MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Deputy President may I point out that the new consideration which is outlined in that letter was bringing forward new facts that were not known at the time that the Policy Committee said no on an earlier occasion, there were new facts that were brought forward and that is why it is being reconsidered, it was not a matter of just rehashing it, it was a matter of examining the new facts that were brought forward.

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Deputy President I do not feel that any additional payment should be made for the period up until 1st January 1980, and to that extent I would support the amendment; however I cannot support the amendment because I do feel that Mr. Bains is entitled to re-negotiation of his contract for the period from 1st January 1980 until, be it the 26th or 28th February - I am sorry that is January 1982 until whichever date the 26th or 28th February 1982, and so I do not propose to support the amendment but in the event that the amendment is not successful I propose to place a further amendment before the meeting.

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Is there any further debate on the first amendment? I put the question...

MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Deputy President, just for the sake of clarity could the amendment be stated to us so that we are clear please.

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: That all the words after 'the period of appointment shall be from 1st January 1980 until 28th February 1982' be omitted.

MR. HOWARD: In other words the amendment has the effect of killing clause 2.
MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Yes.

MR. BUFFETT: Right, thank you.

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: There being no further debate the question is that the amendment be agreed.

Question - put
The House voted:

AYES, 2
Mr. Howard
Mr. Sanders

NOES, 6
Mr. Buffett
Mr. Brown
Mr. Christian-Bailey
Mrs. Gray
Mr. Quintal
Mr. Jackson

Motion negatived.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Deputy President I would like to move another amendment to the motion. I move that the motion be amended by deleting therefrom the date 12th March 1981 and inserting in its place the date 1st January 1982.

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Is there any debate?

MR. BROWN: Mr. Deputy President we are aware that Mr. Bains' contract of appointment had ended by 1st January 1982. I cannot support the proposition that he receive any additional payment up until 1st January 1982 but I feel that as he did agree to stay on after that time it is reasonable to re-negotiate his contract for that subsequent two month period and for that reason I support the motion.

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Buffett.
MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Deputy President I can of course see the reasoning that Mr. Brown has brought forward, however when I addressed the House earlier I did mention the matter of fairness and I think if other officers within the Public Service who in fact are junior to the Chief Administrative Officer, have received this sort of benefit, then I think in fairness we, as good employers so to speak, should take that into account, and I think it is fair that it should be commenced on the same date that the others have commenced, and that date is 12th March as I have earlier proposed, and so I am really supporting a situation which I consider to be fair and I would need to adhere to my point of view which I think pursues the point of fairness.

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Your talking to the amendment?

MR. BUFFETT: No. You have even confused me now Mr. Deputy President.

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Your debate was on the amendment of Mr. Brown's.

MR. BUFFETT: Yes.

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: I was in the two against six minority on the last amendment. I will support this amendment. I am concerned about fairness too. I can see an element of fairness, nevermind how the whole thing ended, in saying that Mr. Bains gets remunerated from 1st January this year at the same rate as a new man who had been hired on that date would have been paid, in fairness I do not think it is fair to the public purse to go back into March of last year and begin paying Mr. Bains more than he contracted for and more than he had already been given rises on. He, as I recall, benefited from a rise above his contract rate, nevermind the superannuation thing, and
I think we have already paid him more than he bargained for. I support Mr. Brown's amendment.

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Any further debate? There being no further debate the question is that the amendment be agreed.

Question - put

The House voted:

AYES, 5
Mr. Howard
Mr. Brown
Mrs. Gray
Mr. Quintal
Mr. Sanders

NOES, 3
Mr. Buffett
Mr. Christian-Bailey
Mr. Jackson

Amendment agreed.

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The main motion as amended, any further debate? Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: I support it as amended and I think we ought to go ahead and vote on it and get back on the air.

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I put the question that the motion as amended be agreed.

Question - put

Motion, as amended, agreed to unanimously.
RESUMPTION OF BROADCAST & RE-ADMITTANCE OF STRANGERS

MESSAGE FROM THE ADMINISTRATOR

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I have to advise that I have received the following message from the Administrator:

Message No. 52 - In accordance with the requirements of section 25 of the Norfolk Island Act 1979 the Administrator recommends the making of the attached Bill entitled An Act to Authorise Additional Expenditure from the Public Account of Norfolk Island for the Service of the Financial Year Ending 30th June 1982, dated this 26th day of February 1982.

PUBLIC ACCOUNT EXPENDITURE BILL (No. 3) 1981-82

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Notice No. 12, Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: I present the Public Account Expenditure Bill (No. 3) of 1981-82, and I move that the Bill be agreed to in principle. I also seek leave of the House for the Bill to proceed through all of its stages at this sitting.

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Is leave granted? Leave is granted Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: The Bill asks the Assembly's authority for money to be spent on a number of matters that have not been provided for in Supply Bills so far this year. Much the largest item is that we have received a Bill from the New South Wales Department of Education for the salaries of teachers which as I understand it, brings us up current to last June 30th once it is paid. That Bill is for $147,500, including the administrative charges that the New South Wales
Department of Education makes, and including $8,000 of school requisites and stationery and so forth that were provided through the New South Wales Department of Education. I should say of that education expense, we really do not have any choice. The teachers have done the work, the New South Wales Department of Education has sent us the bill, we must pay the bill, we must now provide the money for it.

The second largest item is based on a request made by the Executive Member responsible for tourism, among other things, that the Tourist Bureau be granted an additional $20,000 for use in tourist promotion to help in the current downturn in tourism to the Island. I understand that the Tourist Bureau originally presented plans asking for a total of $25,000 between now and 30th June in addition to what they were provided with earlier. The Executive Committee felt that the aspects of the Tourist Bureau's plans which were most directly aimed at getting an increased number of tourists here as quickly as possible should be emphasised and it is the belief of the Executive Member responsible for tourism that $20,000 will go a long way toward helping with that. My understanding is that the money will be spent under his supervision to try to achieve an improvement in tourist numbers as promptly as possible.

The other matters are relatively minor items of additional expense that have become necessary. I am in a position, thanks to a memorandum from the Chief Administrative Officer, to answer, I think, any questions you may have about any of those. If there are any questions I would be happy to try to handle them.

I commend the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Any further debate? Mr. Jackson.

MR. JACKSON: While I support Mr. Howard's proposals, in the past, as a Member of this House, he has always been most cautious when any extra money has been allocated to the Tourist Board. Mr. Kevin Williams has always required balance sheets and details of how
the money was spent. I support the objectives Mr. Howard gave in an attempt to get more tourists to the Island, because I suppose it has the whole community's support. It was only recently however that another substantial grant was given and if we can pursue what Mr. Williams was doing, and get a balance sheet of how the money is spent, I do believe that it would clear the air because the downturn in tourists is so evident. However I can see in the future more requests, perhaps, for financial assistance.

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Any further debate. Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Thank you Mr. Deputy President. In response to what Mr. Jackson has just said I should say that it will be my intention to provide this Assembly with, on a regular basis, the accounts of the Norfolk Island Tourist Bureau so that all Members of the Assembly can see what is being spent and where it is being spent. I am pleased to advise Honourable Members that together with Mr. Christian-Bailey and Mrs. Gray I have attended a number of discussions with members of the Chamber of Commerce, the Accommodation Proprietors Association and the Norfolk Island Tourist Bureau, and have also attended a number of general meetings of the Chamber of Commerce and the A.P.A. We have encouraged these three Organisations to work together in the interests of improving the present position and the future of the Norfolk Island tourist industry, and I am pleased to advise that these Organisations are working together and that a submission endorsed by the Chamber of Commerce and the Accommodation Proprietors Association was presented this week by the Chairman of the Norfolk Island Government Tourist Bureau seeking supply of an additional $25,000 to the Tourist Bureau for the period until 30th June 1982. The Executive Members have not had the opportunity to consider this submission in great depth as yet but because of the recognition of the urgent need to secure tourist funds, supply is being sought for $20,000 today. If supplied this will be spent in consultation with myself and where appropriate with the other Executive Members.
I commend to you the supply of $20,000 for tourism and the remainder of the Bill as put forward by Mr. Howard today.

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Quintal.

MR. QUINTAL: Mr. Deputy President I support the Supply Bill providing funds to enable the Norfolk Island Government Tourist Bureau to secure professional marketing and public relations assistance and advertising and promotion funds. Reading from the recent Select Committee Report on Tourism, which I believe should be adopted by this Assembly, tourism has become so important to Norfolk Island that it should no longer be left to prosper or fade. According to economic conditions and the individual decisions of private entrepreneurs here and overseas the Government must ensure that it understands the tourist industry accurately and keeps its understanding always up to date with new developments. It was recommended in the Select Committee Report that the Tourist Bureau be given the primary responsibility for seeing that this happens, it was also recommended that the Tourist Bureau should take the initiative for putting many of the recommendations into effect if they were approved by the Legislative Assembly. It is my belief that this request for funds to promote tourism is in keeping with a recommendation from the Report which recommends that when Norfolk's tourism is running below the desired level I believe the Bureau should promote Norfolk holidays, and when this is necessary I believe far more substantial sums of public funds should be made available to the Bureau.

I support these views and recommendations. It is also my belief that these are supported by everyone who is effected by this slump in tourist numbers. It is time to begin really promoting the Island now. It is pleasing to learn that apart from this Assembly, funds have been placed by the Chamber of Commerce, the Accommodation Proprietors Association and the Pitcairn Descendants in support of a strong joint promotional campaign. I note also that a general appeal for additional funds will be conducted through the local newspaper. I have been informed that quite a lot of money has already been spent
by the Chamber of Commerce and the A.P.A. on radio, newspaper and magazine advertising and more promotion ideas are being planned.

I support the Supply Bill.

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Any further debate. Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: Just one comment to confirm what Mr. Quintal says about the Select Committee on Tourism's recommendation. The recommendation was that when tourism is down, Government money ought to be spent to help get it back up, and I think we should go ahead and do it.

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mrs. Gray.

MRS. GRAY: Mr. Deputy President, Mr. Howard has taken the words out of my mouth; I was about to quote the Select Committee Report.

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Christian-Bailey.

MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: I support the motion Mr. Deputy President. There is a great awareness on the Island of the need for more promotional efforts and I feel that this is a step in the right direction. I would like to say a little bit more on tourism in adjournment debate.

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Any further debate. There being no further debate the question is that the Bill be agreed to in principle.

Question - put
Motion agreed to unanimously
Leave granted to dispense with the detail stage
Bill (on motion by Mr. Howard) agreed to.
MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Notice No. 13, Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: I present the Public Moneys (Amendment) Bill 1982 and I move that the Bill be agreed to in principle, I also seek leave of the House for the Bill to proceed through all of its stages at this sitting.

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Is leave granted? Leave is granted Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: Thank you. In the Supply Bill at the beginning of the year funds are supplied for all purposes that are considered by the Assembly at that point to be foreseeable and necessary. In addition an advance is made to the Executive Member responsible for finance of $50,000. It is a little bit on the Norfolk Island Administration's scale like handing the Executive Member for finance a large petty cash box which he is allowed to dispense as the year goes along for unforeseen needs that need to be met promptly, he needs to account for those, it is not money that he can spend in any sense frivolously, the spending has to be done with all the proper controls and restraints that apply in the handling of public money.

The Public Moneys Ordinance referred to that advance as the advance to the Chief Minister because the Chief Minister at that time was the Executive Member responsible for finance. With our new Executive arrangements the Chief Minister's position does not exist any more, finance is the responsibility of a separately named Executive Member for Finance and so the purpose of this Bill is simply to change that wording, simply to make it possible for the Executive Member for finance to operate that advance fund in the absence of any Chief Minister.

I commend the Bill.
MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Any further debate? There being no further debate... sorry, Mr. Jackson.

MR. JACKSON: In Division 501 it states that the advance to the Executive Member for expenditure is at the discretion of the Executive Member or of the Chief Administrative Officer as authorised by the Executive Member. Is there any change to the policy of the First Legislative Assembly when authority had to be given by the whole nine Members. What is the position may I ask Mr. Deputy President, what is the situation that exists now and how do you expect to operate on this account?

MR. HOWARD: I am sorry that I cannot give you an accurate answer to that question right now because I do not know the answer myself. I have enquired of the Chief Administrative Officer for clarification on what the restrictions and procedures are in handling that particular advance, I have got some answers but I do not have all the answers. It was my impression originally not that the nine Members had to approve at all, the purpose of the advance in my understanding when the Assembly first began operations two and a half years ago, was that this was a fund that the Chief Minister could allocate for urgent needs on the understanding that an equivalent amount of money had been saved and not spent in some other account. Now it is not clear to me - on my enquiry to the Chief Administrative Officer and the Accountant so far, whether that in fact is the legal case or not, I do not know, it seems to me a good way to operate but I have not yet been given a description of the legalities of the operation of that advance, I of course will use it in accordance with whatever the legalities are, but I am sorry I do not have detail on what they are.

MR. JACKSON: Mr. Howard when the $50,000 Division was in Mr. Buffett's corner you were very strong in debate on this particular issue in the First Legislative Assembly that there was a restriction of $5,000 being spent at one time by the Chief Minister, now you
have given a negative answer that you do not know how you are going to spend it, well is that a satisfactory answer for the Member for finance to give when he has $50,000 at his disposal to play around with by whatever means he desires. You were very strong in the First Legislative Assembly that we place some restrictions on the Chief Minister on how he operates this particular fund.

MR. HOWARD: I was very strong in the First Assembly that that advance be handled in an absolutely correct way according to clearly set out principles, that is exactly the way I intend to handle it - I do not know exactly what those principles are, I have asked for guidance from the Administration.

MR. JACKSON: If you say you will act according to the principles of the First Assembly, those principles were under the policies of the nine elected Members, so how do you intend to operate now when you do not intend to call on the advice of the nine elected Members?

MR. HOWARD: Mr. Jackson's recollection is different from mine. Whatever the legal position is I certainly will conform to it.

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Any further debate? There being no further debate the question is that the Bill be agreed to in principle.

Question - put
Motion agreed to unanimously
Leave granted to dispense with the detail stage
Bill (on motion by Mr. Howard) agreed to.
EVIDENCE (AMENDMENT) BILL 1982

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Notice No. 14, Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Deputy President I present the Evidence (Amendment) Bill 1982 and I move that the Bill be agreed to in principle. I also seek leave of the House for the Bill to proceed through all its stages at this sitting.

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Is leave granted? Leave is granted Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Deputy President this Bill is to amend the Evidence Ordinance, to take into account certain formal changes which have been made in the functions of the Legislative Assembly and the Supreme Court. Those changes basically being, Mr. Deputy President, that we no longer have the offices of Chief Minister and Deputy Chief Minister and we now have more than one Judge of the Supreme Court. So where we used to refer to 'The Judge', we now refer to simply 'Judge'. Those are the major changes which are made, and in addition to that there is a saving provision in relation to Executive Members which reads - "Where an Executive Member has exercised a power under an enactment or performed a function under an enactment which may be exercised or performed by an Executive Member, that Executive Member shall be deemed to have been at the time of his exercise of that power or performance of that function, as the case may be, the Executive Member administering that enactment".

Those are the major changes which are proposed in this Bill Mr. Deputy President.

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Any further debate? There being no further debate the question is that the Bill be agreed to in principle.

Question - put
Motion agreed to unanimously
Leave granted to dispense with the detail stage
Bill (on motion by Mr. Brown) agreed to.
MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Notice No. 15, Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Deputy President I present the Interpretation (Amendment) Bill 1982 and I move that the Bill be agreed to in principle. I also seek leave of the House for the Bill to proceed through all its stages at this sitting.

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Is leave granted? Leave is granted Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Deputy President this Bill is to amend the Interpretation Ordinance to take into account certain formal changes which have been made in the functions of this Legislative Assembly by deleting the terms Chief Minister and Deputy Chief Minister from section 12 and by omitting subsection 2 of section 14(a) in relation to Executive Members. Subsection 2 of section 14(a) reads - "Any power under an enactment that may be exercised or any function under an enactment that may be performed by an Executive Member other than the Executive Member being the Chief Minister, may be exercised or performed by the Executive Member being the Chief Minister". Because we no longer have a person entitled Chief Minister, it is proposed that that subsection be repealed.

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Any further debate? There being no further debate the question is that the Bill be agreed to in principle.

Question - put
Motion agreed to unanimously
Leave granted to dispense with the detail stage
Bill (on motion by Mr. Brown) agreed to.
CRIMINAL LAW (AMENDMENT) BILL 1982

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Notice No. 16, Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Deputy President I present the Criminal Law (Amendment) Bill 1982 and I move that the Bill be agreed to in principle. I also seek leave of the House for the Bill to proceed through all its stages at this sitting.

MR. PRESIDENT: Is leave granted? Leave is granted Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Mr. President during 1981 this Assembly passed the Criminal Law (Amendment) Bill 1981. That Bill has not yet been assented to and certain queries have been raised by the Attorney-General's Department in relation to it. Honourable Members will recall that the purpose of the 1981 Bill was to provide the Norfolk Island Court of Petty Sessions with additional jurisdiction in criminal matters, to enable them to deal with matters which would otherwise need to await the sitting of the Supreme Court. Basically they were matters where it was proposed that if a person is convicted of an offence by virtue of a particular section, he would be liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years or a fine not exceeding $2,000, and the Court of Petty Sessions, subject to the consent of the accused and of the prosecutor, would have the jurisdiction to deal with the matter.

There were three main matters raised by the Attorney-General's Department and these three matters are included in the Bill which is before the House today. The first matter was that the original Bill did not provide for the consent of the prosecutor, it only provided for the consent of the accused, and so we are proposing that section 2 of the Ordinance be amended in subsection (e) by omitting the words "the accused consents to it being so disposed of" and inserting instead "the accused and the prosecutor consent to it being so disposed of".
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The second amendment is that instead of the penalties provided being a term of imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years or a fine not exceeding $2,000 in the event of an adult person, and imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months or a fine not exceeding $500 for a person under the age of 16 years, the Bill before the House today provides for a term of imprisonment not exceeding two years or a fine not exceeding $2,000 or both, and similarly for a person under 16 years, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 6 months or a fine not exceeding $500, or both.

The third matter is that in subsection 4 we were proposing that nothing in this chapter effects the operation of any other law in force in Norfolk Island. The Bill before us today amends that slightly by saying 'nothing in this chapter effects the operation of any other law in force in Norfolk Island by which jurisdiction is conferred on the Court of Petty Sessions'.

Those are relatively minor amendments in the first and the third cases Mr. President; a much more substantial amendment in the second case, where there is provision for in effect a much harsher penalty in that both the fine and the term of imprisonment will be able to be imposed in the event that this Bill is passed, whereas the proposal in the 1981 Bill was either the fine or the term of imprisonment.

MR. PRESIDENT: Further debate. Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: A question or two if I can of Mr. Brown. Did I understand him to say that the Criminal Law (Amendment) Bill that we passed last year had not become law yet, is that right?

MR. BROWN: Yes, Mr. President, that is the situation, and the purpose behind attempting to deal with this Bill as an urgent matter today is to enable both the Criminal Law (Amendment) Bill 1981 and the Criminal Law (Amendment) Bill 1982 to be finalised with the least possible delay.
MR. HOWARD: I am just confused about the terminology here. This Bill is headed 'An Act to Amend the Criminal Law (Amendment) Act 1981' - can we amend something that is not an Act? The Clerk is nodding his head. If we can I am content. Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: Any further debate Honourable Members. The question is that the Bill be agreed to in principle. There being no further debate I put the question.

Question - put

Motion agreed to unanimously

Leave granted to dispense with the detail stage

Bill (on motion by Mr. Jackson) agreed to.

CUSTOMS (AMENDMENT) BILL 1982

MR. PRESIDENT: Notice No.17, Customs (Amendment) Bill 1982, Mr. Sanders.

MR. JACKSON: Mr. President, may I seek clarity on a point of order which I wish to have clarified before Mr. Sanders continues. Can Standing Orders be suspended to allow a Member who is not an Executive Member and who holds no responsibility to move a Bill. Does this mean that the situation has been changed from the First Assembly, that if I wish to move an Act or a Bill before this House in some area of responsibility of an Executive Member, I can do so - I am aware that Mr. Howard is the Executive Member for Customs.

MR. PRESIDENT: There is a Standing Order Mr. Jackson that prevents that from happening. It has been convention nevertheless, you might say that the Executive Members in a given area of responsibility may present a Bill but as I understand the Standing Orders there is no impediment to a private Bill being promoted.
MR. JACKSON: I support the proposal which Mr. Sanders intends to raise but it is just a point that I wish to have clarified, that any Member who holds no responsibility, can introduce a Bill into this House.

MR. PRESIDENT: Private Bills may be promoted by individual Members of the House.

MR. JACKSON: Thank you Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: I present the Customs (Amendment) Bill 1982. I move that the Bill be agreed to in principle.

Mr. President can I speak to the amendment now?

MR. PRESIDENT: Please do.

MR. SANDERS: I wish to speak on the amendment of item 17 in the First Schedule of the Customs Ordinance. Firstly I believe that this Ordinance is very old and obsolete. It has been causing unnecessary hassles with the Customs officials, the Legal Adviser and of course the local farmers who are endeavouring to upgrade their properties and equipment.

As I understand the matter it is with the approval of all parties concerned that this amendment be approved.

I will use this opportunity to mention just a couple of cases, the difficulty with which all parties become dissatisfied.

Item 17 of the Schedule reads "Agricultural machinery, tools and implements and handles for agricultural tools and implements - free; Item 44, Livestock - free; Item 45, Manures and Fertilisers - free; Item 63, Wire Fencing, stranded and barbed and stapled - free; Item 64, Wire Netting, including woven or mesh wire and wire gates - free".
At the moment I believe there is a dispute with Customs over the machine that digs post holes and the posts that go into the holes, without which there is no gate, no fence and obviously no agriculture. Because these items are specifically mentioned, Customs would have them listed under Item 67 which demands a duty of 10%. Obviously if agriculture is to be encouraged in the hope that one day we can support ourselves and particularly if the tourists stop coming, this Ordinance needs amending.

There is another matter just as conflicting as the last which could be better explained by me reading two letters to this House. Mr. President may I read these two letters?

MR. PRESIDENT: Please do Mr. Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: Mr. President the first one is addressed to The Honourable D.E. Buffett, Chief Minister, Legislative Assembly, Norfolk Island - "Dear Sir, I refer to my calling at your office on 15th January 1982 where I requested you to exercise your powers under section 66A of the Schedule to the Customs Ordinance that (1) universal joints for my fertiliser spreader be classed as agricultural equipment; (2) two beehives held by Customs be classed as agricultural equipment.

In the case of the universal joints for the fertiliser spreader, duty of $1.60 has been paid by my wife and I request the immediate refund of these monies. Apart from the fact that these parts are for agricultural purposes, Mr. A. Tavener has fraudulently written a document, the receipt number 11149, and called the parts machinery parts, which is contrary to what the invoice reads. With reference to my beehives, I was informed by Customs that on instructions from the Legal Adviser the goods could not be classed as agricultural because the Ordinance does not say so. I find this truly incredible that an Ordinance can be interpreted in this manner. We are all aware that the Ordinance is obsolete and outdated but surely the intent of such a document must be interpreted to mean all agricultural requisites.

I would appreciate an early reply to this matter so that it
will not be necessary to waste any more of my time on this matter and the health of my bees not be endangered by government policy". Signed W.W. Sanders.

I had a reply - "Dear Mr. Sanders, I am replying to your letter of 19th January 1982 concerning your dealings with Customs. I must say at the outset that I reject totally your imputations of fraud and incompetence against Mr. Tavener and the Legal Adviser. I advise you that both of these officers regard the imputations as defamatory and you may expect that action will be taken by them in that regard.

So far as the question of duty on your universal joints is concerned, I am able to advise you that duty ought not to have been paid. It is unnecessary to debate the issue of whether the goods may be classified as agricultural machinery as since the duty payable was less that $5, they ought to have been admitted free under Item 40 of the Schedule. A cheque will be sent to you refunding the amount of $1.60.

On the question of the beehives I must point out to you that it is not government policy that interferes with the health of your bees but rather the law in the form of the provisions of the Customs Schedule. Whatever may be the intention of the Ordinance if that intention is not expressed in its words it is of no effect. I am advised that as the Ordinance stands, and I agree that it is obsolete and outdated, no provision is made for your beehives, specifically that they do not fall within Item 17, namely agricultural machinery, tools and implements. They are accordingly liable to a duty of 10% under Item 67.

Your remedy if you do not accept the determination of the Collector is clear. You may pay the duty under protest and seek the views of the Court. Upon payment of the duty the beehives will be released to you.

You make reference of Item 66A of the Schedule. The exercise of powers with respect to that item is one that is being pursued but cannot be clarified until early in the life of the new Assembly. For your information I am able to advise you that review of the Customs Schedule is under progress. It may be expected that
the proposed new Schedule will be in a form to be considered by the Legislative Assembly in the near future. Yours faithfully, David Buffett, Chief Minister".

It may be of interest to the House to know that there has never been any doubt in my mind about the competence of our Customs officials. The beehives in question are still in Customs even though the total value is $47 and under Item 40 the duty payable is less than $5.00 and should have been admitted free, even if bees are not agricultural. However the bees for which this housing was meant, if complied to the letter of this antiquated Ordinance, do not exist any more, they are all dead.

I feel with the confusions and the problems that have been occurring between the local farmers and Customs, that this amendment should be passed.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: As the Executive Member with responsibility for Customs, I would have to say that Mr. Sanders has in my opinion put a honey of an argument, and I think we should agree with him.

MR. PRESIDENT: Further debate Honourable Members? Mr. Jackson.

MR. JACKSON: As indicated earlier Mr. President I support the Bill because if the intention is to define what is agricultural and what is not, then that will satisfy the needs of the Customs Department and the community, because there have been some conflicting arguments in the past and if this Bill satisfies everyone then it will clear the air, and I sincerely hope that Max Hobbins does not play the song about the Italian losing his universal joint for his tractor tomorrow morning.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Sanders.
MR. SANDERS: If I can just add something. I had conversations the other day with the Legal Adviser and Mr. Allan Buffett from Customs and I think that they would all be delighted to be able to sort out this thing that has been causing everybody problems.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Christian-Bailey.

MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: Thank you Mr. President. I support the amendment.

Mr. President I wonder whether it would not be a worthwhile amendment to this if the words 'and horticultural' be included so that it reads 'for agricultural and horticultural purposes'.

MR. PRESIDENT: There has been a suggested amendment, and that amendment is without notice I might say. There are normal requirements in respect of placing notice before the House, Mr. Christian-Bailey, so that Members may have some prior notice and so that they may be able to give full consideration to the matter.

Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: It occurs to me that Mr. Sanders' Bill is not an urgent Bill. He has introduced it today, voting on it will have to lie on the table until the next meeting of the House and I wonder if Mr. Christian-Bailey could give notice of that amendment to be moved at the next meeting, that would give us time to find out what the implications are of adding in 'horticultural'. It sounds fine on the surface of it but maybe there are some complications that maybe we ought to look at before we leap.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Sanders.
MR. SANDERS: Mr. President I think I could satisfy Mr. Christian-Bailey by saying that Item 17 will be amended as follows - 'any goods not elsewhere more specifically described being goods which in the Collector’s opinion are intended to be used and will be available to be used for agricultural purposes'. I would assume that would almost cover anything, so long as it was to the satisfaction of the Collector.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Christian-Bailey.

MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: I would have thought that the insertion of the words 'and horticultural' would perhaps spell it out more clearly.

MR. SANDERS: May I ask through the Chair what it would achieve? I thought it was fairly well covered anyhow. The words that are used in this amendment I believe were carefully thought out by all the legal gentlemen on the Island, with the co-operation of the Collector of Customs.

MR. PRESIDENT: Any further debate? Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: I would be glad, between now and the next meeting when the Bill comes through, to enquire of Customs and have them find out whether it would add something worthwhile or whether it would cause problems or whatever.

MR. PRESIDENT: Any further debate?
I just make mention that if the amendment is to be pursued, notice can be given before the matter is finalised in this House, probably at its next sitting, Mr. Christian-Bailey. Would a Member move adjournment of the debate?

Debate (on motion by Mr. Jackson) adjourned.
Resumption of debate made an order of the day for the next sitting.
NEXT SITTING DAY

MR. PRESIDENT: Next sitting day Honourable Members. Mr. Christian-Bailey.

MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: I move that the House at its rising adjourn until Wednesday 7 April 1982 at 2 p.m.

Question - put
Motion agreed to unanimously

ADJOURNMENT

MR. PRESIDENT: Adjournment. Mr. Quintal.

MR. QUINTAL: I move that the House do now adjourn.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that the House do now adjourn. Adjournment debate Honourable Members.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: Thank you Mr. President. In supporting the need for an immediate injection of funds for tourist promotion, I should like to suggest to Honourable Members that we also take a good look at what we are offering for tourists here on the Island. I have always believed that a visitor who goes home happy and impressed with what he has seen is by far the best advertisement. Above all I think we have to show that we care, not only that we care whether or not the tourists are satisfied, but also that we care about our Island itself.

On the first point, we must provide better facilities for the visitor who wants to enjoy Norfolk to the fullest. We should
embark methodically on a programme of establishing roadsigns and walking tracks, seating at lookouts and beauty spots and attractive picnic and barbeque facilities. These things have all been thought of and set up at various stages by individuals, service organisations and the Administration but it has been done in a haphazard fashion. What we need to do is to thoroughly investigate the average tourist's needs in this regard.

Another priority is to re-establish if possible Norfolk's status as a duty free port. It is ridiculous in my view that tourists should arrive here with liquor from airport duty free shops in order to save money. We realise that our customs duties provide much needed revenue but every good businessman knows that when prices are reduced to reasonable and attractive levels, one is amply compensated by the increase in turnover. I have believed for a long time that we should very seriously consider a small capacity public bus service. I am thinking in terms of a bus which criss-crosses the Island every hour or so. There is no need to compete with tour operators but we would be providing a service to the many tourists who do not wish to hire a vehicle but who would like to visit or explore a particular part of the Island, perhaps taking a picnic lunch, perhaps walking to a particular spot and catching the bus back to the hotel, there are many possibilities, a bus service of this sort would not only be a boon to visitors but to many locals as well, it would also help reduce our rapidly mounting traffic and pollution problems, too many cars, visual and noise pollution, these are all things that we are going to have to act on before they become really a serious problem. No-one likes a lot of restrictions but we really must show that we care about keeping Norfolk clean and beautiful. It is within the powers of this Assembly to impose very heavy fines for say littering, such a move can earn us nothing but respect from our visitors. I suspect that it is we locals who are responsible for most of the littering anyway, but we must reduce the number of vehicles, and row upon row of hire cars are very un-Norfolk; we should also be restricting the import of unnecessary high powered vehicles.
In this year of the tree we should also be embarking on a far more vigorous programme of replanting and reafforestation, perhaps visitors could be given the opportunity of planting a pine. Private efforts in beautification should be given far more encouragement by making native seedlings more readily available, and by restricting the free roaming cattle particularly in the commercial area.

There are many other areas for improvement, stricter building codes, better toilet facilities, upgrading of accommodation and other tourist facilities, all these things must go hand in hand with our efforts in promotion overseas. I hope that during the life of this Assembly, this Government will act with initiative and enthusiasm to make this Island a place which we can be proud of and which every tourist will be glad to have visited.

Thank you Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Quintal.

MR. QUINTAL: I think we are all agreed that tourism is the basis of our economy. The majority of the money derived from tourism goes directly to the private sector and a portion of that money is then channelled in various ways for the Government purse for the overall benefit of the Island, therefore it is vital that we have a healthy private sector, a financially sound business community means these things: jobs for people to earn money to spend money; funds to pay for the necessary expenses involved in self-government which in turn again provides jobs for people; funds to assist with education, social welfare and the hospital; funds for the protection and improvement of our beautiful Island; funds to promote Norfolk as a unique experience so that we can help safeguard our only real industry, tourism, in other words a healthy private sector means security for all. The Government must play its part to help stem and if possible reverse the present drop in tourist numbers and to do this you cannot ignore the old saying, you have got to spend money to make money. The shopkeeper is not going to make a sale if he does not spend the money to put goods in his shop. I think it is necessary for the
Government to spend money on promotion at this time but I think it is not good that we have waited until our backs are to the wall before we act and I believe that this expenditure should form the beginning of a planned and sustained campaign, planned well in advance with a known budget for the tourist bodies to work to. It can take 6 to 12 months for the full effect of a promotion to be felt and we should in future be working that far ahead. While that is going along we must also be looking for another way to improve our position and some of the things I think we must be looking at are: the high cost of airfares, how we can improve this or offset it. It may not be possible to improve the airfares until the new airstrip is completed but perhaps by making everything else so attractive and reasonable in cost, the effect of the high airfares can be lessened, therefore we must look at the cost of our goods and services in several ways - (1) by much lower duties, especially on liquor, cigarettes, perfumes and clothing; (2) smaller profit margins, offset by increased turnover; (3) improved services and facilities for the visitor. We must also look at our image, we must keep Norfolk sincere and gentle with warm and friendly personal attention right from when the visitor arrives at the airport customs room, to his reception by his accommodation proprietor, tour operator, car hire people and especially in the shops. Every person in Norfolk has a responsibility to do this, we must try and build a sense of civic pride in the Burnt Pine area for the people there to improve the external look of their shops and businesses - maybe we could institute an annual award for the most attractive premises. The word economy also means to be prudent, not wasteful. Wasteful government expenditure, if it is happening, must be stopped, we must be efficient but not wasteful. The excellent job done by the Philatelic section is a good example - good revenue with a minimum of overheads.

To sum up I believe spending this money on promotion is only a beginning and the next steps are: as a matter of urgency a total review of customs revenue and duties; the setting of a 12 month budget for tourist promotion to enable the tourist bodies to plan for long term campaigns; reduce the amount of liquor, cigarettes and other duty
free items passengers are permitted to bring with them into Norfolk; a review of the cost of government and the administration of government, bearing in mind that we are only 1800 people and 5 miles by 3; a real effort to improve the Burnt Pine area and bring about a sense of civic pride - not only in the Burnt Pine area - there are some really beautiful barbeque spots on the Island such as Anson Bay, just off Jacobs Rock, and other areas, that could be fenced to keep cattle out - the majority of tourists who come to the Island are not used to cattle pads - these areas can be mowed and fenced without any extra workforce.

MR. PRESIDENT: Any further participation in the adjournment debate Honourable Members? Mrs. Gray.

MRS. GRAY: Just a few matters more. I seek advice Mr. President on matters which have been before the House and which, I think as Mr. Howard phrased it, have fallen between the chairs. Specifically the Planning Bill and the Road Traffic Bill - is there action in train to reintroduce those or does it wait until somebody takes them up.

MR. PRESIDENT: Do you wish to make some comment upon that or really pose a question to somebody, if it is a question it would have been more appropriate at question time.

MRS. GRAY: I am seeking advice please Mr. President, will they reappear or is it a matter of somebody taking them up.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Both of those matters are within my responsibility, I am presently working on the Road Traffic Bill, that could well reappear at our next meeting, and the Planning Bill will reappear not long after that.
MRS. GRAY: May I refer to just one other matter, and that is Arbor Day - what progress was made since the notice paper of Mr. Williams dated 4 November?

MR. PRESIDENT: I think they are more properly matters which you might raise at question time Mrs. Gray.

MRS. GRAY: Thank you Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: I would like to make just very brief mention of the fact that the Customs officers at the airport, beginning very soon - tomorrow or the next day, I am not sure, perhaps even today - will be beginning to make some baggage inspections of incoming passengers. The arrival room at the airport has been fitted out to allow this to be done, it is being done in order to make sure that things that should not come in to the Island do not come in to the Island and to make sure that things that should bear duty, are charged duty. It is an interim arrangement until the new terminal gets built, the new terminal probably will be finished about the end of this year, until then there is going to be some nuisance for passengers because the room in which the inspections will be done really is not quite as big as it ought to be, not quite as big as we wish it were. I have asked the Revenue Manager if he will please stress to the Customs officers the fact that they are part of the Island's first line of ambassadors to visitors and I have asked him if he will try to get them to be as friendly and courteous and helpful as they can be while they are enforcing the law. I would like also to ask people on the Island to be patient if they are held up by this inspection process from time to time, it will be easier and more smoothly handled once we get better facilities and there is an interim situation which may cause some delays or cramming in the meantime, please put up with it as it is in the interests of the Island.
MR. PRESIDENT: Further participation in the adjournment debate? Mr. Jackson.

MR. JACKSON: Mr. President, we have heard questions this afternoon on airfares and shipping freight increases - well it is on again - monopoly control is rearing its ugly head again. If residents and intended tourists to the Island were shocked to hear of the latest increase in airfares by East-West, well residents of the Island will also be shocked and most likely go into some form of convulsions when the latest shipping freight increase is added on to the already high food prices.

The C.C.C. Shipping Company announced on 20th February that freight charges will increase by $11.50 per revenue tonne on its existing rate on the next arrival of the Ile de Lumiere which is next week. This increase is to be followed by another in April, representing a staggering 10.6% increase. You can hear residents cry out where is the Kalia, the m.v. Kalia that held freight down for so long, for almost 18 months, when she was on the run. Let us have a look at the reason that C.C.C. gave for their announcement. In their statement that was published in the paper, C.C.C. the agents for the only vessel that comes to Norfolk Island, stated they wished to advise that following the considerable increase in the cost of stevedoring in Sydney and to a lesser degree in the cost of discharge and workers compensation at Norfolk Island, it is with much regret that we have no option but to apply an increase of $11.50 per revenue tonne to the existing rate, such increase to apply from the Ile de Lumiere's voyage 49, which is the next arrival.

Now when we look further into the $11.50 per tonne increase and to what return it will bring to the shipping company we find that the Ile de Lumiere in tonnage carried in and out of Norfolk Island 14,687 tonnes in the financial year 1980-81. There is every reason to say that tonnage rates for the coming financial year 1981-82 will be in excess of the previous years tonnage because of the upgrading of the airport and the building of a new cable station, however taking
into account the 14,687 tonnes last year we find that an extra $11.50 per tonne added on to the existing freight rate will bring in a handsome return for the company to the tune of $168,900.

Delegates from the Lighterage Workers and delegates from the Stevedores had discussions with the local agents and the Principals of C.C.C. during their visit to Norfolk Island a fortnight ago. The main discussions were centred around improved overtime rates for work performed on Saturdays and Sundays; work in excess of 8 hours; and waiting time. It was eventually agreed that an extra $2.00 per hour would be paid for this work. Using the hours worked in overtime last year it would mean an extra $7,000 to pay Lighterage Workers and the same amount, $7,000, to pay Stevedores and Tally Clerks - $14,000 in all. So the question must be asked where does the rest of the $168,900 go to. The public is entitled to know. Food prices will spiral, as will building materials and all other commodities carried by sea freight. Pensioners, persons on low incomes and those on fixed incomes will be the hardest hit, therefore I call on the Minister responsible for sea transport, Mr. John Brown, to negotiate with other shipping companies, whether they be in Australia, New Zealand or the South Pacific Forum Shipping Line, to have talks with the Norfolk Island Government with a view to getting another ship on the run to compete with C.C.C., thus breaking the monopoly strangle-hold they have on the Island.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Quintal.

MR. QUINTAL: Mr. President, at one time we did have an opposition ship coming to the Island and it is my opinion that the reason that this ship pulled out was because there was not enough cargo coming to the Island to encourage two shipping lines to run here, which I think it proves itself because one pulled out and the C.C.C. line is still running here.

I have been given some figures by Mr. Geoff Bennett, and they are notes on shipping freight increase, and he says that the $11.50 increase applies only to Sydney/Norfolk Island and Norfolk Island/Sydney cargo. It does not apply to cargo from New Zealand.
The $11.50 per tonne increase is made in three parts: Sydney stevedoring $10.00 per tonne - this $10.00 increase was fully documented and discussed with the Executive Member responsible;Briefly the increase is caused by average costs of stevedoring in Sydney - October 1980 to July 1981 - $35.43 per tonne; average costs of stevedoring in Sydney - August 1981 to January 1982 - $45.73 per tonne. I understand that documents were supplied authenticating this rise, including full sets of invoices and docketts. Norfolk stevedoring and lighterage - substantial increases in all penalty rates were demanded and received last month, this increase, based on actual hours worked and tonnage handled during 1981, represents an increase of $1.30 per revenue tonne on the Sydney/Norfolk Island freight rate only. For your guidance relevant hours for 1981 were: waiting time 21 hours at old rates, $2,646, at new rates, $4,410; Saturday work, 29.5 hours, $3,097, and at new rates $6,195; Sunday and public holidays, 80.5 hours, $10,143 at the old rate and the new rate $16,905 - 130 hours, 42 men. This represents an increase of 100% for Saturday penalty rates and 66% increase for all other penalty rates. The last increase in penalty rates was in September 1979. The difference means an increase of approximately $11,626 per annum which equals slightly more than $1.30 per revenue tonne on the Sydney/Norfolk Island freight rate. Norfolk workers compensation - as a result of an increase in premiums from $2,800 to $4,983, an amount of 20% revenue tonne is added. Tonnages for the 1981 calendar year - inward ex Sydney, 7,895 tonnes; outward to Sydney, 623 tonnes - a total of 8,518 tonnes. These figures are only to be used to calculate the increase as the new freight rate applies to Sydney/Norfolk Island freight rates only; Inward ex New Zealand was 4,434 tonnes; outward to New Zealand 93 tonnes, making a total of 4,527 tonnes.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Jackson.

MR. JACKSON: Mr. President I think I must reply to parts of the statement which was provided by Mr. Geoff Bennett for
Mr. Quintal.

It is a pity that he did not give more accurate figures. My figures on the quotation for money that will be needed is $14,000 — they have quoted $11,000. I am sure the Stevedores and Lighterage Workers would be very pleased to hear of the substantial increase that has been given to Mr. Quintal by Mr. Bennett. We got a $2.00 increase — not a substantial increase by any means, and it was negotiated in good terms at an around the table conference with all agreeing, as a matter of fact the delegates put up a proposal that if it was a $4 increase, would they be happy without an increase in the freight rates, well they would not wear that, so anyhow there was the original increase then of $2.00 on the existing hourly rate. But they have stated it will cost them an extra $11,000 to pay all this whereas my figure was $14,000, so where is the other money going to, I mean to say there must be a lot of hidden points in it.

However let us take a look at what they provided Mr. Quintal with on workers compensation. This has been a very sore point. It was not until the First Legislative Assembly that we managed to get workers compensation for the workers on the ship. Let me say that when the Kalia was on the run they had no hesitation in insuring the men who worked the ship — one of the most dangerous work procedures that you can find anywhere. In the first instance it was considered, when they brought their Phoenix agents over from Sydney, to offer us $40 a week for any injuries sustained, but they maintained that that would not be sufficient and they would jack it up to $100 a week. Well the men in their discussions with these officials objected to that immediately and said that if they did not come back with a better proposition we would take further negotiations with them. Anyhow not long after — when the next vessel arrived — one of our members was seriously injured, a man with a young wife, pregnant, and two young children, now the first offer was $40 a week — their rent alone was $60 a week — and then they offered $100 a week — well then they saw where the differences where so they immediately said well we know he cannot live on that, we will offer him $160, so that is where it stands now. Now if they are saying that they have to increase freight
to this dimension to pay this $160 in the event of anyone getting hurt - and may I add that we have been very fortunate that there has not been a serious accident, as a matter of fact there was only one or two last year, the last one, one of our members was off for six weeks. Greg has worked the ship - he has been on the Kalia, and while he was out there he was injured on two occasions and had to go on compensation, so he is well aware of the situation as far as workers compensation goes, and I would say that the community would be happy to bear the brunt of the money it costs to insure the workers, but to place $11.50 on existing rates I consider is far in excess of what is needed to recover the outlay they have to pay the workers here on Norfolk Island.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Mr. President, Mr. Jackson asked me a question earlier in the meeting in relation to the increase in shipping prices and at that stage I was not able to totally answer his question. During the course of the meeting I have reviewed the papers which are available to me and in the light of the discussions which have taken place over the last few minutes perhaps I should make clear the contents of the documents which I have.

Firstly, effective from the present voyage of the Ile de Lumiere, there will be an increase of $11.50 per revenue tonne. That is made up of three elements - firstly Sydney stevedoring costs. The representatives of C.C.C. pointed out that allowance had not in fact been made for the increase in these costs for the period from about October 1980 to date, so although it was felt that the rise of $10 as a result of that, which is documented and I will be providing Mr. Jackson with the documents at the close of this meeting, was a large rise, I expressed a hope that future rises for these items would be quite small. Unfortunately I could not gain an assurance of this because in Sydney there is presently under discussion something called The Common Port Roster. This is a new system of rostering the water-
front workers in Sydney, and the representatives of C.C.C. pointed out to me that they have not been able to totally assess the likely increases in stevedoring costs as a result of the introduction of this Common Port Roster, but they expect that for the loading of the type of cargo which is brought to Norfolk Island as distinct from containerised cargo, this increase may regrettably be not small. The second part of the $11.50 increase is the increase in the cost of Norfolk Island stevedoring, and this represents only $1.30 per tonne of the total of $11.50 per tonne, and as I said to Mr. Jackson earlier in the meeting, it is nowhere near the major part of the increase. The last part of that $11.50 increase is the amount necessary to compensate for the increase in workers compensation premiums, again per revenue tonne this is not large, it is only 20 cents per revenue tonne and I totally agree with Mr. Jackson that it is essential that there be adequate workers compensation for those engaged in this function. That is the explanation of the $11.50 per tonne which will apply from the present voyage of the Ille du Lumiere and an indication that there could be a further increase in Sydney stevedoring costs as a result of the introduction of the Common Port Roster.

There is then a further source of increase. I am informed that for some years now the C.C.C. have at six monthly intervals, in April and October of each year, increased the shipping rate to take into account the inflation rate in Australia for the previous twelve months. The inflation rate according to their correspondence for 1981 was 11.3% and they say - "you will appreciate that the actual increase will represent only 10.2% as the new freight rate will apply after the increase sought separately due to the increase in stevedoring costs". So they are saying because we are increasing the costs as from the current voyage, the 11.3% inflation increase for last year will only represent an increase of 10.2% above the current rate, and they are proposing to introduce this 10.2% increase as to 6% on 1st April 1982 and as to 4.2% on 1st October 1982, and they go on to say - "it must be clearly understood that any increase in fuel prices and other areas outside of C.C.C.'s control, for example stevedoring costs in Sydney and Norfolk Island, will be immediately reflected in the
freight rates".

I felt that I should bring this to the attention of the Members as the total of the increases is perhaps even larger than Mr. Jackson had indicated but there does not appear to be a lot that we can do to reduce these with the present vessel. I will be having discussions with the Chief Administrative Officer tomorrow morning in relation to this and we will be writing to C.C.C. with one suggestion which may enable a reduction but I expect it will be a small reduction. That is what I wanted to say in relation to C.C.C.

Mr. Jackson also raised the question of discussing the possibility of obtaining another service, and I can advise Mr. Jackson that I had discussions with the previous Chief Administrative Officer about this and Mr. Bains produced for me correspondence which had passed between his office and the Pacific Forum Line in relation to a particular vessel which apparently now passes only a matter of a few miles from Norfolk Island on each voyage. That vessel is a containerised vessel and at this stage the Pacific Forum Line has indicated that its schedule would be too tight to enable a Norfolk Island call firstly; and secondly that its method of loading and unloading in their opinion would be unsuitable for Norfolk Island; and thirdly that they did not feel they had any other vessel which would be suitable, but certainly at this stage it has been taken up with the Pacific Forum Line and I can assure all Members that I am well aware of the importance of keeping shipping rates to the Island as low as possible and if there is any opportunity for meaningful discussion with C.C.C. which can result in a reduction in shipping rates, that opportunity will be taken and if there is the opportunity to discuss a further service with any other shipping company, certainly that discussion will take place.

Thank you Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Jackson.

MR. JACKSON: I thank Mr. Brown for that explanation, but this shows, as has been stated earlier in the meeting when Mrs. Gray introduced a paper, and I spoke so strongly, that all Members should be kept informed and that documents and papers should go out to
Members. I was aware that the C.C.C. people had had interviews with you and I really expected a copy of one of those documents, however it did not come so I had to extract my own figures from other sources.

Mr. President I wish to raise another issue, it is only a minor one but it may be important to the Island. There is work going on at the moment in the drains to eradicate the water lily. Father Scanlon has been so good as to provide me with a copy of "The Bulletin" of December 1981, and it includes an article on "Weevil Wipes Out Weeds in Worldwide War". Father Scanlon was concerned at the blockage of the drains in the Kingston and Arthur's Vale area and he thought perhaps these weevils may be able to keep the weeds in check. The article states - "Australian Scientists have scored a spectacular success in the biological control of one of the worlds worst aquatic weeds", and it goes on to say how these weevils were introduced into Mount Isa's Lake Moondara in Central Queensland. The weevils worked and eradicated an estimated 30 to 40,000 tonne infestation of weeds in the main water storage of an aquatic playground. The article then goes on with a lengthy description. Over the page is a wonderful photograph of the state of Lake Moondara choked as the weeds spread green death, and on the other side is a picture where the lake is cleared of all weeds.

In appreciation to Father Scanlon I would like to table this and if the Member responsible could look into it. I have heard Mr. John Ryves speaking to Mrs. Gray, and apparently thorough tests were done with the dung beetle before it was introduced here to make sure it did not attack other species, and I am certain that a similar exercise could be done with this weevil. So some good may come out of this and I thank Father Scanlon for his trouble and effort in making the book available to us.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that the House do now adjourn.

House adjourned at 6.38 p.m. until Wednesday 7 April 1982 at 2 p.m.