words at a 40 hour week, 10 weeks of work instead of a two year sentence. There is a great disparity there. If Mr. Sanders can enlighten us when we deal with it again, I would like to hear more about it.

MR. SANDERS: Yes I would be pleased to.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mrs. Gray.

MRS. GRAY: Just a comment, and it is probably a very unlearned one, that might be a description of the maximum penalty. Also, one of the things we have to check is the incidence of "crime" on Norfolk Island to which this Bill would apply, or could be applied.

MR. SANDERS: As I understand it, many of the old laws that were created in the early 1900's where it was six months jail or a fine of £10, which was a fortune in those days, all that appears to have been upgraded is that the pounds have been changed to dollars, so the same six months still applies but the fine is $20 and that is maximum, and I think it is nearly a giggle a minute when somebody knows what the options are when they go to Court. The magistrates just have no teeth, they can either give the guy six months or the most they can do is fine him $20, and as you are aware the same as I am, many persons who have committed offences actually come out of Court laughing. This is a means of getting around that problem.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Jackson.

MR. JACKSON: Mr. Chairman, without entering into the debate on this particular Bill which has just been put before us, I wonder have the Magistrates of Norfolk Island had oversight of this Bill before it was brought before the House. That is a question that concerns me if they haven't. If they have Mr. Sanders may say so, if they have had a good look at this Bill and made some comments about it because of their experience as they are the ones who have to deal with offenders. That is something I would like to know, if they have seen this Bill and given any comments whatsoever.
MR. SANDERS: Mr. Jackson I would doubt very much whether they have because I only saw it myself for the first time yesterday, but you will recall when Mr. Hermes was over here he was speaking in favour of such a Bill.

MR. JACKSON: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Hermes did speak of a Bill of a similar nature and about what is going on in mainland Australia, which I support as Mr. Hermes presented the situation. I did not hear Mr. Hermes recommend that it should be introduced here but anyhow the Bill is before us and I do believe that there should be a get-together with the members of the judiciary to pass comments on a Bill that, if it is passed in this House, they will be the ones who will have to administer it, and I wouldn't like to give the nod to a Bill of this nature which could affect someone being sentenced that the judiciary says well after the Bill has been passed in the House we were not given the opportunity to make comments. Therefore I would like Mr. Sanders to take that into consideration and give the judiciary of this Island an opportunity to make comments on this Bill.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: Mr. Chairman it was my intention to do so but I couldn't hand a copy to the Magistrates today because I needed it. I have asked John Nicholson if he would contact Mr. Hermes in Canberra for his comments on the Bill which I hope to have, and any other interested party in Canberra, while this Bill is lying on the table.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Thank you. Mrs. Gray.

MRS. GRAY: To the best of my knowledge the Bill or something pretty much like it has been floating around in the back blocks as it were, for quite some time and I understand that it has the support at least of one of the Magistrates to whom I have spoken personally, that being the senior Magistrate. Obviously the time that the Bill spends on the table is the one where we will be seeking comment and I hope that it would be forthcoming from those people.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Miss Buffett.
MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President. Community correction is a very specialised field and wants deep consideration of each Member, anything to do with human lives and the rehabilitation of people we must devote our entire service to, and I will look forward to a meeting called by the respective Minister whenever suitable. Possibly the Administrator's office or the Police office here would have some data, and the Legal office would have some data, for us to research. I am quite in favour of an idea like this especially with Norfolk being so far away, but we are very fortunate on Norfolk Island because we don't very often have this kind of problem. Thank you.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: I believe this is very preferable instead of a jail sentence. I don't believe we would have any difficulty in getting supervisors, I have been led to believe that some of the service clubs would be only too pleased to supervise such a thing, and it retains the dignity of the person who has been penalised and it is a useful community service at the same time.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Further debate. Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: I move that debate be adjourned.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The question is that the debate be now adjourned and the resumption of debate be made an order of the day for the next sitting.

Question - put
Motion agreed to unanimously
Debate (on motion by Mr. Howard) adjourned
Resumption of debate made an order of the day for the next sitting.

LIGHTERAGE (AMENDMENT) BILL 1982

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Notice No.14, Lighterage (Amendment) Bill 1982, standing in Mr. Buffett's name.
MR. BUFFETT: Yes Mr. Acting Deputy President I present the Lighterage (Amendment) Bill 1982 and move that the Bill be agreed to in principle.

Mr. Acting Deputy President this Bill proposes amending the Lighterage Ordinance to provide for a Tally Clerk to be appointed who would do such things as marking packages that come in and record the condition of packages and record various other details in respect of goods and items that come into Norfolk Island via a sea voyage. This action really is justified by the present state of affairs which I understand has caused insurance underwriters to be disinclined to insure goods that come to Norfolk Island by sea. This proposed arrangement will offer protection to all those who are involved in the carrying of goods by this method and I see it, if we are experiencing difficulty especially in the insurance field, that it will be of assistance to those who do have a need to make importations into the Island by sea going vessel, and I commend this Bill that it might also lie on the House for a period of time so that Members may examine it and look to its applicability in Norfolk Island.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Thank you Mr. Buffett. Debate. Mr. Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I think this Bill is a good Bill, it is designed to protect all parties. In the past there has been accusations about the stevedores pilfering, the lighterage workers pilfering, the carters pilfering, the business houses not substantiating their claims when claiming from the insurance companies. This has resulted in ever increasing insurance charges and finally the refusal of some insurance companies to do business with anything to do with Norfolk Island. In the past and at present the procedure on claiming for damaged or pilfered cargo is firstly you claim on the ship, they usually write back and tell you that it left in good condition, you then write to your carrier who writes back and tells you he picked up all the cargo on the pier that was consigned to you. There is no method to verify this statement hence the need for tally clerks. The existing Lighterage Ordinance states that you can’t sue the Administration. This must be the only common carrier that I have ever heard of that can do as they please with your cargo and the persons who own the cargo have no legal recourse. Mr. Chairman there was a report on customs by A.L. Walsh
in 1979 and he makes reference to some of these. On page 31 right at the top he states that "the ships manifest is Customs only means of identifying what type and amount of cargo is discharged. Accordingly Customs should have effective measures to ensure the accuracy of the manifest. There are none. Due to the importance of the ship's manifest some effort should be made to achieve this purpose, this can be done by reconciliation to the manifest by (a) tally sheets; (b) random listings of marks and numbers and number of packages; (c) bills of lading; and (d) inspecting cargo". Then he goes on to say "from my experience as inspector in charge of the clearance of vessels from Sydney to the Island trade, the ship's manifest is an inaccurate source of information, therefore I would recommend that any or all of the above methods be undertaken on a continual basis".

Mr. Chairman there is a whole report on this, I think it would be available if anybody wishes to see it, this particular extract came from the one in the Library. I commend the Bill.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Thank you Mr. Sanders. Further debate. Miss Buffett.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President. I have made some enquiries from the importers. Having had a fair bit to do with tallying and ships over the years I, on reading this Bill, considered that on page 2, clauses 3 and 4 would be quite impractical and inoperable in actual fact. Clause 3 says "a record provided by a tally clerk under sub-section 2 shall in respect of cargo inspected and tallied by him show (a) the mark on each package, and (b) the number of packages bearing each mark, and (c) the condition of each package, and (d) details of the person who removes each package from the discharge area". Clause 4 says "no person shall remove imported cargo from the immediate area until it has been discharged from a lighter until a tally clerk has been given an opportunity to inspect and tally the cargo".

The problem I find here Mr. Acting Deputy President is that of actual physical practise. I don't think that it would be possible on the jetties - and admittedly there are a couple of people I have not contacted and hope to shortly - but one would require more tally clerks around that area, you would have to have a tally clerk per truck to say the least and there would perhaps be wisdom if the carriers could
co-operate with tally clerks to have broken cartons go to Customs etc, but this is such a problem, there will be such a problem of congestion at the jetties as a result of slowing down of the process, I think we will have to ask the Minister to go into these two clauses more carefully and we will have to discuss it with the big importers as well as the workers. Thank you. They are my only two comments at the moment, but I have a few more for next time.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: Mr. Chairman I would like to remind Miss Buffett that up until say about the last ten years there always were tally clerks and it didn't ever make any difference to the trade.

MISS BUFFETT: I agree with you Mr. Sanders, I know that there were tally clerks, but we are importing a lot more in building materials etc, we are importing far more now than we ever did then.

MR. SANDERS: I would imagine Mr. Chairman that if you are talking about building materials, if the tally clerk can't count a bundle of timber coming off or a pallet of cement then he ought not be the tally clerk.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Further debate. Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: Mr. Buffett has introduced the Bill. Mr. Sanders I know has been concerned about the subject behind it, I wonder if either of them can comment on the practicality in their mind of if this goes ahead, of increasing lighterage fees to cover the cost of the tally clerk.

MR. SANDERS: Mr. Chairman I would imagine that it would probably have to be so. I couldn't imagine that per cubic metre it would amount to any large amount of money but I think that would be more desirable than the importer losing his goods because the insurance companies won't insure. I'm trying to work out the figures that were applicable when I first went into an exercise quite some years ago when freight rates were about $80 a tonne, and I think they are double that now, I think if I can recall it it made a difference of something like 2 cents per cubic foot, don't quote me but it was approximately per cubic foot, which
would have allowed for two tally clerks to be there all the time and I think that it allowed for on an average of one day with no work where the tally clerks were paid anyhow, on an average of one day every ship that came. I think, assuming that was about correct that it might have to be doubled. It is still not big money. I think 10 cents a cubic foot would go pretty close to cheap insurance.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Jackson.

MR. JACKSON: Mr. Chairman, I am not pointing the finger at anyone, I know Mr. Buffett is the carrier of this Bill because he is the Member responsible, but I do believe someone in their haste has charged in with their head down in presenting a Bill of this nature without examining the practicalities and the consequences and examine the situation closely before a Bill is brought into this House because I can see with this Bill it will create congestion if the wording in the Bill - and Miss Buffett has just read out a few of the words on what duties a tally clerk will have. I am also aware that over the years we have had tally clerks. Mr. Sanders just admitted even with the tally clerks the goods never got to their destination, Mr. Sanders has made accusations all round to everyone about stevedores, lighterage workers, lorry drivers and everyone else, but he failed to lay accusations perhaps at the end of the line. However I am not here to make accusations at anyone, I am here to try and solve a situation or make comments that may solve a situation that someone has gone in and not clearly examined. Now let's have a look at it. Now if I was an importer and I was concerned about my cargo down the wharf, and a large importer at that, I would certainly have a tally clerk down there looking after my interests, but Mr. Sanders is proposing someone else pay that tally clerk to look after that interest, he wants Admin to pick up the check, pick up the tab, that is most unusual, Mr. Sanders did not want to pay extra slaughter fees or something like that. But anyhow let's have another look at the bank-up and the delays and the congestion, because around the crane as the cargo is being discharged the lorries gather and the various carriers for the various importers select their cargo to be carted and they load their trucks accordingly. Now if there are to be tally clerks there well this area would be congested, work would have to cease, lighterage operations would have to be suspended until the area is cleared, but
that could most likely be dealt with if the cargo was carted away and taken to another point up the ramp or up to the whaling station somewhere and put there for them to get into. Now the operation here on Norfolk Island, lighterage, stevedores, the shore crowd, the crane drivers, the lorry drivers, we can shift on a good day 300 tonne of cargo plus, some fast working cargo we can do more, but may I add everything has to work very smoothly, everything has to work according to plan, the weather has to be perfect, everything has to go smooth on the ship, the cranes would have to be in tip top condition on the jetty, the lorries should be able to cope with the cargo that is being pumped ashore and if they can't cope with it well there is a bank-up of cargo. One thing that is always in my mind is efficient stevedoring and efficient lighterage to turn the ship around in a manner to eliminate any future costs that could be added on to the people of Norfolk Island as far as freight charges are concerned. Now a Bill of this nature would only hinder and interrupt a smooth working procedure around the point where the lorries pick up the cargo. If there was a suggestion that the insurance won't insure because of high claims, what would happen then under the Shipping Act that once a cargo is unhooked alongside, the ship has no further responsibility to that particular piece of cargo. Now if it has been tallied off what claim can you make then, but that is for the people who are concerned. My concern in taking part in this debate - they can have all the tally clerks in the world down there but what I do object to is for the Admin to pay for them, and I would object if the efficient stevedoring and lighterage operations are interrupted or have to be suspended or we may have to knock off at 3 o'clock in the afternoon so that they can clear the area. You can rest assured with the wording of this Bill, clauses 3 and 4, that they will have to show on each package the number of packages bearing each mark, the condition of each package, the details of the person who removed each package from the discharge area, good gracious me. We operate here in a difference circumstance to major ports, our facilities here are limited, we only have a limited area. You take Cascade, everyone has been down to Cascade and seen the congested area there, and if you have all this bank-up of cargo, what would happen, it would affect the efficient stevedoring, the efficient lighterage operations being conducted. I would say the only way, and I have mentioned this before, to eliminate all this is for a bond store to be built at either
anchorage, either jetty, and nothing is taken away, the only time you take delivery of anything - that is small cargo - is when it is signed for to be taken out of that bond store. Large cargo such as timber could be tallied straight off, and cement and beer and that sort of stuff. But small cargo should be bonded, taken into a bond and that would keep the ship moving, because as I see it now with a proposition of this nature it would only hinder operations and by hindering operations well then we may find ourselves in a position where added costs of freight will be imposed on the people of Norfolk Island, and that is my concern, just because someone has gone in to satisfy their own ego or something to try and solve this situation by going in and saying tally clerks ought to do the job, we will put penalties on anyone who tries to interfere with them, well I take objection because no-one down there interferes with anyone, you can rest assured anyone who has any connection with the stevedores, lighterage or any operation down there, lorry drivers, DCA workers, everyone works in harmony and assists one another, and to have a Bill like this to prevent anyone intimidating anyone, at the same time I do believe in all seriousness, Mr. Sanders with Mr. Buffett should have a closer look at this with the Lighterage Manager, I am only speaking as a stevedore, I am out at the ship, I am not there on the wharf, but you can rest assured the stevedores will have something to say if they are being delayed just because there is a bank-up and congestion within the area of the crane or the loading ramp at Cascade. Once again I do believe that between the parties concerned with this Bill they should take a very close look at it with the Lighterage Manager and others concerned.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. Chairman. It appears that Mr. Jackson, apart from twisting around what I said, appears to neglect that it would be cheaper to pay the tally clerks and cheaper for the persons receiving the goods and in due course cheaper for the person buying it, to have the tally clerk than to have the cost of the missing goods spread over the shipment and it would just go on automatically when it goes on the shelf. Mr. Jackson speaks of the increase in charges, he has never considered what happens to the person that he so called defends all the time when the cost of the article on the shelf goes up because the
lighterage went up without any consideration. Mr. Jackson has also neglected to tell this House that there are already tally clerks on the ships and they have always been there, and Mr. Jackson is also used to working on the wharves in Sydney and there is no way in the world can you go down there and help yourself.

MR. JACKSON: Point of order, I take a point of order, I presume Mr. Sanders is making reference to anyone connected with the waterfront as helping themselves to any commodity, now I take strong objection to that.

MR. SANDERS: Mr. Jackson is continually twisting around what I say.

MR. JACKSON: You don't know what you have said.

MR. SANDERS: There would be no hold ups, the stuff is moved up to the ramps anyhow, there is no reason why the tally clerks can't be there, the same as up where the ramp used to be at Kingston, there would be no difficulty whatsoever, there would be no cluttering up, no more than what it is now. Knocking off at 3 o'clock, the statement is too ridiculous for words, if the fellows want to knock off at 3 o'clock they knock off anyhow. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Further debate Honourable Members. Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: I would like to move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Thank you Mr. Howard. The question is that debate be now adjourned and the resumption of the debate be made an order of the day for the next sitting.

Question - put
Motion agreed to unanimously
Debate (on motion by Mr. Howard) adjourned
Resumption of debate made an order of the day for the next sitting.
ORDERS OF THE DAY

ROAD TRAFFIC (MINIMUM DRIVING AGE) BILL 1982

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order of the Day No. 1, Road Traffic (Minimum Driving Age) Bill 1982. Mr. Howard to resume.

MR. HOWARD: Thank you. If it is in order I would like to suggest that we deal with this one and then shut down for the night, but this one has been held off for a long long time and people are waiting for it. This is the Minimum Driving Age Bill.

We enacted a Road Traffic law that set the minimum driving age at 16, I think we made a mistake in changing it from 15. The public called that mistake to our attention, including in the public young people who looked into the facts and who presented a very good case to me and I am sure to other Members. Let's not waste time pretending that we didn't make a mistake, let's admit that we made one quickly and set it right and let's pass this Bill.

MR. SANDERS: I support what Mr. Howard has just said.

MR. JACKSON: Mr. Chairman I do also and I am pleased that those who made that mistake in the first place have admitted it and therefore I know around this table at the presentation of this Bill that it was unanimous, so therefore I move that the question be put.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The question is that the Bill be agreed.

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

SUSPENSION OF HOUSE

MR. SANDERS: Mr. Chairman I move that this sitting of the House be suspended until 2 o'clock next Wednesday.
MR. BUFFETT: If we got rid of all the others as we got rid of that one Mr. Acting Deputy President I reckon we could get it done before 7 o'clock tonight. It's worth a try.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Debate Honourable Members.

MR. HOWARD: On the adjournment motion.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: On the suspension Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: I favour suspension for a week. There are four Bills remaining and I think every one of those four is contentious one way or another, I think we have an hour and a half to two hours more debating to do and I think that is enough to justify suspension.

MR. JACKSON: I believe Mr. Chairman there is one to be withdrawn, I wonder which one is to be withdrawn.

MR. SANDERS: The Public Works one.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The question is that the House be suspended until Wednesday next at 2 p.m.

Question - put
Motion agreed to unanimously

Sitting suspended at 6.43 p.m. until Wednesday 13 October 1982 at 2 p.m.
RESUMPTION OF SITTING (2 p.m. 13 October 1982)

VISIT BY 36TH BATTALION OF THE NEW ZEALAND ARMY

MR. PRESIDENT: Before I call upon Orders of the Day from where we left off – Order of the Day No. 2 it will be – I would like to mention to Honourable Members that in the past fortnight there has been visiting the Island a group of some 68 people from New Zealand, all to celebrate the 40th anniversary of the arrival of the New Zealand Forces, the 36th Battalion in Norfolk Island in October 1942. That Battalion was garrisoned in the Island for some 9 months of the Second World War. I have been formally asked by the group to convey to the Norfolk Island community, and I do so through this House, appreciation of the hospitality and warmth of reception accorded to the 36th Battalion members and their relatives who have made this journey to the Island to renew their association of some 40 years ago.

PAPER – EXEMPTION FROM CUSTOMS DUTY

MR. HOWARD: Could I seek leave Mr. President to table a paper I should have tabled at the last meeting to do with a Customs Act exemption. Thank you. I would simply table the paper.

STATEMENT – AIRPORT UPGRADE

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: Mr. President I seek leave to make a statement. Thank you Mr. Chairman. I wish to advise this House and the public that yesterday, Tuesday 12 October, I was advised by Mr. Ray Kempthorne that Kiapara Excavations Limited, the contractors for the upgrading of the Norfolk Island airport, have completed their part in the work that was to be done on the intersection. I would also take this opportunity to thank very sincerely these people for their consideration and co-operation in making it possible for a limited air service to have operated during
this closure period. On behalf of this House I thank them.

MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you Mr. Sanders.

ORDERS OF THE DAY Cont'd

NORFOLK ISLAND GOVERNMENT TOURIST BUREAU (AMENDMENT) BILL 1982

MR. PRESIDENT: Honourable Members I call upon Order of the Day No.2, Norfolk Island Government Tourist Bureau (Amendment) Bill 1982, and Mr. Jackson has the call for the resumption of the debate from 1st September. Mr. Jackson.

MR. JACKSON: Mr. President. This amendment was introduced in the House on 1st September by Miss Buffett. Clause 3 of this of this Bill proposes the amendment of section 18 of the principal Act which sets out audit provisions in the following manner - (1) requiring the auditor to be approved by the Legislative Assembly. Now I cannot see anything wrong with that because of the public involvement in the funds provided to this particular body; (2) by requiring the Executive Member to lay a copy of the auditor's report before the Legislative Assembly. Also in this amendment clause 4 proposes a new section in the principal Ordinance which would give the internal auditor of the Administration access to the books and accounts of the Bureau. Again provision is made by which any report by the internal auditor in respect of an audit he has carried out on the Bureau's accounts is to be laid before the Legislative Assembly. Mr. President I support this amendment.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: Mr. President I find this amendment most unnecessary as Mr. Jackson has just said under section 18 the Executive Member may appoint a person to be an auditor for the purposes of this Act. Mr. President as Executive Member responsible for these matters I have already done so, made arrangements with the internal auditors of the Administration. On matters of tabling the audit, it is already covered in the Ordinance under section 19(b), which reads, "not later than 29th
September each year prepare and forward to the Executive Member for laying before the Legislative Assembly a report and financial statement in a form approved by the Executive Member in respect of the Bureau during the preceding financial year". All these provisions Mr. President are already in the Ordinance. I see absolutely no reason at all why it needs to be amended. I do not support the Bill.

MR. PRESIDENT: Further debate Honourable Members. Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: I think the first part of the Bill that requires the Executive Member to appoint an auditor and that requires him to table the auditor's report in the Legislative Assembly are new proposals. I have no objection to them, it seems to me that as the law stands now that the Executive Member in charge of tourism as a matter of fact will do those things but he is not obliged to, and I really have no objection to requiring him to if that is thought to be useful. I am inclined to agree with Mr. Sanders that the law as it stands is alright but I really do not object to those two first parts of the Bill. I have got fairly serious concerns about the second part of the Bill, the new section 18(a). If the Executive Member appoints an auditor, which he may do as the law stands now or which if the first part of the Bill passed he would be required to do, this new section 18(a) then goes on and in effect makes the internal auditor of the Administration also responsible for audit, and so it sets up a double audit system by perhaps two quite different people and it seems to me that that is confusing and it is unnecessary expense. I was concerned to learn after the Bill had been introduced last time that apparently there had not been any consultation really with the Accountant of the Administration as to whether this seemed sensible to him. It doesn't seem sensible to me, I think it introduces an idea that may be well motivated in that we in the Assembly want to be sure we know what the Tourist Bureau is doing, but I think setting up a double audit routine is bad management practise and extra expense. I would not object to the first part of the Bill but I have got very serious concerns about the second part of it.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: Mr. President I agree with Mr. Howard that it is bad management to duplicate the auditing system. I have had conversation with
the Administration Accountant this morning and he is more than happy for
the internal audit to be carried out by these people. I think it is
ridiculous if we are going to keep on through this House moving motions
that these books be audited by other people at a cost of $150 just at the
whim of what we say, I think it is quite ridiculous. I think the
Ordinance as it stands is more than adequate to cover the process of
handling these public moneys.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: I would like to clarify what I said a minute ago. I said
that the second part of the Bill concerns me because it sets up a double
audit system and that is the reason why it concerns me. I have no
objection at all to the Administration accounting staff doing the audit,
I think that makes good sense, I support that idea, the staff are there,
they are competent, they can do the work, it will not impose additional
cost on us and I think that is entirely sensible, so it is not that I am
objecting to the internal auditor or the Accountant doing the audit, I
think that makes sense, what I would propose to see is that the Executive
Member through his power to appoint an auditor appoints the internal
auditor or the Accountant to do the audit for us and that we not
separately appoint him which may lead to a doubling up situation which is
what concerns me.

MR. PRESIDENT: Miss Buffett.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. President. When presenting this Bill I
had in mind that even though the Norfolk Island Government Tourist Bureau
is a statutory body I felt that the auditor-general's services would
still be appreciated. The Bureau as a statutory body is equipped with a
degree of governmental power yet possesses a certain amount of independence
from the Executive and as such can combine progressive modern business
management with a proper degree of public accountability. All Members
pledged their united support of endorsing the supply of what may be
termed as community investment of $80,000 additional to the $30,000
operating subsidy. At this point I wish to compliment Mr. Sanders for
the efficiency of his reply to my question earlier in this meeting -
before the suspension, regarding the matters of the Bureau, and I thanked
him at the time. But the Bureau is the Norfolk Island Government Tourist Bureau and as such warrants full Assembly scrutiny of the finances over and above the ministerial sanctions to policy formation and implementation. Now that there has been possibly a different system of auditing through statutory bodies in this Legislative Assembly this present year, I had in mind that we would be having the auditor-general beforehand. I still think it is a good idea to have the internal auditor but I would like the provision made, written into the Act, which is the purpose of this Bill, requiring the Executive Member to appoint the auditor as such as I have moved it.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Christian-Bailey.

MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: Mr. President, I do support the Bill but as was mentioned by an earlier speaker, I think Mr. Howard, I feel that it would be desirable for the Executive Member for tourism to appoint the internal auditor to audit the books of the Norfolk Island Government Tourist Bureau if and when required or at the appropriate times. Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mrs. Gray.

MRS. GRAY: Thank you Mr. President. First of all I would like to say that I am rather disappointed not to be able to have some comment from the Chairman of the Tourist Bureau, I did send the Bill to him and asked for comment, that hasn't been forthcoming, that disappoints me. The only comments I would like to make if we are talking about section 18, specifically the audit,'the Executive Member may appoint a person to be an auditor'- I am inclined to agree that 'shall appoint a person to be an auditor' is probably closer to the mark. The other point I would suggest is that in section 19(b), which I think has already been stated here - 'not later than 29 September of each year prepare and forward to the Executive Member for laying before the Legislative Assembly a report and financial statement in a form approved by the Executive Member in respect of the Bureau during the preceding financial year' - would there not be provision in that section 19(b) to insert the words 'audited report and financial statement' or 'audited set of accounts', whichever might be appropriate. I support the concept. I am not convinced we are going about it in the most precise fashion. Thank you.
MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: Mr. Chairman. All these matters that have been discussed are already written into the Ordinance. I see absolutely no point in wasting everybody's time by chopping and changing words that in effect do nothing. This matter of appointing an auditor, as I have already stated I have used by executive authority as I have stated this morning and the auditors are already appointed. I see no point in continuing to order something that has already been done.

MR. PRESIDENT: Miss Buffett.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you. Without appearing to be too repetitious Mr. President I wish to tie the ends of the situation so that it is not too open ended. Whereas Mr. Sanders says that the matters are covered, they are not in actual fact covered as firmly as would be by the passage of this Bill. It is a requirement for the Executive Member to appoint a certain type of auditor, whereas the Bill says may appoint a person to be an auditor - that is the type of thing that I am trying to overcome, and I would ask the Members if they would again have a look at my intention and support the Bill. Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: Any further debate Honourable Members.

MR. JACKSON: I move that the question be put.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that the question be put

Question - put
Motion agreed to unanimously

MR. PRESIDENT: I put the question. The question is that the Bill be agreed to in principle.

Question - put
The House voted -
AYES, 5
Mr. Buffett
Mr. Christian-Bailey
Mr. Quintal
Miss Buffett
Mr. Jackson

NOES, 3
Mr. Howard
Mrs. Gray
Mr. Sanders

Motion agreed.

MR. PRESIDENT: We proceed to the detail stage Honourable Members. Is it the wish of the House to dispense with the detail stage. No.

Detail Stage

MR. PRESIDENT: We examine the detail of the Bill Honourable Members. First of all we turn to section 1. Is section 1 agreed.

MRS. GRAY: There was some suggestion last week that that be changed to the Tourist Bureau Accounts Bill to clarify it.

MR. PRESIDENT: Yes. There is no amendment before the House in respect of that. It is a question of whether it is agreed or not agreed.

Question - put
Motion agreed to unanimously

MR. PRESIDENT: Clause 2. Any objections to clause 2. Clause 2 is agreed.
Clause 3. The question is that clause 3 be agreed.

Question - put
Motion agreed to (Mr. Sanders dissenting)

MR. PRESIDENT: Clause 4. Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: Thanks. This is the clause that particularly worries me as I mentioned a minute ago. I agree that the Tourist Bureau accounts ought to be subject to audit and that it is reasonable for the Assembly to require that there be an audit. I think as the part of the Bill that we
have agreed to so far says that it is proper that the Executive Member shall appoint a person to be auditor and that he shall table the auditors report in the Assembly. Having done that this next clause which goes on to make the internal auditor responsible for inspection and audit, I think is duplicating what we have already agreed on and I think it sets up a double system where you might not be sure who was in charge, who was auditing, you might end up having a double audit of the same set of books which I think is just really a waste of money. I think this clause introduces confusion, I don't see that it accomplishes anything that isn't already achieved by what we have agreed on so far, and so I am quite firmly against section 4.

MR. PRESIDENT: Miss Buffett.

MISS BUFFETT: I don't actually know what the procedure is here Mr. President but I would I think be quite happy with Mr. Howard's suggestion in this point here because I would be happy with the internal audit - is that possible, for me to say so now, does it make any difference.

MR. PRESIDENT: What we are addressing Miss Buffett and Honourable Members is to agree or not to agree to clause 4 which is on page 2, and in fact covers all of page 2. Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: Carrying on I think that if we vote against including this clause, that everything in it is going to happen anyway by virtue of what we have already voted on. I feel sure that the Executive Member is going to appoint the internal auditor to do the audit and I am sure he will have access to the books and a report will be tabled because of section 3 of the Bill, and I think we can avoid some confusion and maybe extra cost by not saying it again with this clause.

MR. PRESIDENT: Further debate Honourable Members. Miss Buffett.

MISS BUFFETT: Is it possible to seek leave to move an amendment at this stage that clause 3 include that the auditor to be appointed shall be the internal auditor of the Administration, just transfer that over to clause 3.
MR. PRESIDENT: Miss Buffett we have already determined clause 3 at this time. Further debate Honourable Members. I put the question that clause 4 be agreed to.

Question - put
The House voted -

**AYES, 3**
Mr. Buffett
Miss Buffett
Mr. Jackson

**NOES, 5**
Mr. Howard
Mr. Christian-Bailey
Mrs. Gray
Mr. Quintal
Mr. Sanders

Clause 4 not agreed.

MR. PRESIDENT: That completes the clauses of the Bill Honourable Members. I seek a motion that the Bill, as amended, be agreed to. Mr. Howard. Debate Honourable Members. The question is that the Bill, as amended, be agreed to.

Question - put
Motion agreed to unanimously
Bill, as amended, agreed to.

NORFOLK ISLAND PUBLIC HOSPITAL (AUDIT, ETC) BILL 1982
NORFOLK ISLAND PUBLIC HOSPITAL (AMENDMENT) BILL 1982

MR. PRESIDENT: Order of the Day No. 3, Norfolk Island Public Hospital (Audit, etc) Bill 1982. Resumption of debate on the motion that the Bill be agreed to in principle, and Mr. Howard you have the call to resume from 1st September.

MR. HOWARD: Yes, thank you. I have again very serious concerns about this Bill, not simply about one part of it but about the Bill as a whole. My fundamental concern about the Bill as a whole is that under the Norfolk Island Hospital Ordinance the Administrator is in effect the government executive in charge of the hospital and he is the one who
appoints an auditor and he is the one who has executive authority. In this Bill the Assembly is asked to give the Administrator some instructions, give him some duties, and I don't think we have authority to do that and I certainly don't think we have in a sense of politeness and respectful dealings I don't think we have a proper position of suggesting such things at least until we have talked with the Administrator about them, and the Administrator tells me that he has not been consulted about this. I have got that concern, but I will leave my remarks there for the moment.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Buffett.

MR. BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President. Whilst I think I can say at the outset that there are some provisions of this particular piece of legislation which I think would be advantageous, there have been some points however that have already been made by Mr. Howard which may benefit from some further consultation in this particular matter. I would also say that I have had some detail from the Hospital Board in respect of the Bill that is before the House, they do find some difficulties with some provisions and I think it would warrant some further consultation with that body to try and tidy some of the detail that is presently before the House also. I really think it might be advantageous all round Mr. Acting Deputy President if we held this over for say a month or until the next sitting in which I would like to liaise with Miss Buffett for example to have some discussions with the Administrator in respect of those clauses for example that do touch upon his office, and some of them do quite directly, and on that basis I would be happy to move a motion of adjournment provided I am not cutting across, at this stage anyhow, what other Members would care to say about the matter this afternoon.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: If there is a possibility for another comment or two. Our next meeting I think is in two weeks and I wonder if that is a bit quick. It may be that the Bill is sensible and suits the Administrator – it may not be. I would be inclined to favour a somewhat longer adjournment if we are going to adjourn it or maybe some form of withdrawing the Bill for the timebeing until that consultation can be held. I am wanting a little
more air for people to do things in than I think Mr. Buffett's suggestion allows.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mrs. Gray.

MRS. GRAY: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President. I was originally going to ask whether it would be possible to move that so much of Standing Orders be suspended to allow us to debate the two Bills before us about the hospital, which concerns the hospital, and that is the Norfolk Island Public Hospital (Audit) Bill and the Norfolk Island Public Hospital (Amendment) Bill. I thought that it may be possible to debate them together, suspend Standing Orders but not so that we suspend also the machinery that allows us to vote on the Bills separately. Is it possible to do that or is it the wish that the whole lot be suspended.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: It is possible Mrs. Gray.

MRS. GRAY: May I then so move.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: You may ask leave to move it.

MRS. GRAY: May I then ask leave of the House to so move.


MRS. GRAY: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President. As Mr. Buffett and Mr. Howard have said there are perhaps difficulties that face us in the Bill that has already been mentioned, the Audit Bill, and there may be some in the Public Hospital (Amendment) Bill as well. If I may at this stage foreshadow that I would favour adjourning both of those Bills but may I give some reasons why. If the House will indulge me with a little time. I was fortunate enough to have a conversation with Dick Crosby before he left the Island on 29 August, and he felt that the present Ordinance, that is the Norfolk Island Public Hospital Ordinance of 1953-64, amended in 1972 a couple of times I think, really and I quote him "does not pay attention to present conditions", and he would be in favour of a redrafting of the entire legislation as it pertains to the hospital. The C.M.O., Dr. Allardyce, is generally of the opinion that
the hospital is a disaster area, and he states that present legislation is difficult to operate under. That was a conversation I had with him on 4 October. I am, and I think this House should be, particularly anxious to re-consider the relationship of the G.M.O. to the Hospital Board, and I think this is something which should be thought about and discussed very carefully if new legislation is to be formulated and I hope that it is. The early sections of the Ordinance as it stands deal with the election, or as it is amended, the appointment, of people to the Board. The Executive Member responsible for the hospital advised the Hospital Board in April of this year that election regularisation would be brought forward shortly. It would appear that no action has been taken, it may be that the present provision for the Administrator to appoint all members is a wise one but let's think about it. Is it also, in appointing members to the Board, desirable to place conditions of discretion or confidentiality upon them once they are appointed.

MISS BUFFETT: Mr. Acting Deputy President could I ask if these matters are relevant with the two Bills that are before us.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: No doubt Mrs. Gray will keep the matters relevant.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you, I ask because I had a matter of elections to the Board on my original motion and it had been taken off, so if I can't mention it I can't see that it can be discussed now - that was in my original amendment.

MRS. GRAY: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President, what I intended as I have already said is to request that the two Bills before us be adjourned. In seeking to achieve that adjournment I want to explain my reasons why because I think it is more than just those two Bills involved, I think it is the whole Hospital Ordinance that has to be looked at, and that is my reason for asking that these two Bills be adjourned. May I continue. Thank you. Section 14 of the present Ordinance says that the G.M.O. shall be medical superintendent and be responsible for many tasks now performed by the hospital manager, and I wish to cast no aspersions, let that be most clear, but is it a legal situation when we refer to the Hospital Ordinance as it is at the moment, another difficulty that I see. According to section 14(d) of the Ordinance the medical superintendent is
to have charge of medical instruments and take stock every six months. Under that same section he must confer with the Board re storage and purchase of drugs. At the moment the G.M.O. does not sight correspondence or orders and in fact has three times been refused access to such correspondence or orders. I suggest that relationship of the G.M.O. to the Board must be clarified. Section 15(b), subsection 2 - the Board shall purchase supplies. There are claims that this is not being done, there are some proprietary medicines and so on and so forth available but apparently often not essential drugs. There is another difficulty, the Board may hire and fire under section 16 of the Ordinance. Surely it makes more sense for the medical superintendent who in fact is the G.M.O. to have overall control of that situation. The G.M.O. is the king-pin elsewhere in any other hospital. In our instance here the hospital manager/pharmacist is responsible to the Board, the staff is responsible to the manager and the nurses are responsible to the superintendent who does not have the right to hire and fire. The contradictions are extraordinary. Sections 18, 19, 20 & 21 deal with the finances of the hospital. I wonder whether the Executive Member responsible took up the question which was asked in this House about the difference between the figures showing in the financial statement of the Norfolk Island Administration which stated $35,000 as being allocated in the budget to the hospital, and the hospital accounts showing that only $32,000 had been received. Clarification had been sought on that from the Executive Member, I am not sure whether he is prepared to make any statement about that at the moment. The finances I would perhaps prefer to go into at another time. Mr. Sanders also has drawn our attention at an earlier meeting to some of the strange entries in those figures.

To return to the Norfolk Island Public Hospital Ordinance - section 23 - debts may be recovered. Who owes the hospital what and why. I am wondering why money is not being collected, if there is a bad debt situation surely something can be done about it if we are talking about large figures of money. Section 22(2) there is power to postpone payment etc. I would have thought that our present situation with social welfare has overtaken that, I hope it has. There should surely be provision within the social services structure for funding of those needing treatment overseas. There is an interesting matter of the advertisement which appears in the local paper, the Norfolk Island Health Insurance Plan, which in fact is an advertisement, one should ring the hospital for details. Is this advertisement, the scheme, is the whole thing supported by
Southern Cross or is it being supported by the hospital, I don't know, I think it is a reasonable question. Also we had a situation recently of people on temporary entry permits being forced to pay hospital benefits. Now if one section of the community is being forced to pay, why not the rest. One or the other. It was said that the people who were not resident on the Island were those leaving bad debts with the hospital, I'm not convinced that that is so. Let me just briefly touch on the geriatric wing or perhaps we could call it or christen it the Mawson Wing. Apparently the design was satisfactory to the Board of the hospital and was approved, the wing was handed to the Board to run, furniture has been supplied, and of course it is a magnificent gesture in philanthropic terms, but apparently demand for the units constructed has not yet been defined. They are self contained units, there is a communal area and laundry and TV facilities etc etc. Perhaps my question on notice which the Executive Member didn't answer at this sitting, is it in order to refer to that - section (c) who will eventually own the senior citizens units now being constructed and who should insure them when constructed against fire etc. Again confusion. The G.M.O. says that the geriatric wing is inadequate, the Mawson Wing is not designed for the elderly, it is not a nursing home, it is only suitable for those who require minimal attention. People requiring minimal attention are possibly happier at home and attended to by the District Nurse. They are questions Mr. Acting Deputy President, I don't know what the answers are and if the Executive Member with Miss Buffett assisting are happy to go into all these things I'm more than pleased.

Are tenders being called for works. There is a suggestion that perhaps we should have one G.M.O. and one hospital superintendent, that may be a way of clarifying some of the duties which the present G.M.O. is carrying including health, hygiene and quarantine. The present G.M.O. says that there is no clear line of direction in the hospital. The supervision of staff is a difficult one, I have already suggested that it is a confused one. Should we be thinking about outside staff as used to be the case here on Norfolk. Would an interchange of staff with hospitals in Australia be a worthwhile exercise, I suggest that it might be. I did send copies of the proposed Bill to the Hospital Board for comment and a reply was received couched in what I thought were rather condescending terms, perhaps it is best not to go into that here, it serves no purpose. If the hospital runs on public money and obviously it
does, the public has a right to know how the money is spent right down to the last cent and I think this is the intention of the presentation of Miss Buffett's Bill. I have no argument with that, but I do suggest that a wholesale revision of the Ordinance is needed, a whole new piece of legislation which clearly defines the relationship of the G.M.O. to the Board, we have had too many G.M.O.'s lately, why. Is it perhaps some of their confusion with the situation at the moment. Costs are becoming significant, we have got to make sure that the people we get are satisfied with the conditions under which they work.

I would ask that debate do be adjourned as has been suggested here already and I would request the Executive Member to bring forward complete legislation taking into account both the Bills which are before us and some of the points I have raised here today. Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Further debate on both Bills. Mr. Buffett.

MR. BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President. I do say that there are a number of difficulties at present in the area of the hospital and they are over a broad spectrum, and Mrs. Gray has accurately described some of them. Let me just give you some of the detail that I have in front of me. There is difficulty with getting and the maintenance of equipment and supplies in some areas; the maintenance of buildings at the hospital, and I stress not only at present but in the long term situation; there are some difficulties with sufficient finance as we all know in these particular areas. We do have some difficulty especially of late in the continuity area of the Government Medical Officers, and we do experience the patent difficulties with the various categories of staffing at the hospital, many having different employing authorities and differing conditions of employment. We are also aware of the increasing demands being placed upon the health services, both from a clinical point of view and a public health point of view. We do know that in the hospital area medical benefits the hospital has oversight of medical benefits. It has been rightly pointed out in this Chamber this afternoon that there has been some compulsion in respect of certain categories of persons, namely temporary entry permit holders and yet there is no compulsion in respect of other areas, and that is something that I think needs to be examined so that there is a fair and equitable application of how these things are managed. What I do want to say at
this time is that there are considerable difficulties but they are difficulties that are being addressed, some by the Hospital Board, some by me, some by the Public Service Board, and I have had discussions with the Chairman of the Public Service Board and the Secretary/Manager and the Chairman of the Hospital Board, and we continue to liaise and hopefully there will be some solutions which will evolve from these discussions which of course will ultimately need to come to this Legislative Assembly. I really feel that the two pieces of legislation, and I now address those two pieces that are before us this afternoon, that they do not address the total picture at all and that is the point that has been made earlier by Mrs. Gray of course. I do have my views in respect of both of them, one I have said that it would be more advantageous to have further discussions, the second one which is the Norfolk Island Public Hospital (Amendment) Bill of 1982 I think probably does not address in great detail many of the things that have been said this afternoon and I think that problem is something that can be addressed in the existing machinery, but that is just one view at this time. I do see merit in adjourning this debate. Mr. Howard has made the point that it may be to everyone’s advantage if it in fact is not brought on at the next sitting in two weeks time, and I certainly agree with that, it would be better I think to have it for call in say six weeks time which is the December sitting, that may be a better time-frame in which to operate. But let me say at this stage that I do recognise as the Executive Member who has responsibility in this House and there have been discussions for example with the Administrator who does have the executive responsibility from the Australian Government's point of view, in respect of a number of these matters and I think it would be better if we gave that some further time to come forward with some all embracing solutions to the problems that have been described this afternoon and I would support adjournment of the matter.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Thank you. Miss Buffett.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President, I am delighted that the Bills have started the ball rolling. I support an adjournment of another six weeks so that all points come into line, that the Ordinance be reviewed. I, like Mrs. Gray and Mr. Buffett have been in very many consultations with the medical superintendent and with matron and with various members of staff and have also had a couple of explanatory
sentences regarding the Administrator, and I won't mention any names but I have been mislead to believe that it was not necessary for me to seek an amendment to my original Bill regarding the ministerial or executive responsibility in the area of the Administrator or the present Executive Minister, however that is beside the point. I will support an adjournment. Thank you.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Thank you Miss Buffett. Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: Thanks. I wanted to comment if I can on one or two things that Mrs. Gray said. I was distressed to hear her seeming to quote the Government Medical Officer saying the hospital is a disaster area.

MRS. GRAY: With his permission.

MR. HOWARD: It may well have been with his permission, I can't believe that standing alone as a statement that any responsible G.M.O. would want that description of the hospital attached to his name. The Norfolk Island Hospital is not a disaster area, it has problems the way a lot of things on the Island has problems but the idea that our hospital is a disaster area is silly talk and I don't think we really need that kind of chatter.

Mrs. Gray among many points about how the hospital might be run better said that in other places the medical officer was the man in charge of the whole shooting match. That isn't true. All over the world it has been found a very effective way to run a hospital to have the medical head man in charge of medicine and the practice of medicine and have absolute authority over that matter, and to have the running of the hospital and the handling of accounts and the physical plant of the hospital handled by a totally separate body. It has been found to work, we've got it here, I would be very careful about wanting to throw that system away.

Coming down to the business that is really before us at the moment about a possible adjournment, could I ask Mr. Chairman if there is some way that our standing orders would allow, assuming it were agreeable to Mr. Buffett and to Miss Buffett whose Bill it is, if it could be adjourned until the Executive Member thinks it is ready to bring back.
MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: That will be decided by the Business Committee Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: I see. Well my preference would certainly be that as the Executive Member, Mr. Buffett, would want to consult with Miss Buffett on the Bill and with other people as he has said, my hope would be that he would not bring it back until he is happy with it and thinks it makes sense, and if that is not six weeks from now, fine, let it go longer but let's get it right.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Buffett.

MR. BUFFETT: I have said earlier in the debate that I would be very happy to consult with Miss Buffett in respect of what needs to be done and the timing. Mr. Acting Deputy President before you put the motion of adjournment I wonder if I could just clarify one matter that was earlier raised by Mrs. Gray, and I think it was raised by one other Member in the House on an earlier occasion, and it relates to an elusive amount of $3,000. If I could just clarify how that has come about. As far as the Administration records are concerned in the period of time that we are talking about, and I think it is for the year 1981-82 in which the Hospital Board statements were tabled in this House on an earlier occasion in the last two months or so, the Administration figures show that in fact there was a direct subsidy of $35,000 and a maintenance amount of $19,500 allocated to the hospital during the year 1981-82, and that totals $54,500. The expression of that in the Hospital Board figures show a subsidy of $32,000 and the repair and maintenance vote $22,500 - in fact they put their $3,000 in a separate compartment - the total of both those two come to $54,500. The $3,000 was a particular grant that was made in respect of specialised equipment as I understand the matter, and so I just clarify that it is accounted for except that it appeared in another heading in the other set of books.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Thank you Mr. Buffett. Miss Buffett.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President, I would like to make a comment here while we are suspending standing orders regarding audits and auditors. An internal audit - this came up in the previous
matter under discussion. An internal audit is quite a different thing as you will realise to an overall audit and an internal auditor is quite different in his qualifications to a man qualified to be an auditor of a general business, and I just wanted to bring that to the minds of people when they are considering the audits of these statutory bodies related to government.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: While we are on that I will follow on for a moment. Nobody on Norfolk Island is qualified to do a full blown big time serious audit, nobody on Norfolk Island, there is not a qualified auditor on Norfolk. There are I think a couple of qualified accountants, auditing is something else again. I think that we can get the equivalent as good as we need, as near as we need, of an audit, using some of the good accounting ability that is on the Island. I don't think we should start thinking about bringing really costly auditors over from the mainland for a whole range of things, costs will go right through the roof if we do and I think we can get quite good enough most of the time on the Island.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Thank you. Miss Buffett.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you. It is the trend with Commonwealth statutory bodies as within the Commonwealth and indeed within State organisations where statutory bodies are formed the internal audit goes on but the tendency is to have the books available to the auditor-general who does not keep running backwards and forwards to all but he does one general audit.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Thank you. Is it the wish of the House to adjourn debate on the Norfolk Island Public Hospital (Audit, etc) Bill 1982 and the Norfolk Island Public Hospital (Amendment) Bill 1982.

Question - put
Motion agreed to unanimously
Debate adjourned.
PUBLIC WORKS (GARBAGE DISPOSAL, SEWERAGE & WATER SUPPLY) LEVY BILL 1982


MR. HOWARD: In the past week I have learnt from Mr. Sanders that he thinks this matter requires additional thought to what it has been able to receive so far, and I understand that he proposes withdrawing the Bill for the time-being, and so rather than debating it I will simply pass over to him.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. Chairman. When I presented this Bill I left it deliberately full of loopholes hoping to get constructive criticism from the public - I certainly achieved that. I believe under the circumstances that there is miles more consideration and thought needed to go into this and I seek permission to withdraw this Bill.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Is leave granted Honourable Members. Leave granted.

BUILDING (AMENDMENT) BILL 1982

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order of the Day No.6, Building (Amendment) Bill 1982. Mr. Brown to resume - Mr. Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Brown has the floor on this matter and as he is absent from this meeting I seek leave to have this matter adjourned.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The question is that the Bill be adjourned.

Question - put
The House voted -
AYES, 5
Mr. Howard
Mr. Christian-Bailey
Mrs. Gray
Mr. Quintal
Mr. Sanders

NOES, 3
Mr. Buffett
Miss Buffett
Mr. Jackson

Motion agreed
Debate adjourned
Resumption of debate made an order of the day for the next sitting.

NEXT SITTING DAY

MR. SANDERS: I move that the House at its rising adjourn until Wednesday 3 November 1982 at 2 p.m.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Debate. No debate. The question is that the motion be agreed.

Question - put
Motion agreed to unanimously

ADJOURNMENT

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Miss Buffett.

MISS BUFFETT: I move that this House do now adjourn.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Adjournment debate. Mr. Jackson.

MR. JACKSON: Mr. Acting Deputy President. An Island resident with Crown lease land has drawn my attention to the fact that pine trees have been cut down on their property and taken away without the knowledge of the owner. The persons complaint is that at least they should have been
told that pines would be removed, even though it is only on Crown lease land, and by being told they would have been in a better position to make sure that fences are properly repaired and the area cleaned up. Therefore Mr. Chairman I draw this to the notice of the Minister responsible for Crown leases so that necessary steps will be taken so that the rights of Crown lease land owners are protected.

Another point Mr. Chairman I wish to make on the political interest that is being shown by the residents and the general public of Norfolk Island concerning legislation introduced into this House where Bills have had to be either amended or even withdrawn because of public reaction. Two of these Bills came before this House last Wednesday to be voted on - the first being the Road Traffic Bill where legislation was introduced some time ago to increase the age limit for riding motor cycles up to 125cc from 15 years to 16 years, where in the first instance the majority of Members supported this proposal, however public reaction resulted in an amendment being carried unanimously reversing the age limit back to 15 years. The second Bill was the Public Works Levy which was introduced by Mr. Howard on behalf of Mr. Sanders and which Mr. Sanders announced last week and again today that he would withdraw this Bill. Now here was a proposed piece of legislation which recommended that the public works levy be increased in some instances from $50 a year to $500 a year. Now this Bill not only met with criticism within the community but it was soundly condemned for its unfair methods of raising this proposed revenue. Therefore I congratulate those who spoke out against this Bill, I congratulate those who wrote me letters condemning this Bill and for the interest shown within the community to any piece of legislation which they consider not to be in the best interests of the welfare of the people of Norfolk Island.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Quintal.

MR. QUINTAL: Yes Mr. Acting Deputy President, a matter that has concerned me for some time is the economic situation on Norfolk Island today. Some businesses are going broke, which is not good, also a lot of our young and not so young are running out of work. One of our carpenters contractors who last year had 18 men on his staff says that if things do
not improve he will be cutting down to 3 or 4 staff in the not too distant future. When businesses start to run down that means that electricians, plumbers and others suffer and our young people have to leave the Island at times to look for employment, which in my opinion is really bad. With the majority of people on the Island being elderly would be just too awful. There is another aspect which is quite frightening and that is the interest rates that the banks are charging on loans which is rather crippling a lot of our young people who have involved themselves in loans which they borrowed when prosperity was at its height. If our economy continues to deteriorate they could lose everything they have worked so hard for and strived for. I would like to see this Government make real efforts to look for markets for some commodity that we could sell to the outside world, maybe joinery, I do not know. Also we have very fertile land and land owners could be encouraged to use their land if an overseas market could be found. Norfolk Island buys goods from New Zealand. Up until recently the amount of imports have been 2.5 million dollars per annum New Zealand currency. I feel that our Government should have discussions with the New Zealand authorities to try and arrange a reciprocal trade agreement. Many years ago we exported huge quantities of bananas to New Zealand and I can't see why we are not sending bananas to New Zealand today. They get their supplies from Raratonga, Fiji and even Equador. With a firm agreement with a buyer such as New Zealand, growers can use their land to produce these crops but would need to know that we have somewhere to sell them. Unless we make a start it will never happen. We cannot just sit here hoping that the tourist numbers will increase. We must be looking at some other ways as well to create work and income for our people. I would like to request the Executive Members to begin discussions with the appropriate people in New Zealand regarding reciprocal trade.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Thank you Mr. Quintal. Mrs. Gray.

MRS. GRAY: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President, I would like to make a comment on what Mr. Quintal has just said. This is probably one of the few places in the agenda as it were, where we can debate a thing, discuss a thing without having to put it to formal motion, and I would like to do that. I feel, I believe, that there are probably three courses of action open to Norfolk. Present employment, or employment as it was lets say
six or nine months ago, was based on a tourist economy of somewhere between 20,000 and 24,000 tourists. We had full employment both in the private sector and the public sector. We are looking at something probably under 14,000 tourists for this year. For arguments sake, for the purpose of the argument, lets bring that back to say half. Now that would theoretically suggest that half the people employed in the private sector and half the people employed in the public sector will have to go. The alternative to that is some form of compromise between our tourist numbers which may not be considered, well perhaps not everybody agrees that somewhere around 20,000 to 24,000 visitors to the Island a year is desirable. If they don't then they have to consider expanding the resident base of the Island. So lets say that the compromise would be to hold on around the 14,000 to 15,000 tourists mark and expand our resident numbers, our population. I suppose the figure 3,000 has been thrown around, now somewhere between those three alternatives as I see them the answer may lie. If we are going to maintain tourist figures or if we are going to not even increase them but just bring them back to what they were, the numbers that were supporting this economy, then perhaps we have to think about our airline service, perhaps we do have to think about not being an end destination, perhaps we have to think about aircraft types. There is some pretty confusing information around at the moment about what the airstrip is capable of taking and how often. I think that we are facing a strange set of circumstances, an extraordinary set of circumstances. Older members of the community remember a depression, many of us have not experienced that. If that is what we are facing now then perhaps extraordinary measures need to be taken to counteract it. It is a very small community, it is very fragile. Perhaps people would like to let us know whether they are pleased to see the tourist numbers go back up to 20,000, 24,000, 25,000; increased air services; bigger aircraft, or whether they would like to see the numbers maintained as they are and expand the number of people living on Norfolk Island, we are going to have to make a decision, whether the people who live here do less damage in the long term than a whole lot of people passing through. And I think that comes round to what Greg has been saying here today, encouraging things like export markets, encouraging primary industry on the Island, trying to make ourselves a little more independent of external influences. If that can be done I think that's the security for Norfolk Island. That is all I wish to say Mr. Acting Deputy President,
it is something that has been puzzling me for quite a few months, perhaps others would like to think about it and in particular talk to us about it. Thank you.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Further debate Honourable Members. Mr. Jackson.

MR. JACKSON: Mr. Chairman I feel that what Mrs. Gray has said also needs some comments because surely the public will hear those comments, and I was shocked to hear them, but Mrs. Gray did paint a very gloomy picture, I don't think it was Greg's intention to paint such a gloomy picture. But what concerned me in the first part of Mrs. Gray's statement was that if the economic situation does not improve we might lose, and I hope she means we might lose half the private sector and half the public sector. I was hoping she may define who is the private sector and who is the public sector - they will have to go she said. I believe the responsibility of the Members around this table is the concern of the people of Norfolk Island, and the concern of the people of Norfolk Island is not the real concern of some other people who would like to see Norfolk Island improved perhaps to their own benefit. Mrs. Gray used some figures, for larger aircraft, the through transit of aeroplanes touching down and taking off to another destination, perhaps as long as the debates that we have had over the years in the for and against of upgrading the airport, there was a strong reaction in the early part of using smaller planes. Well that has been solved, the airport is just about completed and will be finished by the end of the year, to take certain size aircraft. Now I have heard it and I have heard it here this afternoon, the suggestion of larger planes, now what for, to satisfy only a certain section of the community for their benefit. My overall concern is for the welfare of the people of Norfolk Island, their overall concern, not to someone solely who has come to the Island when there has been a boom, when there has been a very high tourist figure and now find themselves in a situation where things are not going as good as what they would like it. Now all I can say on that is that if anyone's feeling the pinch well for goodness sake don't do what we did in the last budget and place another burden or another impost on the community to prop up some of these establishments that may be feeling the pinch. Let us think of the people in the overall concept, not the ones that I have just described,
because in the end, in the final analysis, if things do get really bad I know who will be leaving, perhaps some of these people who have come here expecting the boom period to continue forever. Well anyone who lives in that world of false paradise well they are doomed unless they reassess their situation and assess it to the way Norfolk Island exists, I feel that they are looking into a glass bowl that has no bottom. Therefore I take the point of what has been said about people may be having to leave the Island, well I am certain there are many Norfolk Islanders here who have been through hard times and no doubt they will have to continue, but it is the ones who have come to take advantage of our Island, they are the ones I have spoken out against in the past, they are the ones who have to come to grips with the situation that exists at present. Certainly everyone would like to wave a magic wand and have tourists streaming off the planes but as the situation is there is a world-wide downturn in tourists, it is not just Norfolk Island, there is a world-wide downturn in the whole economic situation. Therefore I think we should be looking at the overall concept, the welfare of the whole of Norfolk Island, not just one sector.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Thank you Mr. Jackson. Mr. Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: Mr. Chairman, I think Mr. Jackson is to be complimented, he never misses an opportunity to grandstand and he never misses an opportunity to be destructive. I think it would be fascinating in this House if just one day he tried to do something constructive. Thank you.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Thank you. Mr. Quintal.

MR. QUINTAL: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say one or two things. I have lived on Norfolk all my life, I have been through depressions and I know what they are. A depression in the early days was really something, not as bad as today. In the early days people helped one another and they lived as a community and things were not so difficult then, but I must disagree with Mr. Jackson, I do feel that the future is kind of gloomy, and the thing that worries me is not the business people, not the successful business people or the people with money who will be leaving the Island if we do get a worse depression than what we had, it would be the likes of my children or one of my sons perhaps, and a lot of the
young Islanders who I mentioned in the first part of my discussion, and that is persons who have had to borrow money to build their homes in good times when prosperity was on the top. Prosperity has gone for the time-being, I don't know how long for but the persons that I am worried about are our young people, also anyone else, I don't care who has to leave this Island whether it be mainlander or Islander, I don't think it is a good thing at all and I don't agree with that in any sense. A lot of our people will have to leave the Island and a lot will not have to, but the persons who find themselves in financial trouble or without work will have to go somewhere else and they are the persons I am concerned about.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Miss Buffett.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President, if I could come in on the general conversation at the moment. Norfolk Island being five by three her resources are very limited but we are blessed with many many of them and we are blessed with very much to be thankful for even now, whereas in I suppose, not knowing the exact dates, but in the late 1950's I think when whaling started up as an industry again here, a lot of our people left their farm properties and intensive farming to work for the very attractive wages, even though it was hard work, in the whaling industry and the consequent dovetailing industries that go hand in hand with a new industry starting up. Consequently a lot of the land has been left idle, herds have been allowed to dwindle, but the land is still there. We have a very good valuable resource of fertile ground and a reasonably good knowledge of how to test it. We have another excellent resource of healthy people who can divert the resource of labour, we are not so especially specialised that we can't divert our labour, and this is essential to any buoyant community, we have been reasonably buoyant over my lifetime. A lot of us can go back to the land and a lot of us who have not been on to the land whose shops for instance are not doing as well as they could be and are possibly not having much turnover at all, to look after them as well we could possibly divert our methods of investment. We could create industries for those who have the resource of their hands. I have come in before in this House about the establishment of primary industry here and allied industries - growing, packaging, or growing, processing, dehydrating, freezing, packaging and
selling for local market, a terrific lot of goods which are now being wasted, take for instance even the bunches of bananas throughout the Island, how many families use a certain portion of a bunch of bananas the rest if they don't have a cow goes out to the birds. Kumeras, potatoes carrots, peas, they don't have to be grown in little batches, they may be grown in several acres during season. Those investors and people whose lines have been sitting on their shelves for several months, use money instead of purchasing more goods that would have gone on their shelves, redivert that money to the investment of the farmer who will have to for instance import plastic bags in which to store his food to be frozen. The extension of the piggery for methane gas, we already have established here. Turning back to, instead of importing, the people on Norfolk Island can't possibly cope with the cheap imported Asian country artifacts. There are handicraft people here, leather work, bamboo work, timber work, shell work, many kinds of things, you can't possibly cope - artists can't possibly cope and live in an economy requiring so many dollars to exist and receive the wages that are being paid by those in Asia, we must produce a tariff barrier if necessary to protect industry for local population, we must look after all facets of our population, starting from the worker we can divert we can move, the person selling crockery in a shop if the people are not here to buy the crockery can divert to something else. As far as banks are concerned of course this is a world trend and demand controls the price of money the same as demand and supply control the price of anything else. As far as tradesmen suffering and unemployment there are some people here employing many outside temporary entry permit holders at a far cheaper rate because they can house them and feed them. The temporary entry permit holders invariably don't have homes and properties to upkeep, they are usually of a different age group on the whole than of the worker resident in any one place, so I would say that if certain tradesmen would have to reduce their staff employed by them, if they are temporary entry permit holders well there again we will be looking after our own and there will be more work for others who are finding it hard themselves. As far as exporting is concerned, freight charges have proved to us that we must try and concentrate on growing and selling locally to even the 14,000 tourists that come here. We are importing a colossal amount, tons and tons, of food that we could be locally producing, packaging, storing and selling. It is only a matter of directing our trade, why grow it and export it
when we can grow it and sell it here. People have said to me we can import them much cheaper, so what, we can import it a lot cheaper but there are some countries that are only getting $40 a year whereas you would get $40 for the one item, you have to take all that into consideration, that is the purpose of customs and tariff. I think if we carefully look at matters and try to all work together for the creation of industry within our own little Island, small as it is, and help each other we will not have to accept a mass bombardment of the place of more two day visitors of tourists that I feel we are proving that we can't even cope with 20,000 at the moment, so we will have to improve considerably before I would be happy with a stop-over destination. Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Thank you Miss Buffett. Further debate. The question is that the House do now adjourn.

House adjourned at 3.27 p.m. on 13 October 1982 until Wednesday 3 November 1982 at 2 p.m.