sure that landowners would be only too responsive to a re-afforestation drive for Norfolk Island pines in the this the year of the tree. What a beautiful gift for those who live here would be a healthy established potted pine, and what pride there is derived from seeing each one thrive when personally attended. Increased air and vehicular traffic creating pollution also necessitate a greater density of the anti-pollutant pine.

We are indeed fortunate to have a skillful and experienced local Forrester and assistants whose expertise and co-operation would undoubtedly ensure smooth and pleasant introduction and operation of a scheme that would be enabled by the adoption of this motion, that if a healthy young viable pine be planted or if three healthy young viable pines be planted in place of an established felled pine, every participant would have the satisfaction of knowing that theirs was a worthwhile cause in the contribution they make to the perpetuation of Norfolk Island's most valuable asset. So I'll ask the Executive Member responsible if he would consider introducing legislation to that matter please. Thank you.

MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Acting Deputy President. I certainly support the thrust of this particular motion. The preservation of Norfolk Island pine is something that should be foremost in the minds of all members of this Assembly. It is something that dominates the scene here, it makes part of the character and value of Norfolk Island extremely unique. There is one point that I would like to mention should it come to the matter of pursuing legislation to give effect to this motion. Honourable Members will know that there is much traditional land held on Norfolk Island and many of those people have a great care for the Norfolk Island pine and I know of many people who in fact have already commenced a system of rotationally fencing off various areas so in fact the young pines can regenerate without competition from grazing stock or competition from people ploughing up the paddock or whatever and in fact on this rotational arrangement, you will find that they have in fact provided for regenerating trees or the replacement of trees well before they are in fact going to cut trees and I hope that sort of programme would be taken into account should such a legislative arrangement be made.

MRS. GREY: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President. There were just a couple of questions which came to my mind when the motion was amended to read "planted nearby an appropriate cattle-proofed places" the first question I asked myself was who would maintain those, and secondly, how many trees were felled on crown land. In other words, if the cattle-proofed places were to be erected on crown land, one would assume that the crown would have to look after them. I was a bit concerned about that but I've managed to track down the figures which might be of some interest. Apparently, according to the Annual Report 1981/82, 210.6 cubic metres of timber was felled, can I phrase it in such a fashion, on crown land and 1,000 cubic metres on freehold land. I certainly think it's a worthwhile suggestion as Mr. Buffett has indicated, there could be some difficulties in actually bringing forward legislation to allow such circumstances he's mentioned to be taken into account, but certainly, as far as the Government is
concerned and the expense the Government would perhaps be put to, it's a worthwhile exercise and not extreme.

MR. QUINTAL: I would like to support the motion that was moved by Miss Buffett and actually, I think it's a very good move and surely would get around the problem that Mrs. Grey has mentioned about the Government lease. It is my belief that there are more pinetrees on Norfolk growing today than there ever was and I hope I am right but I don't think I am wrong. Since the reserve was fenced in and cattle has been kept out of that reserve, there are big areas of pinetrees that have been generated, especially where there's been no lantana guava olive or the other curse, Hawaiian Holly. Where there are vuavas, the pinetrees will not regenerate and guavas and lantana, they regenerate really well under lantana. Also, the pines of Norfolk Island are thinning out in a lot of areas like the Headstone area is getting deluded of pines. There has been a problem out there of trying to grow the trees because I notice Norfolk Island pinetrees do not like growing in kikuya grass, the grass seems to smother the pinetrees. There is a beautiful stand of pinetrees out next to Mr. Jack Hayes there that I was having a look at yesterday and the forestry department has ploughed in between the pinetrees, I think they must have put a rotary hoe through in between the pinetrees and made a bit of a mulch and that has improved the growth and I don't there, apart from the trees, in Kingston, I don't think you could see a better standard of pinetrees and I don't think you'd see pinetrees that have grown so fast. There are other areas of pinetrees that have been fenced in over the last few years and pinetrees have generated quite considerably but I do agree in the early days, this system of planting three pines for every one that has been cut, did operate quite well in the early days, the only problem there was that the looking after the trees, once you plant the trees, they have to be looked after. I feel that we could do with a lot more pinetrees and in my opinion this is a move in the right direction and I support the move.

MR. JACKSON: I do also support the proposition. I think it's a wonderful one and I congratulate Miss Buffett for raising this in the manner and I would also like to congratulate her if we can recapture some of the glowing terms that she expressed in presenting her motion and certainly we will benefit in revenue raising and getting those tourist back and sit out under the moonlight and the pinetrees and all so I fully support it.

MR. SANDERS: I'd like to save the typist all the effort of typing what I was going to say, I'll just say I'll support the Bill.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Acting Deputy President, if Forestry Department is able to have pines available for sale in sufficient quantities, and at reasonable prices, and if the Executive Member with the responsibility, indicates to the community a desire that trees be planted to replace cut trees, then although I agree with the concept of Miss Buffett's motion, I believe that actual legislation would not be necessary. I am myself opposed to any other unrestrained growth in legislation. I believe that we should keep our legislation to the absolute minimum, although I intend to support the motion today, I would hope that when the Executive Member is giving consideration to the matter, he will look carefully at whether it can be resolved.
without going to the full extent of legislation.

MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Acting Deputy President, can I just acknowledge what Mr. Brown has just said, I too agree that there should not be unnecessary legislation and I don't think we do ourselves any good if in fact we just fill up our lawbooks with unnecessary words. I too feel that if in fact it can be achieved without going to legislation, I think that that would be desirable and I just want to acknowledge that comment because I thought it was valid.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President. I really don't mind if the matter is resolved without legislation I would like to - the purpose of mentioning legislation and thinking that it may be required was to overcome what now is the situation of a lot of bare spots in Norfolk Island. I think if there is some surety given that trees are replaced as nearby as practicable in areas that they're cut, we would retain the beauty that we could fast lose.

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

Question put.
The Motion was agreed to unanimously.

NOTICE NO. 5 - PRACTISING OPTICAL DISPENSER FOR NORFOLK ISLAND

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President. In view of the fact I have moved a motion or I seek to move a motion, I know that Mr. Sanders - he telephoned me this morning to say that he wishes to move an amendment to my motion - it is my opinion that the amendment that he wishes to move is more beneficial than the original motion. Is it in order to seek the chair's permission that the amendment come in, or do I still present it.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: If you don't wish to proceed with your motion Miss Buffett, Mr. Sanders by leave can move his amendment to your motion.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I seek leave to.

MISS BUFFETT: Well as long as it comes into the House, as long as that's an acceptable way - is that an acceptable way.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I seek leave to move that motion that Miss Buffett was referring to. The amended motion is to remove all words after 'that' and it would read
that in the absence or deficiency a Norfolk Islander for particular professional service which would otherwise be a benefit to residents, this House recommends to the Executive Member having responsibility for Immigration, that any application for an entry permit which would result in that particular professional service being available to residents, be favourable considered.

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

MR. SANDERS: Mr. Chairman may I speak to the Member thank you. The Administration is occasionally faced with inquiries or applications from professional persons who are seeking to enter the Island to retire, semi-retire or to work either in their profession or a combination of their profession and other work. Quite rightly the Administration or the authorized officer is only able to respond to such inquiries in terms of present policies. There are several policies which would inhibit the entry of professional persons for example, that no entry permits are granted to enable an immigrant to commence a new business, that any business opened locally must be staffed by residents, that no entry permits are granted to part-time employment, that no entry permits are granted for retirement purposes. This policies should at this time continue to apply in general. However, there is definitely a need to favourably consider any applicants which has inbuilt benefits to residents. The amended policy has a much wider application than that proposed which deals specifically with one case. The amendment allows favourable consideration of applications involving all professional services, for example, Optometrists, Veterinary Surgeon, Chiropractor, Surveyor, Medical Specialists etc. Such persons may be seeking entry for retirement, but nevertheless offer their services on a part-time or casual basis or they may be entering to be engaged in a newly established business venture. Additionally, the amended motion restricts favourable consideration to cases where a particular professional service is not already available within the island, for which service is considered inadequate or deficient. The amended motion does not remove any obligation on the part of the Executive Member or the authorized officer to satisfy himself that the usual standards of health, character and financial standing are evident in any application. I commend the motion.

MR. BROWN: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President. Our Immigration Law reform is in limbo at present awaiting the Commonwealth's response to Miss Buffett's motion of last September in relation to one of the international conventions to which Australia is a party. Response to that motion will allow completion of the Assembly's consideration of the amendment's proposed by Canberra to the Immigration Bill which had been passed by the first Legislative Assembly. Completion of revised immigration policies is similarly in limbo. To make exemptions such as the exemptions proposed in this motion might well prejudice proper completion of that Immigration Law Reform. This was originally to be a motion in relation to a particular person. It is certainly undesirable that matters such as that be debated in this House. Such questions should be resolved before persons come to Norfolk Island, even though this may cause delay. Whilst I
acknowledge that persons of particular trades or professions may provide desirable services to the community, I believe that this should be dealt with as part of the complete immigration review and not alone. For that reason, I propose to oppose the motion.

MR. JACKSON: 
Mr. Acting Deputy President. The 1980 Immigration Bill provided facilities for such things as what Mr. Sanders has moved in his motion. It provided facilities to those that where a service is required and it has been established that service is a need to the island well there was provisions built in to the 1980 Immigration Bill that is now held up in Canberra over a racial discrimination clause and it appears all the more that we should be making amove to get this Bill back into this House so that we can implement this sections provisions. We're operating on a Bill and I'll describe it as being outdated, outmoded and every way not suitting the conditions that exist on this Island at present. That's the 1968 Immigration Ordinance. I fully agree that there is an area which has been suggested in Miss Buffett's original motion and also in what Mr. Sanders has read out in his and I took particular notice when he was expressing the wording of the motion was that the Minister responsible for Immigration give favourable consideration. Now favourable consideration it takes away and examination of who is to be a Beneficial service to the Island. I'll name one that I do believe there is a place for a Physiotherapist here on this Island and no doubt, an Optician has been stated and I agree that there is a need for a permanent Optician on this Island but what I mean by a permanent Optician on the Island, I mean that one that can examine and prescribe a prescription, not one that is solely for making spectacles. And in examining Mr. Sanders Motion, it tends to break away from the guidelines that has already been set down where the Minister will be called upon to give favourable consideration. I would like to see a further examination of this motion. This motion has just been read to us and it hasn't to my knowledge been examined in other areas like the Legal Officer, the person that is responsible for issuing permits, the authorized officer, so if Mr. Sanders would agree, we have another meeting set down in a fortnight's time, a formal meeting of this Assembly that I would move that this motion be set down as an Order of the Day at our next formal sitting to give members and especially myself, time to examine and consider this motion.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: 
Mr. Jackson's moving an adjournment of the debate.

MR. HOWARD: 
He didn't move an adjournment. He moved that it be made an Order of the Day for the next sitting which I don't think was a lawful motion actually under our rules. He didn't move the adjournment of the debate. If he had moved the adjournment then we'd have to have voted immediately on that adjournment but as that hasn't been moved, I think the debate is still open on the matter.

MR. SANDERS: 
I'd like to reply to Mr. Jackson anyhow because I think I could answer most of the questions right now. the particular person that we were referring to or Miss Buffett was referring to in the moving of her original motion is a qualified Optometrist and is able to offer the following services.
We nevertheless have a situation now where we find that there are some professional and semi-professional tasks that need to be done and the community has real concern for having them. That's the real situation that's addressed in this motion now and whilst to some extent it may conflict with earlier thoughts that we had, I don't think it's to the detriment of the community. I think in fact it's beneficial. What needs to be done of course is to have it carefully watched so that we don't go overboard in this matter and totally disregard the earlier policies that we had. I know myself that there are some areas optical prescriptions have been mentioned, I know in the area of veterinary services, although that is improved over the last couple of years but still there is not a permanent arrangement that the community can have facility to. And some specialist operations additional to that. I think this motion in fact will enhance some services to the community and on that basis, I would be prepared to support it.

MR. JACKSON: I just sighted a letter from the authorized officer which I wasn't aware of, or I made my contribution and after sighting that letter, I am prepared now to support the motion.

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

Question put.
Motion agreed to.

NOTICE NO. 6 - ADOPTION OF CRITERIA IN COLDHAM PLAN IN RELATION TO LAND SUBDIVISION

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I move the following policies shall apply in respect of land use planning. 1. that the criteria set out in the document entitled "Scheme statement, code of ordinances and plan for the territory of Norfolk Island" prepared by Harrison and Grearson & Partners. The Coldham Plan shall be the basis of governmental and administration policy in relation to land use planning. The the Executive Member for planning, tourism and commerce shall as necessary examine the criteria in the Coldham Plan and submit variations he proposes to meetings of all Members of the Legislative Assembly for approval. These meetings being recognized by this House has authorized departures from the general rule laid down by this House and referred to in the Minute No. 7 of this meeting of 7th April, 1982. A reference to the Coldham Plan has varied under paragraph 18. 2. For the purpose of implementing the criteria in the Coldham Plan, the following policies shall apply in respect of applications to subdivide land or to build or alter buildings. (a) That in respect of the subdivision of land where the Administrator has received an application under section 5(1) or 11(2) of the Land Subdivision Ordinance 1967 and is referred it to the Legislative Assembly for consideration, the Executive Member for Planning Tourism and Commerce shall inform the Administrator the application is not recommended for approval unless the Executive Member has satisfied himself that (a) if the proposed application were granted the resulting subdivision would comply with all the criteria in the Coldham Plan and (b) the size and shape of the parcels into which the land is to be subdivided and the purpose for which these parcels are to be used are suitable
(c) the method of access to each parcel is adequate for the purposes for which it is to be used (d) any increase in the use of existing public roads which provide access to the land, it is proposed to subdivide will not be excessive or undesirable and (e) the sizes of the parcels of the proposed subdivision will be suitable having regard to the size of other parcels in the vicinity and (f) the nature of the terrane of the land it is proposed to subdivide and the surrounding land renders the proposed subdivision suitable and (g) in appropriate instances adequate provision will exist for the disposal of sewerage from each separate parcel and (h) no undesirable effect will be made by the proposed subdivision on the ecology of the land proposed to be subdivided or adjacent land or on the general character of the ecology in Norfolk Island and 2. in respect of building applications and exempt buildings (a) the Building Board shall recommend to the Executive Member for Planning Tourism and Commerce that an application should be refused unless the Board is satisfied that the resulting building will comply with the criteria in the Coldham Plan. (b) The Executive Member for Planning Tourism and Commerce shall refuse an application when recommended to do so under paragraphs (a); and (c). The Executive Member shall introduce into the House regulations to ensure exempt buildings comply with the criteria in the Coldham Plan.

MR ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Debate Honourable Members. Mr Sanders

MR SANDER: Mr Deputy Chairman can I speak on this on please. A recent survey revealed that a vast majority of the people surveyed wanted the Government to have some control over land use on Norfolk Island. The purpose of my motion is to introduce that control. Since 1972 there has existed a proposed scheme for the orderly development of land on Norfolk Island. This scheme is called the Coldham Plan. Contrary to popular belief the Coldham Plan does not simply deal with plot sizes but provides a complete system for the orderly development of land on Norfolk Island. Also contrary to popular belief the scheme contained in the Coldham Plan has never been adopted as policy by the Norfolk Island Government it has been merely followed for land subdivision purposes. The motion therefore proposes that the Government adopts the Coldham Plan as a basis from which to work. The Coldham Plan may possible now be out of date having been originally drawn up in 1972. What my motion therefore proposes is that I should be given the job of revising the plan and of keeping it under constant revision. No variation I propose, however, could take effect until the Members of the Assembly have given their approval. If my motion is agreed we have the basis of the sound system of the orderly development of the Island. My proposal requires no planning action. Most of the powers we require are already included in existing ordinances. All we need to do is to see that the Coldham Plan is followed when Administering these ordinances. What my motion therefore proposes is that when I make recommendations to the Minister or Administrator on a subdivision application under the Land Subdivision Ordinance recommended approval should not be granted unless I am satisfied that the resulting subdivision would comply with the Coldham Plan and certain other conditions. Further, my motion proposes that the Building Board must recommend that a building application under the Building Ordinance should be refused unless the Board is satisfied that the resulting building would comply with the Coldham Plan and
that I must accept that recommendation. I must also bring the proposed regulations before you to see that exempt buildings comply with the Coldham Plan. You will therefore see that without any substantial change in the law and without the necessity of any major legislation we could by passing my motion have the basis of a flexible planning scheme for Norfolk Island. I would like to just remind members that the Minister in Canberra accepts the Coldham Plan as the guidelines to subdivision, in fact, he has refused applications that didn't comply with it - just a few weeks ago. All the items listed in the motion are in actual fact Section 12 of the Land Subdivision Ordinance. I therefore recommend the motion.

MR HOWARD: Could I verify something with Mr Sanders. My understanding is that he proposes to introduce this motion today and then adjourn it for a month for community discussion.

MR SANDERS: Mr Deputy Chairman. Any others wishing input.

MR JACKSON: Mr Deputy Chairman. I don't know what Mr Sanders means by input into it, but I certainly have an amendment to No. 2 of the motion. First of all, I must say that I support the first part of the motion dealing with the criteria of the Coldham Plan to be used as the guidelines for determining any future applications for Land Subdivision. Members will remember that we had a committee meeting to discuss with each other this particular question because of the contentious nature that has existed and still exists on the Island over land Subdivision and a determination of clear guidelines had to be sought and it was a unanimous decision at the committee meeting chaired by Mr Sanders that we would adopt the Coldham Plan as a guideline to any future land subdivision. This motion in respect of exempt buildings has been cleverly worded. It has been worded to get around what Mr Sanders has been trying for a long and considerable time and that is to make the whole Island a designated area because in (c), at the bottom of No. 2, it will exempt all buildings that are exempt now. All buildings under this part of this motion will have to apply for application to build or alter their dwelling so therefore the amendment that I would like to move is that you omit from sub-paragraph 2(a) the words "exempt buildings" in the first instance and (b) sub paragraph (c) in my amendment is removed and therefore it would read "in respect of building applications" not "exempt buildings" and I see that where status quo would remain. Those buildings that are exempt at present in my opinion should stay exempt. There should not be any interference until proper planning has been brought down. I have agreed and this House has agreed to the question of land subdivision but this building application, application must be sought for any building or alteration, well as far as I am concerned it is not on and I take objection to having this put before us in this manner disguised as one that would be used as the Coldham Plan in the application for buildings regarding exempt buildings and therefore I move that amendment.

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

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr Acting Deputy President. I can only offer support for Mr Sanders proposal if Mr Jackson's amendment is adopted. I support Mr Jackson's amendment in other words.
MR BROWN: Mr Acting Deputy President, I do not support the proposed amendment. Mr Sanders is not suggesting that exempt buildings should be subject to building applications. He is saying that at least for the time being people may continue to erect their exempt buildings without seeking a formal approval, but he is saying that those buildings although exempt from the requirement to seek an approval, with nevertheless need to meet a certain standard. I don't think that any of us would really object to that. My recollection is that Mr Jackson, and some other members, has fought quite hard to preserve the exemption from the requirement to lodge a building application in certain circumstances, but Mr Jackson has at no stage suggested that he thought that such buildings should be able to be erected outside of an appropriate standard. I support Mr Sanders motion as it stands and I do not propose to support the amendment.

MR HOWARD: I would be inclined to support Mr Jackson's amendment but I would be interested if he could tell us whether Mr Sanders opposes Mr Jackson's amendment or not.

MR SANDERS: I support it as it stands but if it is necessary to support Mr Jackson's amendment so that in actual fact we have got a plan then I would support Mr Jackson's amendment.

MR BUFFETT: Mr Acting Deputy President, as I see this motion it is an aim to some measure preserve the existing situation whereby it quotes portions of the existing legislation of the Land Subdivision Ordinance for example, and it endeavours to embody with it the Coldham Plan which has been around for some ten years or so. It endeavours to bring those two things together. I share Mr Jackson's concern, because whilst it does that it takes one step further and starts to address the exempt buildings. Let me just tackle the first part first, that is the bringing together the legislation, particularly, the land subdivision ordinance and the Coldham Plan, and as I say, bringing the status quo together. I probably could support that, but I make these observations in respect of it. This plan is something like over ten years old. A good plan, the best of plans have to be updated every five years or so so you can see that it is to some measure considerably out of date and that needs to be addressed. The second factor that needs to be addressed when you look at updating is whether in the longer term the Coldham Plan is the appropriate plan for Norfolk Island. I know in my own experience that there have been more recent Town Planning views brought upon the scene in Norfolk Island that have indicated some of the Coldham Provisions can be considerably improved upon and in fact some considerably different concepts could be brought forward and my question mark in all of this is, if in fact there is support for the present motion, what is in fact going to be done about updating this ten year old plan, how long have we got to continue with an outdated plan and what plans are afoot to in fact bring into being for examination some of the additional concepts that have been proposed. If in fact I am being asked to support a Coldham Plan on a forever situation well I am inclined to say no, because I don't see it as being a satisfactory situation, I have already referred to the reasons why. Now let me come to the second phase that I mentioned and that concerns the exempt buildings. This to some extent is, well there is no "to some extent" about it, this is touching upon an area that I have earlier voiced my view about in this House. I see what is proposed here as being a little nudge in the door. Now my view is quite clear on this. Before there is
any nudge anywhere in respect of exempt buildings, I want to know absolutely clearly and with absolute clarity in this House what it is going to be before I will give any nod at all to that situation. Now, there has been some thought about seeking some further views and leaving this over for a month. I am happy with that. It occurs to me that there are some areas now that in black and white it has been brought forward what it is desired, and if that is a motion I will support that.

MR ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The question is Honourable Members that the motion be agreed. Those in favour say aye.

The House voted -

AYES, 5
Mr Buffett
Mr Howard
Mr Quintal
Miss Buffett
Mr Jackson

NOES, 4
Mr Brown
Mr Christian-Bailey
Mrs Grey
Mr Sanders

Motion agreed to

MR DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The question is that the motion as amended be agreed to. Debate Honourable Members. Mr Howard.

MR HOWARD: Yes. There are some comments that I would like to make. It really is, that I can read what Mr Sanders is proposing. He is saying that a thorough foregoing modern brand new covering all Norfolk Island maybe a long way off. In the meantime he as Executive Member wants some, reasonable clear guidelines. He observes that the Coldham Plan has been used as a guideline even though it is not law and he says that the Department in Canberra tends to use it as a guideline, so he says, why don't we say, fair enough, let us recognise Coldham too and adopt it and I am bound to say that I can see some sense in that broad general idea. I think it gets us off dead centre, it gets something done. It clarifies a situation that causes a lot of people a lot of trouble, however, I think that the wording of the motion needs considerable discussion and thought and I think it has to be clarified before we really know what we are talking about and I would like to point to several aspects of it that I think need further thought. Early in the motion it proposes that the criteria set out in the document that has been called the Coldham Plan be adopted. Now I'm not sure what criteria means. I think it means the requirements and procedures set out in this Coldham document. I think it means the requirements and procedures. There are procedures set out in the Coldham Plan of which no mention is made in this motion and I think they are important procedures. Roughly the second half of the thing called the Coldham Plan is what is called a Code of Ordinances. It starts on, oh, the pages begin on fresh numbering. In the Report there are 19 pages of a Scheme Statement, there are then 29 pages of a Code of Ordinances. The Code of Ordinances includes the specific requirements about how large a subdivision must be or a minimum in any particular part of the Island. It includes requirements as to how high a building can be depending upon how close it is to the boundary, and it includes requirements upon how much space there must be between the building and a boundary. It also says how much space there must be between some nuisance thing like a pig sty and a boundary. It says quite a lot of things of that kind, and it describes
the various proposed zones of the Island, the licensed hotels zones, the agricultural zones, a couple of rural zones, and residential zones and environmental zones and so forth and it describes in each of those cases things such as what the minimum subdivision size can be and if a battleaxe block is applied for what the minimum width of the access driveway can be, and what the minimum and maximum length of that driveway can be and so on and so on, but in the Scheme Statement, in the first 19 pages, there is some parts of the Coldham Plan that I think are essential and that we must not let slip between the chairs. Any rigid set of requirements about the subdivision of land can become a straitjacket. They can do harm to people. The plan must have some provision for flexibility. In the Coldham Plan as it was put ten years ago, there are two very large means for introducing flexibility. One is a provision that there be conditional uses of land, and I believe that that also applied to subdivision and the purpose of a conditional use is that if somebody wanted to subdivide land or build a building in a way that was against the requirements of the Coldham Plan but the person thought that it was a very sensible idea to do it even though it was against the Coldham Plan, he could apply to have a conditional use and a conditional use is one in which the Administrator would say "Yes you are permitted to do that, but subject to certain conditions." and he would then be able to lay down certain conditions that might make it a workable proposition. There was another kind of flexibility on the Coldham Plan which was called "Departures from the Coldham Plan" and where an owner thought that the Coldham Plan in its application to his own property really wasn't helping the public interest he would be able to apply for departure from the Coldham Plan and the Administrator would be able to grant that departure, if after examination it turned out that it was a good idea, and was not against the public interest. Now those two means for getting flexibility in the Administration of the plan I think were terribly important. They are set up in the Coldham Plan in connection with what Harrison Greirson and Partners who did the Plan, what they called in that day a special planning committee of the Council. Now if you translate that to modern translation I suppose it would be a special planning committee of the Assembly and an owner who felt there was justification for a conditional use or for a departure would be able to go to a special planning committee of the Assembly and put his case, make his argument. That Committee would then advise the Administrator and the Administrator would then make a decision. Now I think that flexibility needs to be built in but the motion that is put to us says nothing about it and I think it needs to be thought about. There are a couple of other specific aspects of the Coldham Plan that I think we want to think about pretty carefully for adopting it. I draw to your attention for study Ordinance 14 in the Code of Ordinances which says that the Administrator will keep a register of objects or places of historical or scientific interest or natural beauty and he is to write down in that register all such objects or places and once he has written it down in the register he can't do anything with it. He can't damage it. The Administrator has the authority to do that. Now I think in some ways, Mr Jackson might argue, that that part of the Coldham Plan makes the whole of the Island a historical what do you call it, a reserve or ...

MR JACkSON: I do not think that way, I think that a beautiful spot should be preserved...

MR HOWARD: Fine, but suppose they think that your land is one of those beauty spots and you cannot do anything with it anymore, well then you might not like it them. What I am saying is
that that is putting great power in the hands of the Administrator as one man, the ability to freeze the use of a particular part of Norfolk Island because it is beautiful or it is on historical interest. Now that may be a good thing, it may be a bad thing. I think we would want to look at it rather than adopting it in plan. Next of all I think we would need to give some more thought to the idea that if we adopt the Coldham Plan it can then be varied by a closed meeting of the Assembly advising our own Executive Member. As far as I am concerned that is bad Island planning. The whole Coldham Plan was based on the idea of not adopting anything until there had been wide public hearings on the Island about the Coldham Plan in which all people on the Island would be able to raise objection and their objection would be heard. I think a Zoning Plan which is what the Coldham Plan is had a direct effect on the value of individuals private property and I don't think that you can change the rules on that kind of thing in closed session. I think there has to be a chance for public debate. I think if someone applies for conditional use or for a departure from the plan I think it ought to be published in the gazette that someone has applied for conditional use or departure from the plan and I think the neighbours may not like what he has applied for and I think they should have a chance to come in and say their piece. That is done in the Building Board now, I think it should be part of the planning system as well. As a tiny detail I would point out that the very end of the motion it says that if the Building Board recommends that the Executive Member refused that the Executive Member shall then refuse. I think, I am not sure about this, but I think that that is illegal. I think that in the exercising of executive authority an executive member cannot be directed by somebody else, he has to use his own executive authority and if he has discretion he has to use it genuinely he can't simply be directed by somebody else. If you want it to be that way I think you should simply give the power to the Board to refuse and that is the end of it, not even go to the executive member if you want to do it that way. I raise these not to fix today but because I think they are very important aspects of the Coldham Plan to be adopted that we each want to think about. I support the general idea that I think Mr Sanders is driving at but I do think we need to go about it very carefully.

MR ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Further debate Honourable Members.

Mr Brown.

MR BROWN: Mr Howard has raised some points which do require consideration. Mr Jackson indicated earlier in the meeting that he felt there may well be community input into a question such as this. We do have a long paper ahead of us, in the event that there are no other members wishing to speak at this stage, I propose to move the amendment of this debate, the adjournment, I am sorry, of this debate.

MR ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Are you so moving Mr Brown?

MR BROWN: I so move Mr Acting Deputy President.

MR JACKSON: May I ask, how long is it to be adjourned, to the next sitting or the sitting after next? A fortnight of. Yes. I agree to that.

MR BROWN: I would suggest Mr Acting Deputy President that the adjournment be until our next normal meeting but it may well be at this stage that we feel a further desire to adjourn.
MR ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The question is that the debate be now adjourned and that the adjourned debate be made the order of the day for the next sitting.

Question put

Question agreed unanimously

NOTICE NO. 7 - OPERATION OF '737' AIRCRAFT TO NORFOLK ISLAND - ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STUDY

MR SANDERS: Thank you Mr Chairman. I move that this House be of the opinion that the operation of 737 aircraft to the Island may be advantageous ask that the necessary Environmental Impact Study be undertaken. This has stemmed from the Chamber of Commerce and others showing vast interest in Air New Zealand flying their 737's. I was informed by a letter written to Mr Geoff Bennett, I may quote from the letter...

"Low design to cater specifically for medium jet aircraft" this is with reference to the runway, "...the runway will be able to accommodate limited operations by a number of other aircraft types including the Boeing 737. Evidence to the PWC also mentioned this aspect of the proposed runway design. Under the terms of the environmental impact statement prepared by the Department of Transport introduction of Boeing 737's services to Norfolk Island even on a limited basis would require separate environmental assessment. It may also involve the production of another Environmental Impact Statement.

As with all matters of potential concern to Norfolk Island this Government intends to consult fully with the Norfolk Island Government. Because of this undertaking the decision on the need or otherwise for an Environmental Impact Study will not be made until the Norfolk Island Government expresses it firm interest in the operation of such services."

The final paragraph is "...to date, I have not received a proposal from Air New Zealand to operate a Boeing 737 service to Norfolk Island...

I cabled Air New Zealand to find out whether in fact they had made an application to the Department and if not was it their intention to do so.

The reply from Air New Zealand if I may quote "...in reply to your telegraphed message Air New Zealand has sought the Department of Aviation's approval for 737 operations to Norfolk and received authority only for the Rotary flights in April but with the proviso that if the Norfolk Island Government expresses to the Department of Aviation firm interest in the 737 operations, the Department of Home Affairs and Environment will pursue the Environmental aspects. Therefore suggested approval of ongoing 737 operations will require endorsement of Norfolk Island Government to the Department of Aviation." I have been informed by a Member of the Department of Aviation that it would not matter what happened there has to be an Environmental Impact Study anyhow and while there are those that oppose this type
of aircraft I do not believe that we should say yeah or nay up until such time as this environmental impact study has been made. I support wholeheartedly Air New Zealand's proposal; as has been discussed earlier in the evening about the proposed tourists and loss of revenue it is more than apparent that if we do not get this type of aircraft or something similar flying out of New Zealand the service and our tourist trade from there is going to continue to deteriorate. I support the motion.

MR ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Thank you Mr Sanders. Mrs Grey

MRS GREY: Thank you Mr Acting Deputy President. I would like very much for Mr Sanders to expand on that comment he made on the environmental impact statement or assessment would have to go ahead anyway because my understanding is that an environmental impact assessment or study will only be undertaken if requested by this Government and the only reason that this Government would request a further environmental impact assessment or study is on the basis that we are going to support the beginning of a 737 service to Norfolk Island. I am not sure that this House has established that.

MR SANDERS: I would like to correct Mrs Grey. I did not make that statement in this House that it was going to be done anyhow. I said that... I think you are making reference to a conversation that was had before we came to the House.

MRS GREY: I am sorry, it is a comment that you made just a few moments ago which I think Mr Brown might check me on...

MR SANDERS: This environmental... I said that it was desirable anyhow. Those might not be the words I used but that was what I meant. I did not say that that was going to happen anyhow. I think it is desirable that it be done anyhow. The unlimited 737 services they referred to is something like 40 flights per week. Obviously we do not want an unlimited amount of landings and what have you with the 737 but in discussions with the Administrator, Mr Howard and Mr Buffett a couple of weeks ago it was suggested that an environmental impact study, if we could find
out what happened if there was one flight per week, what would happen if there were two etc, all this would be necessary to base an opinion on as to whether this service was required.

MR HOWARD: I think the motion is entirely constructive. I do not know whether we support the introduction of 737's or not and I noted the wording of the motion that the House believes that the introduction of 737 aircraft may be advantageous. That is my view. I think it may be, I am not sure yet. I do not think we need to decide that now and I do not think that we can decide that now. I think very importantly it depends on what the environmental impact study tells us. If an environmental impact study is done it may well say it will have the following detrimental effects on Norfolk Island and we might say no, we do not want that. At the same time all the talk that is going around the Island over the last couple of months about getting 737's here on a regular basis is absolutely empty talk until an environmental impact statement has been done. That has to be done before they can be admitted. I think our asking the Commonwealth if we can go ahead and conduct that study is an entirely constructive thing, it is a necessary first step if you want 737's asking for it does not commit us to 737's and it may tell us some things that will make us not want 737's but I think the motion is entirely constructive.

MRS GREY: I won't comment a great deal further, I do not think Mr Acting Deputy President, but if I may, it is a little like the chicken or the egg, deciding which one has to come first. I am a little loath to commit the Australian Government at this stage to what must be massive expense, at what at the moment I see as the whim of this House. Thank you Mr Acting Deputy President.

MR BUFFETT: Mr Acting Deputy President, there is not any doubt in my mind which needs to come first and we need to have an environmental impact statement first. Let me hark back to the times when the airport upgrading project was receiving a lot of comment and examination around the town. There were many people who had strong views both ways for 737 type of aircraft and against,
there were people who had much informed information to support
their view one way or another. An environmental impact statement
has been clearly said as to be necessary if there is to be any
consideration of the 737 aircraft flying to Norfolk Island and I
consider that this information needs to be in front of us to
assist in the decision making of whether or not a 737 type of
aircraft is or is not desirable, so I again say, that I am quite
clear in my mind that this study must be done first, and it will
be one of the factors, one of the pieces of information that will
greatly assist further decision by this House, obviously at a later
time.

MR JACKSON: Mr Acting Deputy Chairman. In debating this very
contentious issue no doubt Mr Buffett has hit the nail right on
the head because at the time of the upgrading of this airport
many meetings were held on the Island. Strong agitation was for
the upgrading and equally strong to not upgrade the airport.
To upgrade it to a level that would be suitable to aircraft that
were made available at that present time. Anyhow, the Australian
Government went ahead and conducted a feasibility study and their
final environment impact study is worth reading. I am surprised
that some of the members has not brought this book along with their
final statement. They upgraded the airport at a cost of $6,000,000.
And they upgraded it to be able to take F28 or VAE146 and it goes
on to say that to upgrade it to larger jet aircraft seating 140
passengers, the upgrading costs at Norfolk Island would be about
between 12 to 14 million dollars, so therefore when we look at the
situation and examine which should come first we should examine
this situation for what strength, what capacity can the airport when
it is finally upgraded, can handle. Can it take unlimited 737's.
Can it take only one per week. What will be the case. If we went
ahead and have this survey, had this impact study and we find that
the service that is available to Norfolk Island with these aircraft
may not be worth it. And I say it may not. If there is talk
that they have not heard from the Minister, I have a letter... it
has been said by Mr Howard that in discussion with the Administrator
nothing has been heard, that was a fortnight ago. I have a letter
just over a fortnight from the Minister addressed to a resident and
he states in the letter, this is the Minister, Mr Wal Fyfe, "... there
are currently no plans for regular Boeing 737 services to Norfolk Island. Air New Zealand has applied for permission to operate two services per day on 6, 7, 12 and 13th April in 1983 to carry delegates for the Rotary Convention to be held on Norfolk Island. As I understand it the Airline does not have a more suitable alternative type aircraft .... and so it goes on to say "... that the Department concluded that no environmental impact statement will be required for this limited proposal and requested that the number of measures be adopted to protect the environment. These included making every effort to complete the protective window shields for the St Barnabas Chapel before the 6th April and ensuring that if weather conditions permit all landings and take offs be not carried out over the Chapel...." Now it is amazing when we come in here to put a motion before the House that relevant enquiries or replies have not been brought forward. I do believe that an environment impact survey will have to be done because it was promised. That promise was given to the people of Norfolk Island that outside of any other plane to be used on the runway, with the exception of F28 or the 146 a further impact study would have to be conducted. So therefore I think that it may be one thing or the other. We either find out... Mr Sanders tabled a letter in the Executive Committee... he read a letter from the Department of Aviation what the upgraded airport can take, and if that letter were brought forward we would know that if there is to be unlimited or limited flights of 737's into the Island well we must know that before an impact study is conducted and therefore the people that was promised this, their obligation that the Minister gave to them that before any further study or consideration of any other plane of larger nature than what has been provided, that is the F28 and the 146 an impact statement would have to be conducted. Therefore if it is the wish of this House to request an opinion on the operation of 737 to this Island being advantageous ask that the necessary environmental impact statement be undertaken, well I think that this must be done. There is nothing wrong with a motion like that, however, the points that I have raised I do believe that they should be taken into consideration.

MR SANDERS: Mr Chairman, Mr Jackson made reference to the letter that they spoke of in the Executive Meeting, he was making
reference also a few moments ago to how good is the airstrip going
to be after completion. Mr Jackson should have read the letter
because it actually gave all the details in that letter. The
letter is dated the 26th January and it was circulated to all
members, Mr Chairman would you mind if I read it for the benefit
of all? "... I refer to your letter of 14 September 1982 concerning
possible operations by B737 aircraft following upgrading of the
Norfolk Island Aerodrome. Among other things, your letter sought
specific details in relation to the capability of the upgraded
runway.

The Department of Aviation has advised that technically
the pavement will be capable of handling a range of medium jet
aircraft types but not without some restrictions on weight or
frequency of use for all but the F28-4000. The upgraded runway
strength is based on design criteria to allow unrestricted
operations by F28-4000 aeroplanes and restrictive weight limitations
on 737 operations.

Advise has previously been given to the Legislative Assembly
that up to 12 non-scheduled operations per year by B737 aircraft
would be permitted by the Department of Aviation. This advise
was given on the understanding that such a level of operations
would not require an environmental assessment. Subsequent advice
however is that even this limited level of operations would require
environmental assessment to determine the need or otherwise for
a full Environmental Impact Statement.

It should also be noted that Department of Aviation
policy requires the provision of Air Traffic Control at aerodromes
served by aircraft of performance capability of B737. This
policy would require the provision of a control tower at Norfolk
Island or the grant of a concession against the requirement.

With regard to your specific queries, the following information
has been provided:

i. The Norfolk Island upgraded pavement strength is
   based on "unrestricted" or "unlimited" F28-4000
   services of approximately 70 movements per week
   for 10 years

1547.
ii. Upgrading to permit "unlimited" operations by B737 aircraft (equivalent to approximately 40 movements per week) would require an additional pavement strengthening of 100mm of fine crushed rock.

iii. The group of aircraft used to design the 11/29 runway pavement included the B737-200 at 52000 kg and 1020 kpa tyre pressure. It is considered that this model would encompass the requirements of most models available.

iv. The specifications for the airport upgrading have not changed since the Public Works Committee hearings.

v. The load classification number of the upgraded runway is 30.

vi. The pavement depth factor is 40.

vii. Maximum allowable tyre pressure will be 1050 kpa.

(Please note that the pavement ratings specified at v, vi and vii above are marginally different to the advice provided at the Public Works Committee hearings - see p105 of PWC evidence).

Yours sincerely

R.E. Trebilco
Administrator

MR ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Thank you Mr Sanders. Mrs Grey

MRS GREY: Thank you Mr Acting Deputy President. I did not think that I had much more to say but perhaps I do. For a start Mr Jackson has been referring to the Environmental Impact Statement of June 1980 and he has wondered why nobody else has a copy of it. I can tell him that it is damned hard to get hold of. I had to beg borrow and just about steal the one that I managed to get hold of and it was not until I read that that I heard about a thing called the Challice Report which was compiled at the time of the Environmental Impact... No it wasn't. The Challice Report came about as a result of the visit of 737 to Norfolk Island in 1972. I have been as yet unable to obtain a copy of that. I should be able to in the next couple of days. But the factors
that came forward in opposition to the possibility of 737 aircraft use have not changed and they will not change. The arguments for its use will but the arguments against it won't. And all those arguments were available very shortly after the flight of the 737 to Norfolk Island in 1972 I would suggest. The damage will be considerable both to the environment and the airstrip itself quite apart from the additional expense of further upgrading and that has been confirmed by what Mr Jackson has read out of this Environmental Impact Statement. At the moment East West and Air New Zealand are either cancelling or certainly scheduling very few flights now. Now how is it and on what basis does Air New Zealand justify the need for a bigger aircraft. They cannot fill the one they are flying now which is the F27. I am going to suggest to you that the aircraft type hasn't got much to do with it. Norfolk Island Airlines is the only ones who have been increasing their figures and they are flying the smallest planes of the lot so how is it that Air New Zealand claims that they can fill and run a 737 and increase our figures. The strip on Norfolk Island is capable of medium jet aircraft that it was built to cope with and we are trying to jump the gun into 737's before we have even found out what the F28 is capable of doing and improved promotion in New Zealand. I still query the need today to ask for a further environmental impact assessment. Thank you Mr Acting Deputy President.

MR SANDERS: Thank you Mr Chairman, Mrs Grey is aware that Air New Zealand claims that they lose money every time they run an F27 into Norfolk Island from New Zealand. Apparently it is extremely uneconomical and I would imagine their hotel bills from stopovers would probably be more expensive than running the aircraft. To be very realistic, if they lose money per flight obviously the more they promote the thing to run more flights the more money they lose. One does not have to be very clever to work out why they are cutting flights. It depends on whether Mrs Gray wants tourism here, whether this is where our revenue comes from; or she doesn't. Thank you Mr Acting Deputy President.

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

MR JACKSON: Mr Chairman there are two points that have been raised
by Mr Sanders and Mrs Grey. We heard in the letter that Mr Sanders read to the House that there is unlimited weight restriction placed on the F28 and there is unlimited weight restriction placed on the 146. These two planes were catered for and selected, licence was issued to service the upgraded airport at a cost of $6 point odd million dollars. We have yet to hear the limited weight restrictions of the 737. Now this limited weight restriction was placed before the country that wishes, that is, New Zealand, which will use the plane according to Mr Sanders, to come to the Island, after they find that their limited weight restrictions are not viable they may completely back away from the situation. And that is why I consider there has to be a survey conducted on the airport to see exactly what the airstrip can take. It says here, Mr Sanders read out distinctly in the letter that 737's has a limited weight restriction.

MR SANDERS: Mr Jackson is determined not to acknowledge even though he has received the letter, it also says in the same letter, I just read the damned thing out, that a maximum allowable tyre pressure of 1050 kpa. I would imagine that that's what the damn plane weighs. That doesn't answer his question then what else does?

MR BUFFETT: I can't follow that I'm afraid

MR JACKSON: The pilot of the House may be able to answer that.

MR SANDERS: I am sorry ladies and gentlemen, it is 52,000 kilos and 1020 kpa tyre pressure.

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

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr Acting Deputy President. I believe that a further environmental impact study would be essential before even any thought of planes coming in but of course thereby is the great cost. Mention has been made by the Norfolk Island Conservation Study that during a 737 demonstration some time back, noise levels were registered above 122 decibels in some locations and with its high capacity is totally incompatible with this Island's environment. I am not yet of the opinion that the operation of a 737 aircraft
to the Island may be advantageous at all. However in case it is proved to be not disadvantageous I will support the request that a necessary environmental impact study be taken. Advantages may sound encouraging but if the advantages are such that the immediate short term commercial financial gain outweighs the long term environmental damage to the Island and thereby destroys that which the tourists come here to see and destroys the way of life in Norfolk Island and leaves the flora and fauna bear and damages valuable buildings I would say that I could not support the operation of 737 aircraft on the Island. Tourism... two years ago when the select committee was doing their report, was having a problem restricting tourists. Now I feel that Norfolk Island does not necessarily have to go on and on getting more and more and more tourists. I feel that we should be satisfied for the sake of this Island, for the preservation of all that people come to see we should be satisfied with a comfortable stream of tourists that will be all that is necessary to keep the Island going. I will support a survey if it is required but I cannot say that the first part of the question that I need accept that 737 operations may be desirable.

MR SANDERS: I believe that if we don't support the airline service to Norfolk Island then we will not be getting these tourists that Miss Buffett claims will be coming here to look at the beautiful things because the airlines will not be running. They are not going to continue to lose money just because we don't like their type of aircraft. And of course, as all our money comes from tourism perhaps if they do not come perhaps the environmentalists might like us to eat the pine trees and the birds because there probably won't be anything else.

MISS BUFFETT: Mr Acting Deputy President, as much as my heart would bleed for an airline that is losing so much money to bring their flights into Norfolk Island I feel sure that there would be other airlines with suitable aircraft that could be chartered into this Island. I think we must look after our.....

MR QUINTAL: Mr Acting Deputy President I would like to support the idea of an environmental impact statement but I must mention one thing that Mrs Grey mentioned that I thought was worth
mentioning and that is that the Norfolk Island Airline that has been operating here since 1975 started by Mr Charlie Herman and backed by 70 local people, and without the tourists brought here by Norfolk Island Airlines last year the economy of our Island would have been a lot worse than it is today. In 1980 N.I. Airlines brought in 4,565 tourists from Queensland and that is 37% of all tourists from Australia except for Melbourne. In 1981 N.I. Airlines brought in 3,682 tourists from Queensland, that is 35% of all tourists except from Melbourne. In 1982 Norfolk Island Airlines brought in 23% of all tourists from anywhere. Nearly one quarter of our tourists and 1980/81/82 N.I. Airline brought in a total of 11,677 tourists excluding Melbourne and Noumea. These are Government tourist figures and I would not like to think what the economy would be like if we had not had those 11,677 tourists. I feel that the N.I. Airlines has done a good job, it is set up by local people and although I think probably the 727's might be a good idea for Norfolk it makes you wonder really whether it is necessary when the Norfolk Airlines has been the supplier of the greater numbers of tourists to the Island. I do agree though, and I would support an environmental impact study, but it seems to me that if we expect to have a lot of 737's calling to Norfolk Island than there is an extra six million dollars to find and this Government certainly cannot find it and I am sure that the Australian Government could not find it so I do support the idea of an environmental study.

MR ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Thank you Mr Quintal. I would ask members to contain their debate to the notice. The operation of 737's to Norfolk Island and the environmental impact study. Mr Brown.

MR BROWN: Thank you Mr Acting Deputy President. Firstly I should thank Mr Quintal for that commercial. It was very good. The first Legislative Assembly supported the upgrading of the Norfolk Island Airport to medium jet standard. This was not a decision which had the unanimous support of the community. However, the first Assembly made it clear that its support was limited to an upgrading for medium jet aircraft which it defined as P28. The first Assembly submitted to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works which according to the evidence of
Mr McIntyre to that Committee, had the unanimous approval of the whole nine members of the Assembly at that time. It made it clear that 737's were not wanted. It said in part "... it should be made clear that by the words medium jet the Legislative Assembly understands F28. In particular the Norfolk Island Government does not seek boeing 737 services here at this time believing that this aircraft is too large with its capacity of 110 passengers or so to provide the frequency of services that is desirable."

That submission went on to make a number of comments in relation to the undesirability of allowing the operation of aircraft larger than the F28. That was the compromise which was made by the first Assembly. It said F28's yes, but anything larger, No. Although the environmental impact statement for the present airport upgrading may have glossed over some of the problems there were in fact substantial environmental and other objections to the upgrading.

The existing environmental impact statement did not attempt to deal with 737's and it has always been said that a fresh environmental impact statement would be required if there was an intention to operate 737 aircraft. While I held executive responsibility in this area I wrote on a number of occasions to Air New Zealand. I advised them of what I believed to be the existing Legislative Assembly policy against 737's and invited them to put forward any submission that they might wish to make with a view to changing that policy. I invited them also to include details of fares, flight frequency and promotion levels in the event that 737's were approved whether weekly, monthly or on an unlimited basis.

I am sorry to say that no such information has been forthcoming. Air New Zealand has not said to us that if you allow us to operate 737's we will be able to reduce the fare by so much or we will be able to increase our promotion level by so much and so ensure that the market from New Zealand recovers to its previous level.

It is not the intention of the Commonwealth to carry out a fresh environmental impact statement unless we express a firm interest in the operation of such services. This was expressed by the Minister for Aviation in his letter of 16 December 1982 to Mr Geoff Bennett as President of the Norfolk Island Chamber of Commerce and frankly in the absence of information from Air New Zealand I do not intend to support this motion. Even if Air New Zealand were to provide information which showed a substantial
improvement would result from such a survey there would still be further matters which I would want to consider before joining in an expression of firm interest in the operation of such services. Might I give just one example. The Australian Government has a policy of transferring airports to local ownership. The local authority receives a transfer of the freehold of the airport. And the Commonwealth continues to provide essential staff at the airport such as flight service officers and firemen. But otherwise the airport becomes a local expense with the possibility of some Commonwealth contribution for repairs and maintenance but that is only a contribution if it comes at all. It has been claimed that the Airport will be capable of 12 flights per year that is, 24 movements. 12 landings and 12 take-offs by 737's. There had been an earlier suggestion that one flight per week, that is, 52 per year might be possible but this has not been supported since and may have related it to an upgrading of a different standard. If more flights were allowed by 737's than the maximum of 12 which the Department of Aviation allowed then the present ten year expected life of the strip before substantial maintenance is required may be reduced. I believe that we should ascertain how far that life would be reduced if various levels of 737 operations were allowed. If we were to agree to unlimited 737 operation and the strip required major repairs in say 2 years time at our expense we need to examine whether the benefits would be outweighed by that cost. I believe that we are not in a position to support 737's at this stage. I believe that we need alot more information before deciding whether or not to even express a firm interest. If we are to be asked to express a firm interest in 737 then a detailed submission should be put forward for our consideration and an appropriate time to consider that submission would be after the Rotary 737 flights that come in April when we will have had first hand experience of those aircraft operating to and from Norfolk Island. For those reasons I do not propose to support the motion today but when the information does come forward and when the Rotary flights have come and gone I will be quite happy to consider the whole question with a quite open mind.

MR SANDERS: Thank you Mr Chairman. Mr Brown was quoting from
a Report that was I believe, dated in 1980. In 1980 Norfolk was probably at its most viable time in history. I believe about the most amount of tourists that were ever here, the revenue with Administration was probably at its highest, the local roads were tarsealed, there was a good flow of revenue all over the Island. One can afford to be a little blase in this situation and say that we don't want it any bigger. The point I was trying to make is that that was nearly three years ago. The circumstances are indeed different. We were talking a little while ago about raising revenue and that there was not enough money. I believe that this is a matter that has to be looked at immediately. I do not believe that it would cost us anything to request the Department to do this environmental impact study. It would clear in everybody's mind of how much it would cost us and what we would gain. Mr Brown was also speaking of unlimited service with the 737's. I don't believe that that was ever ever mentioned. In this letter from the Administrator it refers to unlimited services of 40 flights per week. I doubt that anybody would want that. In our informal meetings with the Administrator we asked him if we could have an environmental impact study and what would happen with one flight or two flights or three so that we could have a range of the impact that would occur. Mr Chairman if everybody around this table is so blase and think that we don't need the revenue from tourism then I don't quite know where to go next. I definitely support the motion.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr Acting Deputy President. It seems to be that in our quietest year for many, the year just passed we are only in fact down 5,000 tourists to a desired level by the Butland report. Say, 7,000 tourists down and 3,000 tourists down of the average over the last 10 years so with the airport closure and the interruptions that we have had I don't think that it would take much to boost us back up. Whereas I very much value the service of Air New Zealand and would not like to push them out I think they should be encouraged rather than bring in 737's that create such concern for the environmental matters in Norfolk Island, I think they should be encouraged to charter F28's or other aircraft or fly their own other smaller aircraft.
When are we going to stop. We have not even finished the upgrading of the airport and we should be satisfied with that. When are we going to stop - if we are to continue going on and on and on...

MR SANDERS: I was quite intrigued with Miss Buffett then to say that we are only down 5,000 tourists this year and we were only down 3,000 the year before. By the time that Report was done the figures were about 25,000 tourists per year. This only, these few people, happens to be about 20%. It seems quite co-incidental that that is round about the revenue that we are short too. I do not know if we ONLY lose another 10 how much more money we are going to be short of.

MRS GREY: Thank you Mr Acting Deputy President. What are we letting ourselves in for? Further upgrading. Probability of needing control tower, the possible use by many airlines of Norfolk Island's airstrip by much bigger aircraft than we ever anticipated. How many airlines will get the right to use Norfolk Island's airport if we allow larger than medium jet standard aircraft in. Things like the international airline agreements. The Member assisting Mr Sanders in the Aviation area may be able to give more detail as far as that is concerned. These are the things that the members of the House have not considered. The information has not come forward. There are still too many unknowns about the use of 737's. It is the most difficult information to come by on the Island as far as I can work out. Information about 737's and yet a test flight was made here in 1972. I have already mentioned the Challice Report. I wish I had it here now, it would probably answer alot of the questions. But as far as I am concerned, despite what I am saying now I have an open mind. I can be convinced as easily as the next but I have yet to be convinced that we have the right to request the Australian Government to carry out an environmental impact statement. That is the thing that is troubling me at the moment. Thank you Mr Acting Deputy President.

MR BUFFETT: Mr Acting Deputy President. The question has been asked, what are we letting ourselves in for? Well for my part, I am not letting us in for anything until we have all of the facts in front of us and as I see it, an environmental impact study
must be one of the documents to be examined if we are to examine properly and carefully and clearly the 737 operation to Norfolk Island. I can say quite clearly I have no brief for the 737 but I am quite willing to examine objectively whether it is suitable for Norfolk Island. To make an objective examination one does need to have all of the facts and information. Mr Grey has earlier referred to a lack of information about the 737 aircraft and I can agree with her. What this motion in fact promotes is the gathering of further information which would allow us to examine the question properly and that is the reason why I am prepared to support the motion which gives us more information on which to base a sound decision.

MR ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Thank you Mr Buffett. Any further debate Honourable Members. Mr Sanders.

MR SANDERS: I would like to thank Mr Buffett. Well said.

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

Question put

MR BROWN: No

Motion agreed.

NOTICE NO. 8 - HEADSTONE JETTY COMMITTEE - ADOPTION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

MRS GREY: Thank you Mr Acting Deputy President. If I may just read from the Notice Paper for the benefit of those who don't have it before them and then possibly suggest that we take it Clause by Clause. The motion reads that this House supports the recommendations made by the Committee established to investigate Headstone and other landing places and recommends that the following action should be taken immediately: (a) that discussions be initiated by the Executive Member for Administration, Education and Health between representatives of the Cruise Shipping Lines and the Department of Transport and I should if I may just mention that where the Department of Transport is mentioned it is now the Department of Transport and Construction but it is still the wing which deals with transport that we are interested in, and the Administration of Norfolk Island to ascertain the feasibility of establishing an alternative passenger landing stage (b) that discussions be initiated by the Executive Member for Administration, Education and Health between representatives of Cruise Shipping Lines, the Rotary Club of Norfolk Island, Captain Ron Ware, Dennis Tanner and the Administration of Norfolk Island with a view to agreeing mutual co-operation and assistance in the initial construction of a small boat ramp and possible appropriate passenger landing facilities at Ball Bay with perhaps the provision at a later day of more extensive works, (c) that action be initiated by the Executive Member for Administration, Education and Health to repair improve and extend the existing facilities at Cascade and Kingston landing places. (d) that the Executive Member for Administration, Education and Health holds discussions with the Department of Transport and the Search and Rescue Organisation.
(e) that the Executive Member for Administration, Education and Health holds discussions with O.T.C. with a view to the newly graded access to Anson Bay being maintained to provide emergency access to the sea to the west of the island. The House further recommends that because of the beneficial effect the implementation of some of the Committee's recommendation would have on the island's economy, the Executive Member be urged to treat the matter as one of urgency and to report at each meeting of the House, the progress he has made to date. If I may, Mr. Acting Deputy President, first of all let me say here and now I offer my assistance to the Executive Member for Administration, Education and Health having dumped all that on his plate, it involves a great deal of letter writing in the first instance, and probably a great deal of discussion subsequent to that. I would be very happy for the causes to be taken separately for discussion if it's the wish.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Is it the wish of the House Honourable Members to go clause by clause. Thank you Members. Clause 1.

MRS. GREY: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President. (a) that discussions be initiated by the Executive Member etc. between representatives, cruise shipping lines, the Dept. of Transport, the Administration of Norfolk Island to ascertain the feasibility of establishing an alternative passenger landing site. It's very obvious that a lot of people think that this is possible. Captain Luigi Napo of Sitmar Cruise Lines was here during December and a small group of members of the Assembly had discussions with him. At that time he said he was not in a position to bring his ship in without landing facilities being available. There is some suggestion that pontoon structures or similar non-permanent facilities could be feasible as far as Ball Bay is concerned and even as far as Headstone is concerned and I think that further discussion could take place with these people to ascertain perhaps what degree of assistance they're prepared to offer us in establishing them. I would not add further to that clause Mr. Acting Deputy President.

MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Acting Deputy President. Could I first of all respond to a couple of earlier comments that were made by Mrs. Grey. Firstly, she offered her assistance, may I say as the Executive Member for Administration, Education and Health that if the motion is approved by this House that I would welcome her assistance. The second point that I raise is that I feel that in examining these recommendations it would have been helpful to have the overall report of the committee that has examined this. I think it would have allowed members to examine all of these recommendations - probably in more detail and probably knowing more the background of their coming forward as recommendations. But no doubt Mrs. Grey and other members of the community can elaborate as we go along as to the various thinking as Mrs. Grey has done in respect of the first one. I am aware also that people on the island have shown a great interest in cruise ships coming to the island and have made some suggestions about how they might be managed as far as coming ashore is concerned and I think there could be no doubt some fruit in speaking to the various bodies that have been suggested in respect of this part of the motion to see the viability and feasibility of that.
MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Any further debate.

MRS. GREY: Just by word of explanation Mr. Acting Deputy President, I did mention that the report regretfully was not finalized it is in draft form but I guess we have some streamlining problems as far as getting it typed is concerned.

MR. JACKSON: Mr. Acting Deputy President, the more I look at this motion and examine it, I've had over a fortnight to examine it. It brings me to bear that most likely the main basis of this motion lies in clause (c). Now here we are, I don't want to re-hash the five hour session that we went through a fortnight ago and an hour and a half today—but at the same time I would fully support investigation going ahead on these particular points, these clauses, but I must refer back to (c) because I can clearly remember in the early 30's where we had cruise ships coming to the island with over 1,000 passengers and they were handled with our present conditions and jetties and it was they were brought ashore and taken back on board but the main basis of this motion lies in (c) where recommendation in (c) to improve and extend the existing facilities at Cascade and Kingston landing places. I do believe while we negotiate with all those that's here that Miss Grey has in a motion that we will eventually come back to this clause (c) that will be the one where with our financial arrangements here at present, I can't see how we can possibly have facilities which some of the clauses in this motion which Mrs. Grey has recommended and I say that because the final analysis of all the examination that will require the least amount of finance, will be upgrading Kingston jetty area and doing something about Cascade and these are the two normal jetties that are being used at present and that will be the ones that will be used if any cruise ship was to come to the island. I'm aware of cruise ships and their size and their viability and what they can do and I'm doubtful whether a cruise ship would put its head into Ball Bay inside the two points, neither would I say they would go within cooee when the surge is on out at Headsone, so here we are our two normal landing places which are in use at all times, we're using it now and the main thrust of this motion should be centred around this clause (c) to upgrade the facilities that these two landing places that are in use at present.

MR. HOWARD: I'm inclined to agree with what Mr. Jackson says. I've also got some serious misgivings about the fact that section (a) which we're discussing and section (b) seem to imply if we support those recommendations that the Assembly is in favour of getting cruise ships here on a regular basis if we can. I happen to be not in favour of that. I know that there are a number of people as Mr. Buffet mention on the island who would love to have cruise ships coming every two weeks or every month or something there would be a swarm of people with fat pockets pouring off the jetty and quick on to them and knock the money out of them as quickly as you can. I don't think that that's really good for Norfolk Island. I think it would begood for shopkeepers, I think it would give us a bit of customs duty but the places that I've been where cruise ships do call, it's really a bit of a joke. The whole town gets ready, the toot toot of the horn, in comes the ship and
the natives get their pocket books out and away they go like tigers. They don't respect those tourists, they look on them as a bunch of sort of stupid clowns who don't know much and they strip what money they can off them and then they send them back away again. I don't think it's a very happy tourist kind of relationship to have and I generally oppose the idea of our pursuing cruise ships, so if that's implied in (a) I've got my misgivings about it.

MR. QUINTAL: Mr. Acting Deputy President. Mr. Howard mentioned about the cruise ships coming to the island. I know from our experience in the past, when cruise ships used to come here and drop off about 800 or 1,000 passengers, the island certainly was geared up for them and but the thing that was sold to the tourists in the early days was mainly fruit and souvenirs and planted baskets from the palms at Mt. Pitt and the passengers used to love coming to Norfolk and I don't think that it would matter how much the people tried to get off the passengers at all, because I think they enjoyed spending money and they will only spend an amount of money that they can afford to spend and I would believe it would be a good thing to have them come here, especially while we're so short of finance and tourists and if anything can be done to be able to bring them ashore in any safe manner, I would support the idea quite strongly. Mr. Jackson mentioned about Cascade and Kingston, I wholeheartedly agree with him. Headstone is not a safe place at any time, not even for fishing on a smooth day because you get freak seas come up and if any money is going to be spent and I think really we're talking a bit too soon because we do not have the money to spend on either Cascade or Kingston and but if we did have it, naturally they're the two places. In (b) I was surprised not to see the name of Mr. Art Mawson not mentioned in (b) as he is a person that has built a harbour up in New South Wales in Swansea and a very good one too and at one time he did offer to put a breakwater into Cascade at his own cost and that offer was turned down by the Council of the day which I thought it was a shame and I don't know whether if a person talked to him if he would still be agreeable to doing a thing like that but he has done quite a lot for the island and spent a lot of money so he might still consider doing this. He offered to bring in a bulldozer and the equipment and knock the cliff face down at Cascade and push it out to sea and that is a good thing on its own because just recently, I was working just past the quarry site and there had been huge fallouts of rocks everywhere along that face just past the quarry and I feel that it won't be long before the rocks start falling from the Cascade Hill after all the blasting that's taking place down there. I might be wrong I don't know and I would feel it's a pity that Mr. Mawson wasn't asked to be a part of the Committee also.

MRS. GREY: Just a couple of notes of explanation if I may Mr. Acting Deputy President. First of all, in reply to Greg, the Committee did have discussions with Mr. Art Mawson and in fact, his submission is obtained in the report, Again, I apologise that the report has not been circulated, again, I say it's in draft form. Yes, Mr. Mawson still believes that the cliff face at Cascade can be stabilized and that the material created can be used to develop or repair the present area, so yes, he's very much to the fore in discussions with the Committee in the formulation of the report. May I just also acknowledge as Mr. Jackson has said, for example in the year 1934-35 1,450 persons landed on the island from vessels on pleasure cruises, passenger landings were
up to 793 by 1929 and the value of such visitors to the island was acknowledged. In the year 1932-33 the Strathaird visited the island and 1,000 passengers came ashore, as well as some 100 residents boarding the ship for the day. That's not disputed for a moment, regretfully after our conversation with Captain Luigi Napa he pointed out that the kind of people who were travelling on ships these days were a little less adventurous, rather perhaps more like the visitors coming to Norfolk Island these days. People on the "Lidinblag Explorer" and such as that, a totally different kettle of fish, they'll come ashore in rubber ducks but regrettably, we're talking about people on ships being a lot older or let's say a lot less adventurous than they were in the 1930's.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President. I support the concept of encouraging cruise ships into Norfolk Island. They've been satisfactory in the past, I quite question whether a ship full of passengers all would come ashore but we should well take a lesson from relatives in Pitcairn who do considerable trading without many coming ashore at all. This can be done to great economic benefit to the island. It would boost the sale of arts and crafts which have been the local producers have been rather devastated by the importation of copies arts and crafts from Asian countries, from cheaper importing countries from countries that produce cheaper goods but in actual fact are not of Norfolk Island pine or Norfolk Island bamboo etc. There is I feel great opening for production in that line and the only thing that boosts economy is production. I would also not be averse to negotiation for finance to support the upgrading of the existing facilities in Cascade and Kingston as mentioned by another member of the Headstone Committee, Mr. Jackson. It's been very much supported by all people I've spoken to and to the people who know the waters of Norfolk Island. I think there is much economic gain in this proposal. I don't offer very great support if I may be permitted to discuss all clauses. May I discuss all clauses at once while I'm at it and save me coming back in, too often anyway. I feel that concentration should be on those two ports. Now the lighterage ... the ships in the earlier days that are being spoken of, having sighted the ruined longboats that have been around the Island I would say that those boats perhaps Mr Jackson and Mr Quintal could enlighten me, would have been able to carry far more passengers than the lighters we in actual fact have today but of people can come in in those lighters. The greater the size barge for bringing in a greater number of passengers the greater danger of the fatalities, I don't think its advisable to have large barges because of the type of sea around the Island and the rocky portion. I would be inclined to confine into small boatloads but I support this motion. I would as I say support a term loan, a stipulated term loan for the creation, building of a breakwater in Cascade as has been suggested confidentially by Mr Art Mawson who is a very knowledgeable man in this area, also he making mention of the availability from doing that of small metal for the roads which would be of a much smaller cost than normal because of the usage so in general, I support those portions of that motion.

MR BUFFETT: Mr Acting Deputy President, I should make it clear that it is not my interpretation that supporting clause (a) necessarily makes a commitment to cruise ships. As I understand it, it is an examination to ascertain feasibility of alternative passenger landing sights. It doesn't in fact make a commitment
at this time. It allows information to be brought forward on which such a decision can be made.

MR ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Thank you Mr Buffett. Further debate on Clause (a). Mr Howard.

MR HOWARD: If that is the way it is, if supporting (a) and (b) don't imply firm support for cruise ships, I am happy to support investigation. I'm all for looking at anything and seeing what we can see but if, and Mr Buffett is the Executive Member and he's the one who is being asked to do this, and if he wouldn't sense that support for (a) and for (b) gave him a mandate to go out and find cruise ships and bring them in if he possibly could but simply to enquire then I would certainly support both of them.

MR BROWN: On that basis I am happy to support both (a) and (b) Mr Acting Deputy President.

MR BUFFETT: Well, if we are addressing (b) I would move an amendment that Mr Art Mawson's name be included. I would have to seek your leave Mr Acting Deputy President because I have not given notice of that but I thought valuable comment had been made of his expertise in service.

MR ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Thank you Is leave granted? Thank you. The question is that the amendment to Clause (b) be agreed. Further debate Honourable Members. No further debate. The question is that the amendment to Clause (b) be agreed. That is, the inclusion of Mr Mawson's name.

Question put
Motion agreed. Further debate on Clause (c).

MRS GREY: This is as Mr Jackson rightly says, possibly the crux of the whole thing as far as Norfolk Island is concerned. The paper presented by Mr Silva, principal Maritime Works Engineer with the New South Wales region of the Department of Housing and Construction who visited Norfolk Island from the 26 - 29th May 1975 to advise on a number of works associated with maritime structures and the foreshores of Norfolk Island. His Report contains as others also contain, fairly basic recommendations as how Cascade and Kingston landing areas can be improved within the first instance going into massive expenditure. By all means, if we want to do what is really desirable as far as the Cascade Jetty is concerned we do get into money and perhaps in the future we do get into doing long term loans and so on and so forth. General consensus appears to be that an additional 30 feet extension on the jetty is desirable and we would also then be able to entertain bigger cranes and containerisation which is probably something we have to recognize for the future. However, for the moment I believe that the Executive Member will find that fairly basic things can begin almost immediately without great cost and it's those things which I believe can be started in this financial year anyway. What happens in the next financial year is another question.

MR BUFFETT: Could some of the examples of the basic things be expounded upon by Mrs Grey.

MRS GREY: Yes, I would have to jump from report to report to make a summary on them but basically they involve the dredging programme, continuation of that at both the Cascade and
Kingston jetties and I think to start with that would probably meet with the approval of many of the people working on the ships and lighters at the moment.

MR JACKSON: I support (c) Mr Acting Deputy President.

MR BUFFETT: Mr Acting Deputy President. I certainly support (c). It has been something that has been mentioned for a long time, that the facilities at Cascade and Kingston which are our principal landing places at this time, should, well first of all before we come to the matter of improvement, should have some further attention as to maintenance so that proper standards are available for the lifeline arrangement of working the ship and of bringing supplies into the Island but also for the pleasurable and also industrial arrangement of fishing. Some people do make their living from fishing and one needs to ensure to some reasonable degree the facilities to allow that industry to continue is available. Improvement is certainly another factor but then you start to talk about more money. It really does come down to some considerable question of finance and whilst we can talk about all of these clauses (a) to (e) I would like to have some sort of indicator from members, particularly from the Executive Member for Finance, as to their views on finance being made available for this purpose, whether it be in this financial year or in future financial years. I would just like to get some feeling as to thoughts about priorities and the like in examining this motion that is presently before us.

MR HOWARD: I think the questions Mr Buffett asks are sensible and sound ones. The ability of the Island to invest money where it is necessary for essential services was demonstrated by the passage of the first Expenditure Act today authorizing $95,000 for the crane. We don't have any money to waste. That is not a waste of money; it is a continuation of a necessary service. Surely Cascade and Kingston are necessary to Norfolk Island. We can't survive without them. Clause (c) seems to me to cry out for a more detailed setting out of the range of the options. What is proposed. It seems to me it would be useful if we knew that as a basic essential minimum the following things have to be done immediately. Following on that it is desirable that within the next year the following things be done. If funds can be made available or finance can be found, it would then be advisable in the opinion of the Committee to do the following additional things, in other words, some kind of a scale of priorities or... what is the plan. Simply to ask Mr Buffett to initiate action to repair improve and extend Cascade and Kingston, it seems to me a little vague. Is there some way that that paragraph could ask him to come back to us and say what is feasible. Could I ask Mr Buffett what he thinks would be a sensible approach to it.

MR BUFFETT: I wonder without trying to pass the buck, could I ask whether the report is more specific on what improvements or extensions might be sought.

MRS GREY: In as much as the attachments or appendix to the Report... for example... give Mr Silva's complete
recommendations and so on and so forth. May I just take the opportunity to put in a few bits on information which may be of interest to the House. The crane that we have just authorised is a 16 tonne crane, that is approximately 12 feet longer than the present crane. If we went to a 20 tonne crane we would be going into something which was 16 feet longer and basically Cascade pier just does not permit the use of a bigger than 16 foot crane. It has been suggested that wharfage facilities in Sydney will not be available for much longer, and there is another piece of information that should be considered, we have probably only got two more years out of the two launches. They are 30 and 20 years old and there is another factor that has to be taken into account. In three years time the Ile de Lumiere is due for a major survey. We have other problems as far as shipping is concerned. I think it needs very detailed study and I certainly agree with what Mr Howard has suggested, however, my own feeling is that that is the sort of detail that the Executive Member and only the Executive Member really is in a position to bring forward. He has the facilities, he has the access, greater access than I to the information that should be available.

MR JACKSON: Dredging operation took place in the Kingston jetty a little over 12 months ago. The operation was never completed. A lot of work was done dredging alongside the pier area which was a great improvement. The pontoon is still down at Kingston waiting to take the dredge further out towards the Niggerhead where the main danger is there, but once again funds ran out. There was $15,000 allocated for this purpose in the financial year that the work was done, but funds ran out, and there has been applications to finish off this dredging but then again we are faced with the funds being made available, and Mr Howard can quite remember when the dredging was taking place and $15,000 was made available, so I would say that this is one of the areas. Not to let the growth take place again there where it has already been done to finish it off, and to finish it off out near the Niggerhead where the channel comes in, where damage is likely to lighters and the launches.

MR HOWARD: I wonder if Mr Jackson could enlighten us as to how the money gets spent in that operation.

MR JACKSON: The operation was done by John Anderson and Bruce Mackenzie with the use of our crane. I mean Jim Anderson. With the use of our Allen crane, and other workers and they used the full length of the gib of the Allen crane and when they couldn’t take the bucket out any further a pontoon was built and this they have down near the slide area now. They were going to take the dredge out onto the pontoon and let it off and drag it in from there. Well, funds never made it available to continue any further but it has always been a bone of contention that that area near the Niggerhead should be looked at and dredged as soon as possible.

MR HOWARD: May I raise a question, being that it may be possible to do that kind of work, I don’t know whether it is or not, it may be possible to do it without spending much money that we aren’t already spending. It maybe that much of that $15,000 for example, went to covering the wages of Works Depot men who were transferred off the Works Depot for that job for a couple of days and their wages were paid from that special source for it. Now if we got this may not be so either - but I
have heard it said that because of the squeeze on capital spending that there is not, that the Works Depot crew could be doing more work then they are and they are feeling hamstrung because there is not the money to provide the materials to allow them to do the work that they think should be done. If the time is available and the men are available, maybe a great deal of that work could be done without very little much actual extra cost. Maybe that is something that Mr Buffett could look at. It seems clear to me from what Mrs Grey was saying that it essential that Mr Buffett be given a photocopy of this draft Report as quickly as possible. It is obviously full of detail that we need to look at and that until it has been absorbed and thought about we are sort of doing the same job all over again. Thank you.

MR QUINTAL:

Thank you Mr Acting Deputy President. After the dredging was done I have been told that because the job was not finished the area that was dredged is gradually getting filled in again with stones and alot of mud and dirt from the hillside and it seems likely that if the job had been completed, that would not have happened but the water is very shallow around that niggerhead and a lot of the boatmen that go out fishing, evidently hit rocks from time to time and the sooner something could be done I feel the better because it could be that the whole area that was dredged could be filled in like it was before and it gets shallower and shallower and shallower.

MR. BUFFETT:

Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President. Yes it would be helpful to have a copy of the report as soon as possible. I'm sure that can be arranged with Mrs. Grey, I'm sure that that is not a difficulty between us. I just seek clarification on one particular aspect that was raised earlier by Mrs. Grey. She commenced talking about the Ill De Lumiere's life and other pieces of equipment, the launches for example and I'm wondering whether in fact implicites in this motion is examination of those associated things, for example, yes we do have two launches that are old, 20 years I think is probably the life on at least one of them, if not both, I know that within the last day or so in fact, I think yesterday, one of the launches that has received considerable amount of work upon it. It has had to have mechanical work done upon it and some construction work upon it. Mr. Swynenburg is presently back on the island and has been involved in this way and some thousands of dollars of work has had to be done upon it and it was examined for its seaworthiness yesterday and has to be again, either tomorrow or the day after. These aspects are important to the proper operations of the associated undertakings but I'm wondering whether in fact those are required to be examined in the context of this motion which talks about the actual pier more than the surrounding facilities and I would seek some clarification upon that.

MRS. GREY:

I think Mr. Acting Deputy President that they're all intertwined, it would be very hard to say well we'll just deal with that and not worry about that because the implications in the size of the jetty, the size of the cranes, the condition of the lighters, what's happening in Sydney, what's happening with the Ill De Lumiere, what's happening with shipping lines generally are all matters which have to be thought about
and I think they probably have to be thought about very quickly because of the few things that I've just thrown in that are happening and likely to happen in the immediate future. I've again, I can only say that I would hope that the Executive Member now having responsibility for this, would be able to put all that information together. I might make mention too of the maritime committee which is due to be formed fairly shortly I hope, perhaps they can be brought into the picture as well on certain aspects.

MR. HOWARD: Just to support what Mr. Buffett and Mrs. Grey were just saying about how these things do all intertwine, there's no good our looking at one bit of it and thinking we've solved the problem when there are three other parts of it we haven't yet thought about. I think (c) needs more examination on the basis of what's been said around the table. I don't think we can ask Mr. Buffett to initiate action until it's been figured out what action is sensible in and made sure that money can be made available for it. That can't be done until Mr. Buffett at least has gone through the report that the committee has prepared. Should we think about adjourning this debate for another two weeks, we'll meet again in two weeks, and pick it up again then when Mr. Buffett has had a chance to look at at least the draft report.

MR. JACKSON: Mr. Deputy President. I do believe Mr. Howard is correct in saying, I believe the whole of this motions, here we are piece by piece, bit by bit trying to patch something up that facts and details hasn't been placed before us and I'm not saying this in any fascious way to Mrs. Grey, the motion has a basic foundation for us to work on. However, I do believe that if we agree with the motion in principle and perhaps the Minister responsible takes note of the different clauses from (a) to (e) and then come back in consultation with Mrs. Grey's offer for her assistance to the Minister come back with more details to put before the House and I do believe that we'll be able to solve the problem a little bit more better.

MRS. GREY: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President. I think that's a great suggestion, Mr. Jackson this was my original intention that this should initiate exactly the action that you are suggesting. If the House feels that it can approve this in principle and then come back with detailed recommendation, that to me, this is what each of those clauses should initiate is a specific proposal to the House.

MR. HOWARD: Could I seek leave of the House to move an amendment to the motion we're dealing with. I would like to move that all the words after "that" be omitted and in their place the words "the House supports in principle the original motion put by Mrs. Grey". I think this solves a lot of problems.

MR. BUFFETT: I don't know what you're getting at really. If the motion now reads "that this House supports the original motion put by Mrs. Grey" there is no formal documentation as to that. It appears on the notice paper but that's all. Mr. Acting Deputy President. Just to follow Mr. Howard's views. Is it possible to look at this. "That this House supports in principle the recommendations made by ............. then quote the whole lot. That's really saying the same thing although it
documents all of the words which I just felt that there was a gap if they weren't all stated. And if that be the case then I'd really like to look at (d) and (e) if we're going to accept it in that way because I really have some queries as we've looked at the others I think I just have some queries in respect of that whilst we're talking about it, unless there is any difficulty with that.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The question is the motion as amended be agreed. There has to be a subsequent amendment.

MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman. I would like to, in view of Mr. Buffett's comment about section (d) and section (e) which he feels need debate, and I agree with him, is to withdraw the motion that I made just now until that debate has been completed in the sequence that we're already on then I'll come back again with a motion.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Further debate.

MRS. GREY: It wouldn't be my intention to address this. Mr. Buffett obviously has some questions. Perhaps they can just be put.

MR. BUFFETT: Yes. I don't really want to be too questioning but I do have a query which if somebody can be helpful to me I would be grateful. I would be grateful to have some further background as to the need for suggesting the Dept. of Transport and the Search and Rescue Organization. For example, have they made a submission to the committee that gives some suggestions along these lines. I am aware that Captain Ron Weir has made suggestions in that direction.

MRS. GREY: It's precisely to initiate that kind of report that this motion is proposed. It is considered generally by the committee that that Department is the one which has the expertise to advise us in precisely what their requirements are. You may recall that the motivating submission seems to be a very long time ago, was one which made mention of air-sea rescue. In fact, it was discussion by people concerned about air-sea rescue with the original document that hit this table that discussed air-sea rescue and that's where that clause has come from, perhaps nothing else should be addressed but that one should because that's what started the whole ball rolling.

MR. BUFFETT: In part (a) we referred to the Department of Transport and Construction and I can see that that it no doubt relates to sea transport. In this particular one (d) we continue to talk about the Department of Transport and Construction. I'm just wondering whether in this particular context we're not talking about the Department of Aviation. Is there any clarification available on that.

MRS. GREY: The search and rescue organization is a wing of or a department of whatever terminology is correct the Department of Transport and Construction. When we get into air-sea
rescue, then we probably would seek consultation with the Department of Aviation as well, but certainly search and rescuers under the Department of Transport I am told.

MR. HOWARD:

Only the comment Mr. Chairman that if at the end of the day, we agree to endorse this original motion in principle, rather than in detail, it seems to me clear that that's the kind of thing that Mr. Buffett would be able to look at, adjust if necessary, use judgement, he would not as I see it be bound to every single word in the thing, but generally to follow what's being proposed.

MISS BUFFETT:

Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President, I really am very hazy about clause (d). In that I don't really understand what is being requested. I can read the words alright, but I can visualize that which could benecessary and I would call upon anybody who has information as to what might be required and is there a great magnitude of expense involved in this.

MRS. GREY:

Thank you for the question. Again, I refer back to the motivating submission which was the one that mentioned air-sea rescue and that's where the whole thing started. A lot of people started getting a little bit concerned about air-sea rescue with the greater incidence of plane arrivals and so on and so forth. However, I can only say again that this motion is intended to initiate a complete investigation of all these individual situations.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT:

Thank you Mrs. Grey. Further debate Honourable Members. Shall we move on to clause (e). Debate.

MR. BUFFETT:

Just one aspect I would like to mention in respect of this one (e) says that discussions be held with O.T.C. with a view to the newly graded access to Anson Bay being maintained to provide emergency access to the sea to the west of the island as we will all know, O.T.C. has embarked upon the ANZCAN project in that area, and some work has been done on the road. I have had some discussion with Mr. Bill Schmidt who is the General Manager who has visited during this time and he has indicated a desire that the road be kept in some condition, he has indicated some hesitancy for a total commitment of course to maintain the road on a continuing basis but has indicated some co-operation in having that road available. So I just mention that so you can see it can well fit in to what we are aiming at in this particular part.

MR. HOWARD:

Now I had leave before to move that motion, I presume I still have that leave. Could I now move that the motion be amended by inserting a new initial clause in it that would say "the House supports in principle the motion introduced by Mrs. Grey, namely" ... and then on with all the words in her motion.
MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The question is that the amendment as described by Mr. Howard be agreed.

Question Put
The amendment was agreed to.

NOTICE NO. 9

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Honourable Members

MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Acting Deputy President, the hour is almost 6 o'clock, we've been at it for four hours now. I rather feel that once you've gone beyond four hours, concentration I think your faculties start to be of pressure. If we were going to finish this afternoon, I would have another view and maybe we would bat on but in light of that, I would propose that we do adjourn Mr. Acting Deputy President. May I address the matter of adjournment, if I can seek your indulgence to put some views to the House. We suspended sittings on 2nd February to meet again today, and suspension has meant that we in fact don't commence the meeting at the beginning again but pick up where we left off two weeks ago. It follows that today's meeting commenced two weeks ago and the point of commencement for purposes of applying standing orders was of course 2 o'clock on Wednesday, 2nd February. It further follows that firstly, for the time lodgement of formal motions, that passed, and secondly the time for lodgement of amendments passed to our commencing today. Members will be aware that standing orders are devised for the smooth operation of the House and so that all Members know where they stand and the conduct of business of the House. Members will also be aware that standing orders may be set aside if the majority of members agree and in an emergency and times of practical difficulty not foreseen, that course is appropriate, however, should it occur frequently, some inconsistency and uncertainty in the House's procedures could be involved. We have had, in that two weeks' break, some thoughts about various amendments and some of them have been promoted without notice today for example, and I would suggest that there is a course that is available to us under standing orders that might assist us to handle the business with some smoothness, and I would ask Members to consider this in looking at the adjournment. When the business of a Meeting is incomplete and it's proposed to stop and not recommence for another fortnight, and probably that is what we're going to come to in a minute Mr. Acting Deputy President, that the Meeting should in fact be adjourned instead of suspending and this means that the time of commencements starts afresh, notices, amendments, petitions etc. may be lodged. However, should the meeting be proposed to be stopped and recommenced the following day for example, then we could very well suspend because things are probably less likely to happen in an overnight situation. The point I make is that the longer the time between each gathering, the greater chance of additional businesses being promoted. And so I do just make mention of those Mr. Acting Deputy President and I wonder if I could commend those possibilities
to Members when we next propose stopping the proceedings for the day and that's why I would propose at this time that we in fact adjourn and not suspend. I'm sorry to be so long winded about it Mr. Acting Deputy President but I thought now was the time to raise the matter.

MR. JACKSON: The businesses on the paper that hasn't been completed today, that will be on the end of the businesses we discuss at the next sitting.

MR. BUFFETT: No, in fact, it's designed specifically not for that to happen. It would in fact allow all of the business that is to be considered for that day and the business committee to meet and accord the appropriate priorities over the whole range of matters.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Does Mr. Buffett's motion have the support of the House.

MR. QUINTAL: Before we adjourn, I'd like to seek leave of absence of 18th.

Leave granted.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The question is that the House do now adjourn. Any debate. Until 2nd March. Further debate. There being no debate, the question is that the House do now adjourn until 2nd March. The House stands adjourned until Wednesday, 2nd March at 2 pm.