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The Assembly met at 2 p.m. The President (Hon. D.E. Buffett) took the Chair and read the Prayer.
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

MIDDLEGATE SUBDIVISIONS

MR. PRESIDENT: Questions without notice. Mr. Quintal.

MR. QUINTAL: Could you please give me the latest information on the Middlegate subdivisions, and will the Minister say whether these subdivisions will be offered for sale or will they be offered to permanent residents.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Quintal I am not able to give you a categoric answer in respect of the Middlegate subdivisions at this time. There have been a number of proposals over a period of years I would think to actually make those subdivisions available to various categories of persons. I would need to take it on notice to give a more comprehensive answer to your query, and I am very happy to do that.

DOCTORS HOUSE CALLS

MR. PRESIDENT: Questions without notice. Mr. Jackson.

MR. JACKSON: Mr. President I direct a question to yourself regarding the doctors house calls. This has caused some discussion within the community and I notice it was listed on the agenda for discussion by the three executive members at a meeting early this month. Would you please inform this House was this matter discussed and if so what were the results of those discussions.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Buffett.

MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Acting Deputy President thank you. In response to the query in respect of house calls by the medical profession in the Island, this matter has been raised to determine some delineation of the activity in this area, and I have apart from discussion with members of the Executive, had conversation with the Government Medical Officer at this time. The situation is that the services that are provided at the
hospital in Norfolk Island are comprehensive services and it is preferable from most points of view that if in fact people do require medical treatment that it be dispensed at the hospital. Therefore it is preferable that people who are in situations of requiring medical attention do try to their utmost to present themselves at the hospital so that the whole range of facilities and professional expertise is available to them, however it is understood that there will be occasions where it will be necessary for the doctor to attend places other than the hospital. It is hoped for the reasons that I have mentioned, in other words the full gamut of medical expertise and equipment being available at the hospital, that the range of treatment that will have to be undertaken away from the hospital would be kept to a minimum. It may be preferable in many circumstances that in fact an ambulance be sent for people who may not be able to travel from their home or from wherever else they may be in difficulties so that they are brought to an environment whereby these facilities are available.

I have undertaken with the members of the Executive Committee to have further conversation with the Government Medical Officer to explain and to try and find some solution to situations whereby there may be people who find themselves in medical difficulties associated with accommodation houses on the Island, and I am talking about visitors, so that some arrangement may be made whereby it will be quite clearly known that if people are visiting the Island that they can have adequate facilities available to them whilst they are visiting.

I think that is about the range of the matter that I am able to respond to at this time.

APPLICATION TO START A BREWERY

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Jackson.

MR. JACKSON: Another question to the President, regarding a brewery application for Norfolk Island.
A temporary entry permit holder, already in business in the Island, has made an application to start a brewery on Norfolk Island. This matter was also listed on the agenda for discussion by the Executive Committee, and the question is was this matter discussed and if so what were the results of those discussions.
MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Acting Deputy President, this matter has been listed for discussion amongst the Executive Members. It was firstly raised on the basis that there was such an application and it invited comment from other Executive Members if they so wished to make it. I should also mention that the application that was made to me in this particular instance related to approval, or seeking approval, for the manufacture of alcohol in Norfolk Island which is one sector of the overall basis of a brewery operation in Norfolk Island. You will understand that there needs to be applications in other spheres such as its location etc. I indicated to the Executive Committee that that application was in front of me and was being considered. In the process of consideration a number of things have evolved and some further discussion is taking place with the applicant and some further detail is being sought in respect of the overall liquor situation, especially beer which is the product that they intend to make in the Island, is being pursued. So in brief Mr. Acting Deputy President the matter continues to be under consideration.

WORKERS COMPENSATION

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Jackson.

MR. JACKSON: Thank you. A question regarding workers compensation. Workers compensation has been with us for a long time, and this matter was also listed for discussion by the Executive Committee. Was this matter discussed and if so would you please inform this House the results of those discussions.

MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Acting Deputy President, yes this matter has been listed for discussion at the Executive Committee, it has received interim consideration, in other words some detail was brought forward to the Executive Committee which generated discussion and presentation of papers on a number of aspects of the particular proposal. Those aspects that were raised are being examined further and also some up to date information in respect of Australian legislative arrangements for workers compensation are additionally being sought. It was indicated that when all of this detail was collated it would be again brought forward to the Executive Committee.
HOSPITAL ACCOUNTS

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Jackson.

MR. JACKSON: I have a further question to the President, regarding a letter that was circulated to all Members regarding the temporary entry permit holders hospital accounts. This was also listed for discussion by the Executive Committee. Would the Minister responsible for health state if this was discussed and what were the results of those discussions.

MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Acting Deputy President, I am just thinking over what in fact did transpire in respect of that. There was to be some discussion I think with the hospital authorities in respect of this. Not all of that has taken place at this time, and if I remember correctly after that has taken place it was a matter of again speaking with the Executive Committee. As I said, that has not yet taken place.

MR. JACKSON: I have a follow up question to that for the Minister responsible for health. There appears to be quite a lot of money owed to the hospital, not only by temporary entry permit holders but by residents as well, for various services such as consultations, medical prescriptions, outpatients fees, hospitalisation fees. I am aware it is a sudden question to pose at such short notice however, as the Minister for health could you inform this House of the actual amount owed to the hospital in combined debts of the various services I have listed.

MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Acting Deputy President, in short no I am not able to quote that figure to the House at this time but I can undertake to gain the figure from the hospital and advise Members accordingly. I can say this however, that the hospital has in the past had difficulty in calling in its outstanding accounts and this is part of some of the difficulties of the financial arrangements of the hospital. As you will realise people do become sick, these things are, in most cases, not planned, and sometimes it does create unforeseen expenses, and sometimes there are difficulties in meeting those expenses, and of course that all hinges around the matter of outstanding debts as far as the hospital is
concerned. I can confirm that this is a fact. As to the actual figure I would seek the indulgence of Members to gain that figure and advise them.

VISIT TO NEW ZEALAND BY EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR PLANNING, TOURISM & COMMERCE

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Jackson.

MR. JACKSON: I have a question for Mr. Sanders, the Minister for tourism.
Mr. Sanders will you be making a statement concerning your recent visit to New Zealand at this sitting.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Yes Mr. Jackson, when we get down to reports.

MR. JACKSON: Thank you.

SEALING OF BUMBORAS ROAD

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Jackson

MR. JACKSON: A further question, to the Minister for Finance, Mr. Howard.
It concerns the sealing of Bumboras Road. I am aware that you made no finance available in the budget for new road sealing programmes, however many residents have approached me, and no doubt other Members also, concerning the state of the road leading to Bumboras Beach. Even when it is overcast people are hesitant to drive down because after a light shower of rain it is impossible to drive out again. Bumboras has always been a popular beach and it continues to be so, with more people taking advantage of what the area offers. It has an excellent recreation and picnic area, it has good rock pools for young children at low tide, it is also good for rock fishing. It is a most favoured area for board and body surfing which is a good encouragement to our teenagers
in a good healthy sport. It is a great tourist attraction, which we must not neglect if our desire is genuine to attract tourists. When anyone mentions Bumborases there is always that question - but what about the road.
I suppose everyone is waiting for me to put the question.
Mr. Howard as Minister for finance and Minister responsible in that area would you be prepared to make the necessary finance available to tarseal this road into Bumborases.

MR. HOWARD: It is a matter for the Assembly to judge, not for me. I will be making a statement in a few minutes about the condition of the Island's finances. The Assembly has the power to vote money when it wants to. One of the things that is being looked at at the moment is the possibility of taking advantage of the very large scale metropolitan style of road sealing equipment that is on the Island at the moment at the airport for sealing the runways, and examinations are being made of the possibility of doing quite a lot of sealing taking advantage of that equipment while it is on the Island even though we might not be able to afford it, it might be the wisest thing to do in the long run. It could be that if a programme of that kind makes sense that the Bumborases Road could be included as one of the things that was done in that general programme. I don't want to imply that that programme is going to go ahead, it is something that is being looked at.

OFFICIAL CHECK OF NORFOLK ISLAND ADMINISTRATION ACCOUNTS

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Jackson.

MR. JACKSON: One more question to Mr. Howard, concerning the auditors who visited the Island recently.
Mr. Howard you engaged private auditors from the mainland to audit the books of the Norfolk Island Administration. I listened to your report to the two other Members of the Executive Committee concerning this matter and you mentioned that one of the auditors returning for a short period to carry out further work and a figure of $4,500 a week was mentioned. Could you elaborate further on this $4,500 a week.
MR. HOWARD: The firm of Hungerford, Hancock & Offner was retained to come, not make an audit but to do what was called making an official check, of some of the Island's books and to examine the systems by which the accounting of the Administration is done. This was step one in a process of improving Administration accounting systems which was provided for in this years budget - you may recall an amount of $20,000 was allocated in the budget this year for reorganisation and improvement of the Administration accounting. That visit was step one in that process. If the air strike ends and he can get here, on Sunday the senior partner of the firm who was in charge of that first round, will arrive. His name is Harry Thomas. He will arrive and will be here all of next week. During that week he will be actually putting into effect changes and improvements in the accounting systems and will be drawing up the 1981/82 financial statements for the Island in a new and clear and useful form which I believe we will then want to follow from then on. At the end of that week, assuming he gets here, he will then be joined by another member of their firm, one of the leading computer experts in Australia, a man called Peter Evans, and the two of them will spend that week examining the possible application of computers to various parts of the Administration. The cost of Mr. Thomas' first week, that is the week after this one, assuming he can get here, will be $4,500. The cost of Mr. Thomas' second week and the week of time by Mr. Evans the computer expert, will be, from memory, $7,200. That size of charges is strange and weird to us on Norfolk Island but I can assure you it is what you pay on the mainland for very first class people, and that is what we are hiring to do this work for us.

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

MR. JACKSON: They must be first class at that cost, but anyhow could you say at present how much have these auditors cost us including the projected $4,500 a week and the $7,200 that you just mentioned.

MR. HOWARD: It will be about $17,500 by the time they are done with this coming exercise and that will complete the review of accounting systems that was projected at the time of the budget and for which $20,000 has been provided for in the budget. I think we will come out a bit under what was budgeted.
MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATION FEES

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Jackson.

MR. JACKSON: I have one question for Mr. Buffett which I overlooked and I am sorry I forgot to ask him when I was on his questions. This question, Mr. Buffett, concerns motor vehicle registration fees which was discussed at an Executive Committee meeting. Mr. Buffett will you be making a statement concerning this and if so will it be open for discussion.

MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Acting Deputy President the matter of making regulations pursuant to the proposed motor vehicle legislation is one that is made by the Administrator on the advice of the Executive Council, as distinct from the Executive Committee. The various fees have been of course pursued in the Executive Committee before such action was proposed. Now that that has been done it will be pursued in the Executive Council with the Administrator, and in due course will be of course tabled in this House.

MR. JACKSON: Following up on that question, I would like it to be known at this stage, and I have the fees here in front of me, when the Executive Council makes their decision, that I strongly oppose certain increases that have been recommended for private or family vehicles.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Questions only, Mr. Jackson.

RESIGNATION OF GOVERNMENT MEDICAL OFFICER

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mrs. Gray.

MRS. GRAY: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President, may I return to the matter of the hospital and address questions to the Executive Member responsible for Administration, Education & Health. Beginning with the question has the Government Medical Officer, Dr. Allardyce, resigned.

MR. BUFFETT: Yes Mr. Acting Deputy President.
MRS. GRAY: Thank you. A supplementary question please. Has Dr. Allardyce indicated whether there are any circumstances under which he would reconsider his action.

MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Acting Deputy President when Dr. Allardyce's resignation was made known to myself and to the other Executive Members we did seek at that time as to whether Dr. Allardyce would reconsider his decision and that was conveyed to Dr. Allardyce and his decision at that time was that he had lodged his resignation and that was his feeling upon the matter at that time. There has been no change to my knowledge of that situation.

MRS. GRAY: May I then ask if there is room to manoeuvre if he does make known some set of circumstances under which his resignation could be withdrawn, is there room for it to be considered by whoever has accepted his resignation now.

MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Acting Deputy President I should make it plain that Dr. Allardyce's resignation of course is to the Administrator and Chairman of the Public Service Board context, and those matters that I have just referred to have been through those channels and in consultation with those particular channels. I would be most happy to again pursue, again through those channels, if there is any room for "manoeuvrability".

APPOINTMENT OF ASSISTANT GOVERNMENT MEDICAL OFFICER

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mrs. Gray.

MRS. GRAY: Thank you. A further question if I may to the Executive Member responsible for Administration, Education & Health, still on the hospital. Has Doctor Davey who visited the Island recently to consider finally his application to become Assistant GMO, indicated whether or not he will accept the position or has he given any other indication of his intention.
MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Acting Deputy President as you will realise the position of the second Government Medical Officer in Norfolk Island has within recent times become vacant and we have had I think two locums to fill in there whilst it is vacant and we have gone through the process of seeking a replacement. Doctor Davey who is a man from Tasmania was the person who was thought most appropriate from the applicants and he has come to the Island to examine the situation here to see whether it would be a suitable situation for him. I might say that on the Norfolk Island Government's side it is thought desirable that such an examination does take place because you will realise it is coming to some Island which is a little far removed from some of the facilities with which some doctors from the mainland may be acquainted and it is better all round if they see the facilities, the environment - both professional and social, so that they are able to make up their minds in a more clear fashion before actually making a firm and final commitment. Doctor Davey has done that and we are now going through the final processes of tidying acceptance or otherwise in that manner. I have it on authority that he is very much inclined to accept the position but there are still some tidying pieces to be done in respect of the appointment.

MRS. GRAY: Further if I may Mr. Deputy President. Did Doctor Davey meet with members of the Hospital Board and did they make known to him their requirements of a doctor with the hospital, did they in particular indicate their policy in respect of the hospital and its future.

MR. BUFFETT: Doctor Davey did meet with members of the Hospital Board, yes, and I was advised by the Chairman of the Hospital Board that this did in fact take place. As I understand it, yes, the Hospital Board did put its views as to how they saw the medical situation in Norfolk Island to Doctor Davey.

MRS. GRAY: Thank you. A final question Mr. Acting Deputy President. Are you aware whether or not the Board suggested to Doctor Davey that they required a doctor who was willing to keep the hospital beds full and revenue coming in.

MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Acting Deputy President to be fair I cannot answer that
question categorically. I have not had a categoric statement from the Chairman of the Board that that was the context of the discussion. I have heard rumours that that may have been the context of discussion, it would be wrong of me to try and state categorically that that was the case without some further consultation with the Chairman of the Board.

MRS. GRAY: I wonder Mr. Acting Deputy President, and this must again go to the Executive Member responsible for health, what part this House can play in registering some thoughts or wishes about the appointment and keeping doctors here on Norfolk Island. It appears that the Executive Member responsible for health does not play a principal part in that action. The Chairman of the Public Service Board apparently does. Is it possible for this House to extend some form of recommendation – I hesitate to make it too formal but can the wishes of the Members of the House be made known to the Public Service Board on such matters.

MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Acting Deputy President can I point out to Honourable Members that the role of the Public Service Board is to engage upon appointments and dissappointments in respect of people who are engaged in the Public Service in Norfolk Island. That Board is to a degree detached from the Assembly for sound reasons which we will all realise. Members will realise that they do have an Executive Member who has responsibility in that area and its views can be made known through that Executive Member to the Chairman of the Public Service Board. I think one needs to be careful however that the Assembly is not in a situation of dictation to the Hospital Board, and I think I interpret correctly from Mrs. Gray's question that she would not desire that, but I think, well I am quite sure that there are avenues for Members to place their views so that they can be put to the Public Service Board should that be a desire. I think it is fair for me to say that in my conversations with both the Chairman and members of the Public Service Board that they are very much aware that there is a desire to arrest this matter of non-continuity in respect of the medical officers who come to Norfolk Island. So if that is one of the points of concern, I wish to assure Mrs. Gray and Members that this is something that is in the minds of the Public Service Board which does get about the matter of appointments.
MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mrs. Gray.

MRS. GRAY: The Executive Member suggested that there are avenues of approach, is he able to be more specific.

MR. BUFFETT: Yes I can be more specific, for example Mrs. Gray can mention to me in categoric terms what her desires are and I can assure her that I will pass them on to the appropriate board or authority. It does remain open for this House to make a formal motion in respect of this matter if it so wishes, I would caution however that maybe the House should think carefully before it tries to undertake a course which may, or may not, but it may be interpreted as trying to offer instructions to the Public Service Board who has a statutory authority as will be realised by all.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: Could I give an amplifying comment on that same question from Mrs. Gray please. Mr. Buffett said that there was one Executive Member who has responsibility for liaison with the Public Service Board, I am the one, if he would like messages conveyed to the Public Service Board and would like me to do it in that capacity as liaison, I am happy to do it.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Buffett.

MR. BUFFETT: I should clarify what I said earlier because it may have been misinterpreted. I was not trying to say that I was the person who had responsibility for liaison with the Public Service Board, in fact I was saying that I have responsibility for health in this House that is, and we are talking about the Government Medical Officer, and that was the connotation that I was drawing.

AIR SERVICES DURING EAST-WEST STRIKE

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President. I have a question for the Executive Member for Planning, Tourism & Commerce.
Is it intended to approach the Australian Federation of Air Pilots to seek special treatment for Norfolk Island in relation to the present East-West Airlines strike similar to what I believe Qantas pilots normally did in similar circumstances by providing a service to Norfolk Island on the basis that the pilots accept no salary for the flights, or alternatively is it intended to seek some other means of ensuring the immediate resumption of air services to Norfolk Island from Sydney.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: Yes Mr. Brown there are cables which I believe have already been sent asking for dispensation - I did not read in any of them that they were going to be asked to do it for nothing.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

OWNERSHIP & INSURANCE OF HOSPITAL

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Are there any answers to questions on notice Honourable Members. Mr. Buffett.

MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Acting Deputy President there is one question on the notice paper which is without notice that stands in my name, it relates to the hospital and various capital arrangements that surround it. I have on an earlier occasion in response to a question indicated that there were some rather grey areas in respect of this particular matter and I am merely mentioning at this time, not in total response to this question on notice but to acquaint Members, that some of these grey areas are still being examined and a response will be brought forward as soon as possible. I just wanted to mention that so that Members would know that the matter is not being ignored but a categoric answer that is to be gained in response to this specific question is still being pursued.
MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Papers, are there any papers Honourable Members. Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: Thank you. I would like to table financial indications for the three months ending the end of September, and request that as usual they be included in hansard. May I say to Members who have already been given copies of those indications there is an incorrect figure, the top figure in column 6 is 75%, it should say 25%, if you can correct that.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Compa-</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Compa-</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Compa-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>month</td>
<td>month</td>
<td>rison</td>
<td>year</td>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>rison</td>
<td>year</td>
<td>rison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with</td>
<td>year</td>
<td>proport</td>
<td>with</td>
<td>year</td>
<td>with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>previ-</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>tion</td>
<td>previ-</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>previ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ous</td>
<td>date</td>
<td></td>
<td>ous</td>
<td>date</td>
<td>ous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVENUE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal and Philatelic</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>015</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>-18%</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>+0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customs</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>+45%</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-16%</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor Bond</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-18%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>-27%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other revenue</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>015</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>-18%</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>+0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| EXPENDITURE      |       |        |       |       |         |       |       |        |
| Salaries (other than Education) | 112   | 114    | -2%   | 216   | 315     | -1%   | 358   | -13%   |
| Education estimated salaries | 34    | 30     | +3%   | 93    | 90      | +3%   | 93    | +3%    |
| Other Expenditure (other than Capital Expenditure) | 97    | 75     | +22%  | 281   | 330     | -15%  | 317   | -10%   |
| Capital Expenditure | 33    | 12     | +175% | 41    | 32      | +28%  | 35    | +17%   |
| TOTAL            | 268   | 231    | +16%  | 764   | 800     | -9%   | 840   | -9%    |

| CREDIT TO (or DEDUCTION from) REVENUE FUND | -66   | -24    | +113  |       |        |       |       |        |

NOTE: Revenue/Supply Proportion - is an arbitrary calculation 1/12 of estimated Revenue or Supplied Funds.
MR. HOWARD: At the same time, along with that but not for inclusion in Hansard I don't think, I would like to table a copy of the more detailed Quarterly Financial Statements of the Administration for the first three months of the year, and may I make some comments on those papers please.

What you see is figures for three months in the financial year to the end of September. In the month of September we were in the red by $66,000. Up until the end of September all the revenue brought in by the Administration was just about exactly the same as it was in the first three months of last year and expenses have been running at about 9% lower than last year, nonetheless revenue was not high enough to cover our expenses and so we were in the red for those three months by $66,000 in the month of September, for the full three months in the red by $113,000. The first few months of the financial year are usually poor ones. I was hoping to find some cheerfulness that would shed a bit of sunshine on the situation, so I have made enquiries to get preliminary estimates for what happened during the month of October, to see whether there was a lift that happened in the month that has just ended, and I am sorry to tell you that there was not. I can't give you exact figures but it looks as though in the first four months of the year we will have had to draw out about $200,000 of our past savings to cover running expenses in the first four months of the financial year - July through October.

Now as you know we expected a difficult financial year and the budget that we are working toward is an austerity budget with restraints on spending and I think we are very fortunate that we planned it that way. If we had simply gone sailing along with the kind of budget that was originally proposed for this year, we would now be more than $400,000 in the red for the first four months instead of less than half that amount in the red. The outlook for the economy of the Island over the next few months seems to be pretty good with a number of tourist accommodation houses fully booked up; we have some attracting and promising new stamp issues just about to reach the market. At this point there is no justification for any easing up on the need for continued austerity in our control of spending, on the other hand I don't think that there is yet any clear necessity for new additional austerity measures or for any additional taxes on either tourists or residents. The loss of
$200,000 of our savings in the first four months of the year is cause for genuine concern. At current interest rates spending that amount of money instead of keeping it on deposit means that we are losing out on $30,000 a year of income that we otherwise would have had in interest. Our financial situation at the moment calls in my opinion for continued austerity and for increased watchfulness. Keep your fingers crossed and I will keep you informed.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Miss Buffett.

MISS BUFFETT: Is it possible to note the paper and ask Mr. Howard a question on the matter.
Through you Mr. Acting Deputy President, could I ask Mr. Howard with his statement of us being $400,000 in the red at this time of the year so far, would this figure not be related to the large amount of supply voted early in the year. We have voted supply over for a year which would show against the figures of the first three months, are they related figures please.

MR. HOWARD: I wish that were so, it is not I am sorry to tell you.
The figures that I have quoted are based not on what we have supplied for the year as a whole but what has actually been necessary to spend in those four months, that money has been spent and gone, and compared to our income in those four months we are down by about $200,000.

MISS BUFFETT: Can I ask a further question please. Mr. Howard in view of your reply there, the situation last year, would you have related this to last year's expenditure, how were we situated financially at this time last year, was there any greater expenditure this year in comparison to last year because of the situation.

MR. HOWARD: The expenditure this year is lower than it was last year, we were further in the red a year ago for four months of that year than we are for four months of this year. We are not as badly off at the end of October 1982 as we were at the end of October 1981.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mrs. Gray.
MRS. GRAY: Would the Executive Member responsible for finance like to comment on why capital expenditure is as high as it is or up as much as it is.

MR. HOWARD: Let me see if I can give a sensible answer. In percentage terms it is way up, in dollar terms it is not much, it is as I recall $8,000 or $9,000. Part of the reason is that one of our capital expenditures authorised for the year was an increase in $20,000 in the working capital that is needed in the Bond Store, that has already been given to them in one hit, although that is to cover them for this whole year. That seems to reflect a point that Miss Buffett was talking about a minute ago. In that particular case yes there is something to that line of thinking. That would be the principal item, that accounts for nearly, no it accounts for more than half of all the capital expenditures in the first three months of the year. There have been no exceptionally large capital expenditures other than that one.

MRS. GRAY: I am not prepared to put any further questions on the spot thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Buffett.

MR. BUFFETT: Mrs. Gray mentioned she would not be prepared to put any more questions on the spot, may be it would be useful if Members do wish to have more time to examine some of the matters that have been prepared, to adjourn the matter so that some further examination could be done. I think it might be of benefit to Members. There is the presentation of the quarterly accounts of the Government and I think that is an important step as we go along the year especially in these fairly difficult economic times, and I would be happy to move an adjournment if that would be helpful. I so move.

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

Question - put
Motion agreed to unanimously
Debate (on motion by Mr. Buffett) adjourned
Resumption of debate made an Order of the Day for the next sitting.
TOURIST FIGURES

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Further papers. Mr. Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I have the total tourist arrival figures from the Tourist Bureau for October. Everybody has been circulated with a copy of this. It may be interesting to note that we are down 621 persons in comparison to October last year.

TRANSFER OF FUNDS - IMPROVEMENT OF EFFLUENT DISPOSAL AT THE HOSPITAL

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: May I table another paper please Mr. Chairman. The Public Moneys Ordinance requires that I table instructions that I have given for the transfer of funds from one account to another. I have recently instructed that funds be transferred to make possible the improvement of effluent disposal at the hospital, and I would like to table that instruction.

STATEMENTS BY LEAVE

IMMIGRATION ORDINANCE POLICY - APPEALS

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Statements by leave. Mr. Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I have a statement with regard to the policy of the Immigration Ordinance.

The Immigration Ordinance 1968 makes provision for an appeal to the Minister from a refusal of an application for the grant of a permit. Such an appeal it should be made clear does not operate as a stay of proceedings or have any effect upon the status of a person whose application for a permit has been refused. A person whose permit has expired and whose application for a further permit has been refused is a prohibited immigrant and is liable to deportation under the provisions of the Ordinance. In the past under the Administrator's, prior to the
Norfolk Island Act 1979 during the life of the First Legislative Assembly and during the life to date of the Second Legislative Assembly, it has not been the practise to seek the deportation of persons whose application has been refused pending the resolution of their appeal. I wish to announce today that this practise will not necessarily continue. Persons whose applications are refused should have no expectation that they will be permitted to remain on Norfolk Island pending any appeal. The lodgement of an appeal should no longer be regarded as a device to obtain a few months stay of execution. Persons without current permits whose applications are refused should be mindful of their status as prohibited immigrants liable to deportation.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Thank you Mr. Sanders. Further statements.

MR. JACKSON: I move that the statement be noted Mr. Chairman, and I would like to clarify a question in my mind concerning the statement Mr. Sanders just made on the Immigration Ordinance. It is really only a question on this particular matter. Mr. Sanders stated that anyone who has been refused a permit or their permit has expired and who has appealed, will not be able to stay on the Island pending the appeal. The question I put to Mr. Sanders is, there are some persons on the Island who have committed misdemeanours and the Immigration Review Board has recommended that they leave the Island and some of these people have appealed, the question is do those waiting on appeals come into the category which Mr. Sanders has just read out.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you. I would like to answer, the purpose of this policy was to resolve that same thing that you are referring to Mr. Jackson. In the past people that have lodged appeals have in fact been able to stay here until their appeal has been heard. The purpose of this is to say that this may not be the case in the future.

MR. JACKSON: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Sanders said it may not be the case in the future, is it may not be or will not be the case.

MR. SANDERS: There are people who are appealing at the moment that have already been permitted, it would be a little bit difficult to say as from today you are out. The purpose of this is that in the future this will be how the situation will be handled.
MR. JACKSON: This question always come up in the Review Board and perhaps we may be able to resolve it here. As I indicated the Review Board has recommended to the Minister responsible, and may I add that Mr. Sanders was a member of the Review Board at the time, and it was a unanimous decision on one particular case, no names mentioned for goodness sake, but one case came before the Review Board that because of the police’s recommendation and this persons conduct within the community it was recommended that he not be issued a further permit. This person immediately appealed to the Minister. Well it was a serious offence which came before the Review Board and the Review Board recommended to the Minister responsible, Mr. Brown at the time, that his permit not be granted. Now here is a case where the police came into, recommended that he should not be granted another permit because of his conduct on the Island, and now here we have a situation where just because he has lodged an appeal to the Minister, and appeals in some instances take up to twelve months to be heard or results heard from the Minister, and it really makes a mockery of the Review Board when a unanimous decision comes in, backed up by the police and now we hear that these persons will be allowed to roam around the Island at will until their appeal has been heard. Now this has always been a contentious issue with the Review Board. I know members of the Board in the past have said at least they should have to leave the Island while their appeal is pending, because their time ticks away, if their appeal is upheld well that time in between goes on to their residency time limit. So therefore I do believe that anyone regardless of whether it is those in the future or those previous, if they have appealed they should leave the Island and if their appeal is upheld successfully well they have every liberty to come back again.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Jackson seems to be deliberately not even bothering to listen to what I say. The purpose of this is to prevent those circumstances from occurring again, it was not meant that it was another lever to grandstand on. Surely if Mr. Jackson is a little bit thick in understanding, I am more than happy that he reads this so that he can get it clarified in his mind. Thank you.
MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Further debate. Miss Buffett.

MISS BUFFETT: Mr. Acting Deputy President I wish to uphold further the emphasis given by Mr. Jackson. I see that he has understood the point given by Mr. Sanders. I am prepared to accept that what has ruled in the past alright that has been the policy, but Mr. Sanders' statement will govern further policies. Where does the situation end such as is mentioned by Mr. Jackson where the police have recommended against an appeal, do we have to wait then for the Minister to reply in an instance like this. Could I ask Mr. Sanders that. It has been dealt with in your further question but not in this specific case.

MR. SANDERS: The purpose of this policy statement is to say that it ceases today, that is why I have made the statement.

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

Question - put
Motion agreed to unanimously

TENDERS FOR EXTENSION OF AIRPORT TERMINAL

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Further statements by leave. Mr. Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: Mr. Chairman I have one here that by neglect should have been at the last meeting, and it is in the form of a reply to a letter that Mr. Brown wrote to the Administrator concerning tenders for the airport terminal. I think the best thing Mr. Chairman if you don't mind is that I read it:

"Following receipt of Mr. Brown's letter I made enquiries of the Commonwealth Department of Transport and Construction. That Department has responded to my enquiries in the following terms -

'Your telex of 8 September 1982 re tenders for Norfolk Island terminal building is acknowledged. It is regretted that rumours persist regarding these tenders. You will appreciate that rumours reflect adversely on the integrity of this Department's tendering procedures
and are totally unwarranted. The current position is that tenders received for this work are currently under examination and a result is not expected to be known for two weeks' - Mr. Chairman this letter was dated 20 September, and as I said I should have brought it forward at the last meeting. 'Reference to promises and to incentives on behalf of this Department are entirely without foundation and are categorically denied. The Department of Transport and Construction in no way has any involvement with any incentives if indeed any such incentives exist. Tenderers are required to tender in terms of the specifications and prices offered are a matter entirely for tenderers alone to decide. Tender prices have not been made public by this Department. A calling of public tenders is a requirement of existing Australian Government policy and there was no valid reason to depart from this policy for this work. Might I suggest you give serious consideration to making a public statement in these terms. The Department's tendering procedures are above reproach and any suggestion that it has acted other than with integrity in this matter should be put to rest as quickly as possible'. Signed R.E. Trebilco, Administrator'. I table that letter.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Would any Member wish to move without notice that the statement be noted for debate. Further statements. Mr. Howard.

POSTAL SERVICES DURING EAST-WEST STRIKE

MR. HOWARD: Just a brief one Mr. Chairman to say that in the East-West strike that is on at the moment one of the concerns of the Island of course is transmission of mail back and forth to Australia. I wanted to report that the Revenue Manager and the Post Office authorities, with help from Australia Post, have worked it out that last night 19 bags of air mail went up from Sydney to Brisbane and were there this morning waiting for Norfolk Island Airlines to carry them if they could. They could not carry them on the first flight but it is believed that those bags of mail are on the second Norfolk Island Airlines flight coming in later today. There will be outward mail from Norfolk to Australia I understand going out tomorrow by way of New Zealand. I wanted you to know that those services are being improvised in the light of the strike, but things are being done.
INTERIM REPORT OF THE HEADSTONE JETTY SELECT COMMITTEE

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Presentation of reports. Mrs. Gray.

MRS. GRAY: Yes thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President. Before I do I must ask leave of the House to move that the House grant the Committee investigating the Headstone jetty proposal permission to delay presentation of its final report until the December sitting. We find that there are further submissions to be heard, however it is the wish of the Committee to present an interim report at this sitting.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The question is that the Committee be granted further time.

Question - put
Motion agreed to unanimously

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mrs. Gray.

MRS. GRAY: Thank you. If I may present the interim report then Mr. Acting Deputy President.

At the 6 October sitting of the House a committee comprising Bill Sanders as the Executive Member having responsibility for sea transport, Gilbert Jackson and myself, was appointed charged with the duty of investigating and considering proposals put to Members regarding the construction of a jetty at Headstone. Because of the urgency of the matter the committee was ordered to report to the House at this meeting, I have sought an extension of time on that.

The members of the committee met briefly on the afternoon of Friday 8 October to elect a Convenor. It was decided at that meeting that articles should be published in the local newspaper advising that the committee wished to receive further submissions from the public. That information appeared in the edition of the Norfolk Islander dated 9 October 1982. A further notice appeared in the Gazette dated 16 October 1982.

The following written submissions have been received by the Committee to date:
A submission from Compagnie des Chargeurs Caledoniens of Noumea, from the General Manager, Mr. Cordier, dated 27 September 1982;
from Mr. R.H.H. Nobbs; from David Buffett on behalf of John Ryves of Norfolk Island; from Captain Jean Gada of the vessel Ille du Lumiere; from the Norfolk Island Conservation Society, and from Peter Woodward of Norfolk Island.

On 21 October a notice was placed in the Government Gazette calling for those persons wishing to make an oral submission to the committee to be present at a meeting called for Tuesday 26 October 1982 in the Committee Rooms of the Assembly. The Convenor advised those present on that occasion that due to unforeseen circumstances neither Bill Sanders nor Gilbert Jackson was able to be present at the meeting. Those wishing to make oral submissions to the committee were asked whether they were prepared to offer their submission to the Convenor or did they wish another meeting to be called at another time. Those present expressed a wish for the meeting to continue, and oral submissions were presented by: Bill Blucher of Martins Agencies; Mr. Boy Satt Buffett; David Buffett; John Nobbs; Mike Carroll, Michael Prentice; Bernie Christian-Bailey and Alice Buffett. On separate occasions submissions were presented by Matty Nola and Peter Woodward, Borry Evans and Norm LeCren, as signatories to the original Headstone proposal. There has also been correspondence with the office of the Administrator and the Department of Home Affairs in Canberra. Discussions have been held with the Works Supervisor Booney Buffett; with the Lighterage Manager Puss Anderson and with Ray Kemptthorne of Kiapara Excavators and with Art Mawson. The committee has also been provided with copies of a report prepared in 1970 by Wilton & Bell, Dobey & Partners a firm of consulting engineers in Sydney. A report to the Administration on marine structures by Mr. M. Silva, principal Maritime Works Engineer with the New South Wales region of the Department of then Housing & Construction dated 1975. Various documents and correspondence on file with the Norfolk Island Administration have also been sighted.

The Committee is particularly anxious to obtain copies of a report prepared by Captain Ron Ware who was appointed by the Norfolk Island Government as Honorary Marine Consultant in 1981. Captain Ware prepared a report for Rotary here on Norfolk Island as well and it is hoped that the committee will sight both of those reports shortly. In fact I must note that the report prepared for Rotary has come to hand in the past 24 hours.

The committee will meet further during the next fortnight to consider
submissions to be presented by Geoff Bennett of the South Pacific
Shipping Company (N.I.) Limited and Art Mawson who has carried out a
breakwater development on the N.S.W. coast. I have also received in
the past few hours a submission from Mr. Jim Anderson.
The committee does ask that persons wishing to make submissions
concerning the development of jetty and/or landing facilities here on
Norfolk do so before the 15th of November 1982 so that this committee
might indeed present its final report at the December sitting of the
House. Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President.

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

MR. HOWARD: Is it in order to ask a question.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Would you like to move that the report be
noted.

MR. HOWARD: I would be happy to move that the report be noted.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: Thank you. In her opening remarks Mrs. Gray said that it
was a committee to enquire into the building of a new jetty at
Headstone, and as I recall the terms of reference were enough wider than
that so that really what the committee is looking at is Headstone and/or
other landing places and the problem of access by ships and so on and so
forth and it occurred to me that Mrs. Gray might want to make that
clearer in inviting further submissions that people may want to make,
that it is not just about the Headstone jetty it is about jetties - is
that right.

MRS. GRAY: That certainly is right. The terms of the motion in the
House were quite lengthy Mr. Acting Deputy President, I sought only to
make it concise. Mr. Howard is quite right.

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

Question - put
Motion agreed to unanimously
MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mrs. Gray.

MRS. GRAY: I have another report Mr. Acting Deputy President which I would like to present on behalf of the committee established to investigate Commonwealth legislation.

Again at the sitting of the House on 13 October a motion was passed which established a select committee to consider whether or not Commonwealth legislation or proposed Commonwealth legislation should be extended to or should extend to Norfolk Island. The committee was ordered to report to the House at the first sitting following referral of such a question to the committee.

The Administrator's office has referred 9 pieces of Commonwealth legislation to the committee. They are: the Australian Broadcasting Corporation Bill of 1982; the Australian Broadcasting Corporation (Transitional Provisions and Consequential Amendments) Bill of 1982; the Defence (Visiting Warships) Bill 1982; the Ombudsman (Amendment) Bill 1982; the Taxation (Unpaid Company Taxation) Assessment Bill 1982; the Taxation (Unpaid Company Tax) Bill 1982; the Taxation (Unpaid Company Tax) (Consequential Amendments) Bill 1982; and the Income Tax Assessment Amendment (Additional Taxation) Bill of 1982. The Special Prosecutors Act, also received by the Committee, received royal assent on 21 September 1982 and was proclaimed on 5 October 1982.

The Administrator has also advised the Committee that the Department of Home Affairs foreshadows the presentation by the Department of Transport & Construction of two Bills concerning the prevention of pollution from ships. The proposed legislation will extend to all external territories and will regulate the discharge of oil, oily mixtures, oil residues and noxious substances into the sea. Those documents will be forwarded to the committee when they are to hand.

The committee wishes to make recommendations to the House regarding 8 of the pieces of Commonwealth legislation. They are: the Australian Broadcasting Bills; the Special Prosecutors Act; the 4 Taxation Bills and the Defence (Visiting Warships) Bill.

I may refer first of all to the Australian Broadcasting Bills. In as much as the Bills relate to Norfolk Island, the Department of Home Affairs advises that there is no significant difference between these Bills and
the Act which they replace. The Department also says, and I quote from a telex received by the office of the Administrator and passed to this committee - "As far as we can see this Bill does not affect the powers of the Executive Government of Norfolk Island to pass laws concerning domestic radio and television services. The Legislative Assembly may pass a law to provide for their own services if they so desire provided such a proposed law does not clash with the provisions of any laws governing telecommunications in general which extend to Norfolk Island". The committee notes the words "as far as we can see the Bill does not affect the powers of the Executive Government of Norfolk Island". The committee takes note also of Schedule 2 matters listed in the Norfolk Island Act, in particular item 35 - radio and television. The committee suggests that these statements may be in conflict, therefore it seeks clarification from the Department and will make its recommendations to the House in due course.

In respect of the Special Prosecutors Act of 1982, the Act provides for the appointment of special prosecutors with the function of instituting, undertaking or carrying out prosecutions for offences against the laws of the Commonwealth or a Territory, that is in respect of matters specified by the Attorneys-General - One thinks immediately of the Kostican Report and bottom of the harbour schemes. They may also be given the function of co-ordinating civil remedies by the Commonwealth in particular matters. Special prosecutors may also deal with prosecutions under State laws when so authorised by State law.

In its application to Norfolk Island the Special Prosecutors Act will give authority to special prosecutors to institute prosecutions for offences against Commonwealth laws throughout the Commonwealth and Territories including within the Courts of Norfolk Island. In the light of a motion passed by the Norfolk Island Legislative Assembly at its sitting on 16 June this year, which states and I quote - "That this House reconfirms the belief of the people of Norfolk Island that their Island and its laws should not be unscrupulously used by those persons whose main interest in the Island is to evade or to profit by helping others evade tax they would otherwise be liable to pay under the laws of Australia and asks the Executive Member for finance to draw this resolution to the attention of the Commonwealth Government so that appropriate action may be taken against such persons and the tax avoidance schemes they promote or exploit".

In respect of the Special Prosecutors Act of 1982 the committee
recommends to the House that no objection be raised to the extension of the Special Prosecutors Act to Norfolk Island. I would seek a motion that that be accepted Mr. Acting Deputy President.

MR. SANDERS: I move that the recommendation be adopted.

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

Question - put
Motion agreed to unanimously

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mrs. Gray.

MRS. GRAY: If I may continue Mr. Acting Deputy President. The Taxation Bills - may I just collectively refer to them as the Taxation Bills rather than go through all that again. In the application of the Taxation Bills to Norfolk Island the Bills will enable the recovery of unpaid company tax from proprietors of companies involved in so-called bottom of the harbour schemes. The extension of the Bills to Norfolk Island will enable recovery of such tax from persons in Norfolk Island and within the Norfolk Island Courts, however it is probably common knowledge that considerable amendments have been put to those Taxation Bills since they were sent to this committee. The committee has not sighted the final legislation and believes that it should do so before making a final recommendation to the House. However at this stage the recommendation of the committee to the House is that no objection be raised to the extension. It may be that the House would seek to not accept that recommendation at this stage Mr. Acting Deputy President but wait until the legislation is finalised in Australia.

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

MRS. GRAY: Perhaps I can put the recommendation and see how the vote turns, perhaps if we could move that the recommendation be accepted.

MR. HOWARD: I was going to recommend that the interim recommendation be noted, and I don't really see how we can agree to something when we have not seen what it is that we are agreeing to - good or bad.
MRS. GRAY: If that recommendation could be noted Mr. Acting Deputy President.

MR. HOWARD: Well I move that it be noted.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Any further debate. Miss Buffett.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you. In view of the recommendation, I agree with the principle of the recommendation, would it not be best to accept what is already before us in the interim and view the amendments as they come through.

MRS. GRAY: The Bills have not been passed in Australia, if they had been passed and then amended, yes perhaps, but they are still in the process of formulation as I understand it.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: Perhaps there is a point here of wanting to show the Commonwealth that we are not resisting such things and I would be happy to amend my motion from being that the recommendation be noted to endorsing the recommendation that there is no objection to the Bills in the form that we now see them, even though that form may disappear later on or be substantially changed. If we voted that we see no objection to them as we see them that might have some benefit, and if I could have leave to amend my motion in that way I will do that.


MISS BUFFETT: I agree with Mr. Howard's amendment.

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

Question—put
Motion agreed to unanimously

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mrs. Gray.
MRS. GRAY: The Defence (Visiting Warships) Bill 1982. This Bill provides authority and legal framework for the entry to Australia of the warships of other countries. The Bill empowers the Minister administering the Act to grant approval for the entry of foreign warships providing a statutory basis for existing practise. The entitlements conferred by the grant of approval are set out, provision is made for the Minister to give directions to facilitate access by foreign warships should such facilitation become necessary. It is intended that the Act will be administered by the Minister for Defence, and in this instance the committee recommends to the House that no objection be raised to the extension of the Act to Norfolk Island but that the aspect of cooperation in respect of the Territories be clarified.

MR. SANDERS: Mr. Chairman I move that the recommendation be adopted.

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

MR. HOWARD: I think for the interest of people listening who unquestionably would not have had a chance to look at that Bill, it seems mainly essentially to have to do with the political question of nuclear powered vessels, and with political stirring that has been occurring elsewhere in the world of some people trying to prevent visits by nuclear powered warships, obviously this Bill says that those are part of defence arrangements that are important to Australia, and I totally support our welcoming the extension of this Bill to Norfolk Island.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Further debate Honourable Members.

MR. SANDERS: I support Mr. Howard's statement, I would like to think that they were there.

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

Question - put
Motion agreed to unanimously

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mrs. Gray.
MRS. GRAY: In respect of Commonwealth legislation which this report mentions, I would like to table the following documents - the Taxation (Unpaid Company Tax) Assessment Bill 1982; Taxation (Unpaid Company Tax) Bill 1982; Taxation (Unpaid Company Tax) (Consequential Amendments) Bill 1982; Income Tax Assessment Amendment (Additional Tax) Bill 1982; Special Prosecutors Act 1982; - I beg your pardon it is a copy of the Bill, the Act is not yet available; the Defence (Visiting Warships) Bill 1982 and the Ombudsman Amendment Bill 1982. Copies of the Australian Broadcasting Corporation Bill have been circulated to all Members of the Assembly. Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Thank you.

MR. BUFFETT: Is that final statement to be noted, I would so move.

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

MR. BUFFETT: I would like to address the matter Mr. Acting Deputy President. I am concerned about some of the procedures in respect of the matter that we have just heard addressed. What has been brought forward relates to what in fact may become law in Norfolk Island and you will know Mr. Acting Deputy President that our procedures in this House for the making of laws that come before the House is that it comes before us, unless it is of an urgent nature when it is so declared, it lies on the table of the House for a period of time so that Members may have some notice of the laws that are proposed and so the community may have some notice of the laws that are proposed. Whilst I quite clearly see that in respect of some of these it has not yet reached the final stage, nevertheless this House is being asked to cast an opinion as to whether these laws might be suitable for application in Norfolk Island. Some of these Bills I had not heard of before they were mentioned today and I really think that I would like to make the suggestion that if a motion is to be brought, I see two ways of handling it, if a motion is to be brought endorsing whether something does apply or does not apply, that it be brought as a formal motion and then it is therefore given notice of to Members, if that is not possible or if it is preferred to handle it another way then when the motion is actually moved in respect of any of these pieces of legislation then that matter be adjourned until
the next sitting. By either of those two methods it does allow Members - it is alright for the Members who are of the committee for extension of legislation, they will have seen them - but other Members may have not, and so to provide that facility to other Members and to provide the facility to members of the community who may be interested in those particular pieces of legislation I would ask that consideration be given to one of those two methods so that we could be better informed before we come to cast our vote in respect of these matters.

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

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I see no difficulty in what Mr. Buffett has suggested other than there is going to be a lot of photostating to circulate some of those Bills, because they are very very lengthy. Perhaps Mr. Buffett might like to be on the committee and be the photostater.

MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Acting Deputy President we have a number of pieces of very voluminous legislation that passes through this House, just because something is of some inches thick or it contains a lot of information does not mean that any Member of this House should cast an opinion without having the opportunity to examine it in detail, and that is really what I am asking be done.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mrs. Gray.

MRS. GRAY: Yes I would like to refer to the motion which was passed in the House at the sitting on 6 October which created the committee to handle this. The House directed that any question of whether Commonwealth legislation or proposed Commonwealth legislation should be extended to or should extend to Norfolk Island, be referred to that committee for consideration and recommendation before any other action is taken by the Government and further that the committee's report or recommendations under the preceding paragraph be brought into the House for consideration and approval at the first sitting of the House following referral of the question to the committee.

I too agree with what Mr. Buffett is pointing to however it is not the intention of this committee to establish a cut and dried vote within the House. The recommendation is brought to the House, it is then up to
the Members in the House to create the policy which goes on from there.

**MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT:** Mr. Howard.

**MR. HOWARD:** I would like to support what Mr. Buffett said. Of the two possible ways of handling it, a more correct style, I rather preferred his idea of seeing that we be given notice of motion on these things. It seems to me it would not be a very great complication if on the notice paper for the meeting, on today's notice paper for example it might well have said - Mrs. Gray as Chairman of this committee to move that the Assembly recommends no objection be raised against the Visiting Warships Bill, the Taxation Bill number so and so, and so on - Now the notice paper comes out at the weekend, I was interested that it was read out over the radio this morning, that is an effective way of giving people some notice, and I would support that kind of procedure unless it is going to complicate life for the committee.

**MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT:** Miss Buffett.

**MISS BUFFETT:** Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President, as Mr. Buffett has said, and I thank him for drawing attention to the point, it is a matter of avoiding acceptance of something we have not seen before. If having recommended acceptance by the committee to the Assembly at a meeting and acceptance of that recommendation, I would prefer not to see that the whole matter is cut and dried as a result of that one move. I would have taken that we would have managed to receive a copy of the Bill. The notice paper comes out on Friday yes, but if one did not have supplied with the notice paper copies of the Bills, there lies the problem, it would be Wednesday before we managed to see the Bill.

**MRS. GRAY:** It would not be the intention of the committee to circulate copies of Bills Mr. Acting Deputy President, that is the reason for tabling the documents at this sitting. Thank you.

**MR. HOWARD:** Could I ask a question. One of the documents that Mrs. Gray tabled was the Ombudsman Bill, I did not hear anything about that, is there no recommendation, is it one that will be dealt with in the next report, it will, good. Just before the debate shuts down I wanted to
say that while there may be some improvements to be made in the procedure on this committee and its work, somebody is doing something right. In the past the extension of Australian law to Norfolk has been confusing and changing and difficult to understand, and I want to compliment the committee on the work that they have done, they have obviously done a lot of work and I think we are moving in what looks to me like a good direction, I think it is right and proper that the attitudes towards the extension of these Bills should be considered by the House as a whole, and I wanted to express my happiness that we are making progress in that direction.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President, I would like to endorse the comments which Mr. Buffett made. I regret that all of the Members had not had the opportunity to look at the actual legislation before these recommendations were brought into the House today, it certainly is always regrettable when Members have to make a decision without having had the opportunity to properly consider what it is that they are to decide about. I certainly hope that we can resolve this problem in the future.


MRS. GRAY: Is it then the wish of the House that the committee bring forward formal motions at its next sitting in respect of the recommendations that have just been made.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Buffett.

MR. BUFFETT: For my part Mr. Acting Deputy President I have no difficulty in recommendations being brought forward at the next sitting provided adequate notice is given so that Members do have the opportunity to examine them in detail before they are asked to vote upon them.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: I would hope that that would happen. The notice paper has always set out in some detail, sometimes very long motions that are
going to be put, and it seems to me quite proper that on that notice paper should appear notice that we are going to consider a motion that there is no objection to the extension of the Visiting Warships Bill or whatever it is, I think that properly ought to be on the notice paper.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Miss Buffett.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President, I too appreciate what the committee is doing and I am not posing these questions to be awkward. Being a new procedure I am wondering whether time would always permit us to accept the tabling of the proposed Bills expecting to discuss them at the next meeting, would that timeframe not be too long in view of application by the Australian Government, how long do they wait for our comments, it is my pure ignorance on the Australian scene as to how long it would take us to answer them. I think we should if necessary, rather than all 9 queue up for a lengthy Bill, wouldn't it be better if the committee called a special meeting in the case of an urgent Bill so that all 9 Members would be able to discuss it, it is legislation regarding Norfolk Island, and it is important, that is what we are here for.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I would personally oppose any more committee meetings on this matter, I think once the thing is tabled that anyone wishing to see it should make their own arrangements.

MR. HOWARD: It is also perfectly possible if any Member has uncertainty about a particular Bill that is being proposed for no objection to move that the debate on that particular question be adjourned, for some more study, that is always do-able, although I think Miss Buffett's point about how long will the Commonwealth wait for us - two minutes, three minutes maybe - not very long, I think we are lucky to get any time at all and we shouldn't waste it.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Further debate Honourable Members. Mrs. Gray.

MRS. GRAY: It might be of some assistance if I read the letter which the
committee sent to the Administrator, with the Chairman's permission. Thank you - "At its meeting on 6 October last the Legislative Assembly resolved to appoint a Select committee comprising myself" - and the letter is signed by the Chairman of the committee, Mr. Bill Sanders, "Chloe Gray and John Brown to examine Commonwealth legislation proposals intended to extend to Norfolk Island. The committee's brief is to examine and report upon such proposals to the House with a recommendation as to the action the House should take. The committee wishes to adopt the following procedures - (a) that the Administrator convey to the Chairman of the committee details of the proposed legislation with copies to the other two members of the committee; (b) the committee to undertake circulation of information to Members of the Assembly with the exception of Bills, these to be made available if to hand upon request; (c) discussion between members of the committee, Legal Adviser and others as required; (d) recommendation of the committee to the House followed by debate, the views of the Legislative Assembly to be conveyed to you" - that is to the Administrator - "by the Chairman of the committee. Whilst I am aware that the Department of Home Affairs & Environment keeps the Norfolk Island Government informed of any legislative proposals which are intended or desired to be extended to Norfolk Island, there is not so far as I am aware any machinery for informing the Norfolk Island Government of any legislative proposals which are intended to amend or repeal legislation which already extends to Norfolk Island. Whilst I appreciate that realistically the weight that would be given to any Norfolk Island input with respect to such proposals would not be great, I feel that it would be most desirable if the Norfolk Island Government could be kept informed of any such proposals and given the opportunity to have some input. The committee would be grateful if you would convey these views to the Department".

I understand, although I have not got it to hand, that a reply was received to that letter, the Administrator expressing acceptance of that method of operation of the committee.

If we just take note of the Bills that are with us at the moment, one of them for example was an Act already, fait accompli - over and done with, that was the Special Prosecutors, as I tabled it, Bill, but is now an Act proclaimed as I suggested. So time is limited and I think this is why the committee has been established to consider quickly the legislation.
MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Miss Buffett.

MISS BUFFETT: In view of that Mr. Acting Deputy President I think the committee should then consist of the full Assembly, I don't think any Members of the Assembly should have precedence over other Members of the Assembly of knowing what goes on and what does not. I feel that regarding Mrs. Gray's comment with the fait accompli, alright, but I think perhaps the link that is missing is that we could perhaps ask the Administrator's office to supply Members with those Bills because the less time we have the more copies we need, we must have a copy to each Member, I mean I insist that I see what is going on. Through you Mr. Acting Deputy President could I ask Mr. Sanders as Executive Member if link could be approached, do Members feel that we ask the Administrator's office if we are to make decisions, to supply those Bills to us.

MR. SANDERS: Mr. Chairman we could request the Administrator to furnish more copies, failing that the Bill is tabled, and I believe there is access via the Clerk. I will ask the Administrator if it is possible to have more copies.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: Could I ask a question about the committee. Mrs. Gray referred to it once or twice as a select committee. I don't think that term was used when the committee was formed, and my understanding of the committee's job is that it isn't really set up to do the kind of job that I think a select committee does. A select committee is, to my understanding, chosen to attack a particular problem that can be attacked and dealt with and then put before the House and that is the end of the committee, and I think really what we are talking about here is a standing Committee that goes on functioning from now on.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mrs. Gray.

MRS. GRAY: I had the same argument Mr. Howard with people who should know and you will find that in our copy of standing orders, yes, standing committees are clearly defined and apparently a committee which is appointed other than those committees may be referred to as a select committee.
MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: Mrs. Gray has the standing orders in front of her, doesn't that go on to say such other standing committees as the House may want to establish.

MRS. GRAY: It does.

MR. HOWARD: It seems to me we have established a new standing committee.

MRS. GRAY: I would be very happy for the committee to be a standing committee. My advice at the moment is that it is a select committee.

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

MR. HOWARD: When we voted on noting this report I'd like to seek leave to move that this be a standing committee, not a select committee.

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

Question - put
Motion agreed to unanimously

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: Could I seek leave to move that this committee be a standing committee.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Leave granted Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: I move that this committee to consider the extension of Australian legislation to Norfolk Island be a new standing committee of the Legislative Assembly.

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

Question - put
At the conference that I have mentioned, the International Conference Ecology Workshop, delegates voiced support for captive breeding programmes to safeguard the population whilst investigations are carried out into factors endangering the parrots, and I have already referred to those. It was recognised that formulation of long term conservation methods may necessitate detailed field studies, but the immediate requirement is to ensure survival of the remnant population and that would be best achieved by establishing captive breeding programmes.

A successful captive breeding of woodhens is in operation on Lord Howe Island and I think most Members of this Assembly and in fact of the Norfolk Island community will have at one time or another heard of the Lord Howe Island Woodhen captive breeding programme.

I think when we mention captive breeding programmes in parts of the world such as Lord Howe and I have already mentioned New Zealand, I think it is wise to also mention on a wider international scene that these programmes are also conducted in areas such as the Galapagos Islands, not only with birds but also with subspecies of tortoises and the like. These Islands are world renowned for their bird and animal life, and if I remember correctly the cruise ship such as the Lindblad Explorer that has visited Norfolk Island on a couple of occasions and its sister ship does regularly make visits to these places, and I think again of more recent times there have been some residents who have enjoyed a trip to those places on that particular ship. So that might offer some closeness also of more international spheres that do conduct such programmes.

Of the utmost importance to the success of any captive breeding programme is support and involvement by Norfolk Island residents. The green parrot is an integral component of the unique national heritage of Norfolk Island and there is evidence of a strong commitment on the part of Island residents to conserve these birds. I have had letters and indications of support from the Lions Club in Norfolk Island, from the Flora & Fauna Society as I have already mentioned, and from the Conservation Society which I have already mentioned, but also from a number of individuals in the Island. I have circulated to Members of the Legislative Assembly a copy of the letter that has been sent from the Norfolk Island Conservation Society.

In promoting this proposal of the Australian National Parks & Wildlife Service they have provided a paper which in fact contains much of the detail which I have just quoted to you and much more. This paper is of
organisations I have earlier quoted and I will be making this available to the press for some wider distribution in the Island so that the members of the community can see some greater detail about what is proposed. All of that has led, Mr. Acting Deputy President, to the motion that I have earlier read to this House which does propose that the Australian National Parks & Wildlife Service with the expert advice and assistance that it can summon do those things such as identify costs of the programme and likely sources of funding; itemise procedures and detail for setting up the facilities for this programme and also to set out proposals that would outline long term objectives for the release of these aviary bred birds back into the wild, and I do commend very strongly to the House this conservation measure.

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

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I think this is a wonderful idea, I support the motion.

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

MR. JACKSON: Mr. Chairman, I also support this 100%, I believe that the motion itself spells out quite clearly what is meant that this House seeks the Australian National Parks & Wildlife Service's expert advice and assistance and then to prepare a detailed proposal which will identify all these other items which Mr. Buffett has read out and I think we should be very proud to say that one of the endemic birds of Norfolk Island one day may be within our midst in numbers again and I support the motion 100%.


MRS. GRAY: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President, I think I made quite some lengthy noises about the green parrot and the Mount Pitt Reserve some weeks ago in the House and I have no intention of doing it again. I would like to say that I have received a further letter from the Lions Club - I am not too sure whether Mr. Buffett is aware of that - saying that the members of the Lions Club of Norfolk wish to reaffirm their
support in principle to the establishment of a captive breeding programme for the green parrot, and they also say that they appreciate being kept informed on the developments in the project and look forward to working with Members of the Government to bring the plan to fruition.

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

MR. QUINTAL: Yes Mr. Chairman, I do believe that every Member of the Assembly supports the motion that was moved and also the whole of the community I would think supports the idea as well. It would be really good to see the parrots breed up again. I know it will be a very difficult task to capture them because they seem to be so very few and the idea of putting a guard around trees it seems to me we will not need to have many guards because there are not many green parrots, and which tree to put the guards around would be very difficult but I guess with experts it could be done. I do realise that the red parrot does nest in dead pungas and dead trees, hollow trees especially, but I have never been able to find out where the green parrot lays its eggs, I don't know whether anybody else knows that at all but probably they would lay in the same trees as the red parrots, but I do support the motion.

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

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President. I support the principle of the establishment on Norfolk Island of a captive breeding programme for the green parrot and I appreciate the wisdom of seeking guidance in the manner as has been suggested in this motion. The National Parks and Wildlife Management Plan that has been produced for us states that the green parrot has suffered a combination of pressures as has been stated by Mr. Buffett earlier, and notably the loss of their habitat which Mr. Quintal has just brought up, and in a conversation with Mr. Owen Evans only this morning and his wife yesterday, during the time people have been contacting Mrs. Evans when they have detected a green parrot in their area, she has not managed to find where they are nesting either, and their suggestion is that Mr. Glen Fraser who has already carried out in New Zealand captive programmes for the green parrot and put them back into their natural habitat Islands elsewhere in
the Pacific, also he is doing the captive plan with the Lord Howe Woodhen, it would be good if he could be mentioned and I daresay the National Parks & Wildlife Service would be involving him, but I would like to think that Mr. Glen Fraser was kept in mind or mentioned even by the Minister concerned to the National Parks & Wildlife Service and in this with the Conservation Society's suggestion of taking in the same consideration the other endangered species the Boobook or the Owl and the Silver-eye and the Bat - I don't think it is called anything else. I support the motion.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Thank you Miss Buffett. Further debate. There being no further debate the question is that the motion be agreed.

Question - put
Motion agreed to unanimously

CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE
ENQUIRY INTO TOURISM

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Notice No.2, Select Committee's Enquiry into Tourism. Mr. Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: I move that this House considers the report of the Norfolk Island Legislative Assembly's Select Committee Enquiry into Tourism. Mr. Chairman I would like to table the document so that other Members may have time to consider the report. I have been informed that the Chamber of Commerce, the Accommodation Proprietors and the Tourist Board and others would like input into this report. Because of the interest of these other persons I would like to move a motion that this matter be adjourned and made an Order of the Day for the next sitting.

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

Question - put
Motion agreed to unanimously
Debate (on motion by Mr. Sanders) adjourned
Resumption of debate made an Order of the Day for the next sitting.
GRANT OF TEMPORARY ENTRY PERMITS INVOLVING SCHOOL AGE CHILDREN

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Notice No. 3, Children of Temporary Entry Permit Holders, Mr. Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I move that this House recommends that where an application for a temporary entry permit includes school age children and would otherwise be granted, approval be granted if -(a) the principal applicant is engaged in an essential public service; or (b) the principal applicant is seeking to be engaged in private enterprise where - (i) expertise whether technical or managerial is an essential qualification; and (ii) that particular private enterprise is considered an integral part of private industry within Norfolk Island; or (c) the principle applicant is entering Norfolk Island to purchase an existing business and has indicated that he wishes to stay indefinitely or for a long term.

Mr. Chairman I have always been perturbed about the discrimination in these matters but what brings it to attention more than anything else is every single appeal that has been based on children has been upheld by the Minister. I can see no point in having something in a policy that will not stand up anywhere else apart from in the Committee Room. I support the motion.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Thank you Mr. Sanders. Debate Honourable Members. Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: I am surprised that there is no debate. We discussed this at the Executive Committee meeting the other day briefly. It is a policy that has been followed for years and years on the Island that if someone is applying for an immigration permit they have a better chance of getting approval if they have no children or one child than if they had six. Now I don't know the whys and wherefores of that policy really, I don't know why it has existed for many years but it has and it seems to me that when you suddenly overturn a policy that has existed for a long time that there must be some pros and cons to it and I was hoping to hear some pros and cons because I don't know my own mind on the matter.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Jackson.
MR. JACKSON: Mr. Chairman. Once again this question has been with us for a long time and it has been a bone of contention for the Immigration Review Board because there has not been a clear cut policy on the matter. We have been confronted when officers have been seconded, like technical officers, whether it be in the Administration, in the Department of Transport or in any other area where officers come to the Island, and it has always been the policy ever since I have been a member of the Immigration Review Board that these departments be notified that where practicable, where possible, officers be recruited who have the least amount of children as possible, because we do not want to strain our facilities, for instance the school, the hospital, the sewerage system, water supply, and other things that go with it, and if this is going to be the policy in the future then I am very fearful. I am aware, as Mr. Howard stated, that they discussed it at the last Executive Committee meeting and he jumped the gun by saying he is sorry there is no debate, but there was intended to be debate on it. Norfolk Island will some day reach a saturation point, we are only so big. One of the worst features of it perhaps when we lay the finger on who is to blame in recruiting seconded officers for the Island well we may be able to say well we should keep our own doorstep clean because the Norfolk Island Government recruited an electrician and they recruited him without any objection, but I mean to say here is a situation which has confronted the Immigration Department over the years, and if places as the banks, OTC, the Department of Transport are notified of this situation because of perhaps straining the facilities of the Island, and I know they have been notified, but the point is if this has to be the case that when recruiting people with technical skills and expertise and those who have to be seconded to the Island, does that mean it is an open slather, that you will open the floodgates and let everyone in with a family of five, six, seven, eight or nine, because I see this motion somewhere along those lines that it may happen, because if we say that perhaps one of the hotels might need a chef, and that chef has five or six children, some not quite of school age, well are we going to say yes that is an expertise position, he should be allowed in, how about the housemaid, the kitchen hand, is this going to be the situation where we will open up the field because I see in the paper that was brought down that the ratio at the school is 30 to 1, and it should be kept in mind that there is presently a great deal of flexibility to allow
additional students without incurring the expense of another teacher, however it should be pointed out that in the infants/primary area once the number of students exceeds 240 then an additional teacher would need to be engaged to maintain the 30 to 1 ratio. Now what is our position towards that. I have always believed that working on close conjunction with the school master, the head master, who would give us guidance, guidance to the Immigration Review Board and to the Minister that in one particular class that class has reached a limit and any further immigration input into the Island by children of that age group, regardless of what year it is, whether it is year 5 or year 9, another teacher will have to be employed, now do we want that situation or do we want to say on the Review Board well the head master has notified the Executive Member that this particular class cannot absorb anyone else - do we ignore that and say no this motion has been put through the House and it becomes law, if a teacher, and I say a teacher, is an expert, you cannot recruit a teacher on the Island and the teacher is brought in, or any of the technical officers within the Administration or the Department of Transport, now if they bring children in within that age group what happens then. Mr. Sanders is always saying to keep costs down, Mr. Howard has got the reins on finance, are we going to say yes by all means let them in we won't discriminate against children, it is wrong to discriminate, we'll hire another teacher and perhaps build another class room. I don't see it that way, I do believe we have got to look at this in a sensible manner, sometimes we may have to play it by ear, because if we open up the floodgates, the reasons that I have indicated in my first remarks that we will strain the facilities of the Island and one of the most important is the public school. Now at all times I would say there should be some flexibility there for anyone who wishes to come home, any family that is away for some reason or another, and when they do come home we might have to get another teacher, so therefore I say that because I do believe that the Review Board has looked at this in a sensible way and I am very pleased this motion has come before the House today to get some clarity on it, but I pose the question and the remarks that I have said because I know there still will be some problems around this particular question as far as children are concerned, and let me say it quite clearly here and now that as far as discrimination - a word Bill often uses - I for one do not wish to discriminate against any child or any person who has children, but at the same time we must remember that this is a small Island and we can only
accommodate what we have got facilities for. I support the motion and it is my intention to continue to work towards a decision where we keep a close watch on all these facilities. In one point in the paper it says that in all cases prospective employers should be encouraged to draw their labour requirements from the resident work force in the first instance or from employees without school age children in the second instance, such encouragement should be by the way of regular government gazette notices. Now that to me is a sensible approach. But if people are going to completely ignore our local employees on the Island and go out and deliberately import employees just for the sake of bringing in someone from outside who may have children, well I believe there is a difficulty there because the paper said in all cases prospective employers should be encouraged to draw their labour requirements from the resident work force. All in all I support the motion.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mrs. Gray.

MRS. GRAY: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President, I never cease to wonder at the time Mr. Jackson's spends speaking against a motion and then voting for it. May I just say that regretably...

MR. JACKSON: I am not a yes man Mrs. Gray.

MRS. GRAY: I don't know what you are Mr. Jackson.

MR. JACKSON: You are the one who said open government will stimulate debate so lets hear what you have got to say.

MRS. GRAY: There is a difference between debate and dialogues and monologues Mr. Jackson. I'm not permitted to quote from this paper which was presented to the Executive Committee and of which you would be perfectly well aware. There is a couple of sentences in it - for example, 'The head master can see no difficulty in the near future arising out of a policy relaxation'; and there is another paragraph which goes into the numbers, it says that presently there are seven classes and eight teachers to cater for slightly in excess of 210 students. Approval was granted in late 1981 for the eighth teacher if numbers exceeded 210. The head master
anticipates that the number may fall below 210 early in 1983, however it is understood that the eighth teacher will be retained for at least that year'. In other words there is no problem at the school, according to the head master, which opinion I am prepared to accept. Also the terms of the motion are very specific. It is not a matter of somebody coming in and working at a hotel who has a stream of children as I believe you were suggesting, it is a matter of expertise. It is suggested that approval be granted if expertise, whether technical or managerial is an essential qualification; and that particular private enterprise is considered an integral part of private industry within Norfolk Island. People who have come to work for the Public Service in one way or another on Norfolk Island have been able to trail as many children as they wish, and I agree with Mr. Sanders, it has been an action of great discrimination that that has been allowed to happen over the past years and as far as I am concerned if something can be done to stop it happening I am very much prepared to support it.

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

MR. QUINTAL: I wish to support the motion. I don't want to say very much but the population ceiling that was recommended by Butland and Coldham and I think they are the two planners that we have been following, they suggested a population ceiling of 2,000 by 1985, and if we keep a watch on that I don't think we have any worries about children anyway, and the discriminatory part is not a good one and it will not stand up anyway, so I support the motion.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: Mr. Chairman I just wanted to correct one thing that Mr. Jackson said, he was referring to people coming in here with eight, nine and ten children, I think he is a little bit out of date, large families do not sort of exist that much now - probably because of the modern invention called the pill.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: I have got a little bit of concern about the sweeping nature of the motion. It seems to me if we are trying to keep the school
from becoming overcrowded, and it may not be overcrowded right now and there may be no reason to discourage people who have a lot of kids, but Mr. Jackson said that the Immigration Review Board had written to the Department of Transport and the banks and so on and I gather what they have said is if you have got a choice between somebody who has a whole bunch of kids and somebody who has none or one or something, please lean towards the person with fewer children because we have got a problem at the school, now it seems to me that that is an entirely reasonable thing to say, I don't think that is discrimination against anybody at all, that is not saying you cannot come here, it is simply asking people to give some thought to this problem and if they can conveniently accommodate the Island and go along with such suggestions then I think we are better off for it, but I am a little concerned that the motion as it is put is so sweeping that really the way I read it it says from now on the number of kids involved is not to be even taken into consideration and I wonder if we aren't throwing out the baby with the bath here. If we don't have a problem at the school at the moment then the Immigration Review Board need not be concerned about this particular question at the moment, on the other hand if the school begins getting crowded, maybe once again you want to say to the banks and the Department of Transport and so on could you if you have a choice send somebody who does not have a bunch of kids because we have a school problem, and I have got some reluctance about the Assembly passing a motion which in effect will block anybody from asking for that kind of consideration in the future.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mrs. Gray.

MRS. GRAY: I would suggest that that could only apply as long as the House allows it to remain, just as the House is seeking to amend a policy situation here it could do it again should the need arise.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: I think the theory of the motion as it is put is to say up until now we have in consideration of the school and the hospital not getting overcrowded we have tried to encourage people to bring small families rather than large families to the Island, in future we want that policy chucked out and we are going to replace it with a different policy
which is that we are going to see that the school has as many teachers as it needs, we are going to maintain the 30 to 1 teacher/student ratio and if the numbers of school kids build up we will hire another teacher and provide another class room, and I think we are undertaking that responsibility if we go down this path. Do we want to do that.

MR. SANDERS: Yes.

MR. HOWARD: What is wrong with encouraging people, if the school is getting crowded, if they have a choice of bringing a small family rather than a large family, I see nothing wrong with that.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Miss Buffett.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President. I agree with the principle of Mr. Sanders motion, I like to see a community with a lot of young families. I feel that when we suffer so many teething troubles as we are suffering, there could be wisdom in building the size house you intend occupying. I don't think that we should disregard the fact that the hospital only has 21 beds, 4 of those in the maternity section, another 4 a separate section. I feel that we must consider our amenities before we expand our immigration policy. I agree that we should not discriminate against the family at all in favour of the no family, but we are not. The status quo allows for recommendations that applicants for positions be chosen by virtue if possible of their having either no or small families. It does not stop them. I see that this is a very open motion, too wide open for what we can cope with. We might have half a dozen people or more on immigration applications all of say an average of three children of school age, now they won't all be the same ages, we might have more families come in than that because we have a large immigration work force, we have a large itinerant work force here. I think we should really and truly consider this matter. We also have housing problems, we have a housing problem in our very own area of government for seconded officers or for officers for the community service. Of course this will boost building if we have to build some more. I would prefer to remain with the status quo and ask at this point when is Mr. Ewens coming over, when are we going to get into the Immigration Bill that has been put before us, there has been so much work
done on it for months, there have been letters coming forward when do you want Mr. Ewens to come over, when can we get into the whole situation.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: I don't know whether Mr. Buffett wanted to respond in particular to Miss Buffett's question. I have some concern along the lines of the concern expressed by Miss Buffett and by some of the other Members today. This policy has been a very long standing policy, that is the policy by which we attempt to restrict as far as possible the number of persons with school age children coming to the Island on temporary entry permits. It can be most unwise to quickly and without proper thought and consideration dismiss a policy of such long standing. No doubt there have been a lot of reasons behind that policy. The school has been mentioned. Certainly it may be the case that in some classes today there is room enough for more students, however the Island is not at its most prosperous today, it may be that in 12 months time the worldwide decline in tourism will have been reversed, it may be that the economies of Australia and New Zealand will be much healthier and that Norfolk Island will be in quite boom times again. Should that happen we may have real problems in the event that we totally drop the present restrictive policy. We may also end up with problems at our hospital as Miss Buffett quite rightly pointed out. It has been my opinion for some time that we must look carefully at the recommendations of Professor Butland and others, that we must accept the wisdom behind those recommendations, that we must take note of the fact that we have had some problems with our water supply, we must recognise that there is an upper limit as Mr. Jackson said to the number of people who can live in this Island. Once we recognise that I believe that we must establish that upper limit and that we must establish a quota system so that the upper limit is not exceeded. In the event that we introduce a quota system we have to give consideration to the fact that a family of six would move us much more quickly towards the end of our quota than one single person would, it may be that we will have to introduce some form of points system to assist the Immigration Review Board in determining its recommendations. I share Mr. Sanders' displeasure at policies which appear to prejudice families with children or to prejudice unfairly any person, but I think that we should be very careful in our consideration
of this particular motion and that it may well be appropriate for us to adjourn further consideration of it until our next meeting so that all of the Members can carefully consider their positions, so that Members can hear from and speak to members of the community so that they have got the ability to have a very overall view of what we are discussing and so that we can ensure that we do not make a mistake in turning aside the existing policy. I think it likely that I will at the time of voting support Mr. Sanders' motion but that I may wish to move some form of amendment so that we can introduce an upper limit to our population and so that we can introduce some form of quota system.

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

MRS. GRAY: Yes I would like to make some comment on what Mr. Brown has said. He said that a family of six would move us much closer to a quota should we establish a quota, I would just like to ask one question, and I think this is at the basis of Mr. Sanders' motion, would that quota be enforced in respect of seconded public servants or only in respect of us lesser mortals, and I wish I could recall the words of wisdom which were offered by the Minister Tom McVeigh when he was talking about the really important thing was to obtain the best man for the job. I'm not too sure that how many children he has has very much to do with it. Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Buffett.

MR. BUFFETT: I am not too sure whether the inference there was you are judging how best a man is by his progeny.

Mr. Acting Deputy President really this area is a difficult area about which we speak this afternoon. I should say at the outset that I don't interpret some of the decisions that have had to be made and continue to be made at this time as discrimination, I really feel that they are decisions that need to be taken into account knowing all the facts of Norfolk Island's situation, and it does have some unique aspects, it does have some aspects that are not experienced in many other parts of the world and some of the problems are probably a bit more difficult, and some of them need to be tackled in a different manner. I have got to say that I see it as my first responsibility in this House is to care for the people who live here, and the people we are talking about who will
be the subject of temporary entry permit applications are people who are seeking to come in, they are not presently in the community, and sometimes you have got to look at the cold hard facts of the matter and some of them, especially in these economic times are that we don't have unlimited finance for capital works which covers such things as additional class rooms at the school, we don't have unlimited funds in which we can make allocation for additional teachers. It is all very well to say at this time our numbers are OK but you have got to take into account what will happen if you do adopt a practise of no careful examination and some restrictions by whatever means are so decided in respect of some categories of persons that might place strains on the education system. They are really the facts of life about the Island and I think it has been said earlier this afternoon that one has got to be mindful of benchmarks, upper levels, lower levels, we are really talking about an upper level here, and if in fact your facilities and your pocket do not allow you to accommodate even though you may wish to accommodate, if those facilities and your money does not stretch that far regrettably the facts of life are you are not able to accommodate those people, although you may have serious reservations about having to say no because it might involve in this particular instance school age children, if I was asked to vote on the matter now I think regrettably I would have to vote against the motion. I would be happy to entertain an amendment which might not be as categoric as it now stands but certainly asks that those factors that are listed be seriously taken into account when applications are considered. I am inclined to say that Mr. Brown is right about some further in depth consideration of the motion which probably would mean that it would not be finalised today. I would support such a move at this time.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: Of course Mr. Buffett is absolutely right when he says that you have to face the facts of life and of course it is right that Norfolk Island as a matter of fact discriminates against many people in many ways, it may not be a pleasant fact but it is true. If someone wants to come here and stay longer than two months and does not have a job on Norfolk Island I'm sorry but you can't stay, that's discrimination; if someone wants to move to Norfolk Island and spend the rest of their lives here but they are broke and have not got any money we say sorry
you can't come, that is discrimination of a very serious kind, that is discrimination on the basis of money, we are discriminating against the poor. We discriminate in a lot of ways and I think I have to agree with Mr. Buffett that while it is unpleasant you need to do it for the proper protection and benefit of the people who live on the Island now. I would be happy to move the adjournment of this thing until the next meeting.

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

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

IMMIGRATION (AMENDMENT) BILL 1982

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Notice No. 4, Immigration (Amendment) Bill 1982, Mr. Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. Chairman, I present the Immigration (Amendment) Bill 1982 and I move that the Bill be agreed to in principle. Mr. Chairman in speaking to this amendment, Members will recall that last year the Assembly passed a Bill to amend the meaning of 'resident' in the Immigration Ordinance. What that amendment did was to say that a resident was not just a person in respect of whom a declaration of residency had been made but also included a person who could as of right have a declaration of residency made in his favour. These additional people included persons who were born on Norfolk Island, children of persons born on Norfolk Island and who had not attained the age of 21 or married, and the spouse of a person born in Norfolk Island. No difficulty arises in respect of persons born on Norfolk Island and they will continue to be automatically regarded as residents. The difficulty however is in respect of those other persons, for instance children and spouses of persons born on Norfolk Island and arises where for example a child becomes 21 or a married couple divorces, in this instance although prior to becoming 21, marrying or divorcing, a child or spouse was a resident on becoming 21. On marriage or divorce the child or the
spouse as the case may be, suddenly ceases to be a resident. Members will appreciate that this is obviously an unsatisfactory situation. What my Bill does is to provide that persons born on Norfolk Island will still be regarded as residents but that other persons, for example children and spouses of persons born on Norfolk Island will no longer automatically be regarded as residents. It is however important to emphasise that the Bill takes no rights away from these people, they will have an absolute right to have a declaration of residency made in their favour and once they have such a declaration they have a right to remain residents notwithstanding any marriage or divorce. What I am trying to avoid is giving people a false sense of security and allowing them to believe they are residents for all time only to find that when they reach 21 or marry or divorce that residency and that security has gone. I commend the Bill.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Thank you Mr. Sanders. Debate Honourable Members. Mr. Jackson.

MR. JACKSON: Mr. Chairman while it is still fresh in Mr. Sanders' mind, and this is the first time I have heard this submission and he read it very fast. I think I heard him say that persons born on Norfolk Island - his or her children born on Norfolk Island are not residents, they have to make some form of application, I may have heard you wrong Bill but I would like some clarification.

MR. SANDERS: Everybody has to make application to be declared a resident. These people who have not made application because they thought it was not necessary suddenly find that they have lost their right because they have not done so, all this is doing is tidying up an untidy set of circumstances.

MR. JACKSON: Even by being born on Norfolk Island?

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Further debate Honourable Members. The question is that debate be adjourned. Mr. Jackson.

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

MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS REGISTRATION BILL 1982

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order of the Day No. 1, Medical Practitioners Registration Bill 1982. Mr. Jackson to resume.

MR. JACKSON: Mr. Chairman I am aware that I had the call on this particular piece of legislation, I am also aware that there will be some amendments foreshadowed towards it, but there are some points that I would like to clear concerning surgeons, orthopaedic surgeons or gynaecologists, visiting surgeons. I take it that this Bill will need those persons to be registered as well as our permanent medical officer. Also I take it that optometrists, the likes of Dr. Baker, will have to be registered. I support the Bill in principle because I do believe and I indicated this at the last sitting that we must give all the protection we can to the people of Norfolk Island as far as medical treatment is concerned. I suppose everyone around this table, the community as well, has heard of quacks getting into the community and setting up practices when they are not qualified. I would now like to hand the debate over to the ones who have indicated that they are foreshadowing amendments to this piece of legislation and hear what those amendments are.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Buffett.

MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Acting Deputy President this particular piece of legislation was introduced at this House's last sitting and you will realise that the purpose of introducing legislation and allowing it to sit on the table of the House for a period of time is to invite comment and seek amendments if that is appropriate. There have been a number of suggestions in respect of this piece of legislation and in fact a number of other pieces of legislation that has been introduced over the past couple of months. In respect of this proposed Act the amendments are still being pursued and I really think it would be more practical if I sought an adjournment at this time to allow them to be tidied in a fashion that they can be brought forward for further assessment by the House.
MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Thank you Mr. Buffett. Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: Before Mr. Buffett moves that adjournment could I ask a question about it. I spoke quite loudly in opposition to this Bill when it was introduced last time and I have since quite changed my mind. I think it is probably a sensible Bill. I wanted to raise a question though - is the Administrator willing to keep such a register, have we talked with him. The Bill instructs him to do so - has he said he is willing to.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Buffett.

MR. BUFFETT: I can clarify that to the House Mr. Acting Deputy President. A copy of this Bill has been sent to the Administrator both for his comment and for the Australian Government's comment. There have been comments received from the Administrator and they are part of the collated amendments that will come forward, there has been some useful comment. I might say that there has been no objection raised on that particular point but there are useful comments from the office of the Administrator.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Thank you Mr. Buffett. Further debate Honourable Members. Mr. Buffett do you wish to move the adjournment. The question is that the debate be adjourned.

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

SLAUGHTERING (AMENDMENT) BILL 1982

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order of the Day No.2, Slaughtering (Amendment) Bill 1982, Mr. Howard to resume.

MR. HOWARD: Thank you. The purpose of the Bill as it was introduced at the last sitting was to increase the fee charged for the supervision of slaughtering from 50cents to $2, and in discussions that I have had
with various Members and residents, there appears to be serious question as to whether the fee that is charged now really is fully justified. There also seems to be a serious question as to whether the whole Slaughtering Ordinance may not need re-writing. I have got misgivings about just going ahead and raising a fee from 50cents to $2 to cover a cost when there is some question as to whether that cost is proper, well thought out and necessary, and with that query I will cease for the moment.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Buffett.

MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Acting Deputy President the particular piece of legislation that is before the House does of course relate solely to the matter of raising the fee for slaughtering inspection from 50cents to $2. The examinations that have been presented to me at this time is that this is a particular requirement required by the legislation. Mr. Howard has mentioned that it may not be proper and it may not be well thought out. I should make reference to the fact that it has been in operation and thought proper and well thought out for some long number of years in Norfolk Island and the opinion that is available to me and my own opinion is that during that period of time that it has been a necessary part of the slaughtering arrangements in Norfolk Island. What I can accept however is that in this day and age it might need some adjustment. What is a fact however is that the law requires that it be done now and until that assessment is made as to whether it needs some adjustment, it needs to be done, and again I say that we are losing money on the deal as it stands at this time. I am rather surprised that Members of this House such as Mr. Sanders and Mr. Howard who have had a very close opinion about how moneys should be spent from the public purse and the moneys that should come in to the public purse and the costs of the various services provided by the Government, I am surprised that they appear at this time to wish to continue an arrangement whereby we continue to not pay our way, in other words lose money.

Let me just make my thoughts clear to the House on this matter. Firstly I am quite agreeable to the examination of the up to date requirements in respect of the Slaughtering Ordinance in Norfolk Island, I am quite happy to examine it to see how it stands up in light of this day and age requirements. The next point I make is that until that is done I think we should ensure that we don't lose money, and this proposal is to
ensure that we don't lose money until we can get about pursuing that updating of the particular law.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mrs. Gray.

MRS. GRAY: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President. I have a quote written here which came from notes taken at an Executive Committee meeting and I would just like to seek confirmation of them - the additional fee is proposed to cover actual overtime costs on operation - is that right, may I address that question to the Executive Member presenting the Bill.

MR. SANDERS: I think I can possibly answer that for Mrs. Gray. I think the figure was $3,538 overtime.

MRS. GRAY: Yes I seem to recall a figure something like that. However the principle remains, is it a suggestion that the additional fee is proposed to cover actual overtime costs.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Buffett.

MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Acting Deputy President, the proposal for raising the fee is to cover the overall costs, certainly some of it is entailed in overtime arrangements because some of the services are in fact performed at weekends, so yes, some of the content does relate to overtime.

MRS. GRAY: That puts a slightly different tone on the question because we were given a figure of 2,000 head slaughtered per annum, and 2,000 per head slaughtered per annum at 50 cents worked out to $1,000; 2,000 head at $2 worked out obviously at $4,000. Now the assumption is that the overtime is being worked on weekends, and this has come only as a result of discussions with the butchers which I understand not many other Members have had. So even at the outside we are talking about 52 weekends of the year and I understand that that is not so, and I understand that the inspections would take something in the vicinity of two hours and we are talking about 104 hours and if we multiply that for example by $10 an hour we come up to $1,040. It would seem that the existing cost of 50 cents is coming very close to covering that charge, that is why the original question is so important, or the answer
to that question, if it is proposed that the fee is to cover actual overtime costs then I would suggest that it is being very close to covered now by slaughtering fees, however if it is to cover something else then I think it should be made clear as to what else it is supposed to cover. Let me just before I finish, we are back again to the Public Service time off in lieu of, and on my figuring even taking those two hours per weekend comes up to around 24 minutes per day over a five day week. So I must admit that the figures don't seem to jell with what is being proposed. I seek clarification thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mrs. Gray quoted the figure of 2,000 head killed – that was the figure that was nominated, but Mr. Chairman I would like to point out that I think there is only 1,000 head all up on Norfolk Island, I think it would be very difficult to kill them twice. The other point that Mr. Buffett made was that the Ordinance had worked very effectively for many years – I would like to correct that too – I have fought it personally for over 25 years but nobody has ever taken any notice.

MR. BUFFETT: That doesn't mean it is incorrect.

MR. SANDERS: I would like those that think it is incorrect to come and slaughter with me. The other point that I wish to make is that $3,538 in overtime, as Mrs. Gray suggested, is not for 52 weeks because the Stock Inspector also has a months holiday too, so it is for 48 weeks. I would imagine that the total amount of money all up that is required to kill the total amount of stock on Norfolk Island would not amount to the Stock Inspector's overtime rate just to look at them and count them. I would like to move an adjournment Mr. Chairman of this total matter until the Ordinance can be completely looked at and preferably re-written. I move that Mr. Chairman.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The question is that the debate be now adjourned.
Question - put
The House voted -

AYES, 6
Mr. Howard
Mr. Brown
Mr. Christian-Bailey
Mrs. Gray
Mr. Quintal
Mr. Sanders

NOES, 3
Mr. Buffett
Miss Buffett
Mr. Jackson

Debate (on motion by Mr. Sanders) adjourned
Resumption of debate made an Order of the Day for the next sitting.

LIGHTERAGE (AMENDMENT) BILL 1982

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order of the Day No.3, Lighterage (Amendment) Bill 1982, Mr. Howard to resume.

MR. HOWARD: This is a complicated and sensitive and difficult subject addressed in this Bill. It proposes that the lighterage operations include tally clerks on the wharf; it proposes that the Administration take responsibility for loss or damage that is caused in lighterage; and a number of other provisions. My understanding is that there is still consultation needed in the community. Mr. Sanders proposed the Bill, I understand that he wants further consultation before we proceed with the Bill, and on the understanding that that is what he wants and that he will propose adjourning this to another meeting when that consultation can be held, I will propose adjournment.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mrs. Gray.

MRS. GRAY: I would like to support the adjournment Mr. Acting Deputy President. It is my understanding that the Chamber of Commerce has developed a sub-committee to discuss and possibly in time seek input to amendments or reconstruction of the Bill, and I would very much support an adjournment at this stage.
MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The question is that the debate be adjourned.

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.

BUILDING (AMENDMENT) BILL 1982

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order of the Day No. 4, Building (Amendment) Bill 1982, Mr. Sanders to resume.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I sought the adjournment at the last meeting because Mr. Brown had the call and he was not present. I don't know whether the Members want me to go on on the lengthy things that have come out in the last five months, I think it might be diplomatic at this stage to pass it over to Mr. Brown.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: It is my understanding Mr. Acting Deputy President that Mr. Sanders' original motion was not successful and that we are now looking at Mr. Howard's amendments.

MR. HOWARD: I don't think that is quite right Mr. President.

MR. SANDERS: No, Mr. Jackson had an amendment which failed and then Mr. Howard moved an amendment which is still what is in existence now.

MR. BROWN: If you will excuse me Mr. Acting Deputy President, we have just been attempting to ascertain where we are. I think it is more appropriate at this stage that Mr. Howard have the floor rather than myself.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: And could I confuse things a little bit further by seeking
leave to make a small amendment of a technical nature to the amendment that has been circulated.

In putting this amended form of the Bill a couple of meetings ago, Mr. Jackson drew attention to a paragraph which is on page 1 of the Bill - it is 15(2)(a) in which it says that a person may erect on a parcel of land on which no other building is erected a building for use solely as a single private dwelling house, and Mr. Jackson pointed out that that could mean for example that the Norfolk Hotel not having a dwelling house on it but having a building on it, could go ahead and build another dwelling house, and I took his point and moved that the word building be changed to the word dwelling house and the House approved that change. Since then it has been pointed out to me by the Clerk that that hastily made amendment gets us into other troubles.

What I would now like to move is that that paragraph read as follows - 'A person may (a) erect on a parcel of land on which no other building is erected (other than a building or buildings referred to in paragraph (c), (d), (e), (f) or (g)), a building for use solely as a single private dwelling house'. The purpose of that amendment is to get us out of a mouse trap that we accidentally got ourselves caught in, and I accept the Clerk's recommendation and I would like to move that technical amendment before going on with the discussion of the Bill on the whole.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Buffett.

MR. BUFFETT: Yes, I wish to really draw attention to the House of this matter Mr. Acting Deputy President - it has been shown over the last ten minutes that there is some confusion about this particular piece of legislation, it has been quite conclusively demonstrated the difficulties we get in when we have hastily made amendments and patchwork legislation. It would be a different matter if the building arrangements were quite simple and you could then just do one piece which tidies that area. It has been shown over a long period of time that that is not the case, and what is required is a broad spectrum Island plan in which should be the subject of the efforts of those people who are so involved. I think we have had a very good illustration this afternoon of the difficulty, confusion and cross referencing of confusion that results when you try to just involve yourself in a patchwork arrangement. I would have certainly liked to have seen that all of the efforts that
have been put into proposing those amendments finding a way out of the mire that it so created and coming up with another alternative which probably in another two days is going to lead us to a similar situation, all of that effort should I think be put into an overall Island planning situation which will take into account the total spectrum not just a bit here and a bit there and will better equip this Assembly and the people who have to administer both an Island planning arrangement and a Building Board arrangement a much better sense of where they are going and a much better ability to in fact carry out the duties which they need to perform.

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

MR. HOWARD: I agree with Mr. Buffett totally that hasty amendments are foolish. I hope that we are in the course as totally another matter in the Executive Committee of taking some steps that will lead toward a better legislative drafting procedure than we have had and in which if amendments are to be made on the spot they will be drafted by the draftsman on the spot, not by us amateurs, I agree with the foolishness of making hasty amendments to legislation that has been carefully thought out. As to the need for a Bill of the kind that we are discussing and the technical amendment that I have just proposed is essential if we are going to have a Bill of the kind we are discussing. The point is that a broad Norfolk Island plan is badly needed and it is going to take a year or two to develop and there has been quite strong feeling on the part of many Members that we need at least some degree of control over residential building. Now what that degree of control may be is what we are debating. Mr. Sanders' original Bill proposed that we control building on private land by allowing the Executive Member to lay down regulations. I opposed that very strongly. I don't think an Executive Member ought to lay down regulations of his own making and begin controlling freehold property; I oppose that. Mr. Jackson then proposed an amended form of the Bill in which with a fair amount of effort he had worked out and was proposing a specific set of specifications that people could go ahead and build to on private property without special permission. On that amended form of the Bill my feeling was we were trying to move too fast, we were trying to quickly throw together some requirements for what kind of building was permissible and I felt it needed more study. The
proposed form of the Bill that we are talking about now by way of the amendment to the Bill that I have proposed, simply would allow at some future time the Executive Member to come forward with proposed regulations on private buildings which the Assembly would then consider and consider as long as the Assembly wanted to consider and if the Assembly was not happy with those regulations it could throw them out and if it thought they were reasonable it could approve them and they would then take effect. I think that is a process that will be difficult to carry out but I think it is something that can be done in less than a couple of years, and to the extent that Members around the table want there to be some measure of control over private building I think it is essential if you want it in anything under two years that we go ahead and act on what admittedly is patchwork legislation but which I think is perhaps desired by the community, that remains to be seen, but if you want the opportunity to vote yes or no on that approach to the problem then first of all we need to approve this technical amendment that I have just moved.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The question is Honourable Members that the amendment to the amendment be agreed.

Question – put
Motion agreed to unanimously

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Any further debate on Mr. Howard's amendment. Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: I was really, in what I just said, talking to the point of this amended form of the Bill which I have moved. I want to say once again what it is intended to do. If the amendment that is before us now fails, is voted down, the House will then be left voting on Mr. Sanders' original Bill which would empower the Executive Member to lay down regulations on private property, and I am opposed to that and I think the majority of Members around the table are opposed to it, and I think Mr. Sanders' Bill is going to fail if it comes to that. We will then be in the position that I think Mr. Buffett would like us to be in where we are not trying to have any legislation, we are going to go ahead and try to work out a general Island plan which is going to take us a couple of years. If the majority want some possibility of
some interim control of some kind on private building the amended form of the Bill that is in front of us now is the first step in that direction. If you accept and pass this amendment you are not putting any restriction on private building at all today, none, you are simply setting up a situation in which Mr. Sanders as the Executive Member can at some future meeting come forward and say I would now like to propose that we consider putting these five restrictions on private building, and the House can then debate those and if it does not like them it can throw those out or modify them. All this Bill does is set up a machinery that allows some regulation of private building short of a full Island plan. I think it is a sensible way out and I commend it.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President. It is probably necessary for most of us to compare Mr. Sanders' original Bill with Mr. Howard's proposed amendment. Whilst we all know that Mr. Sanders is a very reasonable man we can't always be sure that future Executive Members with responsibility for building will be as reasonable as he is, and I quite take Mr. Howard's point that the Assembly should in the first place be making decisions as to building regulations rather than have a situation where the Executive Member can make a decision and it is necessary if the Assembly wants to do anything about it to tip upside down the Executive Member's decision. If we accept Mr. Howard's proposal that the Assembly should discuss and bring about the regulations then there are not in my view any substantial further differences between Mr. Sanders' original motion and Mr. Howard's amendments. In the event that Mr. Sanders might feel that Mr. Howard in his amendments has missed something, should the amendment be passed then it is up to Mr. Sanders to decide upon what form of regulation he wants to recommend and he can add to his recommendations whatever he may desire and they will then come before this House for consideration and this House will decide whether to pick up the recommendations and run with them or whether to throw them out. On that basis and after having given the matter quite a deal of consideration over the last few months I am inclined to support Mr. Howard's amendment.

MRS. GRAY: I would just like to say Mr. Acting Deputy President that over the months that we have been debating this I have probably exhausted my store of points in favour of supporting the Bill. I stated last time that Mr. Howard's amendments came forward that I am prepared to accept the amendments put by him so that something may be achieved, and to me it is not the ideal but at least it is a start and better than the situation that we are dealing with now. There is no question in my mind, and I say again that the household survey brought forward the fact that most people on Norfolk would like to see building control and Bill Sanders brought that point up in support of his Bill. I am prepared to accept and support Mr. Howard's amendments as a beginning.

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

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President. I would just like to refer to one statement made by Mrs. Gray that the household survey came up with a fact - it is not a fact of what the Island generally wants because the survey was not a general Island survey. The people I have consulted, I have only had an increase of one person in support of a change from the status quo. I see the necessity for some regulation - can I ask why we aren't adopting, are we not operating by the Coldham Plan administratively, through the Administration, can I ask the Minister responsible in that direction, with building regulations do we not operate from the Coldham Plan.

MR. SANDERS: Mr. Chairman as far as I can gather there is hardly any regulation on anything, this is the purpose of introducing the Bill in the first place is to stop people from doing exactly as they wish.

MR. HOWARD: If I could try to offer an answer to Miss Buffett's question. The Coldham Plan is followed as a general guideline by the Building Board but at the moment in the Building Ordinance private buildings are excused from the whole Ordinance, so it doesn't matter whether Coldham is used as a guideline or not, people on private property can just go ahead and build.

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

MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Acting Deputy President there are two things that I
would like to address in respect of this matter. Firstly is the matter that this House is being asked to provide the machinery to control buildings in the total spectrum on the Island including on freehold land in what I would term in a patchwork legislation arrangement; and the second matter that I think needs to be addressed relates to the traditional aspects in respect of buildings in Norfolk Island, certainly in certain categories. I think if people do vote to provide machinery under the present arrangement that they are effectively destroying that traditional aspect which in Norfolk Island has been held extremely valuable for generations. Now I am not saying that at some time there may not need to be some adjustment in that but what I am saying at this time that if such a decision should be made it should be made in the full knowledge of the total spectrum of land planning in Norfolk Island. Now we have not got that total spectrum on which to base such a decision at this moment. We do have efforts that I have earlier referred to this afternoon in pursuing what is complicated arrangements on a patchwork legislation arrangement, and I again say that it would be better to put those efforts by all of those persons who are so involved into coming up with an overall Island plan which would provide better information for us all to make some decisions. Mr. Sanders is promoting this piece of legislation, supported by Mr. Howard. I want to point out that Mr. Sanders does have the responsibility for Island planning in the larger sense to which I have referred and I would say it would be better for him to place some of those energies in providing an overall Island plan. I think that the proposed machinery may provide some answers, it certainly doesn't provide them all. It certainly only allows you to assess the matter on some of the facts that surely must relate to Island planning overall, and when one considers that in taking the decision that is being asked of this House this afternoon that it will totally destroy what I hold dear to be traditional aspects in this Island. I am just not prepared to vote to say yes traditional aspects out the window you go and I make that decision based on not full knowledge of the total spectrum of planning in Norfolk Island, I don't think that is good enough and I certainly won't be casting my vote in that direction. I am surprised really that some Members don't hold more value with some of the traditional aspects - certainly you can't live totally on tradition but you have got to take recognition of how they do fit in to ones lifestyle
and ones thinking and how it affects a number of the aspects that are valuable in Norfolk Island, and the ownership of freehold land in the Island cannot be disputed as being one of those things. I would like Members to more carefully consider those aspects and if there needs to be a change in respect of some of those aspects that the decision can be made knowing the total picture which has not yet been presented to us. I cannot support the amendments that are proposed by Mr. Howard this afternoon because although it might be said well it just sets up the machinery and that does not take anything away, it does, it takes a decision which totally destroys the traditional aspects and I want to see the bigger picture before I am willing to consider that factor, so I can't support the amendments and I would not be able to support the original motion proposed by Mr. Sanders.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Quintal.

MR. QUINTAL: Yes Mr. Chairman. Mr. Buffett touched on something that is very dear in all the hearts of just about every Islander or most Islanders, and that is the traditional aspect of the situation. When the Pitcairners first arrived on Norfolk Island they were very poor, they did not have very much money but they did build some very beautiful homes and most of the old homes on the Island today are very beautiful old homes and how the early settlers ever managed to build the homes with very little money I do not know, but there are some very very old beautiful buildings on the Island and I think it is a credit to the people who first arrived on Norfolk Island. I can't see the reason for a Building (Amendment) Bill at all because when you consider that all buildings on government lease land is covered by a Building Ordinance and when you have a look at the shocking state of part of the Middlegate subdivision and there is an Ordinance to cover that sort of situation and it has never ever been controlled, I can't see how we will ever control all freehold buildings on the Island. I have been wondering if the fairest way to settle this argument or the dispute that is before us today is to put a questionnaire out to the community, to the people of the Island, and see what their views are and not take it unto ourselves to fetch forward an amended Bill that the people of the Island might not want and I cannot support the amendments. If I was to support any it will not be Mr. Sanders' and not Mr. Howard's.
MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: Mr. Buffett has done something that I regard as rather naughty - he has said that the amendment that we are looking at now, the Bill in the form that I have put it, is going to totally destroy traditional aspects of Norfolk Island, he said that twice, that is nonsense, absolute rubbish. If this Bill in this amended form passes, nothing will have changed, nothing, zero will have changed except that we will have said to the Executive Member Mr. Sanders, if you think you can see some sensible regulation that you think ought to be put on private building, you bring that proposed idea along to us and we will look at it, if we don't like what he brings we throw it out. This Bill in itself does not change one thing it simply gives the Executive Member the ability to come back with proposed regulations if he wants to do that. Now I share the very strong feelings that Mr. Buffett has referred to and that Mr. Quintal has referred to about the traditional values of the Island and about the value of freehold land, I have opposed controls on freehold land right from the beginning but I am not afraid to listen to proposals about how we might control them, I am not afraid to have Bill Sanders come in with proposed regulations, I was not afraid to have Mr. Jackson in his amendment propose a series of conditions that if people met those they would be excluded but if they didn't meet them the law would not affect their freehold land, I wasn't afraid to hear that, I don't think we ought to be afraid to hear suggestions, if we don't like the suggestions we can vote them down when they come. Seriously anyone who puts it to you that this amended Bill today destroys anything is being excitable.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I would just like to make one comment on the statement of Mr. Quintal's on the basis that there should be a questionnaire to the public, in actual fact we have had one and the result was what you call an election.

MR. QUINTAL: Thank you Mr. Sanders.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Buffett.
MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Acting Deputy President, I think I should draw attention to what Mr. Howard has mentioned. He and I obviously don't see eye to eye on what is contained within this Bill. This Bill changes the law, there's no two ways about that, and the law as it presently stands does not cover freehold areas to which I have earlier referred. The Bill as it is now proposed will cover it and it will provide a machinery in which various things can be pursued in respect of that. And so in doing that I just can't accept that it does not change the existing situation and takes away the aspects to which I have earlier referred as being valuable. I don't want to pursue the matter but I just wanted to point out that obviously we just don't see it in the same light but so be it.

Reference has been made to the fact that some of us are not afraid to listen to proposals that might come forward, let me say that I am not afraid to listen to an overall Island plan that might be brought forward, and the sooner it is brought forward for our consideration the sooner we are able to solve some of the difficulties that in fact do now face us. I have earlier said, and I am probably being repetitious now, that if in fact they were brought forward, plans such as those were brought forward, it would be a better job than trying to pursue the line we are now pursuing. I again say Mr. Acting Deputy President I don't support the amendment and I don't support the original Bill.

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

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President, could I at this point in time suggest that the previous Assembly had worked several months, over two years, on a Planning Bill, a lot of discussions have gone on, it would be a pity I think to waste all the legislation and all the planning that has come up to that time, could I suggest Mr. Acting Deputy President that we perhaps pick up where the previous Assembly left off. The ideas are there, it is a start, I feel it would be a base for the present Executive Member to start on, he will have the benefit of at least a years work even if not the following years ideas with half a new Assembly in, perhaps that might be an idea, can I see what the Members think on that.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Thank you. Mr. Sanders.
MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. Chairman, I move that the question be put.

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

Question - put
Motion negatived

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Debate continues. Mr. Jackson.

MR. JACKSON: Mr. Chairman. Mr. Howard was quite correct that I had an amendment that spelt out quite specifically what a person on freehold land can do and what they cannot do. This amendment does nothing to that, and Mr. Howard is quite correct again in saying that this Bill in its present form will change nothing, he is correct there also, because it is only for the time being it will change nothing. When we look at the Minister who is responsible for promoting the regulations, that is where it will change, when the regulations by Mr. Sanders who is the Minister responsible brings into this House regulations towards this particular amendment that is here before us. Now my version of an amendment is not one that is placed before the Members in the dark, it is not one that is put before us with nothing on it, it is left to one person, Mr. Sanders, and I have heard everyone describe Mr. Sanders' original Bill as one that they do not want and we all know that in that proposed Bill of Mr. Sanders is his desire to convert the whole of Norfolk Island into a designated area and that is the whole purpose and basis of his first original Bill, we are aware of that.

MR. SANDERS: Mr. Chairman could we ask Mr. Jackson to confine himself to the facts.

MR. JACKSON: Here is a man who can't get a hat to fit his head and he trying to intervene, goodness me.

I believe that if Mr. Howard would consider coming forward with a Bill that had some specific plans in it until the land planning situation that is proposed by Mr. Buffett gets into operation in the interim which has been stated, instead of to one man, if you were to come forward in your terms with a Bill that has specific plans of what you can do and what you cannot do and then with that in view it might suit the requirements of the whole nine Members until a proper Planning Bill for
Norfolk Island could be introduced, and therefore at this particular stage I seek permission to adjourn this debate, the reason for the adjournment being for Mr. Howard to come before this House at its next sitting with some specific plans to put with this amendment for us to debate.

MR. HOWARD: Was that a motion or is there still room for debate.

MR. JACKSON: Well I have moved it as a motion.

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

Question - put
The House voted -

AYES, 4
Mr. Buffett
Mr. Quintal
Miss Buffett
Mr. Jackson

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

Motion negatived

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The debate continues. Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: I would like to try to comment on what Mr. Jackson was just saying. He thought it would be a good idea if I would come forward with some specific proposed regulations on private property, I don't want to do that, I think it is going to be almost impossible to do. I don't have it in mind to propose how freehold property should be regulated myself, I am not a supporter of the idea, but I don't want to stand in the way of somebody else having a go if he thinks he can do it. I feel very strongly that if we are going to consider regulations that might be put on freehold property that they have got to be made in this Assembly, not by anybody outside or any one Executive Member. I think it is going to be a lot harder job than even Mr. Sanders as Executive Member thinks it is going to be. I think when you sit down and
begin trying to write regulations to govern freehold property, it is going to be a difficult, difficult job and I don't expect to see those being brought in to be proposed to the House quickly. I can imagine that there might be a couple of fairly simple ones brought in, and there is no reason you would have to try to do everything in one hit, for example I think you might find general agreement that there could be a requirement on building on freehold property that if you cut a tree down on freehold property you have got to plant another one, that could be a requirement and I think probably the House would support that kind of requirement. What other requirements might there be - you might want to say no houses higher than three storeys, I don't know, but I can imagine that some restrictions would be acceptable to the membership. I think it is going to be terribly hard to draw sweeping rigid restrictions on freehold property and I think if those are proposed they are very likely going to fail when it comes to the vote around the table. I think that probably in the long run it is going to be necessary to have an Island plan before people will be willing to accept such restrictions, so I am not really interested in Mr. Jackson's idea of my coming forward with restrictions to put on freehold; I don't want to put them on. I am willing to have somebody else propose them. I intend to vote against them if I don't agree with them.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Jackson.

MR. JACKSON: Mr. Chairman, it certainly gives me some further food for thought from Mr. Howard's statement that he does not want to interfere with freehold land and if Mr. Sanders comes down I am sure that puts another one on the vote that was just taken, so there is a committal just been given and I am quite satisfied with that committal.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Buffett.

MR. BUFFETT: It is interesting Mr. Acting Deputy President, what Mr. Howard has just said is in fact what I have been promoting to this House. I have been promoting to this House that you are best able to make a decision when you have the total picture of an Island plan. Mr. Howard has just acknowledged that in fact it is going to be extremely difficult to do anything without coming to that particular stage in the proceedings, that is exactly what I have been saying to the House for the
last 20 minutes, and I am just starting to be repetitious again on the
matter, but it does confirm what I was saying. It seems funny that what
I have been saying and the way that I am voting, or going to vote, is
now being confirmed as exactly what Mr. Howard thinks about the matter
yet he is going to vote differently.

MR. HOWARD: I first of all better make clear - Mr. Jackson said he was
willing to accept the commitment that I had made, I want to make it
clear to him that I did not make a commitment to vote against any
regulation that might be brought, for example if this amendment passes
and if Mr. Sanders brings a regulation requiring the planting of trees
that are cut down I think I would vote for it. There was concern
expressed about a big house in Grassy Road and a number of people thought
we should have had regulations of some kind that would have prohibited
that happening. I can imagine that Mr. Sanders could come forth with
a regulation which would talk about the maximum length of one flat wall
of a building or something that might be acceptable to the membership.
If he is wanting to have a try I am certainly willing to have him have a
try and I am willing to listen to what he wants to put if he wants to
have a go, if I don't like it I generally will lean toward the side of
not interfering with the rights of freehold land owners, but if there
are sensible and good proposals that I believe are for the benefit of
the Island, I am certainly willing to listen to them and if they can
come even though they are piecemeal over the next few months instead of
two years from now or three years from now, that might be of benefit to
the Island.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Jackson.

MR. JACKSON: The committal that I take Mr. Howard as saying is that he
will not vote or support anything that interferes with building on
freehold land.

MR. HOWARD: I didn't say that.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman I move that the question be put.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The question is that the question be put.
Question - put
Motion agreed to unanimously

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

Question - put
The House voted -

AYES, 5
Mr. Howard
Mr. Brown
Mr. Christian-Bailey
Mrs. Gray
Mr. Sanders

NOES, 4
Mr. Buffett
Mr. Quintal
Miss Buffett
Mr. Jackson

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Would somebody move that the Bill be agreed.

MR. BROWN: I so move.

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

Question - put
The House voted -

AYES, 5
Mr. Howard
Mr. Brown
Mr. Christian-Bailey
Mrs. Gray
Mr. Sanders

NOES, 4
Mr. Buffett
Mr. Quintal
Miss Buffett
Mr. Jackson

Bill, as amended, agreed.

NEXT SITTING DAY

MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman I would like to move that the House at its rising adjourn until Wednesday 1 December.
MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The question is that the House at its rising adjourn until Wednesday 1 December 1982 at 2 p.m. Debate. The question is that the motion be agreed.

Question - put
Motion agreed to unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mrs. Gray.

MRS. GRAY: I would like to move that the House do now adjourn.

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

House adjourned at 5.45 p.m. on 3 November 1982 until Wednesday 1 December 1982 at 2 p.m.