be responsible for the creation of service delivery arrangements around health and education particularly will be the Commonwealth and what we need to ensure is that contract is in our best interests, in our community's best interests, and that there is a review mechanism, because the last thing that we want is there to be a contract that is 2015 and in 2023 we are still banging at the door saying but NSW wasn't able to supply the full range of services because way back at the beginning when you created the contract you didn't pick up the relevant pieces of NSW legislation. Now obviously legislation evolves and it evolves rapidly around the delivery of education and health. So that is where I, like any member in the community, struggle with the concept of having a period of a non-elected Government, that was number one, but also with having to come to terms within a sense letting go. Letting go around those state level service delivery problems and that was education and health because they were so huge and they were only going to get bigger and we were struggling to update our education legislation as it is, we were unable to consolidate our health legislation. That was something that was put into the Funding Agreement, I think that the Commonwealth and the bureaucracy have given the Norfolk Island Government

every chance, every opportunity to demonstrate their capacity to modernise in these areas. So while I certainly acknowledge and hear the concerns of Mr Speaker and I am glad that he has come down on the floor to express those today because it's very important but rather than seeing it as a blocker and stopper and the reason for trying to make this Government decision go away, because as Minister Sheridan says, this is the only model, there will be no cherry picking, this is the decision that has been made, the proposal that is on the table currently before the Federal Parliament, and so I certainly won't be doing anything, and the Chief Minister has referred to the referendum and people need to think very carefully when they make that vote, but I won't be doing anything to try and delay the progress of the reform legislation through the Federal parliament, but I will be speaking with whoever the members of the Advisory Council are to ensure that all of those things are very well understood by those members and that every effort is made, in fact demands are made, to ensure those service delivery contracts are in our community's best interest and are regularly reviewed and there are open and transparent mechanisms around the review and response to those reviews around the two areas that I'm stating education and health. Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker.

MR WARD I would like to make one quick point if I may Mr Deputy Speaker. Just along the lines of what Mrs Ward has referred to there, an interim Council, unelected, shaping the future of this island, is a forerunner to an advisory council, advisory does not get to demand anything, they get to give an opinion, they get to advise, they do not get to demand, and this is one of the key points that we do not get the same level of say as is the case now. Direct say, direct representation of our community and our views. Thank you.

MR BUFFETT If I may Mr Deputy Speaker, I think I would just like to elaborate the matter about education and health that has just been emphasised in the last couple of speakers contributions. At present we meet all of those costs and it's equally known that we are not able to do so in the broad spectrum of things and just using education and health as two examples, there are a number of reasons why our small pool is not able to continue to meet the costs of all of the services within the island, one is that the cost of health services have risen dramatically and on the other side of the ledger our principle industry of tourism is diminished. But the cost of health services are huge. There have been huge advancements in medical technology, medical knowledge, and wonderful things can be done for human beings today to save lives, to prolong lives, to tackle difficulties, of which you, in earlier years, quite simply died. But they are costly, and in the main they are beyond the cost of Mr and Mrs Average, you need to belong to a scheme or an organisation where the costs are shared and we know that in terms of Norfolk Island's health scheme it needs to be propped up from the public purse, now I must say that I don't know of any public health scheme that isn't propped up by Governments, I think that is an accepted arrangement throughout the world. However the difficulty with us is that our public purse is bare and we don't have that capacity to do so. So you will see that we need to look as to how we settle that. In education, probably twenty years ago if you wanted to up the anti about your education needs you brought another hundred exercise books, but today it is much different, it is now entering the information technology age, and really that's been shown in the Australian sphere to be multi-million dollar stuff and we don't have that, in our model we accept, we accept that some things need to go to the Commonwealth, but they are in the Federal sphere, but what we are talking about here are the states sphere, and in our model also, as in all of the other states and territories within Australia the state authority meets those costs but with the assistance, with the assistance of the Federal purse, and just as it happens in other places, it is being sought for here. That doesn't mean that we abolish the process that we have now, it means that we gain further assistance financially in being able to deliver those services exemplified by education and health. So those difficulties that we are having in now meeting in the model that we proposed will be solved, will be solved, because we will have Commonwealth funding to assist it further and we will, and if we use the same model that we have now with NSW be able to benefit from their total spectrum of delivery of education services, just as they deliver in their place to be delivered in our place. So I am trying to emphasise that our proposal will deliver the best that is available in the Australian context of things.

MEMBER(S) Hear hear.

MR BUFFETT Just to use those two examples again, both in education and in health, it deserved some elaboration and I have tried to do so, thank you Mr Deputy Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER Thank you Mr Buffett. Further debate? No further debate, okay. No further debate then I will put the question that the House take note of the statement.

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED

Thank you, the motion is agreed. Thank you.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

It's 12.35pm I think a lunch break be adequate at this stage? 1.45pm the House will resume, one hour and a bit.

RESUMPTION OF SITTING

SPEAKER Honourable Members we resume after our suspension for lunch. We remain at Statements.

MS ADAMS Mr Speaker last Friday 10 April, with your good self in your role of CPA Branch President and Regional Representative for the Australian Region, and Mrs Gaye Evans, Branch Secretary, I attended an **extra-ordinary general meeting of the Australian Region Management Committee** of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association held at the Victorian Parliament in Melbourne. The meeting was convened by the Australian Region Management Committee principally for the purpose of considering a Media Release dated 19 March 2015 sent by myself as Minister for Cultural Heritage and Community Services and Vice President of the CPA Norfolk Island Branch to all CPA Branches in the Commonwealth of Nations. I read into Hansard the Media Release which was the catalyst for the Melbourne meeting. It was titled Will the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association defend the right of the people of Norfolk Island to retain their Parliament and remain a member of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association? And it reads "Less than three hours after the Norfolk Island Parliament voted on 18 March 2015 to hold a referendum to give the people of Norfolk Island a voice in determining their future governance model, Jamie Briggs, Assistant Minister in the Australian Commonwealth Government, rang the Chief Minister to tell him that the Commonwealth Government was removing the Norfolk Island Parliament without first consulting the Norfolk Island community at the ballot box as was requested by over 700 members of the community in their petition to the Federal Parliament last October. This recommendation is arrived at not because of failures of governance but because of a perceived view that the continuation of the Legislative Assembly is an impediment to strengthening the Norfolk Island economy. The date Wednesday 18 March 2015 will go down in the history books as the day the Australian Government indicated its intention to remove the Westminster system of Government in Norfolk Island; a day of shame; a day that will be a blot forever on the history of Australia. Our Island ancestors and our ANZAC and World War 1 veterans will be rolling over in their graves. Prime Minister Abbot speaks of a fair go. Prime Minister Abbot was asked for a "Fair go for Norfolk Island by letter of 10 February 2015. It is most regrettable that history will record that his government is the first since federation - and probably the first in the British Commonwealth - to abolish a democratically elected parliament. Norfolk Island is the homeland of the descendants of the HMAV Bounty "Mutineers" and their Tahitian wives who were moved as a self-governing community by the British Monarch, Queen Victoria, from Pitcairn Island to Norfolk Island in 1856. The British Crown placed Norfolk Island under the authority of the Commonwealth of Australia in 1914. Limited self-government was returned to Norfolk Island in 1979 by Act of the Commonwealth Parliament of Australia (Norfolk Island Act 1979). Since 1981, Norfolk Island has been a loyal and active member of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association (CPA) and is one of the CPA's smallest branches. The Speaker of the current 14th Legislative Assembly of Norfolk Island and

“Father of the House”, the Hon David Buffett AM, is also currently on the Executive Committee of the CPA as a regional representative for the Australian Region. Norfolk Island has contributed many articles to The Parliamentarian over the years, the most recent being “The Commonwealth and Norfolk Island: Bridging the Divide” (Issue 2 of 2014), a noteworthy piece which includes how the Pitcairners who moved to Norfolk Island in 1856 had been the first in the Commonwealth to give women the right to vote, and to make education compulsory in 1838. Other contributions in The Parliamentarian by Norfolk Island can be found at and I give the link. Further information about the Norfolk Island Parliament is at www.norfolkislandparliament.com. Democracy is at Risk on Norfolk Island Is the Norfolk Island Parliament which represents a people who recognised basic rights of equality and education, well ahead of its much larger and more affluent counterparts - a parliament of a diminutive and thus vulnerable size – to be wrested from its people and abolished? Should this abolition be accomplished by the Commonwealth Parliament of Australia (a Parliament which removed itself as a Branch of the CPA effective 31 December 2012), Norfolk Island will no longer be eligible for membership of the CPA, not of its choosing, but by the dictate of a larger power. I therefore ask the question – Will the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association defend the right of the people of Norfolk Island to retain their Parliament and remain a member of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association? I invite and welcome any advice that our parliamentary “family” in the CPA can offer to assist Norfolk Island in these challenging times. The meeting in Melbourne afforded Mr Buffett and I the opportunity to provide first hand the facts on what was currently transpiring on Norfolk Island and the intention of the Commonwealth Government to abolish self government and the Legislative Assembly of Norfolk Island without appropriate prior consultation of the Norfolk Island community at the ballot box. The meeting was represented by all of the Australian States and Territories CPA Branches, either personally or by teleconference, and I extend on behalf of the Norfolk Island delegation our sincere thanks to the Australian Region Management Committee for facilitating this meeting at short notice and for the resolution agreed by the Committee at the meeting. I will now read into Hansard a letter dated 14 April 2015 received this morning addressed to the Hon Jamie Briggs MP, Assistant Minister for Infrastructure and Regional Development, Parliament House, Canberra ACT 2600. Dear Minister at a meeting of the Australian Region Management Committee of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association (CPA) held in Melbourne on Friday 10 April 2015 it was resolved that I write to you concerning the Commonwealth Government’s proposal to abolish the Norfolk Island Legislative Assembly. The resolution agreed to was in the following terms “ That the Australian region of the CPA 1) Notes that on 1 December 2014 a Petition was presented in the House of Representatives (votes and proceedings No. 88 page 102 1) signed by 834 citizens asking that before voting on any Bill to change governance arrangements for Norfolk Island that the residents of Norfolk Island have the right to be provided with the facts and consulted at referendum or plebiscite and have a democratic say on the future model of governance for Norfolk Island before any proposed changes are voted on by the House, and on 18 November 2014 a Petition was presented to the Senate (Journals of the Senate No. 65 page 1784) from 830 petitioners requesting that the Senate not vote on any Bill to change governance arrangements for Norfolk Island prior to consultation with and the consent of the residents of Norfolk Island. 2) Notes that on 18 March 2015 the Norfolk Island Legislative Assembly resolved that a referendum of Norfolk Island residents be undertaken on the following question. Should the people of Norfolk Island have the right to freely determine their political status, their economic, social and cultural development and be consulted at referendum or plebiscite on the future model of governance for Norfolk Island before such changes are acted on by the Australian Parliament. Yes/No. 3) Notes that a referendum will be conducted on 8 May 2015 with that question being put to the residents of Norfolk Island and 4) Calls on the Assistant Minister for Infrastructure and Regional Development not to proceed with the legislation currently before the House of Representatives dealing with this matter until a) The result of the Referendum to be conducted on 8 May 2015 is known and b) Further consultation with the people of Norfolk Island on the proposed governance models for Norfolk Island has been undertaken by the Commonwealth Government”. Yours Sincerely Michelle O’Burn MP, Chair of the Australian Region Management Committee and that letter was dated 14 April, 2015. I am advised by email this morning that a copy of the letter has been emailed on 14 April 2015 to the Minister and a hard copy has been posted in the mail. A copy is also to be sent to CPA Headquarters and the UK CPA Branch. Mr Speaker so that the record is complete as to

what transpired at the Melbourne Meeting I table a copy of the package of material that was provided to all attendees. The package included the Media Release just read, A Fact Sheet titled "Has the Hon Jamie Briggs MP, Assistant Minister for Infrastructure and Regional Development, Misled the Australian Parliament?", and I do believe that appeared in last weekends press and thirdly a Historical Timeline 2015 back to 1979 titled "Self Government on Norfolk Island – To Be Or Not to Be – That is the question" – which documents key milestones in Norfolk's history from 1979 leading up to the present day culminating in a referendum to be held on 8 May 2015 and a copy of the Article titled "The Commonwealth of Australia and Norfolk Island: Bridging the Divide" which was published in Issue 2 of The Parliamentarian in 2014. To conclude Mr Speaker I table a letter received in my office on my return on Saturday. It was received in my office on 8 April a letter to Dr Dennis Jensen MP, Chair of the Standing Committee on Petitions, a letter from Assistant Minister Briggs in which he states it is not his intention to call a referendum or plebiscite on the governance arrangements on Norfolk Island. It is to be hoped Mr Speaker that as a consequence of the resolution of this House on 20 August 2014, the petition to the House of Representatives and a Petition to the Senate from the number of petitioners from Norfolk Island exceeding 800 and the referendum agreed upon by this Parliament on the 15th march 2015 and the letter from the Australian region of the CPA, from that Minister Briggs reports and look further into this matter. Thank you Mr Speaker.

MS ADAMS

Comparison of benefits between Norfolk Island Social Services and Commonwealth Benefits Mr Speaker, I refer to the press release in last weekend's local press titled "Self-Government on Norfolk Island" and I table a copy for inclusion verbatim in Hansard. Mr Speaker I refer to the quotations in my name in the press release which read. 'It must be acknowledged that whilst the Norfolk Island Government did agree to the extension of the Commonwealth's social security and taxation systems on the island, it did so providing there was a net benefit to the Norfolk Island community and taking local circumstances into account. The Australian Government needs to give more than just lip service to the fact that some Norfolk Islanders identify as being of Pitcairn-Norfolk descent and with that comes a distinct culture and traditions that must be respected and treasured. I further quote "In 2013 I requested a review to be undertaken by a working group to provide a comparison of the Norfolk Island social services benefits against those of the Commonwealth. For two years we have awaited in good faith for the time that the Norfolk Island and Commonwealth Governments would discuss and negotiate transition arrangements. Regrettably that time has not come, despite repeated requests for this from Norfolk Island. The working group aimed to ascertain where members of the Norfolk Island community may not be captured positively in the integration process. Mr Speaker in the press release I referred the community to the online report titled "Comparison of Benefits between Norfolk Island Social Services and Commonwealth Benefits" and suggested the document may assist them in formulating questions when meeting with Commonwealth Officers on island this week. Whilst the report is available on line, anyone requiring a copy is welcome to contact secretary@assembly.gov.nf or phone 22003 and a copy can be provided electronically. Mr Speaker for the record I again table for inclusion in Hansard my letter of 12 November 2013 to Assistant Minister Briggs and Minister for Health the Hon Peter Dutton in which I raised the decoupling of taxation and social welfare in line with the recommendation of the Commonwealth initiated Economic Development Report by Acil Tasman (March 2012); Dr Fogarty the author of that report having recommended the development of a tiered strategy for reform; phase 1 being immediate measures be taken to improve community welfare; phase 2 being continued implementation of a microeconomic reform agenda to bring competition and transparency to the Norfolk Island economy; and phase 3 being the resolution of the long term taxation and funding arrangements for Norfolk Island. This involves either the staged integration of Norfolk Island into the Australian tax system, or the development of an alternative mechanism for providing financial support for Norfolk Island. At that time in 2013 I sought urgent dialogue with the Federal Ministers on the matters raised in my letter and have continued to do so since that time, but regrettably this dialogue never occurred and the Acil Tasman recommendations seemingly ignored. Mr Speaker I also table for inclusion in Hansard my letter of 11 December 2014 to the Administrator copied to Senator Seselja in which I again raised the urgent need to "have a shop front" in the Burnt Pine CBD with Commonwealth officers being available to explain the operation of social services and taxation in Australia and how the extension of these systems to Norfolk Island will impact on each individual. I am pleased that they have taken

up this suggestion. For the listening public if the consultation process and Commonwealth Fact Sheets have not yet provided you with satisfactory answers to these questions and the concerns that you have, and there must be many do continue to press the Commonwealth to provide you with the answers. Do not let yourselves be bobbed off by glib words. Press for the answers. Thank you Mr Speaker.

MESSAGE NO 24 – OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

SPEAKER It reads Norfolk Island Act 1979 – preservation of proposed laws for the pleasure of the Governor General. It is hereby notified that on the 31st March 2015 acting pursuant to Section 21 of the Norfolk Island Act 1979 I reserve the following proposed laws passed by the Legislative Assembly for the pleasure of the Governor General. The Message is dated the 14th April 2015 and the legislation is Community Title Bill 2015, Community Title (Consequential Provisions) Bill 2015. The Message is signed Gary Hardgrave, Administrator.

REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

SPEAKER There are no Reports from Standing Committees Honourable Members. We commence at Notices. We have no formal Notices given but there are two matters which I understand leave will be sought. Endorsement of Report, Minister for the Environment, would you care to speak now please.

NOTICES

ENDORSEMENT OF REPORT – MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT'S RESPONSE TO THE SAFER ROAD TRAVEL ON NORFOLK ISLAND: DEVELOPING A ROAD SAFETY STRATEGY FOR 2014-2016

MR WARD Mr Speaker I seek leave to move the foreshadowed Motion in respect of my response to the Ian J. Faulk's Road Safety Report.

SPEAKER Thank you. Could you read it and identify it so that Members can make their decision knowing what it is.

MR WARD Mr Speaker I move that this House endorse the Minister for the Environment's response to the Ian J. Faulk's Report – "Safer Road Travel on Norfolk Island: Developing a road Safety Strategy for 2014-2016 tabled on 17 September 2014.

SPEAKER Thank you. Honourable Members that is the Motion for which leave is sought. Is leave granted? Leave is granted

MR WARD Thank you Mr Speaker. On the 17th September 2014 I tabled a Norfolk Island Road Safety Strategy titled "Safer Road Travel on Norfolk Island: Developing a Road Safety Strategy for 2014-2016". The report was researched and compiled by consultant road safety specialist Mr Ian J. Faulks. The development of this strategy was a Norfolk Island Road Safety Committee and Norfolk Island Government initiative that subsequently received support funding from the Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development through the office of the Administrator. The brief for this project was to develop a road safety strategy that is relevant to Norfolk Island conditions, rather than merely lifting concepts from other jurisdictions then trying to adapt them to Norfolk Island. Mr Faulks undertook this localising aspect extremely well. While I personally prefer retaining an uncomplicated way of life, including not imposing mainland jurisdiction limitations, there is a strongly held view in some external circles that Norfolk Island traffic laws are inadequate, and unfortunately statistics support their argument in some spheres. Mr Faulks did a superb job of addressing the areas of concern without trying to impose unrealistic or unworkable controls onto this community. Mr Speaker I am bringing this report to the attention of members today because I believe, given the recent constitutional move by the Commonwealth, this report deserves more than merely being on the public record – it should have the status of having been endorsed by this Assembly. However we need also to factor

into the report from the Impact of Bills Committee which differs from Mr Faulk's on one key point, the transition to 0.05 blood alcohol level. Having regard to the finding of the Impact of Bills Committee around this point I am not seeking their endorsement on this point of difference, that is not seeking Members endorsement on that point of difference. Without doubt road safety will continue to be on the agenda of the Commonwealth reformists. As we discussed this morning blanket extension of New South Wales traffic legislation would be an impractical and retrograde step for this community in many ways. For example: Most vehicles on our roads today are Japanese domestic models that are totally appropriate for our conditions, but are not Australian design rule compliant. Even if a new authority allowed existing registered noncompliant vehicles to continue, the economic impact of not being able to access this low cost source of vehicles would be significant and would eliminate a significant recycling contribution this island makes to global resources. Driver licencing provisions would change with provisions such as learners permits for 15 year olds becoming a thing of the past. Registration requirements and costs could be as prescribed by New South Wales – a jurisdiction with multi-lane roads and highways. Mr Speaker I might skip to the recommendations rather than boring the House with all the details that we have all had ample opportunity to read. Recommendation 1) and I should mention that the Recommendations weren't numbered in the Faulk's Report but I have numbered them here for the convenience of ease of reference. **Recommendation 1)** The collation and reporting by annual publication of statistics for road safety performance on Norfolk Island, and the reporting on the general operation of the road transport system; I have agreed with this. This will enable the Norfolk Island community Road Safety Committee, Norfolk Island Police and Emergency Services and the legislating body to have a better understanding of crashes and risks on Norfolk Island **Recommendation 2)** The continued use of the Road Safety Committee and the Youth Assembly as the primary consultative mechanisms to address road safety issues on Norfolk Island; I have agreed to this. The Road Safety Committee and the youth Assembly have been productive and meaningful mechanisms to the relevant Minister for the Norfolk Island Government and in turn the Legislative Assembly of Norfolk Island on road safety measures. **Recommendation 3)**A focus on drink driving by Norfolk Island residents and visitors, particularly drink driving at excessively high blood alcohol levels (over 0.15 BAC); I have agreed. The statistics on accidents at the .15 BAC level and over is alarming. In accordance with Recommendation 2 above advice to be sought from the Road Safety Committee, Youth Assembly, Administration, Norfolk Island Police and the Liquor Licencing Committee to provide advice on the best way to address and educate on this matter. **Recommendation 4)** Addressing drink driving in the context of a general public health strategy relating to alcohol use on Norfolk Island, including responsible service of alcohol in licensed premises, provision of alternative transport (shuttle bus), and development of health and judicial interventions for problem drinkers; I have agreed to this recommendation. I am a strong believer that education campaigns play a vital role in the change of community behaviour, not just penalties and enforcement in legislation. The recommendation also aligns with Recommendation 4 and 5 of the Impact of Bills and Subordinate Legislation Committee March 2015 report to the parliament. **Recommendation 5)** The need for targeted enforcement of occupant protection for vehicle occupants on Norfolk Island, particularly for children and adults as passengers riding on vehicle tray backs; I have agreed in principal. I support the current law that allows the carriage of passengers on traybacks if they are seated and the tray has a minimum 150 mm height. Just for clarity there Mr Speaker, that height refers to the sides of the tray rather than the floor of the tray. The argument raised in the Faulk's Report that the driver should be subject to a higher penalty for exceeding the speed limit when carried unrestrained passengers on a vehicle trayback has in principal support. **Recommendation 6)** Ensuring that driver information, training and testing on Norfolk Island is adequate for all drivers, including novice drivers and riders, older drivers, and visitors to the island; I have agreed to this recommendation. Driver information, training and testing are clearly core elements for driver and community safety. **Recommendation 7)** Introducing a traffic offenders intervention as a pre-sentencing option for use by magistrates on Norfolk Island in determining appropriate punishment for traffic offences; I have agreed this recommendation. Pre-sentencing options are successfully used in other jurisdictions and consideration should be given to utilize these provisions in Norfolk Island. **Recommendation 8)** Using school-based education and public education and awareness interventions to: (a) challenge values held by some members of the community that support or promote inappropriate and unsafe road use on Norfolk Island, and (b) to

promote the positive benefits of safer road use for the island community and for visitors; I have agreed this recommendation. As previously mentioned I'm a strong believer in education campaigns to change community behaviour, ensuring that the education and awareness interventions are aimed at both youth through the local school, and the wider community I feel will have a greater chance of success, rather than aiming at one of those groups only. **Recommendation 9)** Preserving the "country lanes" aspect of Norfolk Island roads where the road itself is "self enforcing" for low vehicles speeds, while improving the roads to reflect Australian standards; I have agreed this recommendation. An excellent example of the recommendation that considers the unique environment and circumstances of Norfolk Island whilst also taking safety into account. Anecdotal evidence from the community would indicate that most would be pleased to see improved roads on the island. The country lanes aspect of Norfolk Island roads is appealing to visitors and residents alike. **Recommendation 10)** Conduct and maintain a road safety audit of the Norfolk Island road transport system, including signage, lane markings and other road markings; I have agreed this recommendation in principal. All efforts to undertake and maintain audit have my principal support. **Recommendation 11)** Identification and rectification of hazardous roadside infrastructure through replacement, relocation, and provision of barrier protection; I have agreed this recommendation. Efforts to improve safety have my support taking local conditions and budgetary measures into account. **Recommendation 12)** Ensuring high drop locations within the Norfolk Island road network are provided with adequate roadside barrier protection systems; I have agreed this recommendations. Measures to address community and visitor safety are paramount. **Recommendation 13)** Ensuring that where the Norfolk Island road network is adjacent to vulnerable venues or sites there is provision of appropriate and adequate roadside barrier protection systems (e.g., in the Kingston and Arthur's Vale Historic Area, KAVHA, as well as specific locations such as Bloody Bridge); I have agreed this recommendation. Some of these matters have already been addressed in recent works, for example the Water Mill Dam barrier and other areas need to be identified and addressed. **Recommendation 14)** Passage of a legislative reform package that includes, but is not necessarily limited to: (a) introduction of a lower legal blood alcohol level of 0.05, commensurate to other Australian jurisdictions, and providing for a mandatory requirement for drivers to submit to alcohol and drug screening as directed by police; I have disagreed with this recommendation. Having regard to Recommendation 2 of a March 2015 Impact of Bills and Subordinate Legislation Committee Report to the Parliament review of the impact of introducing the Traffic Amendment Bill 2014 Recommendation 2 of the committee: The prescribed alcohol content be maintained at the existing threshold of 0.08 and not be adjusted until historical information demonstrates a need to do so. (b) provision of a general power for police to stop vehicles, without prior suspicion of an offence occurring; I have agreed this recommendation. I believe it is important to provide Police Officers with the relevant tools and powers to undertake their roles and responsibilities. This matter has been raised by previous Officers in charge of the Police as a matter of concern and restriction to the Norfolk Island Police. (c) review and reform of the compulsory third party (CTP) insurance scheme on Norfolk Island to address issues relating to the availability of insurance for personal liability for all road users, and the viability of the CTP scheme; I have agreed this recommendation in principal. This is a complex matter involving insurance companies and agents and needs further consultation with stakeholders. (d) reform to the driver licensing law to allow for recognition of non-Norfolk Island learner and provisional (probationary) driver licences; I have agreed this recommendation. This is currently being considered in proposed amendments for the Traffic Act 2010 with other amendments. (e) development of a specification for vehicle standards – derived from Australian standards, as modified for use on the island – for vehicles imported onto Norfolk Island, based on what is considered acceptable for importation and use within the island's road transport system. I have agreed this recommendation. A considerable number of vehicles on Norfolk Island roads today are Japanese domestic models that are appropriate for our conditions but are not Australian design rule compliant. If a new authority did not allow the registering of such vehicles to continue the economic impact of not being able to access this low cost sorts of vehicles would be significant and would eliminate a significant recycling contribution this island makes. Thank you Mr Speaker and Members of the House.

SPEAKER

the question that the Motion be agreed to.

Thank you Minister Ward. Further debate on

MRS WARD Thank you Mr Speaker. Through you I would just like the Minister to know and why I'll be abstaining on this Motion. I do note that it is the Minister's response to the Ian Faulk's Report. It's not a Norfolk Island government policy position. It is a Norfolk centric report, the Ian Faulk's Report. I agree, strongly agree with some of the points that the Minister has agreed with, the recommendations and not with other, and I think because clearly there is no intent for the Government to deliver on the milestone which is the harmonization of the Road Traffic legislation, I don't believe that it's going to have a great impact either way on how we vote today. However, it is an ongoing issue. The points around the culture of drinking and taking drugs and driving are of course a public health concern, it's a broader concern, so it needs a lot more examination. That's where I do agree about public education in dealing with that holistically. The Ian Faulk's Report was a reaction to a community who had said it's not our rights to drive, it's a privilege to drive, is the people have a right, the other road users have a right to be safe on the roads. So that big community consultation and the meeting that took place last year was based around that. Obviously Ian Faulk's went a lot further and dealt with points that the Minister has just read out. I won't repeat those, but there are funding implications to that. So it's a broader picture and also there will need to be the examination around the availability of grants to, as we enter into the new world of having access to these grants to adequately deal with what we call black spots here, are called black spots on the mainland and here we certainly have them. We know at Middlegate crossroads and Mission Road. So my abstention is certainly not intended to offend the Minister, it is just that I still have questions. I can't endorse his position on every response to every recommendation at this stage. Thank you.

MR NOBBS Thank you Mr Speaker. I can't support this, mainly because I've got a couple of problems with it. The first one is really that it doesn't really cover illicit drugs and this has been a proven issue, and it was not covered in any great detail by Mr Faulk's and so I guess on the report that the Minister's made he'd be quite in his place to not really referring to it but I find that difficult and I also have no intention to support it on the basis of the random testing powers being given openly to the Police, without even at least suspecting that the driver has committed an offence. Those are the couple of points that I have. The first one is that it could be added in in relation, because I think that it has proven subsequent to the Faulk's Report on the local scene under fairly difficult issues, the illicit drugs, and also, but in reality I can't support random testing powers at this stage and I'll be dealing with those a bit latter on. So except for that one point and maybe half a point I can't put my name to support it. I'm sorry.

CHIEF MINISTER Thank you Mr Speaker. I made some quite detailed comments previously on the Report when it was first submitted. I have some concerns with it but nevertheless I appreciate that we have to expect reforms and changes and this indicates that we are prepared to continue to do so by the acceptance of this report, and I compliment Minister Ward on his efforts to bring this to finality at this time. It indicates also that we are prepared to move forward. There are some concerns, vehicle imports as Minister Ward has mentioned on imported vehicles from Asia, the age of youth for retaining their licences and the recommendation by others that Norfolk Island's road laws be harmonized with those of NSW which is impossible. It can't be agreed to. But nevertheless I think what Minister Ward has endeavoured to do is commendable. He has I think in other areas addressed the issue of both blood alcohol and drug testing and I think under the circumstances that the report should be noted and endorsed and I will certainly support the Motion. Thank you Mr Speaker.

SPEAKER Further debate. No further debate. Then I'll put that question to you. Mrs Ward has just left the House but I'm going to record her abstention which she earlier indicated. Honourable Members the question is that the Motion be agreed.

QUESTION PUT

SPEAKER Mr Nobbs is No – do you wish to have the House called Mr Nobbs.

MR NOBBS

No.

QUESTION AGREED
MR NOBBS VOTED NO
MRS WARD ABSTAINED

SPEAKER

Mr Nobbs is against and Mrs Ward is an abstention. The Motion is carried Honourable Members. The next is a Motion again where Leave must be sought

PLANNING ACT 2002 – PORTION 21B2 SELWYN PINE ROAD

SPEAKER

Minister Ward in your direction again please.

MR WARD

Thank you Mr Speaker. I seek leave to move the foreshadowed Motion in respect of an amendment to the Planning Act.

SPEAKER

It's a fairly lengthy Motion. Are Members comfortable that they understand what that Motion is about. Is Leave granted Honourable Members. In that context is leave granted.

MR WARD

Thank you Mr Speaker.

SPEAKER

Mrs Ward we recorded your abstention in respect of that matter earlier.

MRS WARD

Thank you Mr Speaker.

MR WARD

Mr Speaker I'm a little bit confused here now that you've asked that this be not read out. Perhaps I'll just explain that this Motion

SPEAKER

I'm very happy for you to move the Motion in that context. I was trying to prevent it having to be done twice because I wanted to ensure that Members knew what the Motion was about before they considered the matter of leave. We've covered that and if you would like to use those words there, that would be appropriate. Mr Speaker I move that in accordance with Subsection 12 (4) of the Planning Act 2002 this House resolves to make a determination to approve the draft plan laid before this House being a proposed amendment to Schedule 2 of the Norfolk Island Plan (as amended), and that, if the decision is to approve the draft plan, for the purposes of subsection 13(1) of the Planning Act 2002, the date of commencement of the approved plan be 24 April 2015.

The aim and intent of this Plan is to allow for a subdivision of Portion 21b2 Selwyn Pine Road into two portions, one with an area of 8,000 sqm and one with an area of 3,360 sqm. The inclusion of this subdivision in Schedule 2 of the Norfolk Island Plan would have the effect of allowing for the creation of two portions, one with an area smaller than the standard minimum area required under clause 16(1)(a) of the Norfolk Island Plan (as amended), in accordance with Development Application (DA) 0041/14, which may be determined subject to approval of this draft plan. Mr Speaker the purpose of this is to allow a property as is stated in Selwyn Pine Road to be subdivided under the terms of a Will of a deceased person and to allow one of the beneficiaries named under that Will to retain a portion of the property and allowing the remainder of that property to be sold or otherwise disposed of as the Estate sees fit. I commend this Bill to the House.

MR NOBBS

I just seem to be no today but I mentioned this to Members yesterday that I can't support this Motion. I've been in the House here, not on this occasion but previous occasions where we knocked back applicants on virtually similar arrangements and we've even discouraged people from even thinking about doing it. So I can't know turn around and say that we've got to, that I will support something like this. I know the circumstances, I appreciate the issues completely with it and it's to me, it is something that has to be addressed and it's something that we have ducked around I believe and it goes to

the heart of the thing when we have allowed people to construct two residences on the one block. This hasn't happened in this case but that's something that I believe we should consider and if that's to continue well we should allow for subdivision arrangements to occur in the event that something happens with the arrangement, or the person dies, and leaves one to one and one to the other, all those circumstances. To do this behind, not behind closed doors but to do it this way. I just honestly can't support it. I'm sorry about that and I'm sorry to the family concerned, but there is more in it that what one application is involved in. Thank you Mr Speaker.

MRS WARD Thank you Mr Speaker. May I just let the Minister know I will be supporting the Motion. There is certainly a shift in policy around the table. I understand that family's have had similar applications rejected in past years but every Government has the right. In fact it is incumbent upon them to review their policy positions over the years, and this is not different. I think that it's appropriate to add at this stage that in terms of a review of the Plan which will be coming up and is in fact due is that the issue of rural land and tenure, coupled with subdivision restrictions and municipal rates is something that will need to be explored further. So that will be dealt with then, but in this case and the Minister can clarify this agreeing to this is putting it in to Schedule 2 which then allows the planning application to proceed. That isn't ticking the box today, it's similar to how we deal with immigration. This is just allowing people through to the next stage and it will be dealt with through the appropriate planning processes. Thank you Mr Speaker.

MR PORTER Thank you Mr Speaker. I would support the Motion because refusing this application on previous history would be a high cost for these particular people to pay given that in the adjacent area there are ample evidence of blocks subdivided to this level or smaller, and I noted the Minister's comment that a provision in this subdivision would be that the undersized block would be prohibited from the dual occupancy or dual residence rule, which I believe is the bigger, perhaps what Mr Nobbs was alluding to is a bigger problem for the orderly development of the island or controlled development of the island, than allowing this particular subdivision..

MR WARD Mr Speaker just to assist members a little. The planning process as it stands sets specific criteria for different zones as to what can be done with a particular piece of land. Ultimately it's the potential usage of that land that is affected by subdivision. In this case the undersized portion that would result from the subdivision has this restriction on it that prohibits the development of a second dwelling on the property. The effect is there would be no on ground impacts from this subdivision. There would be no change to the existing structures and usage of the property from that which is occurring today. So each application is assessed on its merits. The Planning Officer has covered the issue of precedence very thoroughly and each application has its own merits on the issues and I certainly have no problem with agreeing with this one. Thank you.

MS ADAMS Thank you Mr Speaker. I have a difficulty with this one and I share Mr Nobbs' thoughts because this Parliament on previous occasions and on similar grounds has said no, but I understand the circumstances here and I'm going to support the Motion on the clear basis that Minister Ward will revisit those ones that earlier Parliament's have denied that are on similar grounds of allowing people to use their land to their full potential to see whether justice was denied those people on the grounds of what's been done today. I'm only agreeing on that condition, that you really look back and just see whether justice was denied to people on similar grounds or in conflict on what we are agreeing here today, and if they can be remedied that they be encouraged to do so..

MR NOBBS I just suggest that, that's fine but the issue really is about the land in general and the future for other people as well on that area, and there is some fairly. Some blocks here have been subdivided in a long thin strips. They've become quite useless, they are overgrown with noxious weeds which we're supposed to control. They are not producing anything of value. I would have thought that the subdivision of hillsides and that sort of land which is obviously not useful for building would make, a consolidation of those types of blocks, may be the way to go, but that's only my thinking on it and I'm just looking at specific areas that maybe that land may be better off sold off and the people using

the money to buy areas that are more suitable to subdivide for. That's the plan and I would think if your looking at a review of the plan something along that line should be considered. It mightn't be acceptable but it certainly, to the general public but it's an option, and I don't think we can keep going on just splitting up blocks here and splitting up blocks there if you want to maintain the rural ambience of Norfolk Island or parts of Norfolk Island. Let's put it that way and also get the most value out of the land which we are not in parts, we're not getting that. Thank you Mr Speaker.

MR WARD Thank you Mr Speaker. I'd just like to address Mr Nobbs' comments there. I'm certainly well aware of these long narrow strips of land often over hills and valley's that are quite inappropriate, and there has been some instances, in fact they are straight across the road from you Mr Nobbs where people have taken some of these long strips of land, they've worked it out behind the various owners of those blocks and they've reconfigured those properties to make wider, shorter blocks that are more appropriate for the terrain. So the ability is already there within the plan for that sort of thing to happen. Thank you.

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

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED
MR NOBBS VOTED NO

The Ayes have it the Motion is agreed. Mr Nobbs votes no.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

SPEAKER We're resuming debate on the report of Impact of Bills and Subordinate Legislation Committee dated March 2015. The Motion there is that the Report be noted. We're continuing that debate.

MR NOBBS Thank you Mr Speaker. I wasn't prepared for that but anyhow. I'll try.

SPEAKER If you'd like me to see if there are other

MR NOBBS No I'm fine. I think the Members know the Committee was established to investigate the impacts of the proposed amendments to the Traffic Act and the report is nearly, advice for the Legislative Members prior to dealing with the proposed legislation. However in putting this Report together I came to differing views on some points to my three colleagues on the Committee and it is only fair that the reasons be briefly enunciated .first it must be stated and I believe an appreciation and I think you probably did it last time Mr Speaker as Chairman of the Committee of the assistance provided to the Committee by those who gave evidence and also the secretarial support provided by Miss Anita French. After considering the evidence and the views of my colleagues and I respect their opinions, however I reached a differing view after considering the evidence as provided. There appears no other options than providing a dissenting view as has occurred in this report. In my opinion there are four key points which I consider. 1) Is the adequate evidence was not provided to require the change from .08 to .05 which that was not different from the other members of the Committee. The Second point is the current provisions in the Act in relation to initiating a breath test are clear and no evidence was provided to state they were unenforceable, and the same arrangements could be provided for the drug test of a driver, using a different system obviously. There was no clear evidence provided to support the need for random or what is also referred to as road side testing stations. Evidence was however proved to support the introduction of a more appropriate test for drugs. The fourth point was that evidence was provided in relation to the use and inherent dangers to a drivers skill of drugs, and this has been known for some time and there is no compulsive evidence given by introduction of drug testing regime as dealt with earlier in my second point should

be delayed for six months following the commencement of legislation. Again I reiterate that Policing in a very small isolated community is completely different to that within major centres within Australia or New Zealand. Our approach to problems which are generally more clearly visible should be dealt with under community policies. Such community policies should actually be driven by the community and its representatives to provide for Police to operate inclusively within the community whilst maintaining clear objectives and the necessary enforcement arrangements. To me roadside and similar testing arrangements are what is seen as being contrary to such a community process. Thank you Mr Speaker.

MR WARD Thank you Mr Speaker. The Bill which triggered this Report has generated significant interest and in some areas a degree of angst and was presented to the House on the 15th October 2014. The Impact of Bills Committee is a review Committee of this Assembly and the Traffic Amendments Bills was the first to be referred by this 14th legislative Assembly. The Impact of Bills Committee undertook a massive task interviewing a range of stakeholders and ultimately producing a report containing 8 recommendations. As Minister responsible I would like to thank all who were involved in this process. The Committee Chair Mr Buffett and members of the Committee and all from the community who made submission on this matter which is of deep importance to them. The Impact of Bills review process is an important aspect of this legislature. It is a means by which the Norfolk Island community gets to have a say on controversial matters. While the Committee did not support all of the provisions in the Bill referred to it, it has delivered an outcome that members of this community sought. If the changes mooted by the Commonwealth come to pass it will be interesting to see if those who follow us will respect the verdict this process has delivered. In all the Recommendations of the Committee are fair and I am comfortable that a balance has been struck that will allow adequate policing without risking causing the harm so many were concerned about. Thank you Mr Speaker.

SPEAKER Further debate. I will put the question then. The question is that the Report be noted.

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED

ORDER OF THE DAY NO 3 – TRAFFIC AMENDMENT BILL 2014

SPEAKER We're resuming debate on the question that the Bill be amended. Minister Ward you have the call to resume this matter.

MR WARD Thank you Mr Speaker. I seek leave to withdraw the amendments currently before the House and to replace them with the foreshadowed amendments.

SPEAKER Is leave granted honourable Members. Leave is so granted Minister. The amendments are therefore withdrawn Minister Ward.

MR WARD Mr Speaker I move the following amendments dated 14 April 2015 namely 1.)That the title of the Bill be amended to 2015.2.)That clause 2 be replaced by the following — "2.(1) This Act commences on the day on which notification of assent is published in the Gazette. (2) Sections 32C to 32F have effect from the day that is 6 months after the date the Act commences."3.That Item 1 of the Schedule be replaced by the following —"Amend Section 3 At the end of the definition "prescribed concentration of alcohol" insert —"; and any reference in this Act or the regulations to a quantity of grams of alcohol in 100 millilitres of blood is for all purposes the same as if it were expressed as a quantity of grams of alcohol in 210 litres of breath;". 4).Delete Item 2 of the Schedule. 5).Renumber Item 3 of the Schedule as Item 2. 6.)From Item 2, proposed paragraph 32B(1)(b), delete "0.05", substitute: ""0.08". Mr Speaker this BSA has the effect of withdrawing our original Motion of changing the prescribed blood alcohol level. It complies with the recommendations of the Impact of Bills Committee of the recommendations of the

Committee and it provides for the provision of road side breath testing and drug testing as prescribed. The hearsay is pretty self explanatory. Do you wish me to read it out.

SPEAKER Not necessarily unless Members wish to have that so read. I think most are shaking their head.

MR NOBBS Mr Speaker I'm putting up some amendments of my own if I may and I've only just completed them so I couldn't have got them to you last night. I've had to change this around a bit because I keep getting some amended DSA's from the Minister with all due respects Minister. The last one arrived last night.

SPEAKER Let's be clear about this. We have one proposal about amendments. We need to settle that. If you wish to then follow that with another set of amendments we will do that. We can't have two running at the same time without having settled the first.

MR NOBBS I just wanted to explain first about this

SPEAKER Yes by all means do so. But I'm not accepting your amendments at this stage Mr Nobbs. We will need to settle those presented by Minister Ward first and then we will turn to yours. There is no difficulty in you addressing the amendments that are presently in front of us.

MR NOBBS Ok the first amendment, the title of the Bill, that's fine. The second clause arrangements there to be replaced by the following, and I think that it was 1 and 2, I was distracted there at one stage. The Act commences on the date to which notification of the assent is published in the Gazette. I believe that the original should be retained and that is precisely what 2 (1) is of that Mr Speaker. Ok so that if we don't delay the introduction of the drugs business for six months. I think it was a furphy that was put around that they didn't have training and they didn't have enough money and everything. This was identified as a serious issue early last year, if not earlier. I think there have been others that have gone before us. It should be able to be addressed straight away and it should be addressed straight away. That's my view. So that's the second change. The third one is that I agree with what the Minister has proposed, the third clause. In item 1 the first clause is fine, replace the following with Amend Section 3. I've got none there. I then start to, on the original schedule I believe that the illicit drug situation should be dealt with in simple terms, this explicit drugs system should be done in conjunction with the current alcohol provisions, testing for alcohol, of course naturally that you would use this fluid testing arrangement that they have nowadays for those, and therefore under that I delete certain paragraphs in the main schedule. That's the thing you have to go back to the main schedule, the main Traffic Bill, the arrangement is there that all....It appears that everything can be dealt with in 32, that's what my....In paragraph 32 and therefore I would delete paragraph 32 (a). I would utilise some of 32 (b) as 32 (a) and delete those certain subsections which are mentioned in there and replace them with more relevant ones which are 32 (a) 1 would be replaced by just the plain Subsection 32 (3) which exists and then I would delete paragraph 32 (c), I would delete sections of it. I would then also delete all paragraphs 32 d,e,f. Ok? That's how I would do it. It would be far more simple I believe and cover more. The issue really is that I just can't believe that we have to go into all the detail of the division of oral analysis following arrest and all that. It should be covered in one hit, one thing before alcohol, and if it's not covered in the alcohol provisions well we're only covering it in the random drug testing. It should be all done in one amendment. So what I was going to do Mr Speaker was seek an adjournment, that was all. That was what I was hoping, that it be adjourned.

SPEAKER We are continuing to address Minister Ward's amendments at this stage. Thank you for those contributions. Further contributions.

MS ADAMS Thank you Mr Speaker. Working around this policy that we don't do amendments from the floor on the run. This creates a difficulty for me. I was going to myself move an adjournment so that, because this is another policy that we did have in

place when we have substantial amendments around that we will be provided with consolidated versions that included the amendments in it so that we could see absolutely clearly where we were tracking as legislators and that's what we are, we're legislators and I need to know exactly what I'm legislating on as far as this community is concerned. So at the appropriate time unless Mr Nobbs does and of course it lies with the House as to whether or not they agree that it would be my wish that we adjourn until May or such earlier time is needed and we get provided with consolidated version with Mr Nobbs' detail stage amendments and a consolidated version with Minister Ward's amendments in it, and then we will have clearly in front of us....because in this moment in time we've got this great report, and I congratulate the Impact of Bills Committee for their extensive work that they have done but all we've done at this point in time is we have noted this report. We have not gone through and agreed any recommendations nor have we looked at the dissenting report, and so it's a bit of a....The Impact of Bills Report, we've only noted it at this point in time. Not that I'm saying that we must...

SPEAKER

It was presented at the last Sitting

MS ADAMS

That's correct but once again it was only noted. We hadn't gone through and agreed the Committee's Recommendations or Mr Nobbs' dissenting report, they were noted. The Report was noted, and that's what we just reaffirm today. That's my understanding. We have just reaffirmed the Report be noted. I'm just putting that on the table for consideration Mr Speaker but that's what would be my preference so that I'm quite clear on what I'm voting on.

MR SHERIDAN

Thank you Mr Speaker. I thought we discussed this yesterday about the Impact of Bills Committee Report and agreed that it was a Report to the House. Ok it's been presented to the House, it's been noted, but it was a Report to the House for our sake advice from the Impact of Bills Committee how they saw fit. I didn't think it was up to the House then to go through each Recommendation and either endorse it or not. The Minister has just gone through the Faulk's Report which the Impact of Bills Committee virtually was, took into consideration when they made their Report. So I don't have a problem with it. I do have a problem with, it's only a small amendment this Traffic Amendment to the legislation and now for people to suggest that we need the Act provided to us with track changes, with this change and then we need it with track changes, with Mr Nobbs' change, we wouldn't know where we're going. We have a DSA here from the Minister which indicates certain things and we've had time to consider that. I wouldn't consider Mr Nobbs at the moment, I wouldn't even consider it at all. He shouldn't even get leave to move it because it changes everything and we're not prepared for it. We don't have the Act in front of us etc, but what I am interested in and we're talking to the Detail Stage Amendment that the Minister has just moved, I appreciate that he's left the prescribed concentration of alcohol at 0.8. He's taken out the 0.5 from the original Bill which is one of the Recommendations from the Impact of Bills Committee was, and then really the only other issue is about the ability for the Police to conduct random breath testing and then it goes on in regards to processes you might say what happens after they provide an oral fluid sample or blood sample etc. I don't have a problem with that. What I do have a problem with is I'm a bit confused. Previously in this sitting we when the Minister tabled his response to the Safer Road Travel on Norfolk Island, the Faulk's Report at Recommendation 14 in the first part of it he's disagreeing with that Recommendation and that's the Recommendation to lower the blood alcohol level of 0.5 which he's taken out of this Bill which is correct and so it refers to .08, but then the second part of that Recommendation 14 "and provides a mandatory requirement for drivers to submit to alcohol and blood screening as directed by Police". That's the power to conduct random breath testing. The Minister's disagreed with that but he still intends to move, well that's what he's moving today. So I'm a bit confused as to the Minister's motives as to what he's actually agreeing to. Does he support the random breath testing as the Bill that we're discussing now? Or doesn't he in accordance with the Recommendation 14 that the House just endorsed and this is the Minister's Recommendations after the Report was tabled, and the Faulk's Report. So just for the Minister to consider that's all. I'm in a difficult position there because I endorse that Report because I saw what he originally....and I agree with that, that he would disagree with that, and now that he's bringing this forward and it really is only about, really for the Police to

conduct random breath testing because Recommendation 14 part B that he's agreed to is a general provision for Police to stop vehicles etc. Now this has always been the belief of the Police that they haven't got the ability to stop a vehicle without reason. He's agreed to that so he's facilitating that, but he's not agreeing to the mandatory requirement for drivers to submit to alcohol and rug screening as directed by the Police. So he's having two bob each way you might say Mr Speaker and I just don't know exactly where he stands in regards to this and it makes it confusing to other Members to fully support the Minister or otherwise.

MR WARD Mr Speaker Recommendation 1 from the Impact of Bills is an RBT provision to provide NI Police the power to require roadside breath testing of a person driving a motor vehicle ???? This Recommendation is an existing component of the Bill before us. It's inclusion provides enforcement Officers the right to stop drivers and require compliance with roadside breath testing requirements. I believe traffic officers should have this clear and unambiguous power to act as needed. I should add here, this measure is not expected to generate the booze bus arrangements that are deemed necessary in other jurisdictions. Recommendation 2 The prescribed alcohol content be maintained that the existing threshold of 0.08 and not be adjusted until historical information demonstrates a need to do so. This recommendation is a the heart of concern for me. It was probably the main reason the Bill was referred to the Impact of Bills. Concerns expressed directly to me and to the Impact of Bills Committee repeatedly highlighted concern around both economic and social impact. As Minister responsible I take the view that lives and safety are the first priority, but welcomed the work of the Impact of Bills Committee who were able to take the time to draw in wide ranging input and review it in depth. I should make mention here that this Impact of Bills referral process is an important component in our democratic process which we should respect. Recommendation 3 was that random breath testing be introduced into the Traffic Act 2010 with a commencement date deferred up to six months to enable the Norfolk Island Police to make necessary compliance arrangements. We could have done as Mr Nobbs has suggested and just had the commencement starting with the commencement of the Bill, not the Act. What would that achieve really? If the Police need this six months to get compliance arrangements in place then it's not a difficult thing for us to give it to them. This recommendation is a component of the Bill and sadly as occasionally necessary with professional advice highlighting a massive increase, risk factor in drag and alcohol use which is combined. Recommendation 4-8 we don't really need to look at in this context. If that helps Members well and good.

MS ADAMS Just very briefly thank you Minister Sheridan. I hadn't meant the Traffic Act per se, meaning the Bill. That's all.

SPEAKER May I remind Members that the amendments that are on the table are those proposed by Minister Ward. That's the set of amendments that are formerly on the table. Mr Nobbs has foreshadowed amendments but they are not yet on the table.

MR NOBBS I move that...

SPEAKER You will not get them past me until we have settled the first matter. I've endeavoured to explain that.

MRS WARD Thank you Mr Speaker. I at this stage prepared to support the Minister's amendment that currently stands before us. I'm probably the one who's done the greater shift in our positioning around this because of course I was prepared to fully support the original Bill. So I've supported that being withdrawn and this Amendment coming in after having sat as part of the Impact of Bills Committee inquiry and listening first hand to people who have come and spoken before the inquiry, and has been pointed out that I've shifted position in two areas and is why I am prepared to support the Minister. If you take a look at the big picture issue we're not trying to comply, the Minister is not trying to comply with the Funding Agreement. So we can set that aside, it's part of why I'm prepared to compromise at this stage, because what is really important is giving the Police the powers to conduct their random breath testing. The compromised positions and the first one for me

was at 2. (2) was that there is effectively a delay or a commencement, six month after the commencement of the Bill to do with drug testing, and the blood sampling of drugs. So where you look at your points of 32 a,b,c,d,e,and f, the points that are being delayed just relate to the drug testing and the blood sampling around drugs. Why am I agreeing to that? Two issues were raised in the Inquiry, one was around the budget implication. There didn't seem to have been an understanding when the budget was being formed to have adequate funds although the Sergeant did say there was a \$200,000 part there that was AFP contribution, but the other, the most important was around the education programme. So having the Police having some time to educate the community. So that was what it was about was a delay to allow some public education to take place. The second where I'm prepared to compromise is, and my compromised position is stated in the report where we have found consensus bar Mr Nobbs who provided a defecting opinion and that's all on the public record, everybody knows that and that's what he's attempting to do now, is push, with all due respect to the Member he is free to day that, but he is trying to have another crack at pushing through his views on the position where as Minister Ward has taken a position and this is the Bill and it's been done through the Legal Services Unit. So the second area that I'm prepared to make a compromise was at Point 6 which was to again if effect delay, the reduction of the blood alcohol level from .08 down to .05. Now last month I was fully supportive of that. Well I thought that's up to the people to educate themselves. I took a pretty hard line position. However, my position has shifted in that area for two main reasons. One is that between that .08 and .05 when you look at the statistics of incidences that's not actually where we have the problem on the island. The readings are far higher is where the incidences are occurring. So that coupled with what were and are undeniable financial impact on business. So that was why I was prepared to make that compromise and the words in the report were, if I can just pull them up were that the prescribed alcohol content be maintained at the existing threshold of 0.008 and not be adjusted until historical information demonstrates a need to do so. So it's just a delay. It's not saying no don't do it. It's just because we understand that we have a depressed economy and a really struggling community out there, in particular the service industry and the restaurants and the licensed cafe's. There was no denying from the information that the business owners provided to the Committee members that there was going to be a financial impact. So to take an interim responsible approach, that was what we did. We coupled that with the fact that the statistics don't demonstrate that the accidents are occurring under .008. so that was a compromised position. That is why I'm prepared to support Minister Ward in his amending Bill today and I will deal with Mr Nobbs' issue when we come to that stage. Thank you Mr Speaker.

MR NOBBS

Thank you. Mrs Ward was speaking about .08 to .05 as if we were going to have all these accidents but the idea is what should happen is that there's a education, a serious education that was supposed to have been done before and it's never been done, serious education. When you talk to people, I don't know whether they are .08 or .07 or .05 or .06 or what they are, until they fall over I supposed but the go is that that's the issue. People have to know have to get to know their capabilities and that's the only way it will come through education, provision of testing arrangements and the whole gambit of it. There will be some that will not take any notice at all, we know that. It's just human nature you call it. So that's the thing. So it's not a done deal at this stage. I think the done deal is dead isn't it?. I'd just like to ask, I've had difficulties with this. It's in relation to 32 d Minister, an arrest following a failed oral test or refusal to submit a test. This is from the Bill which is 2014, the last one. It's going to be changed to 2015. Under 1 a Police Officer may exercise the powers referred to in Subsection 2 in respect of a person if a) it appears to the Officer from one or more oral fluid test carried out under Clause 6 (1) by the Officer that advice by means of which the test was carried out indicates that there may be one or more prescribed illicit drugs present in the persons oral fluid etc etc. Where are we looking at Clause 6 (1), I can't find it. It's on page 4 actually 32 (d) is at the bottom of page 3 and then you go over to page 4. A Police Officer may exercise the power referred to in Subsection 2 in respect of a person, if a) it appears to the Officer on one or more fluid test carried out under Subsection 6 (1) Clause 6 (1) by the Officer that the device etc etc. I was just wondering where 6 (1) is. I can't find it.

MR PORTER

Thank you Mr Speaker. I'd preface this by saying what I've said before. This is about contemporary road safety management. So per se I have no

problem with the legislation but having said that while I understand this action will impact on our payments in regard to the Funding Agreement and as I questioned earlier in today's sitting this impact is serious. Having said that I have spoken before on the fact that the type of change from .08 to .05 has occurred over many years in Australia and as such I believe we need time to adjust here. Couple with that I can't find any conclusive evidence that to lower a limit without properly determined research to prove it is of benefit on Norfolk Island is needed. Even the Police confirm that .08 to .05 reduction at this point in time won't show us any immediate benefit. So having said that I can support the Bill and the Amendments that the Minister is proposing. Thank you.

SPEAKER Any further debate. What we have in front of us honourable Members is the series of amendments proposed by Minister Ward. If there is no further debate in respect of that I proposed to put the Motion to you whether you agree or do not agree to those set of amendments. They are numbered 1-6.

MR WARD Mr Speaker before you progress that I'd just like to table the Detail Stage Amendment to have that on the table.

SPEAKER Thank you.. 1-6 that you earlier read and the one's I've just referred to.

MR WARD As long as the Detail Stage Amendment as provided for this – yes.

SPEAKER Just let me sight that please Minister Ward.

MR WARD Mr Speaker I also table the Explanatory Memorandum.

SPEAKER Thank you. They are the Amendments earlier tabled and the one's that we've been addressing. Any further debate.

MR NOBBS ...put something through which obviously out of kilter with something, I don't know what it is Mr Speaker, but what it's supposed to mean. I think that's quite wrong isn't it? I don't know. You tell me. You've been here a bit longer than me.

SPEAKER As Speaker I am progressing the matters that have been placed before the House. There are processes that are available to you to debate them and you have done that. There are processes available to you in a whole range of things on how you want to proceed or not to proceed. You've got to make the proposals. What I have in front of me at this moment is a set of Amendments and they are progressing at this time, and I'm about to put

MR NOBBS All I can say is that I would suggest that the mistake or whatever it is, is cleared up before we vote on it, that's all I'm suggesting, and I would so move that it be adjourned.

SPEAKER The question therefore is that this matter be adjourned. We now have a proposal from Mr Nobbs.

MR WARD If Mr Nobbs believes that there is a mistake there then certainly it should be reviewed. If there is an inadequacy I'm happy to have that adjourned to a later time.

SPEAKER What I can say to members if there is so called discrepancy in terms of a cross reference, it that's what it is, that can be made by a Speaker's amendment. It doesn't have to hold up that legislation.

MR WARD On that basis Mr Speaker I'd like to move that the Bill as amended be agreed to.

SPEAKER Well we now have a Motion of adjournment. So I will need to put that to you first. The question therefore at this time is that this matter be adjourned and made an Order of the Day for a subsequent day of sitting.

QUESTION PUT

Could the Clerk please call the House.

MR BUFFETT	NO
MR PORTER	NO
MR WARD	NO
MS ADAMS	AYE
MR SNELL	AYE
MR NOBBS	AYE
MRS WARD	NO
MR EVANS	NO
MR SHERIDAN	NO

The result of voting Honourable Members the Aye's 3 the No's 6. The Motion to adjourn is not carried. So we're continuing with this matter and I'm about to put this Motion therefore which is that the amendments be agreed. They are Minister Ward's amendments.

QUESTION PUT

Could the Clerk please call the House.

MR BUFFETT	AYE
MR PORTER	AYE
MR WARD	AYE
MS ADAMS	ABSTAIN
MR SNELL	ABSTAIN
MR NOBBS	NO
MRS WARD	AYE
MR EVANS	AYE
MR SHERIDAN	AYE

The result of voting Honourable Members the Aye's 6 the No's 1 with two abstentions. The Aye's have it. M That set of amendments are agreed. Mr Nobbs this is now your opportunity to move your amendments if you so desire.

MR NOBBS Well Mr Speaker there is only a couple which really area applicable and that's the one's in relation to deleting the deletion of the reference to illicit drugs going alone, and having it combined in 32, that's virtually what it amounts to, of the

SPEAKER Mr Nobbs you need to be specific about the amendments that your proposing to the House. You have circulated a paper. It is itemised 1 – 6. Which of those? All of those?

MR NOBBS All of the above Mr Speaker. Some have been covered in Mr, well it's only a couple, three. Three of those are covered in the Bill that

SPEAKER Then which are your proposals.

MR NOBBS I'm proposing that Clause 2 be changed ok, that's one and then replacing item 2 and 6. So it's two and 6 of that document would be the one's that I propose.

SPEAKER Ok Mr Nobbs' amendments in terms of the paper that he has circulated are item number 2 and item number 6. Debate in respect of those items.

MR NOBBS Thank you Mr Speaker. Item 2 really is that the Act be brought in to force immediately, not the 6 months delay. That's all that is ok? Simple. I believe that if we've got a problem with illicit drugs well let's get into it and deal with it and get the education going and all the other things that are required. Not just having a belting of people. You've got to have education and those sorts of things and provide that. So I mean that's what I believe. The second one really is that it all should be within the one exercise, and if we have not got for alcohol a provision of the blokes to grab a guy who refuses to have a blood test and wheel him around to the hospital, this is for illicit drugs, and get some blood out of him. If we don't have that for alcohol breathalyser why have we got it for the...What I'm saying is why make such a hear and cry about illicit drugs when the same problems will come up and have come up in alcohol situation, and that's what I was suggesting, that it should be combined, that we have the....if somebody who's under the influence of alcohol and they need to take, they can't get the proper test out of him on the breath and they need to take some blood, well they wheel him around to the hospital and he has to submit to a blood test. For alcohol, I can't see where that's provided, but for illicit drugs, it's up there and centre in the thing, which may be needed. I'm not too sure but I would have thought they were much of a muchness. So that's all Mr Speaker.

SPEAKER Thank you. Debate honourable Members. I remind you that the proposed amendments in front of you are numbered 2 and 6 in terms of Mr Nobbs' paper circulated amongst you.

MR SHERIDAN Thank you Mr Speaker. I couldn't support the changes because just saying it's number 2, and that's clause 2 of the Bill remain unchanged. Now that's just been amended by the Minister's Detail Stage Amendment, so is Mr Nobbs saying that Clause 2 remains the same as Minister Ward has just put into the House. If he wants to change it put the words there, not to say it remains unchanged. Because at the moment it's Minister Ward's Detail Stage Amendment that sits in the House. So it's very confusing as Minister Adams' just mentioned before doing these Detail Stage Amendments on the run, just don't work. So I would suggest that, and Mr Nobbs' concerns are such that the drug testing should commence immediately. There has been reasons why it's been delayed for six months and that's because the Police don't have the ability to test for drugs at this point in time. They need to get the equipment and educate the community. So that's a fair enough statement. So it should be six months deference on the commencement of that, and then for Mr Nobbs other stuff saying it should all be consolidated into one or two Clauses, it's all there. It's in about 5 or 6 Clauses but the Explanatory memo says this provision, now this 32 (c) the provision mirrors that to alcohol testing 32 (d) and mirrors a provision for alcohol. So they've got the alcohol wherever they've got the drugs. Mr Nobbs wants to put them into one Clause. What's the bloody difference – none.

MRS WARD I will just say for clarity Mr Speaker that I will not be supporting this Detail Stage Amendment as proposed by Mr Nobbs because No. 2 denies the Police the time that I believe they need to educate the public in relation to drugs and driving while taking illicit drugs and being under the influence of drugs. The second point is No. 6. This is the one that is giving the greater powers to the Police to conducts random breath testing in relation to alcohol immediately. This is the RBT that everybody, not everybody. I shouldn't say that. This is a result of a community that's sick to death of drunk drivers on the road and they want something done about it. So what this is doing is going to act as a very real deterrent. If it passes through all stages now the limit will stay at .08, but over and above that the Police have been given the powers to random breath test and the Police should be funded appropriately to enforce the new law. Thank you Mr Speaker.

MS ADAMS I will be abstaining again as I will not legislate off the floor.

MR SNELL Thank you Mr Speaker There would be no doubt confusion in everybody's mind who is listening this afternoon on this matter, and it's regrettable. However I will also not support the amendments as proposed by Mr Nobbs, because of the very fact that it contradicts what has already been past here this afternoon.

MR WARD Thank you Mr Speaker. I'd just like to address a couple of Mr Nobbs' comments there. Firstly he referred to something along the lines of there being, there is believed to be a big drug problem. I don't know that anyone believes anything in particular along those line but certainly there is an awareness that drugs are used on the island and to what extent doesn't really matter. The law should be there to provide for those circumstances where those things emerge as a problem. Whether there is a need for a wider initiative to educate people about drug use and the dangers and so around that, well that's a matter for the Minister for Health and she may well choose to pick that up. Thank you.

SPEAKER Thank you. Anything further. Ok I think we have exhausted debate in respect of Mr Nobbs' Amendments and I will put the question to you in terms of Mr Nobbs' Amendments. The question is that Mr Nobbs' Amendments be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION NEGATIVED
MS ADAMS ABSTAINED

SPEAKER Do you wish to have the House called Mr Nobbs.

MR NOBBS No I don't think so.

SPEAKER 1 abstention from Minister Adams. The Motion is defeated.

So those Amendments are not agreed. What we have in front of us now are agreed Amendments as moved by Minister Ward. Therefore now I'm progressing beyond that point. We have those Amendments. I'm going to now put to you a Motion that the Clauses as amended be agreed. That is the Amendment that Mr Ward promoted. I put that question Honourable Members. The question is that the Clauses as amended be agreed.

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED

SPEAKER Mr Nobbs Abstains. The Clauses as amended are agreed. We are now going to address the remainder of this Bill, and the question therefore is that the remainder of the Bill be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED

SPEAKER 1 abstention from Minister Adams. The question is agreed. Given all of that I seek a formal Motion please that the Bill with it's amendments be agreed.

MR WARD I so move Mr Speaker.

SPEAKER Thank you. Any final debate on the question that the Bill as amended be agreed.

QUESTION PUT

Are there any abstentions. Please call the House.

MR BUFFETT	AYE
MR PORTER	AYE
MR WARD	AYE
MS ADAMS	ABSTAIN
MR SNELL	AYE
MR NOBBS	ABSTAIN
MRS WARD	AYE

MR EVANS
MR SHERIDAN

AYE
NO

The results of voting Honourable Members the Aye's 6, the No's 1 and 2 abstentions. The Bill is agreed,

STANDARD TIME BILL 2015

SPEAKER We're resuming debate on the question that the Bill be agreed to in principal.

MR SHERIDAN Thank you Mr Speaker. I foreshadowed some Amendments there Mr Speaker and if there is no other debate on the original Bill I'd like to move an Amendment Mr Speaker.

SPEAKER Yes fine.

MR SHERIDAN Mr Speaker I move that the Bill be amended as follows. Paragraph (a) of clause 3, substitute (a) at 200 hours on Sunday 4 October 2015 or". Thank you Mr Speaker. I think I said all of my debate in the House last month. This Detail Stage Amendment has come about because in the original Bill it was to commence on the 5th April and that time has since passed, or at another time that the Administrator so declares. This only changes that date from 5 October which was the end of daylight saving in the Eastern States of Australia to the 4th October 2015 which is the commencement of daylight saving in Australia. Now Mr Speaker that time was chosen because of a couple of factors and that is the process for this Bill, if it's agreed is that it needs to go to the governor General for assent and then once it's assented to there are various people in Australia, the Chief Meteorologist Officer needs to be informed of these things and so it gives people to prepare their documentation from that date onwards with the removal of that 30 minutes and our time zone. So that's just a brief explanation as to why the changes in the commencement date. Other than that Mr Speaker I haven't had any feedback since I tabled this Bill into the House last month. No information either way, whether people support it or disagree with it. So I'll leave it in Members hands to deal with this matter today and see what we can conclude.

SPEAKER Thank you. I'm firstly going to put to you that the Bill be agreed to in principal, then we're going to vote on the Amendments and then we're going to finalize the Bill. The first question to you Honourable Members is that the Bill be agreed to in principal.

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED

I now turn to the Amendments that have been proposed by minister Sheridan. The question in terms of the Amendments are that the Amendments be agreed.

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED

Moving on from that the Clauses as amended be agreed to. I put that question.

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED

We move to the remainder of the Bill being agreed to.

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED

Final Motion then please.

MR SHERIDAN Mr Speaker I move that the Bill as amended be agreed to.

SPEAKER The question is that the Bill as amended be agreed to. I put that question.

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED.

FIXING OF THE NEXT SITTING DAY

MR EVANS Mr Speaker I move that this House at its rising adjourn until Friday the 24th April 2015 at 2.00pm.

SPEAKER Thank you. Members will realize that this is a special sitting to commemorate the 100th Anniversary of the landing at Gallipoli. I put that question to you Honourable Members in terms of the next sitting.

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED

ADJOURNMENT

MR NOBBS I move that the House do now adjourn.

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

MR NOBBS Just a quick one. Mr Speaker I was asked by the Clerk to mention about the special service for ANZAC Day, you've already done that. I just want to say to the community that it's a pretty important day, ANZAC Day this year in particular, not that it's not important every year, but it's really important this year and going back 100 years today we had five Norfolk Islanders on a flotilla of 200 boats in Mudros Harbour on Lemnos Island waiting for the signal which was a bit slow in coming to launch themselves at Gallipoli at what became ANZAC Cove and also Cape Helles. The issue really is 100 years is something to commemorate and I would hope that the community really turns out in force on that morning of the 25th which is Saturday week we're holding the sitting here on the 24th and on the 25th I'd sincerely encourage and hope that people turn out in force. There are people coming from overseas who are relatives of the descendants of the people that were actually serving at Gallipoli and in other areas in the First World War and it's most important I think to turn out, if not for the Dawn Service, if it's too early for you well 11.00am or mid morning service I think they call it would be ideal, just to show your respects because we owe them heaps. Thank you Mr Speaker.

MS ADAMS Thank you Mr Speaker. I seek leave to table a document that I omitted to do in my second Statement this morning entitled "**Comparison of benefits between Norfolk Island Social Services and Commonwealth Benefits Report**" and I seek leave to table that.

SPEAKER That report is so tabled. Thank you.

MS ADAMS Secondly a phone call from a member of the public was relayed to me after the debate on Motion by leave No. 2 in respect of Selwyn Pine Road. It was my intention in saying that asking the Minister that he look back at other subdivisions of similar ilk that have been denied by this Parliament, that's been taken to mean this Parliament only. I'm not talking about that I'm talking across the Parliament's of the Legislative Assembly's that have sat, that have been denied. So I just wanted to make that quite clear.

SPEAKER Thank you. Any further participation in Adjournment debate. The question Honourable Members is that this House do not adjourn.

