presently have. But we should look at the surrounding events at that time. At the moment a temporary entry permit holder cannot vote. But when the voting legislation was changed to stop a temporary entry permit holder from voting the immigration policy was such that a temporary entry permit holder who wanted to reside in Norfolk Island for a longer period or indefinitely could make application for an enter and remain permit and could eventually make application for residency. Present policy precludes that and so under our present policy a temporary entry permit holder even after residing here for 20 years without the passage of my amendment would be unable to vote, so I would like to draw to the attention of the members of the House that we are in a very different position today to the position which the Island was in back in the Council days when the voting legislation was changed to its present form. It is my belief that it is reasonable for us to look at the voting qualifications in other places, probably one of the simplest for us to look at is the voting qualification required within the Commonwealth of Australia where it is my understanding that a British subject who has resided in Australia for a period of 6 months is entitled to register himself for enrolment on the voting roll. I am not suggesting that Norfolk Island should go back to a six month requirement. I believe that it is necessary for a person to be here for something considerably longer than 6 months before he can really understand sufficiently the Norfolk Island community and be really qualified to wisely exercise a vote. It is for that reason that my amendment takes on a period of two years. It makes ability to vote much freer than it presently is but not quite as free as it is in mainland Australia. It is my belief and it is the belief of the many people to whom I have spoken within the community not only temporary entry permit holders but also very many residents that the time has come to allow a temporary entry permit holder who is a British subject and who has resided in Norfolk Island for two years or more, subject to the proviso that he intends to continue to reside in Norfolk Island if he is able to do so to vote. I don't have details of the number of people that this would effect but my understanding is that it is a number between 60 and 100. The effect of their being able to vote will probably not be great as far as the result of any election is concerned but the morality of denying them the ability to vote is very important question and in my view it would be totally immoral to deny those persons the right to vote. I have listened to arguments that have been put over recent weeks to the effect that nothing should be done to delay the passage of the new voting legislation. I don't believe that the passage of my amendment would delay in any way the passage of the voting legislation through Canberra. This is not a radical amendment it, as I said, only goes part of the way towards putting our voting qualifications in line with those that already exist in Australia. I would be most surprised if it caused any delay and I don't believe that it should so Mr President, that is my proposed amendment. I commend it to the Members of the House.

MR QUINTAL: I would like to ask Mr Brown two questions and the first one is, if a person is given the right
vote for their Legislative Assembly does not that give that person the right to stand for the Legislative Assembly.

MR BROWN: I don't think it is right for me to be answering such a question.

MR PRESIDENT: I don't intend that it should be answered as to question I just thought you may wish to enter debate on it Mr Brown.

MR BROWN: There are certainly two different sets of qualifications. There is one set of qualifications for voting purposes and there is a completely different set of qualifications for the purpose of standing for election and merely allowing someone to vote does not entitle him to stand for election. He would have to satisfy all of the criteria within the other sections to be able to do that.

MR QUINTAL: Thank you

MR HOWARD: May I comment a bit further on that. the requirement, I think it is in the Norfolk Island Act, but I am not certain, the requirement to run for the Assembly is that you have to have been ordinarily resident on the Island for five resident, don't have to be a resident but you have to have been ordinarily resident for five years.

MR SANDERS: Thank you Mr President. I agree with Mr Brown's explanation of this amendment and I thoroughly endorse it. I support it.

MR JACKSON: Here we have an amendment before us which no doubt will drastically change the way of life on this Island. Mr Brown has brought down an amendment and in his own words he has admitted that he has no idea how many of these temporary entry permits would be allowed to be enrolled on Norfolk Island

MR HOWARD: Point of Order Mr Chairman. I think Mr Jackson is misrepresenting what Mr Brown said. He didn't say he had no idea he said he understood it was between 50 and 100 people. That is very different from saying that he had no idea.

MR JACKSON: Mr Chairman his words was that he had no idea how much it will effect... that was his exact words and that was the exact words that Mr Brown used, however, I have also done some examination and it has been put to me that there could be over 200 that could qualify, that has been here over two years. That being the case we can just about examine what effect would it have on our small community with a total electors on the roll less than 900. It was represent, somewhere in the vicinity of 25% being added to the electoral roll. Why wasn't this question put to the referendum, put to the public, because of the delicate situation of adding as I have estimated some 200 names on the electoral roll. When the two experts provided by the Commonwealth Government on electoral matter visited Norfolk Island early last year, Dr Snider and Mr Abbot, conducted this survey and the survey was conducted with the understanding that our total number of electors was in the vicinity of 900. Now if they had been aware that another 200 names may be placed on the electoral rolls they could have come down with a different finding. They may have made a different assessment of the situation. We have had for the last
three years a bill that has been tabled in this House known as the Norfolk Island Immigration Bill and that bill has not been ratified yet and that bill has been held up because there has been consideration against a section, and the section 17 and 18, against that bill which takes into account the Pitcairn descent question. Now the Pitcairn descent question has been the main basis that has been used for delaying that bill and may I add that the delay hasn't been caused by Canberra. It has been caused by legal argument here on this Island that suggested that there may be...

MR SANDERS: I think there is a point of order Mr Jackson, you are debating things that are irrelevant to the voting.

MR JACKSON: Well Mr Chairman I would add that immigration matters is relevant to this particular question because this is immigration matters that will be used after the person has been here on immigration business for two years.

MR SANDERS: Mr Jackson you are debating a Bill that hasn't been before this House

MR JACKSON: The Bill has been before this House

MR SANDERS: It hasn't passed Mr Jackson, would you confine your debate to the voting bill please

MR JACKSON: Well now let us take a look, and have a look at previous voting systems on the Island. Mr Brown has made a few remarks about the previous voting conditions that existed for temporary entry permit holders. One stage on the Island prior to 1968 it used to be 6 months but then a referendum was held on the 4th December 1968 and one of the terms of that referendum was that the laws of Norfolk Island should permit British subjects being Australians to be enrolled as electors of Norfolk Island. That referendum was defeated by 66% of electors those voted for the referendum of 214 against 240 with a total number of 667 of electors who was on the roll in 1968. Well may I correct that to 440. Now the 12 months voting qualification went on for 4½ years where we find some ten years ago nearly to the day on the 13 March 1973 a notice of motion was proposed to the 5th Norfolk Island Council. Now the 5th Norfolk Island Council met on the 3rd April 1973 and the notice of motion that was proposed by Mr John Ryves read "the Norfolk Island Council Ordinance and the Norfolk Island Referendum Ordinance be amended to confine voting rights to those holding resident certificates and those holding enter and remain certificates. Mr Brown stated that he said certainly we are in a different set of circumstances today. The Council ten years ago considered what effect people on 12 months voting rights would have on the Island future and no doubt what would effect would this proposed amendment of Mr Brown's to put another 200 electors on the Norfolk Island roll. That motion was moved by Councillor Ryves and was seconded by the late Charlie Evans and the Chairman of the day being Air Commodore Dalkin stated and he explained that the purpose behind the motion was that persons holding temporary entry permits be excluded from voting. And the members of that 5th Norfolk Island Council was the late Mr Wilf Randall, the late Mr Charles Evans, Mr John Ryves, Mr Puss Anderson, Mr Roy Smith, Mr Ralph Weslake
Mr Bruce Mackenzie and Mr Greg Quintal so with this in mind I do believe that the Councillors of that day were concerned with what effect people that come to the Island for a short while on a work programme what changes they can have and then leave the Island, no homes, they are here on a work permit and may I add at this stage Mr Deputy President, that in no way in my debate on this amendment appear to be disrespectful to these people or even facetious in any way to any of the persons who may be effected by this amendment. The roll now is about evenly balanced. It is evenly balanced because on the pitcian descent side and their relatives and the settlers who has come to settle on the Island and once again we examine what effect would another 200 persons have on this electoral roll. Some of the people who is waging the campaign to be allowed to vote they are already on the electoral roll in their own country and one may I name, Mr Bob Mickey, no doubt he is on the roll in his own electorate in Australia, and they are entitled to vote. The polling booth in the Administrator's Office was open all day the week before the election in Australia on the 5th and all day on the Saturday to provide these facilities to provide for these people to vote so no-one has been denied the right to vote and no doubt many of these people took advantage of the facilities within the Administration to cast their vote within their own country and it is interesting to note further that some of the persons wish to come and take advantage of our conditions don't bring the other conditions with them but they enjoy in their country. And if I will name some of the conditions that they enjoy in their country that is denied the Norfolk Island people, and may I add that we are part of Australia, and may I add Mr Deputy President that one of your favourite words is discrimination. Now, are we being discriminated against when we are being denied as Australians some of the benefits that these people are seeking to get on the roll.

MR SANDERS: Mr Brown has a point of order

MR BROWN: Mr Jackson appears to be straying from the point of the debate Mr Chairman

MR SANDERS: Mr Jackson would you confine your... 

MR JACKSON: I certainly will Mr Deputy President and may I add some of the Commonwealth benefits. Now persons on this Island are well aware...

MR SANDERS: Mr Brown

MR BROWN: Mr Chairman, Commonwealth Benefits are totally irrelevant. Point of Order

MR SANDERS: Would you withdraw that Mr Jackson

MR JACKSON: If that is your wish I will withdraw it, but may I bring to your attention that Mr Brown in his debate and contribution drew out that persons being British subjects
can vote in their own country and we, if we went to Australia we could vote, well certainly we can but if we went to Australia and asked for the same conditions that apply on Norfolk Island I know what we would be told because there are certain conditions that apply on Norfolk Island that does not apply on the mainland, but the point that I am raising is that certain conditions that people are asking for to be able to be put on the roll here, they are not bringing the other conditions with them and I do believe that it is relevant when I put to the previous Minister why we should be disadvantaged. Why should not we be treated the same as other Australians. If ..

MR SANDERS: Mr Brown

MR BROWN: Point of Order Mr Chairman. Mr Jackson persists in debating irrelevancy.

MR SANDERS: Please confine your debate to the matter of the voting Mr Jackson please.

MR JACKSON: I have mentioned before Mr Deputy President that I am concerned with the delay of the Immigration Bill

MR SANDERS: And that is irrelevant

MR JACKSON: I am concerned with this amendment. Because this amendment does have some relation to the Immigration Bill. Section 9 of the Immigration Bill lays down certain conditions. Section 9 of the Immigration Bill states that a temporary entry permit holder if they left Norfolk Island for one day their permit is terminated so what effect just before polling day where you have up to 200 persons on the roll extra on the roll and some of those has left Norfolk Island for various reasons. Has left Norfolk Island for holidays, sickness or whatever but once they leave Norfolk Island, once they leave Norfolk Island, their permit is terminated so therefore, what sort of situation would that be if we find that persons going to the polling booths have to be asked a question, have they left Norfolk Island within the last two years, because Mr Brown's amendment in 1(a)(a) a holder of a temporary entry permit is not entitled to enrol unless he has been ordinarily resident in Norfolk Island for a period of two years immediately preceding his application for enrolment. Now the definition of ordinarily resident immediately preceding his application when in Section 9(1) of the Immigration Ordinance of 1968 states subject to this section where a person is a holder of an entry permit leaves Norfolk Island and the entry permit has no force in effect in relation to him or after his re-entry into Norfolk Island so therefore the question must be asked at this particular stage why is there a move, why is there a move to come in now with this amendment. There was argument in the previous sitting of this House whether this Government is in a form of a caretaker Government. I believe that the Executive Committee examined this situation with the Administrator and telexes were sent off to Canberra and indications were that it may not be a caretaker Government but it still at the same time, it does not give ..
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Mr. BROWN: Point of Order Mr Chairman. Again, Mr Jackson is debating irrelevancies.

Mr. Buffet: ... everybody can have their say.

Mr. BROWN: I maintain the point of order Mr Chairman.

Mr. Sanders: Thank you Mr. Brown. Mr. Jackson would you please confine your debate to the matters we have before this House.

Mr. Jackson: I am confining my debate to the matters we have before this House because this is a relative question that has been put to the... the electors went to the poll on the 16th February and on 1st December they changed the method of voting on Norfolk Island Mr Deputy President. On 16 February they went to the poll again and the question was put - does the electors of Norfolk Island require an election immediately and 65% of the electors indicated that they wanted that question in the affirmative. Now, they didn't say that that they wanted the question next week, next year or something like what they said immediately, now from then on it was a question of meeting the wishes of the electors, of getting on with it. Not to come into this House and start putting contentious here before the House which I consider this to be a very contentious issue of altering the voting system on the eve of a general election and I find myself in a situation where I cannot support this amendment and if it means that this amendment will be embodied into the Bill that was presented by Mr Howard if it means that that be the case that we will be put to the members as a Bill that has been amended I find myself in a position that I cannot support the Bill either because of this contentious issue.

Mr. Howard: We hear that Mr. Jackson doesn't like the amendment and won't support it. Some of his reasoning, raise questions in my mind and he may be able to clear some of the questions up I don't know. He said that he had done his own examination of the situation and it was his estimate that about 200 people would be added to the roll. Now I am not sure how he arrived at that number of 200 and if he has any list of names or any analysis of categories of people that would help the House understand whether that is a fact or not I think it would be helpful to the House to see it. I think that that is a meaningful number and I think that that is information we ought to have if it is a matter of fact that he has it. I can't help expecting that in his 200 estimate Mr. Jackson includes a number of people who as a matter of fact wouldn't be eligible at all. I would guess that he includes that schoolteachers ordinarily stay here for two years, that employees sent to a number of companies on the Island, most importantly the banks, come ordinarily for two year terms, sometimes stay over for an additional year or longer, I believe the same thing is true in the case of a number of employees in the Commonwealth Departments that are here on the Island and he may be including all those people, that is a substantial number of people. None
of them would be eligible. Unless they intended to stay settled permanently on Norfolk Island and that would be quite easy to sort out if we have a schoolteacher who were to apply for enrollment saying I have lived on the Island for two years I am a British subject I am over 18 years I would like to vote and it is my intention if permitted to remain indefinitely on Norfolk Island then I think the Administrator would say to this schoolteacher, oh have you given notice of resignation to the New South Wales Department of Education because while you are employed by them I am aware that you are subject to being moved around by them and that at the end of your two year term, certainly at the end of your three year term you will be off to an assignment somewhere else, are you resigning from the Department, and if the schoolteacher could give evidence having resigned from the Department of Education then that may well be a person who intended to remain on Norfolk Island and settle here if they were permitted to do so. I don't think many schoolteachers would give that kind of evidence. I think the same thing would apply with employees of the banks and with other people employed on tours of duty here that last for two or three years so I suspect that there are probably a great many people in that estimate of 200 that as a matter of fact wouldn't qualify at all. Mr Jackson made a point that the Councillor's ten years ago were concerned not to let temporary entry permit holders have a right to vote. He is correct, they were. That was in 1973, it was in 1973 if I remember correctly that our Administrator of the day temporarily put a halt on any more enter and remain permits and that temporary half to permits to new settlers to the Island went on for something like eight or nine years. Once again that is pretty much the case. Enter and Remain permits really are not being issued and in the absence of enter and remain permits to allow the Island to function to allow people for health or family reasons or personal necessity of any kind had to leave Norfolk Island to go away for medical care or whatever, have had to sell a business that they had here in order to allow those natural life processes to take place in a way that was fair to people quite alot of new settlers have been admitted to Norfolk Island on temporary entry permits. Now a temporary entry permit doesn't say that it is for a new settler but that is the way that it has been used for many years and those people are counting on that. Their permits may be good for only six months but they have an understanding that if they behave themselves well they will be allowed to stay here and that is a very different kind of temporary entry permit holder than the ones the council was concerned about in 1973. They were concerned about the people who were part of a temporary work force who came in to build a hotel, work for a year and shoot through back to New Zealand, back to Australia wherever. Not permanent residents. Mr Jackson made the point himself. He said that the Councillors were concerned about what effect would be created about people coming for a short while, making changes on the Island and then leaving. Part of Mr Brown's amendment is that to be on the roll somebody would have to satisfy the Administrator that it was his intention to settle permanently on Norfolk Island, not to leave, not to shoot through. So, we are not trying, this amendment is not trying to do anything different to what was concerning the Councillors,
Mr Brown's amendment would still leave people who have come here only for a brief period of work and then leave, would still leave them without a right to vote. I think quite properly. It would give the right to vote to people who are trying to settle here and who are trying to do so as lawfully as they can.

I was quite confused about something Mr Jackson said about temporary entry permit holders losing their permits if they leave for even one day. There has got to be some confusion about that provision because I know many people who have temporary entry permits who have to go off or who from time to time go off on holiday or who go to visit family or who go to take care of business or for medical care or whatever, they don't lose their permit, so I don't really know what Mr Jackson was talking about there. I think this amendment becomes a very contentious issue only if someone wants to make it contentious for political reasons.

Mr Brown has explained that what the amendment proposes is to allow people who have lived here for two years and intend to stay here to have them vote. If they are British subjects and if they are 18. I think that on the face of it that provision, that enfranchisement of those people is so reasonable and so fair that it is difficult for me to believe that anybody with a straight face an argue against it. It is not, as Mr Jackson says, is going to drastically change the way of life on Norfolk Island. Those are the words of someone who wants to make it a contentious issue. I don't think the minds of the people of the Assembly here today are very different from the minds of the Councillors of ten years ago. I don't think we wantbrief visitors having the vote. We don't. Ten years ago new settlers had the vote. The temporary entry permit holders who would gain the vote under this amendment are new settlers and I think when they have lived here for two years they are entitled to the vote and I would like to hear a greater more evidence before I think otherwise.

Mr Buffett: Thank you Mr Deputy President. This is a very important piece of legislation. It does contain some very straightforward provisions but it also contains some very delicate and difficult proposals and they are delicate and they are difficult for reasons that I hopefully can explain to the House. Let me first of all put down the basics as I see them. The basic Bill is to introduce the cumulative voting method into Norfolk Island and this is being done as a result of a referendum held in December of last year 1982 in which a significant majority of electors in the Island said that they wanted to change to this voting system and to that stage all is straightforward and I doubt whether any members of the Assembly will quarrel with that. There have been some delays and some debate on whether such delays have been necessary or not, nevertheless we are here today with a bill that will realise what the referendum instructed. That is, a change from proportional representation voting to a cumulative system of voting. There it is. There is no more to be said about that. All the arguments about systems have been said and solutions have been proposed and they have been accepted, at referendum. And we now have an opportunity for all of us to agree, which in itself, would
be an achievement, to comply to the letter with what the community has instructed by referendum. This opportunity is there for the asking. Are we going to take that opportunity Mr. Deputy President. I am most certainly willing to take that opportunity. I wonder how many others will. From the indicators to date a greater number of members may not. I do hope that I can persuade them to do so. What could prevent this harmonious agreement on the basic bill which responds to the referendum by changing the method of voting. The preventing factor appears at this time to be the amendments that have been proposed by Mr. Brown, and I would like to examine that in detail if I may Mr. Deputy President. The amendment firstly proposes that in addition to residents all persons who hold entry permits may be enrolled if they're Australian Citizens or otherwise British subjects, that they're 18 or they're persons that were earlier removed and have returned to live in Norfolk Island. Now a new part to note is that entry permits includes temporary entry permits, as well as enter and remain permits, so that's the first significant part and I'm sure that that's not escaped Members - they know exactly what I'm talking about. The significant part is the temporary entry permit. Persons are to be enrolled. Then follow the provisos which are these. A temporary entry permit person can be enrolled provided, firstly, that he has been ordinarily resident in Norfolk Island for the two years immediately preceding his date of application, and secondly, that he intends to continue to reside indefinitely if permitted to do so. I'd like to now point out what I see as some of the delicacies and the difficulties Mr. Deputy President. Firstly, the delicacies. I really can accept that a good number of people who've been here for two years or more do wish to continue here, are sound citizens and have a genuine interest in the Island's destiny, and therefore, they should be permitted to vote. Another factor is that you find that many people who are here for that period of time or beyond, have in many instances needed to relinquish the facility to vote where they come from. That is not in cases, but in some cases, although they are usually aware of this when they actually elect to come to live on the Island. On close examination of the amendment, I find that the Administrator who is responsible for the electoral roll will have to examine a number of things. Let me try and list them Mr. Deputy President. Firstly, he will need to examine who must apply to be enrolled have residency? and enter and remain permit? or a temporary entry permit? and to be satisfied on these points, he'll need to site immigration certification or seek clarification from the immigration authority who deals with such matters. Secondly, he'll need to examine if the persons who have been ordinarily, to examine whether the person has been ordinarily resident in Norfolk Island for two years immediately prior to his applying for enrollment and to be satisfied on that point, he will need to have extensive examination and no doubt advice from immigration records. I think many members of this Assembly will know that the words "ordinarily resident" are ones that already exist in pieces of legislation that are in Norfolk Island, and I do know that with some experience, that this phrase has plagued us in respect of five year residency applications and I do foresee additional difficulty in this context, i.e. for two year applications for enrollment on the Norfolk Island electoral roll. As a third point, I mention he, the Administrator will need to examine whether a person intends to continue to reside indefinitely and will he be permitted to so do. Now this will be a difficult situation to determine again, in many instances the prime records which might throw some light upon this, are held within the immigration machinery but there
or a long absence. This has been mentioned earlier in the House and that is in fact as I have described it, and it automatically is cancelled unless the holders take the initiative to have their permits so endorsed that it will not be invalid during the period of their absence and depending on the reasons and the length of their proposed absence, there may or may not be such an endorsement. If in fact somebody does either through ignorance of the law, lack of time to do so, or any other reasons, have their permit automatically cancelled, then you will see that they will be automatically misfranchised. A temporary entry permit is also subject to cancellation. If a person fails to comply with the condition upon which the permit is granted, and of course a temporary entry permit is subject to cancellation if a person contravenes a condition which is being posed when it was given. Those things happen reasonably regularly Mr. Deputy President, and under the proposals that are before this House now, you will find that they are facilities which would in some circumstances render a temporary entry permit invalid, and therefore, their participation on the electoral role. But there is another extremely significant factor which I wish to draw to attention of the House. If Mr. Brown's amendment proceeds, temporary entry permit holders would, if they have lived in the island for five years, be eligible to stand for election to this House. It's very difficult to assess but if one runs your mind across the community and various people, one could probably with some conjecture say that there may be 20, 30, 40 persons who may hold a temporary entry permit but have lived in the island for five years or more, and therefore, it's quite possible that some of these persons may seek election. I'm not opposed to them doing so but I want to point out some difficulties of such a situation. Should such persons be elected, what happens if that person subsequently falls outside the immigration ordinance, and faces cancellation of his or her permit. What would be the situation where a temporary entry permit holder who is elected to the House, fails to attain a further entry permit before a current entry permit expires, and I don't think that is entirely uncommon. It has been my experience that persons in every case do not in fact renew their application before it expires, but may do it post the expiration. That places such persons that I have described Mr. Acting Deputy President, at risk because if that happens, the person immediately after the expiration of his permit, becomes a prohibited immigrant. He is no longer entitled to vote, and that's what we're addressing, but if he is no longer entitled to a vote, he is therefore no longer entitled for election, and in terms of the act, he facades his office as a member of this House, so you can see that there could be a flow on situation Mr. Deputy President in which members could have a very tenuous basis as a Member of this House and I doubt very very much the desirability of placing a person in such a situation. If a person is to be elected as a Member of this House, his security should be greater than that that I have described, and of course a person could not regain his seat in those circumstances by just regularising his immigration status, because once the act is done, it's done and if a vacancy is created and it can only be filled by a bi-election, and so you will see Mr. Deputy President that within the amendment that is proposed now before this House, there are some very wide, some very difficult and some situations which I feel are not adequately handled as is now proposed. It raises a series of worms which I don't think have been adequately taken into account. Now in no way I've already described this, am I trying to say that there is not a need for some facility for the category of persons to become involved in the electoral process. What I am trying to describe is that there is an existing process with which they can be processed and by using
the existing arrangement, one doesn't draw upon all of the difficulties that will come into play if we proceed along the path that is now proposed, so I explain Mr. Deputy President that I do support the Bill, but you will realize that I oppose the amendment for reasons that I have explained. I wish to mention one point additionally and finally. We have had a referendum in which the community has been asked whether we should have immediately another general election. The overwhelming answer given by the community at that referendum was that we should have immediately another general election. On that basis Mr. Deputy President, I doubt the where-with-all for this House to be embarking upon, new initiatives that would cause the difficulties that I have endeavoured to explain, one finds it even more difficult to go along that path when you realize that it is in the context of the community having said, "no more go to the polls, now".

MR. BROWN: Thank you Mr. Deputy President. Mr. Howard has already queried the means by which Mr. Jackson was able to ascertain that 200 persons or more would become entitled to a vote if this amendment were passed. I too query that. I am aware that Mrs. Grey has done considerable work to attempt to ascertain the effect of this amendment and it was on the basis of the work that Mrs. Grey has done, that I indicated that I understood that a figure, perhaps between 60 and 100 would be the correct figure. Certainly, if Mr. Jackson does have some evidence on which to base his claim, that 200 persons are involved, then I would welcome hearing what he has to say. I certainly hope that he does have such evidence because that evidence could then be examined by the House and the House could determine whether it was such a number or whether it was something considerably smaller.

Mr. Jackson has suggested that the number of persons who would obtain the right to vote would represent a 25% addition to the electoral role. Well, firstly I doubt that the figure is anywhere near that high, but secondly, if the figure was that high, if it really would add 25% to the electoral role, then that would underline even more the necessity for this amendment to pass. To be attempting to deny a vote to 25% of the population would be a terrible thing. I must say that I have not had one unfavourable comment in the many discussions that I've had with members of the community in relation to this amendment. Mr. Jackson, with all due respect, misunderstood the intention of the amendment. He seems to feel that I'm attempting to change the Immigration Law by means of this amendment. Well this is certainly not the case. This amendment relates to entitlement to vote. Immigration legislation is totally different legislation. Mr. Howard has already pointed out that the situation in Norfolk Island in 1983 is very different to the situation in 1973 when the Council of the day sought to exclude temporary entry permit holders from voting. Mr. Howard has already pointed out that temporary entry permit holders in those days, were persons who would not become entitled to vote in any event if this amendment were passed. Mr. Howard has already pointed out that in the period up until 1974, a temporary entry permit holder who wanted to remain indefinitely in Norfolk Island, could make application for the issue of a enter and remain permit but for the last ten years or most of the last ten years there has been a freeze on the issue of enter and remain permits, and after ten years, its my submission that it is
time we recognized that such a freeze is there and did something to correct some of the indignities that is caused by that freeze, and one of the indignities is the denial of the right to vote. Mr. Jackson suggested that those who have been waging a campaign to become entitled to vote in Norfolk Island are already on a voting role somewhere else. Well I can't speak for each and every temporary entry permit holder; and I can't speak for Mr. Hickey who was referred to by Mr. Jackson, I acknowledge that facilities are available in Norfolk Island for persons who are enrolled in electorates within Australia to enable them to vote when there is a state or federal election on in Australia. Mr. Jackson has been away from Australia for some time and he may have forgotten that if one is residing away from his electorate for more than I think the period is six months, then one loses his right to vote in Australia. He cannot simply live in Norfolk Island and continue to vote in Australia, and with all due respect, comments in relation to that are nothing but red herrings insofar as this amendment is concerned. Mr. Jackson has had difficulty in reconciling the term ordinarily resident. I can assure Mr. Jackson that to be ordinarily resident in any part of the world, one does not need to live there 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. Mr. Buffett has quite rightly told the house that we could go about the contents of this amendment in a different way. He has said there is another machine which could be used. What he was talking of was the immigration machine and he seemed to be saying that we could simply give people the immigration status that they need under the present voting legislation and that they could then successfully seek enrollment. Mr. Buffett had not forgotten the freeze on enter and remain permits but he seemed to be suggesting that this House could simply lift that freeze that enter and remain permits could be issued to all who sought them and that the amendment would no longer be necessary. With all due respect, I believe that this is clouding the issue. However, the next three or four weeks will show whether it was an attempt to cloud the issue because we will see within the next three or four weeks whether Mr. Buffett brings a private Bill into this House to lift the freeze on enter and remain permits. If what Mr. Buffett said in relation to this alternative machinery was anything other than an attempt to cloud the issue, then he will bring that Bill forward and he will support it. If he fails to do so, all Members of this House will then see that it was nothing but an attempt to cloud the issue and gain cheap points. Mr. Buffett referred to a number of technical problems. He suggested that if a temporary entry permit holder lost his temporary entry permit, he would lose his right to vote and by inference I suppose that he was suggesting that that person would then need to reapply for enrollment. Well that's not a difficult technical problem to overcome. It could be simply overcome for example by all holders of temporary entry permits re-applying for enrollment immediately before any election. Mr. Buffett made reference to the problem which would be created if a temporary entry permit holder were to stand for election to the Assembly and then lose his temporary entry permit. The question of qualifications for election is dealt with in Section 38 of the Norfolk Island Act and Section 38d clearly anticipates such a problem. That section provides the means to avoid the technical difficulty to which Mr. Buffett has referred. On a number of occasions over recent weeks, there has been reference to this Government being
a caretaker government and that suggestion has been soundly put in its place on each occasion. This government is certainly not a caretaker government and it is here to wisely continue in office until such time as a new election. Mr. Buffett made reference to the referendum as saying "no more, go to the polls now". Well again, that sort of suggestion has come before the House in recent weeks but that's not what the referendum said. The referendum was not a question of confidence or no confidence in the assembly. The referendum simply said "we're getting a new voting system, we want to then have a new election". If one was to speak to ten voters as to why they voted in a particular way, they may give ten different reasons as to the way that they voted and none of those reasons in my view, relate to confidence or lack of confidence in the Assembly. Mr. Deputy President, I support the amendment.

MRS. GREY:
Thank you Mr. Deputy President.
I think both Mr. Howard and Mr. Brown have taken up most of the points that I noted during the time Mr. Jackson was speaking and I suppose I made my own position clear at an earlier sitting of this House. I refer to the 200 figure that Mr. Jackson quotes and I think he used his words very carefully. He said that there were may be 200 people for two years. Yes we're well aware of that but the provision of the amendment put before us is that that person must intend to continue to reside in Norfolk Island indefinitely and has already been put to you, that figure doesn't get anywhere near 200 and I'd like to confirm the estimates that have been made already in the House of 60 to 100 people. That figure has been based on information provided to us from immigration records.

Taking that argument into account, I think Mr. Jackson's statements lose some of their validity. Mr. Jackson also made much of a referendum which dealt with the grant of a vote within 12 months and we're talking about two years, and Mr. Brown's bought forward the information about voting rights in Australia and whether or not a person living on Norfolk Island has the right to vote in Australia. He doesn't. There isn't an immediate denial by his coming to live here but there is a denial of the right to vote after a period of absence, and Mr. Brown's already dealt with that. And the points that Mr. Buffett's raised. I can see the point that he's making, it was a point that was considered and was discussed at the time the amendment was being discussed by some Members of the House. Every time I see the the ban on enter and remain permits lifted, I become concerned about what Norfolk Island is committing itself to. What are we committing ourselves to in terms of social services, education and health. Giving a temporary entry permit holder the right to vote gives him a voice in the process of government. The grant of an enter and remain permit carries with it the obligation for Norfolk Island to support the areas of education, health and social services. The person holding an enter and remain permit. What Mr. Buffett is suggesting, is an expansion of the resident numbers of Norfolk Island before the matter has been fully considered. I find the granting of a number of enter and remain permits, a lot more frightening in the long-term than granting bona-fide residents of Norfolk Island who are holders of temporary entry permits a voice in the government and in the way the government runs the island, and finally, I too noted Section 38d of the Norfolk Island Act which made provision for such qualifications relating to residents as are prescribed by an
MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I believe Mrs. Grey has just gone to fetch the document proving Mr. Brown's figure of 60 to 100 people who may be permitted to vote, should this amendment become law. Most of the points supporting the amendment have been well and truly covered and I won't bore the House with repetition. However, I have always been of the opinion Mr. Chairman that temporary entry permit holders who are British subjects and over the qualified age should have the facility to vote on Norfolk Island. I believe Mr. Chairman, it is only their democratic right that these people who qualify should be able to vote. I believe that it would be a sorry day for democracy on this island if this amendment is defeated today. I strongly support the amendment.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. Deputy President. This amendment so worthy of debate by the newly elected Assembly cannot possibly be successfully incorporated in the Legislative Assembly Amendment Bill 1983 of which Mr. Howard has carried. Mr. Brown's amendment should essentially be a separate Bill. Whereas both amendments seek to change the principle ordinance, the one telex from Canberra and of which Mr. Howard has carried, provides the necessary machinery for which an election under the preferred accumulative method of voting can be held with greatest expedition. That Bill is the result of widespread negotiation, and scrutiny, ranging from the electoral experts in Australia who assessed the situation over here with our 900 odd electors and numerous candidates, through the Department of Home Affairs has been drafted and checked by the Attorney General's Department, endorsed by the Government of this island and is in and is the direct result of the wishes of a decisive majority of the electors of this island, the lifestyle and environment of which we are trying to preserve. So on the one hand, the Legislative Assembly Bill 1983 presented by Mr. Howard, fulfills its purpose by equipping the Legislative Assembly Ordinance 1979 to provide for elections under an accumulative voting method. Mr. Brown's amendment on the other hand is a totally different matter. It has nothing to do with the question put before the electors at the last two referendums and furthermore, it would significantly alter the base of electors upon which the electoral experts founded this system especially designed to give fair and equitable representation of the people on the Assembly. In the Norfolk Island situation, one must be very mindful of the ease with which this homeland can become through careless legislation, purely a commercial centre which would be detrimental to both island life and tourist attraction. Tourism and commerce are both essential but what the people who live here want and how they want their island to be is essential, by "they" let me make it quite clear that I mean all who permanently live here and call Norfolk Island their home. I respect also those who have decided to spend a few years here and aren't yet decided whether they will ever leave. Mr. Brown's amendment seeks to enfranchise those temporary entry permit holders who have been normally resident here for two years prior to their application for enrollment and at this point, I would like to explain for the benefit of those people living here and are in that category, the reason for this subject always being one of serious consideration and debate. In my introductory explanation, I will no doubt be repetitive of many people who have debated the subject over the years and will no doubt be doing so for the same reasons as they did. However, for
those people who have not seriously weighed all the points for and against the enfranchisement of temporary entry permit holders, may I begin by explaining that until the tourist boom was well under way, the number of temporary entry permit holders on the island were few in comparison with the number of normally resident electors. Consequently, the amount of temporary entry permit holders voting would not then outweigh the number of residents. This situation rapidly changed in the late 1960's and early 70's to such an extent that immigration and electoral policies had to be changed so that the wishes of the people who live here and indeed, whose only means of livelihood is ever here, were not distorted by the votes of those people, though permitted to vote were only here for a short time and neither knew nor need worry about what further what future the island held for those who permanently live here. If one were to put the whole 900 electors into the Australian electorate, Australia I'm estimating of holding about 14 million people, I don't know whether that the electors or people, the wishes of many million Australian electors would not be grossly effected by such a small number from this electorate of Norfolk Island, but not so is the case by an influx of voters into Norfolk Island. Mr. Brown's amendment seeks to amend Section 6 of the principle ordinance which deals with the qualification for enrollment so that temporary entry permit holders having been ordinarily resident on the island for a period of two years immediately preceding his or her application for enrollment and intending to continue to reside in Norfolk Island indefinitely if permitted to do so, become eligible to vote. This second Assembly whose life has been suddenly shortened by the wishes of about two thirds of the electors, does not enjoy the endorsement of the residents and electors of the island to implement such a sweeping change of policy. Indeed, when the Australian Government puts this very question amongst others to the people in a referendum in 1968, the proposal was outvoted then by two thirds of the people so I could not accept the timing of this amendment which .... If the amendment had been brought into the Assembly for debate before whoever it was informed Canberra of Mr. Brown's intention to propose the amendment, surely it could have been put before the people at either referendum. The new Section 6(2) 6(2)1ab would state if amended "that a holder of a temporary entry permit is not entitled to enrollment unless (a) he has been ordinarily resident in Norfolk Island for a period of two years immediately preceding his application and (b) he intends to continue to reside in Norfolk Island indefinitely if permitted to do so. So in the case of (b) above, the categorisation of "intends to continue to reside in Norfolk Island indefinitely if permitted to do so" may sound an interesting comment, but to me it is not a convincing guarantee of any person's sincere interest in the well being of this island on which his or her vote could bear irreparable consequence. Of the nearly quarter of a thousand eligible temporary entry permit holders presently covered by a two year normally resident period, one must wonder how many of them may qualify as being eligible for enter and remain permits by standards other than the time factor. Perhaps Mr. Brown has some other suggestion for their proven categorisation but whichever method is chosen, there would be a considerable time lapse during the categorisation process which should not be used to further delay the election. Why not have sought to lift the freeze presently imposed by this Assembly on the enter and remain permit holders who would have been eligible to vote but for the freeze.
about the future of Norfolk Island and the concern for the island's fugute and she said "decisions about the future of Norfolk Island should be decided by all who permanently give here and call Norfolk Island their home". Those are the people who would get to vote under this amendment. People who have decided that they would like to love here permanently and people who call it their home. They can't vote now unless they have residency. They ought to be able to vote because they call it their home if they've been here for two years.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. Deputy President. Could I come in with another pertinent emphasis that I mentioned before that it is the length of time that would be taken to categorise who intends staying here permanently and who don't and we have been asked to give another election immediately.

MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Deputy President I'm concerned about a couple of inconsistencies of argument and I'd like to just point them out if I may. One of them has been when Members have been addressing bona fide residents. Mrs. Grey for example, has mentioned she would wish persons who are bonafide residents of the island to be able to participate in the voting arrangement, but she has also clearly indicated from what she said and it was my interpretation that in fact, those persons who are bonafide residents, should not have clarified their basic security of tenure in the island. I see an inconsistency in such an argument and I just say it to emphasise the point that I made earlier, which was that if you do accept that such persons have a reason for being bona fide residents in the island and to pick up Mr. Howard's words that he has just mention just now "all who permanently live here and call it their home" then if you in fact accept that, then I think there is some obligation to ensure that there is security of tenure. I mention my argument earlier that if you provide that within the existing machinery, this amendment which we are now addressing does not become necessary because those persons will have the facility to be enrolled. On that question again, you've either got to accept or not accept whether those persons are in the category that you describe - bona fide residents of the island. I think you've just got to make up your mind about that. It has been mentioned that section 38 of the Norfolk Island part (d) relates to the qualifications in respect of persons who may be elected to the Legislative Assembly. I mentioned this in my earlier participation in the debate, and one other member has made reference to this particular section, and it was said that this provides the means to avoid the technical difficulty that I described. I again say, that if you accept the means that I have mentioned, there is no need to avoid the technical difficulty because it would not exist. If you accept what this amendment proposes, then you do have the technical difficulty. Then you have to make another enactment which relates to section 38d and then you ask yourself the question "how long are you going to chase your tail to solve a particular matter". I just mentioned those two matters, I thought they were important to emphasise some of the points that I made earlier Mr. Deputy President.
MR. BROWN: Thank you Mr. Deputy President. I hope I have misunderstood part of what Mr. Jackson said a short while ago but it seemed to me that Mr. Jackson was suggesting that we should get ourselves a list of names of the persons who might become entitled to vote as a result of this amendment. Have a look at the names, see whether we like them or not, if we don't like them, tell them where to go, if we do like them, well we'll think about giving them a vote. That may be what goes on in a communist trade union or a banana republic.

MR. JACKSON: I would ask Mr. Brown to withdraw that statement.

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown would you withdraw that please.

MR. BROWN: I was not suggesting that any Member of this House was a member of a communist trade union.

MR. JACKSON: I would ask that Mr. Brown withdraw that statement, they're offensive to the whole community.

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: No point of order Mr. Jackson, please continue Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: But that's not the sort of thing that should happen in a democratic community in Norfolk Island. I really start to wonder whether we're looking at one particular segment of the community being upset that its proportion of the vote might be lowered. We know that those who work within the public service, basically control something like about 35% of the vote in Norfolk Island. Some persons appear to be worried that this percentage would decrease if more electors were enrolled. That's not a proper thing for us to be considering in deciding whether or not we should seek justice in our voting system or whether we should look for something else. Mr. Howard has put a few facts before us at last in relation to the 1968 referendum and the 1973 Council motion. He has quite rightly said that the 1968 referendum dealt with immigration issues and even insofar as it dealt with voting. It dealt with a totally different issue to that which is dealt with in that amendment. Here we are talking of persons who have been here for two years and intend to make the place their home. It is a totally different issue and it is misleading to suggest that this House should feel in any way bound to knock this amendment out because of the result of that 1968 referendum. The 1968 referendum was about something totally different. We've already dealt on a few occasions today with the real nature of the 1973 council motion. Again, it is misleading to suggest that we should know out this amendment as a result of that motion, and it's clouding the issue to attempt to think up reasons to stall going further with this amendment. It's something that has to be dealt with today. I believe we need to get back to the facts. Firstly, we've got to stick to questions of voting and forget about immigration. Secondly, we've got to stick to facts and not red herrings, and thirdly, if there is a gerrymander, we've got to end it.
MR. JACKSON: Mr. Deputy President. I'd like to clarify some points there. In no way, did I suggest in my contribution that names should be brought into this House and processed. Now it's wrong for Mr. Brown to say such things because if he is in such a desperate situation to justify this amendment, well he is really looking in cupboards and searching for other things that he may find something that he would not want to see, however, it's been clearly expressed that no definite number has been Mr. Brown hasn't come forward with any number that the electors should be made aware of to be placed on their electoral role. Now, Mr. Brown has raised the issue about one section of the community are frightened that their percentage votes may be reduced. Well Mr. Howard made that quite clear last week in the last sitting that this amendment is designed to reduce the voting power of the public service by a few percentage points.

MR. HHoward: May I just modify what Mr. Jackson just said, it wasn't designed to do that, I said would have that effect.

MR. JACKSON: Would have that effect to reduce the public service votes by a few percentage points. Well it's not only that particular section of the community could utilize their block if they so desire, why shouldn't and I say why shouldn't the Rotary if they so desire do utilize their voting block, they have every right, why should not the Lions utilize their voting block if they so desire, why should not the Chamber of Commerce or any other organization utilize their voting block, they all have it and that is the basis, that is the basis where this accumulative system does not guarantee a minority representation on the Assembly, but it could happen. Now it could happen if those community service like the Lions and the Rotary and the Chamber of Commerce was to utilize their voting strengths. Well when a member, when a member comes out in this House and openly states that we would have the effect of openly reducing the block of one certain section, well we must question the real desire of this amendment here this afternoon.

MRS. GREY: Just a piece of information for consideration by Members Mr. Deputy President. Again, forgive me, I've been working at some speed from handwritten sheets, the figure I think put forward in this House was 60 to 100 I'd like to revise that figure, based on a revised list I must say one I have not seen before, 95 to 125, I think it's still within the realms of reason within the debate.

MISS BUPPETT: Thank you Mr. Deputy President. May I ask Mrs. Grey through you, if these people supplied on the list or the quantity of people supplied on the list, how would Mrs. Grey know whether they were eligible to be of that category, or are you only including the qualification of two years and no other qualification.
MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mrs. Grey, would you care to reply to that.

MRS. GREY: With your permission Mr. Deputy President. The figure I've quoted is one which was brought forward as a result of counting the number of people who have been here since some time in 1980. Now there's going to be some variation because some of them perhaps came in the 11 month of 1980, some came in the first month of 1980. I have not looked at this stage to see how many of those people are eliminated by the qualification which is put forward in this Bill that he intends to continue to reside in Norfolk Island indefinitely. That's why I suggested that number would be more likely reduced than increased.

MR. JACKSON: Just another question Mrs. Grey. This figure that you just stated to the House - were they researched through Immigration records.

MRS. GREY: Mr. Deputy President, it's a question that you as the member responsible for Immigration perhaps would care to take.

MR. SANDERS: I don't wish to discuss that list in this House.

MRS. GREY: I thought so Mr. Deputy President.

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: There being no further debate that the question be agreed. Those in favour say aye.

The House voted.

Ayes 6
Mr. Howard
Mr. Brown
Mr. Christian-Bailey
Mrs. Grey
Mr. Quintal
Mr. Sanders

Noes 3
Mr. Buffett
Miss Buffett
Mr. Jackson

Does this House wish to agree to the rest of the Clauses or go through the detail stage. The question is that the Bill be agreed, as amended. All those clauses up to 4 agreed. Will somebody move that the rest be agreed.

MR. BROWN: I so move Mr. Deputy President.

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: All those in favour. Will somebody move that the Bill as amended be agreed.
MR. HOWARD: I so move.

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Thank you Mr. Howard. All those in favour.

The House voted.

Ayes 6
Mr. Howard
Mr. Brown
Mr. Christian-Bailey
Mrs. Grey
Mr. Quintal
Mr. Sanders

Noes 3
Miss Buffett
Mr. Jackson

Abstentions 1
Mr. Buffett

QUESTION NO. 2 - TOURISM REPORT

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown to resume

MR. BROWN:

Thank you Mr. Deputy President.

In May, 1981 a select committee of the first Legislative Assembly consisting of Mr. Howard, Mr. Ryves and Mr. McIntyre delivered its report of the Norfolk Island Legislative Assembly Select Committee Inquiry into tourism. That report made a number of recommendations and those recommendations were considered by the policy committee of the first Assembly at meetings held on 11th August and 19th August, 1981, and as a result of what was agreed within that policy committee, the then Executive Member for Planning Tourism and Commerce, or I'm sorry, the then Executive Member with responsibility for Tourism, Mr. McIntyre made a statement in the House, setting out the tourism policy that he intended to follow as a result of the debate within the policy committee. Also in 1981, the House in open sitting debated the question of whether the report should be adopted, and it's my recollection that Mr. Howard had moved that the report be adopted, but most of the Members felt that the adoption of the report was not necessary because of the fact that it had been considered within policy committee and that the report need only be noted. I believe that one of the achievements of this second Assembly is its achievement of open government where all matters unless of a particularly sensitive nature, are debated in the House, and the general community is able to listen to that debate and listen to the decisions that are made. Perhaps a substantial part of the community is not aware that within policy committee, the First Assembly did consider each and every one of the recommendations of this select committee report, and it is to no small extent because of that confusion that the report is now before the House for debate. Perhaps if I could run briefly through each of the recommendations of the report, I could also advise of the attitude of the policy committee of the first Assembly to those recommendations. It may then be appropriate for any of the Members that have comments in relation to the report in general to make, and subject to the feeling of the House, it would be my belief that we ought then to look individually at each of the recommendations. Perhaps if I could go through the recommendations as considered by the policy committee of the first Assembly. Number one was that the Assembly should recognize tourism as the basis of the economy. This was accepted
by the first Assembly. The second was that the Legislative Assembly should ensure that all its policies regard Norfolk primarily as the home of its residents and not primarily as a tourist resort. This was also accepted by the first Assembly. Thirdly, the Legislative Assembly should relate future tourist growth to resident population as a percentage not exceeding the present figure. This recommendation was not accepted. My notes are correct, the words were not accepted at this time. The fourth recommendation was the Legislative Assembly should recognize that tourism has both good and bad effects and requires the best balance. This was accepted. The fifth recommendation was that the Legislative Assembly should ensure that the benefits of tourism go mostly to residents. This was accepted. Recommendation 6 initially said that we should encourage ownership of tourist, I'm sorry, that we should encourage local ownership of tourist facilities and discourage further overseas ownership. This was amended by the first Assembly to read that "the Legislative Assembly should encourage local ownership of tourist facilities" and in that form it was accepted. Recommendation 7 recommended that we should resist trends to shorter average stays. The first Assembly amended this to read "tourists should be encouraged to stay longer" and in that form it was accepted. Recommendation 8 was that the Legislative Assembly should recognize that Norfolk does not need an international luxury standard hotel. This recommendation was not accepted. Recommendation 9 originally suggested that we should accept that seasonal peaks and troughs cannot be substantially levelled. This was amended to read "all weather tourist activities should be developed to eliminate tourist peaks and troughs" and in that amended form, it was accepted. Recommendation 10 "the Legislative Assembly should develop an active relationship with airlines" was accepted. Recommendation 11 originally suggested we should seek Department of Transport and Department of Home Affairs help in influencing airlines. This was amended to read "the Legislative Assembly should seek Dept. of Transport and Dept. of Home Affairs held in influencing airlines in order to ensure that controls of tourism, transit air passengers, airline schedules, fares and types of aircraft are effective in preserving the Norfolk Island environment and economy, and in that amended form, it was accepted. The recommendations then went on in part 6, recommendation 1, the Assembly should continue the freeze on tourist accommodation, license by units as well as by beds, continue only those licences which are now actively used and not reissue surrendered licences. This was accepted with recognition that the accommodation freeze is a short term solution with control of air services seen as a long term solution, that was by the first Assembly. The next was that the Assembly should legislate minimum standards of accommodation and empower inspectors to suspend unit licences on the spot. That was accepted. Part 7 went on. Recommendation 1, the Assembly should renew licences annually and levy an annual fee for each licenced unit. This was accepted, subject to a scale of fees being decided and a facility being provided to examine cases of genuine hardship with a view to affording some relief if warranted. Next, the Legislative Assembly should ensure that the Tourist Bureau monitors booking trends in comparison to the minimum desired tourist level, uses direct promotion to maintain this minimum and does not otherwise use direct promotion, and also, that it should fund this promotion. The first Assembly accepted that the Tourist Bureau should monitor booking trends and make projections on booking levels. It accepted
also that the Tourist Bureau should use direct promotion primarily but not exclusively, for the purpose of maintaining a pre-determined level of tourist numbers and that reasonable funds be provided by the Assembly for such purpose. The third recommendation of that part was that the Legislative Assembly should investigate involving the Bureau in all bookings, and investigate the Bureau's appointing one head Agent in each key city. This was accepted with additional investigations into Agents fees. The Lord Howe Island booking system and all other types of booking systems. The fourth recommendation of that part was that we should improve tourist facilities such as museum and litter cleaning. This was accepted. Fifth recommendation of that part was that we should support and if necessary, legislate for grading of accommodation. This was accepted. The sixth recommendation of that part the Assembly should recognize that conservation and ecological protection are essential. This was accepted, and the final recommendation was that the Legislative Assembly should broaden the Bureau's role. This was not accepted. That was the result of the consideration of this report by the policy committee of the first Assembly. We must remember that some things have changed since the select committee report was put together. Now tourist numbers peaked in 1980 and from 1981 onwards, they declined substantially. Some members of the community feel that we should re-examine a number of the recommendations in the light of the fact that tourist numbers are no longer as large as they were and that the present design may well be to increase tourist numbers rather than to put some form of restriction on what was at the time seen as a rapidly growing number. No doubt, many members of the House will have many different views about that. My own view however, is quite clear. I believe that we should attempt to get the tourist numbers back to the 1980 numbers but once they are back at that level, we should be looking at the recommendations of Butland, we should be looking at the comments of Nimmo, we should be looking at the records of all of the earlier considerations of ideal tourist numbers and ideal resident numbers, and we should be facing the fact that at least on present bed nights, 25,000 is pretty close to the maximum number of tourists the island can cope with. Some members of the community argue that if average bed nights reduce, we should pro rata increase our allowed number of tourists. There is some merit in that argument, but that is an argument that has been considered by Butland and others, and my recollection of Butland's comments is that he felt each pair of feet would tread once through each of the historical sights during the stay, whether the stay was for five days, ten days or longer and that purely because average stays decrease, is not sufficient reason to increase the number of tourists. I think there is merit in looking at a slight increase if the average bed nights were for example to halve, but I don't believe that that increase should be pro rata, I believe that there should be some factor created by which we can relate those future tourist numbers to the declining bed nights. If they do in fact continue to decline, many people have claimed that average stays will continue to decline because people will take two holidays in a year instead of one holiday, and they will stay at each holiday destination for a shorter time. I don't agree with that, I've certainly had no evidence put in front of me to indicate that we should expect bed nights to continue to rapidly decline. I think that the tourist figures during
February out of Sydney at least showed that from that port bed
ights had increased compared to February of the previous year
and it is quite possible that if we market the Norfolk Island
product correctly the advent of medium jet aircraft with hopefully
lower fares could lead to people being able to afford to stay longer
in Norfolk Island rather than shorter. Mr President, any other
comment that I might make would be in relation to each individual
recommendation and I feel it more appropriate that we are going to
consider the items individually that I do so at that stage but I
hope that a number of the members will have general comments in
relation to the report before we get to the particulars stage.

MR PRESIDENT: Thank you Mr Brown. Any debate in
respect of the overall report before we actually examine each
particular part. Mrs Grey.

MRS GREY: Thank you Mr President. What I tried
to do before coming into the House was to get through the copies
of hansard that this Assembly has managed to produce in its time
and try and get concensus of what all of us felt about tourism
and had said over the past, for arguments sake, twelve months.
However it proved a daunting task. There aren't many editions
of hansard which don't deal in some way with tourism. We as an
Assembly are vitally interested in tourism. We have to be because
it is the lifeblood of Norfolk Island, however, we must as has
so often been said in the past, continue to think of all who live
here, not just any one in the community. However, it has become
increasingly difficult to single out a sector of the community
as far as tourism is concerned. Who in the community, which sector
of the community can claim to be unaffected by the vagries of
tourism. As our economy has tumbled I believe many people have
realised, have come to terms with the fact that no-one living
on Norfolk is totally isolated from its major industry, tourism.
The drop in the number of visitors has affected everyone, somehow
or another to some degree or another. Therefore we as community
representatives are obliged to interest ourselves most deeply in
tourism. Bill Sanders is the Executive Member responsible for
tourism. John Brown is the member assisting him in the field of
aviation and Bernie Christian-Bailey is the Executive Member
of the Touris Bureau, the Norfolk Island Government Tourist Bureau
and it is to those gentlemen I believe we should listen most
intently during this debate. There are in my opinion some matters
of principle which need attention. We are currently considering
proposals by a number of airlines, all of a sudden, Norfolk has
become a desirable port of call, not only for airlines but for
cruise ships too and we can go into that at another time. However,
the possibility of cruise ships calling in should be taken into
account if we start talking about tourist numbers such as John
Brown already has because we must take into account the number
of people who are on Norfolk at any time. Is it 25,000 plus those
landing from ships or is perhaps a limit of 1,800 persons on Norfolk
Island per day. I tend to simplify the numbers, justifiably I hope
with... I have been advised that there are approximately 1,300
beds on the Island. We have also been given to understand that
some of the beds are rarely used and some of them are never used
to accommodate visitors to Norfolk Island so for the purpose of the
exercise I would like to cut that figure back to 1,000. It is
an easier number to work with and one which I believe will be pretty
close to the true figure once we establish it. I would like to licence those beds. I would like to draw up the set of minimum standards, a set of qualifications for the beds to be licenced that is probably the number one element in my plan of action. Some ground work has already been done by the N.R.M.A. and the New Zealand equivalent and I would like to get hold of those recommendations if it is possible because I would like to make sure that no visitor to Norfolk Island stays in accommodation which is not up to standard. So let's say we have 1,000 beds, that means 365,000 tourists per day, I beg your pardon, per annum, 365,000 tourists per annum. It is possible, but it is not what anyone in their right mind I believe would want for Norfolk Island so what we have to take into account is the length of stay and that at the moment again for the sake of simplicity in mathematics works out to 10 days, I think it is 9 point something but for the argument let us accept that it is a ten day stay. Well that reduces it, we chop of .noughts, once again we keep the numbers simple and that means we could accept round about 36,000 visitors per annum. That figure is not quite so frightening but to some it is still too many. So take into account the further points that I raised. Not every bed is occupied and most accommodation houses would agree that normal occupancy is between 60 and 80% so let us say that the maximum number of bodies in licenced premises on any given day or night is going to be around 21,900 to 28,000 if you use that method. If you further round that off by taking the halfway figure we are talking about 24,000 visitors and interesting enough that comes up to a number we are pretty familiar with. We know we can handle that and we know that thats just about capacity and that is why I'm so keen to limit accommodation on Norfolk Island. How it is done, whether it is by bed or by unit I don't mind. I think the Accommodation Proprietors Association and our advisers here on the Assembly can assist us to make those decisions. We have been hearing how Air New Zealand wants to bring in 737's and I have had some reservations about supporting that proposal blindly. There is no assurance that we can call the shots at they begin. And just recall for a moment the executive member's reply to my question earlier at this meeting that concerned decisions taken by the airline. I asked him what consultation took place between yourself and the airlines prior to the announcement. I will remind members that his answer was none! Therefore as far as I am concerned what the Assembly must achieve is a controlled situation. Whether the reigns are held firmly by the Tourist Bureau or the Assembly is another matter. The people on Norfolk Island, the ones living here, the ones who know what is good for Norfolk, what is best for Norfolk, not the ones living in Sydney or the ones in Auckland, or anywhere else for that matter, once we are sure that our industry, our industry, is in good hands, we can afford to take from the big operators. Not unless or until we have done that. We know what we are capable of we know what we can handle, lets us know what we can chew before we bite it off. I have spoken of licencing and the limiting of beds or bed numbers and I have an open mind on that. There is almost an automatic parallel one would think - but we should consider licencing all businesses or business houses,
I am not sure, I know that Bernie Christian-Bailey had some thoughts about that. He may bring them forward later in today's debate.

It may well be that not only does the Government have to run its own affairs efficiently or at least attempt to, it has to make everyone else run theirs efficiently too. It's all part and parcel of being Norfolk Island. That's not a new suggestion, it's one that's been around for ages, probably as long as I can remember. So it comes back to a question. Has the time come for the Government to become more closely involved with the most precious industry. Marketing travel and travel destinations is a much less delicate operation than one we now undertake in philatelic areas. How closely should we the Government, the Assembly, be looking at the operation of our Tourist Bureau and I've come to think that we should be looking very closely indeed and ask the question, is the best possible job being done for Norfolk Island. Recently, there was the first of what I hope will become regular meetings of the four airlines servicing Norfolk Island, Qantas, Air New Zealand, Norfolk Island Airlines and East West. The expertise in that room at South Pac is what Norfolk Island needs to guide its industry. I'd like to see more of that kind of co-operation, so let us initiate or our Executive Member be stimulated into initiating that kind of meeting, at the moment we seem, and I stress that seem because I suppose it's only those who are directly involved on the Bureau and the Executive Member who are in a position to truly know, but it seems that we have a number of people doing the same sort of job for us in a number of different ways and a number of different places. Again, Bernie Christian-Bailey has I know, some strong views about a Director of Tourism. I believe that John Brown supports that and the past President of the Chamber of Commerce also supports that, and I must apologize, I haven't caught up with the present one. When I last spoke with Bill Sanders he was undecided but certainly agreed that the concept had merit, so maybe we should get that one sorted out and sorted pretty quickly. It's a job for the Executive Member, perhaps the Assembly, depending on how you see the issue. But to come back to the recommendations of the select committee report, as they may be amended or rephrased in this meeting, they'll form the basis for the establishment of the policy which dictates the future of Norfolk Island's major revenue earning industry, what we talk about here today is vitally important. If the recommendations are accepted as amended as we choose to amend them, then we must formulate the policies necessary to implement the recommendations. The Pitcairn Society has made a point in their submission to the Assembly of highlighting the practical difficulties which would follow on the Assembly's acceptance of the recommendations as we see them and as John Brown has read them and as they were amended by the first Legislative Assembly. For example, the Society asks how do we ensure that all the Legislative Assembly's policies regard Norfolk primarily as the home of its residents and not primarily as a tourist resort. That's something we've all picked up, it's something we all agree with. How do we do it. I believe that the answer to that one in particular is in the licensing of accommodation and of businesses on Norfolk Island. This step may also give us the answer to recommendation number 5 that is to ensure that the benefits of tourism are mostly to the residents. It's another very important one. Priority no. 1. Clean up our own operation here on Norfolk. Licence the accommodation units and limit the number of beds or whatever's decided. I don't express the expertise to sort that one out. The limit on the number of beds, and I'll continue to
use that figure, means that only a certain number of people may be accommodated on Norfolk on any day or night and I see that maximum as 1,000. In some respects, we've been very lucky, we've had our peak year and we know what's comfortable for us. During the year we had I think close to or in excess of 25,000 people. The second priority is the decision about just how far and how deeply this Assembly, the next Assembly, the Government if you wish should involve itself in tourism and how directly. Bernie has views which he'll express about the Director of Tourism and I say again, he's supported by John Brown and Bill Sanders. Minimum standards legislation would be required to implement my suggestion about licensing, I believe that it's very necessary, I believe that it's the first and most urgent area of tourism which requires our attention because it's not until we have our own situation under control that we can make decisions about 737's and cruise ships. I'd like to address matters as they come in the recommendations, Mr. President, but for the moment that's broadly the picture as I see it for Norfolk.

MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: Thank you Mr. President. I'd like to say a few words about tourism in general before we consider the individual recommendation if I may. I should first like to say Mr. President, how pleased I am that this important document is at last before this House for consideration in open session. It represents a milestone in our development because it is a recognition of the importance of tourism as our main industry, but it is also a recognition of the need for government oversight and involvement in the development of this industry. I hope that after today, firm, fair, sensible government policies will evolve in support of our most important industry, tourism. A great deal has been said recently in these somewhat troubled economic times about negative attitudes, well I feel very positive about Norfolk's future. I believe that there are signs of recovery all about us. I believe that the slump in our tourist figures which took many of us by surprise, jolted us out of our complacency and the vigorous efforts we have been putting into promoting our island, are really producing results. Let us hope that we will never become complacent again, even when things appear to be going well. We cannot afford to be greedy, we must give our visitors good value for their money and we, as a government, must play a strong role in promoting and steering the development of our tourist industry. We must remember that this report is two years old, although much of it is relevant today. The policies we formulate today must reflect the conditions of 1983 and indeed, as far into the future as we can sensibly predict. Mr. President I predict that the advent of the F28 jet from Australia, the possible introduction of 737 jets from New Zealand, and also, the potential introduction of services from other destinations, will all have a profound effect on the numbers of people designed to holiday on Norfolk Island, in fact within a couple of years, we could be seriously looking at ways of restricting numbers. Therefore, Mr. President the policies we formulate will need to be clear, firm and sensible, I see this Assembly in future, having to withstand tremendous pressures from commercial interests, many of them from outside the island, therefore, now is the time for us to decide firmly on the direction we wish to follow. That
is not to say that we should not be flexible, as conditions and trends change, the government should beware of them. This is where the Tourist Bureau must continue to play an active role and keep the government advised. I have spoken before about the need of a Director of Tourism and I'll be speaking further on this at a later stage. However, such a person being a professional in his field would be the best one to advise the government through the Tourist Bureau on the directions we should be following in order to cope with the changing situations. I strongly support that we adopt this report at least in principle, because unless we have some policy as a government, we will have to cope with disastrous effects of individual greed, haphazard development, undesirably commercial pressures from outside and in general, we will see more of the bad effects of tourism than the good, but I stress that this should only be a starting point. Start off an active and ongoing involvement by this Assembly in our tourist industry to ensure that this industry is for the maximum benefit of all people of this island.

MR. PRESIDENT: Further debate Honourable Members in respect of the overall procedure before we commence to address the individual sections.

MR. JACKSON: Mr. President, I would like to just clarify one point that Mrs. Grey in her comments on the situation of taking on the big operators. I think her words was "once we control our own business that then we'll be able to take on the big operators" well I wonder can she qualify whether she meant the bigger planes such as the 737's or she has indicated that is the case. Well I believe that those persons who has the aeroplanes the airport has been upgraded to support are coming in the fore, their coming the fore now I've been told that there is a meeting tomorrow morning by an official from the New South Wales Airlines and we heard last weekend where there was an airline from Melbourne who indicated that they have the plane that is conditioned to fly to the airport to the degree that has been upgraded to. Now it shocks me to hear a statement then we'll take on the big operators, that's the super jets, without one comment in either Mrs. Grey's report or Mr. Christian-Bailey's report on our situation as far as water supply and sewerage, it also frightens me to think that we have as Mrs. Grey said we have 1322 beds at the time of this recommendation, and if those beds were 70% occupied, we'd accommodate 37,530 tourists a year and Mrs. Grey has reduced it somewhat down to 1,000 which she said would accommodate 36,000. Well I do believe that in debates leading up to the upgrading of the airport, the numerous meetings that was held throughout the island in Rawson Hall, that in no way would many of the people on this island supported the upgrading of the airport if some understanding hasn't been given that the floodgates would not be open and only planes the service that plane would be the two planes that's been recommended that's the F28 and the VAC146. We've heard that New Zealand wishes to fly 737's. It's only recently that I believe from the Minister responsible for transport that they have made application. Now for two years they stayed dormant, they never made application
for a plane to fly to Norfolk Island to meet the conditions that the airport has been upgraded to accommodate. It's only just recently, perhaps through pursuance and we have aircraft carriers that are prepared within the limits to use our airport to the state that they've been upgraded to, and I'm disappointed that nothing has been said about the most important thing that confronts us on this island, with raising the rate to a degree of above the 1980 tourist figures without certain recommendation along the lines I've said of something similar of what happened in the Dengue fever days, could happen again, and then what would happen. I take particular notice of recommendation 2 in the report. Recommendation 2 to me is one of the key and I say one of the key because the whole index has some very important role to play also. Recommendation 2 states that they ensure that all it's policies regard Norfolk Island primarily as a home of its residents and not primarily as a tourist resort. Now that in itself gives some guarantee to persons who has this island at heart and does not wish it to be turned into a tourist monopsonise, let's not wish it to be, the floodgates to be opened does not wish to see these big operators that Mrs. Grey has expressed and then Norfolk Island would, I would say that tourist come to Norfolk Island mainly to enjoy the beauty of the environment and the relaxed and friendly way of life on the island and it is these qualities which we should maintain to preserve and by doing that, the residents of today will ensure that Norfolk Island will remain a tourist attraction. When we look at what's been the pride of Norfolk Island over the years, of airfares, and I would add now, we could scream in this Assembly in this room in this chamber until we are blue in the face we never reduce the airfares as far as East West are concerned unless we get a competition. When you pick up a brochure that has been put out in the amalgamation between Norfolk Island Booking Centre and East West Airlines you will see how Norfolk Island residents are being discriminated against compared to tourists. We find that tourist can fly to Norfolk Island return, stay at a motel, bed and breakfast cheaper than a person can fly to Sydney and return. We find that in luxury suites, dinner, bed and breakfast they also can stay cheaper than a resident can fly and return to Sydney. We find at a hotel all meals are provided, all meals are provided for $529 for six days and five nights, and may I add, the normal fare return to residents of this island to Sydney and back is $529.00 return, the off peak fare is $486 return, the peak fare is $578 return. Now who is getting the benefit out of these airlines when in package deals tourists can come here. For that price it would cost Mr. and Mrs. Citizen and Resident of Norfolk Island a peak fare of $578 return and yet they can come and stay for up to 8 days and 7 nights cheaper than Mr. and Mrs. Resident of Norfolk Island can fly and return to Norfolk Island. So there we are, and sometimes in these package deals, tourists are included and other facilities are included. So I would say that something if we can't encourage tourists to this island under those fares, well we must start doing something about it because, here it is, last year was one of our worst years and this brochure was current for all last year, so I would suggest we may have to look at other areas instead of our old method of duty free shopping, duty free shopping may have been an attraction some eight to ten years ago when tourists got value for their money but it appears that it's finished, it's gone because of certain conditions, certain conditions has changed
and that is mainly because of high air freight or high sea freight and of because tourist can purchase duty free goods in their own country. Now that never existed some 8 or 10 years ago, it's a new thing that come in, but getting back to what I said about this package deal what tourists can use and Agents or someone issues it out to them compared to a resident's fare, something's wrong somewhere. Many factors has been stated because of our downturn tourism. It's been stated that the economic situation within our immediate surroundings of New Zealand and Australia has caused that economic downturn. I do not regard as the main source of the downturn. I do believe that if a proper assessment and proper conclusions were to be got at this document, I'm aware, I was part of that first Assembly that endorsed the majority or 97% of the recommendation. In this document, submissions has been placed before us in the 8 past, everyone appears to be vying for one step ahead of the other. The A.P.A. and other Chamber of Commerce, other business say we want to unload it on to someone else, we should pay this, the others are not paying enough, the tour operators are not paying enough. Someone else is paying too much. Don't put more levy on us but I do believe a fair and realistic method of a levy will be the only result and the only way that we will come to grips with this important document, and I say it's important because I endorsed it at the time and same as the unanimous decision in the House but when we find such things as of the number of beds that's on the island, that can accommodate 70% occupied, and 70% is not much but it's a lot to the proprietors but would accommodate the 37,500 tourists. The Pitcairn Society's recommendation, I take particular note of their recommendation because one of their points and they made a specific statement outlining all their various recommendations and the reasons and I support the majority of them but in one supplementary report; they use Lord Howe Island as an example. Now we have all heard of Lord Howe Island by many residents, by many visitors that's been to Lord Howe and return by many residents from Lord Howe who has come here and returned, by many coming bodies who has gone to Lord Hose and returned to Norfolk Island and nothing but praise has been heaped on the Lord Howe lifestyle, the Lord Howe method of their accommodation and their prospects of closing down every three months, their only open 9 months of the year and they're quite satisfied with the intake of tourism but the real point why I drew was that the Pitcairn Society mentioned Lord Howe in their report and they stated Norfolk Island suffers severely in comparison with Lord Howe Island in such matters and the such matters are with regard to the means by which tourism is currently encouraged, we believe that there is an excessive emphasis on overseas promotion to the detriment of putting our own house in order and this should be remedied in future. We would note the extent of litter throughout the island, the continued construction of eye-sore buildings and the ugliness of Burnt Pine Commercial Centre for example. Now, once again, Lord Howe Island has been used as an example, and I do believe that if we set about and do exactly that by putting our house in order here on this island by cleaning up our recreation area, not only for tourists might I remind the House but for the residents also, and then in that way we may be able to attract tourists that would be looking, not for the old fashioned method as they have come to Norfolk Island previously before of looking for cheap duty free purchases, but they will come for what I've expressed to enjoy the beauty and the environment and it is these qualities which we must maintain and I do believe
if we maintain these qualities, we will cement a future for the tourists who will wish to come to Norfolk Island.

MR. QUINTAL: Thank you Mr. President. As time is going on and it is getting quite late, I will only say very few words. We all agree that the tourist trade is our main money earner, and without tourism Norfolk Island would change considerably. In the early days, Norfolk was a beautiful place to live in and people lived as a big family. Everyone helped one another. Life was quite hard but a lot happier place than it is today. I am sure that very few persons would want to go back to the old days - the good old days when we had to put up with a lot of hardship, we didn't have washing machines or the modern facilities that we have today. When Norfolk's tourists were at its top level or highest peak, the island enjoyed a form of prosperity that was quite good, and when a community is prosperous, people seem to be happier. At present we are having an economic problem and people are worried. I feel that if we can improve the facilities and get our tourist figures back through improved accommodation and lower airfares, and I do feel that there are a lot of things that we could do to improve the life of the tourists on the island, and that is a more friendlier attitude by everyone and I think it's bad that some people of the island when they see tourists they pass nasty remarks at them and I hope this will cease because it's not good and people do not enjoy that sort of a set up. Mr. Jackson mentioned about cleaning the island up, I do agree wholeheartedly and I think we all agree that the island needs a real good tidying up. The Pitcairn Society used to take it in their hands and clear the place up nearly every year but of late they have not been doing this and cleanliness, I think is one of the main things. I feel with the upgrading of the airstrip to the standard it is upgraded to, I will always support any local industry, but I do feel that the airstrip, they have made a very beautiful job the upgrading and it is capable of accommodating quite a number of new planes, and as the 737's will be coming to the island very soon, I am wondering if the 737's might not be a good plane for Norfolk. The airstrip has been built to that the landing takes place a lot further away from the Chapel. I would hate to see the Chapel, the windows in the Chapel cracked or destroyed in any way by the 737's. We have had a 737 before and it didn't seem to crack anything at all. If we did accept and allow some 737's to come to Norfolk, may be one a week or something like that, if it will mean that we would get more tourists or build up the tourist figures, and also to offset the airfares, the fares that are so high, I think we should consider and look at that angle also in the future. I would feel that it's a very good thing that this report has come to the Assembly and is not before time and I think it's a very good report and the Pitcairn Society has spent a lot of time going through the whole paper, I think they had three meetings and I would support the report.

MR. BROWN: Mr. President, the last year's been a very interesting year for tourism in Norfolk Island. This Assembly has quite solidly backed tourism and quite solidly supported it, and when I talk of this Assembly I'm sure that I talk of every single member of this Assembly. Whenever there has been a meeting at which East West Airlines has been present for example, I've normally seen Mr. Jackson there, I've normally
seen Miss Buffett there. On the occasions when each individual Member has been able to attend any of the tourism oriented meetings to which Assembly Members have been invited, there has been a very strong roll-up, and my recollection is that each of the members of this Assembly has at different times expressed quite strong support for the tourist industry but within bounds. I certainly wouldn't like to see the tourist industry get out of control and spoil this island. I very strongly support the first two recommendations, the recommendation that we recognize tourism as the basis for the economy, but also the recommendation that we ensure that all of our policies in regard to tourism, regard Norfolk Island primarily as the home of its residents and not primarily as a tourist resort. I think those are important and probably, I support the vast majority of the recommendations of the select committee report, but I would certainly not support any endeavour to throw open the floodgates to any unlimited number of tourists. I said that the last year had been interesting as far as tourism is concerned. This Assembly has granted to the Tourist Bureau, far more money than the Bureau has ever had in one year in the past. Members will recall that when this Assembly was first elected, we quickly allocated some additional funds to the Tourist Bureau to allow them to get on with the job, and in last year's budget, we allocated $30,000 for the running of the Visitors Information Centre and a record $80,000 for promotion. The Tourist Bureau, during the last year, has done a lot of work. It has spent a lot of money. Various surveys have been done, various consultants have been engaged by the Tourist Bureau to fulfil different functions, the airlines have been encouraged and the tour wholesalers have been encouraged to energetically and efficiently promote the island, rather than simply sit back enjoying the commissions that might be earned by default and the Tourist Bureau has taken a very active part in marketing Norfolk Island. Now I don't pretend that what the Tourist Bureau has done is absolutely the best job that could possibly have been done because in this world, very little is absolutely perfect, but I believe that all of the members of the Tourist Bureau, have during the last year really put their best endeavours into what they believe were the interests of developing tourism in Norfolk Island. I strongly believe, as does Mr. Christian-Bailey that it is time for us to appoint a Director of Tourism. Tourism is a very important basis of the economy in Norfolk Island. It's something which should not be left to simply a part-time tourist bureau, and it is something which is far too large to be totally handled by the Executive Member with responsibility. It needs one very competent person with a responsibility to the Executive Member who can guide the future development of tourism in this island. It needs a person who totally understands the industry, who totally understands how to get the best possible value for every dollar that is spent, who totally understands why it is that a tourist decides to go to one particular place instead of another, and who totally understands how to get at that tourist when he's in the middle of the decision making process, and convince him that Norfolk Island's a pretty good place to come. It needs a person who understands how travel agencies work and understands how airlines work. It has to be a person who understands just how we can go about making the job as easy as possible for the Travel Agent because Travel Agents, with all due respect to them,
are to some extent, lazy people, they are very busy and they
will pick the easiest way of going about their job. If to sell
a holiday to Norfolk Island is going to take two hours of their
time, but to sell a holiday to Fiji will only take ten minutes,
they will push their customer in favour of Fiji. There are many
reasons why a Director of Tourism is necessary in Norfolk Island
at this time. I think that that is one improvement that the
next Assembly may be able to bring to Tourism. But certainly,
I believe that this Assembly has done a very sound job during
its year of office. Tourist numbers peaked at about 25,000 in
1980. They then started to go downhill and to go downhill very
rapidly. My recollection of the figures for the 1982 calendar
year were that we had somewhere around 15,800 tourists for the
year, compared to almost 25,000 number in 1980, but with the work
that this Assembly has done and with the work that the Tourist
Bureau has done in the last year, it does seem that we've managed
to turn the tide. We saw in February, the tourist numbers from
every destination increased over tourist numbers in February last
year. March is looking to be a very successful month, compared to
last year, and with the assistance of the rotary convention in
early April, there is every indication that April will be a very
successful one. This Assembly bought in a flat 6% customs duty,
which although it had the effect of imposing for the first time,
duty on some items, also had the effect of making a considerable
change in the attractiveness of shopping in Norfolk Island, and
once again, if one stands at the airport when an aircraft is departing
you can see tourists departing with fairly substantial shopping bags.
A year ago, that had stopped. There was not a lot of shopping being
done, but it is the case that in my observation at least, people are
starting to shop in Norfolk Island again. I think that it's also
the case the the amount of shopping they are doing in duty free
stores on the mainland before coming to Norfolk Island, is decreasing,
and I certainly hope that we will be putting to an end the practice
of some persons who are shopping in Australia, sending their goods
by freight to Norfolk Island, leaving the goods in bond in Norfolk
Island, and then having the shopping which has never touched the
soil of Norfolk Island other than the Customs shed, returned to
Sydney to be picked up there. There is value in the maximum possible
amount of shopping being done in Norfolk Island and I believe that as
a result of the promotion that has been done, and as a result of the
introduction of the 6% flat duty, we are seeing a reversal in the
down-turn in tourist shopping in Norfolk Island, and if we do manage
to continue the present trend of the numbers turning back up again,
we will quickly find that the stores will again be purchasing their
goods in reasonable volume and the Customs Duty in reasonable amounts
will be starting to flow into the Administration again. And we'll
all benefit from that. So I think that we have achieved a lot in the
last year, we've done it in some cases, quietly; in other cases
there's been a lot of argument but it's been done, and I believe
that we are now starting to see the fruits of it. I believe it's
now starting to work, and if the next Assembly follows along the
lines we've taken and proves in some areas, I believe that we can
within a reasonably short period of time, get back to the kind of
prosperity that we saw in 1980, but I do agree with Mr. Christian-
Bailey that one of the first things that will have to be done is
to appoint a Director of Tourism to properly guide our marketing
efforts at the least possible cost. A lot can be done for very
little money and I believe that's the way we should be doing it.
There will be any number of Consultants waiting for us on the shores
of Australia and New Zealand, who believethat for an appropriate fee they can solve all of our problems. I don't believe that's the direction to go and I don't believe Mr. Jackson does either. Mr. Jackson has made reference to airfares and he has said we can scream until we're blue in the face and we'll never see reduced airfares until there's competition. Well sadly that has certainly been the case until now. We have been promised on different occasions that the introduction of medium jet aircraft will allow that to change, I share Mr. Jackson's scepticism but I certainly hope that it will change, I hope that we'll see cheaper fares because there is no doubt that when you're talking of a holiday destination, price sells, and even if a fare is only reduced by $25.00, it does make a difference to the market. Mr. Jackson referred to the fact that the moment a person can come to Norfolk Island for a week's holiday for less moneh than a Norfolk Island person has to spend in order to go to the mainland and come back again. I agree with Mr. Jackson that that's an unsatisfactory situation. However, we continue to be given all kinds of reasons for that situation existing and it may even be the case that we're lucky that East West is silly enough to offer such packages at cheaper than the normal fare because it may be that if they had thought it out properly, those cheaper packages would not have been offered and our tourist numbers would have been lower than they are now. I don't wish to add anything further in general Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you Mr. Brown. Honourable Members do you have any further matters to debate in the general picture. Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: I just want to make a couple of short comments about the list of recommendations. There are 20 of them. To my mind is one of the people who was on the Committee, I think the first five recommendations are different in their nature from all the others. First five recommendations are an attempt to set out the broad basic attitude that the Committee felt should be taken about tourism permanently from now on. If the Assembly agreed essentially on those, and the first Assembly had a question about number 3, then all the rest of the recommendations are ways of accomplishing what's set out in the first five recommendations. The first five recommendations are first of all to recognize that we depend on tourism fundamentally. Secondly, that this is a place where Norfolk people live basically, and not basically a tourist resort. Thirdly, that there should be a relationship between the number of tourists and the number of residents, fourthly that there's good and bad about tourism and fifthly, a greedy one, tourism ought to benefit Norfolk. It shouldn't benefit overseas companies or be good for the world economy, it ought to be basically good for people to live here. Those five recommendations set down a philosophy toward tourism which I think will work. Times will change. Times will be good. Times will be bad but I think those are views on tourism that this Assembly and future Assemblies can if they choose to, adopt and live with permanently to the island's advantage. I simply wanted to draw the special nature of those first five recommendations.
MR. SANDERS: Mr. President. Do you wish to move on along the track as Mr. Howard said the first five are basic, the first six actually all except from the Accommodation Proprietors have agreed, there's the Chamber of Commerce, the Accommodation Proprietors, the Pitcairn Society and the Norfolk Island Tourist Bureau have agreed to the first six of the recommendations, other than the Accommodation Proprietors, they did not agree with No. 3 which is to relate future tourist growth to resident population as a percentage not exceeding the present figures.

MR. PRESIDENT: Would you like to address numbers 1 to 5 as a collective group.

MR. SANDERS: Could I just on behalf of the Accommodation Proprietors, give their reasons for not agreeing with number 3.

MR. BROWN: Mr. President I think some of the members of this table may have difficulties with No. 3 also but if it's of any assistance to you, I have no difficulty with 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 and I think most of us are in the same position.

MR. PRESIDENT: There may be a situation where without any difficulty, members may wish to express their views about it so may be I shouldn't go along too quickly if that can be understood by Members.

MR. SANDERS: How are you going to attack it just do 1 and see if everybody agrees.

MISS BUFFETT: With the placing of the recommendation I do position them differently to that which is positioned at the moment. Will that be taken into consideration or, for instance I've placed No. 2 as No. 1 and I've placed No. 5 as No. 2.

MR. PRESIDENT: In calling them in the order that is mentioned in the recommendations, I didn't interpret that they were necessarily in order of priority but if members of the original committee may wish to give a view upon that.

MR. HOWARD: I think they were set out in a sequence that seemed logical to the Committee as an order of which to address things, and there may be some reflection of priority there but it certainly was not on the basis that No. 1 is the most important and No. 2 is next important and so on and I would think that if we tried to assign priorities all the way down the list, we would add immensely to the difficulty of the debate.

MR. PRESIDENT: It's not a matter that I would encourage at half past five this afternoon.
MISS BUFFETT: The comment I add here that I too was involved in the first Assembly discussion of this and arrival at the policies, but I just wanted to make that point.

MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you. So may we go through the points on the understanding that they are not necessarily numbered in basis of priority but listed for ease of addressing the matter.

MR. HOWARD: Without wanting to get into priorities all the way down the list I would like to say that if Miss Buffett and others feel that point No. 2 ought to be at the top of the list whether it's priority or not, I certainly wouldn't object to that. I think it's a tremendously important thing and I think we could easily just switch those first two and maybe leave it at that if that's helpful.

MR. PRESIDENT: Then let us continue Honourable Members and I call the first one which says "recognized tours and its the basis of the economy. Debate upon that.

MR. JACKSON: Mr. President, I have no objection to get through it one by one. I have no objection to the recommendation of 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6, which seems to be the first block. I'm prepared to vote on each recommendation.

MR. PRESIDENT: Can I just point out Mr. Jackson that there have been a number of thoughts put forward that people find 1 to xyz acceptable but they may not all coincide and the only realy way I have of ensuring that each person has the opportunity of addressing each, is for me to call each one and so I would continue to do that so we're on the first one.

MR. SANDERS: I support No. 1.

MRS. GREY: Mr. President, it may be of interest to those listening to us to note that the four submissions which were made by organizations within the community, the Chamber of Commerce, the A.P.A., the Norfolk Island Government Tourist Bureau and the Pitcairn Society also, and I'm happy to do this as you work through if you wish, support the recommendation NO. 1.

MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: I certainly support recommendation No. 1 Mr. President. I believe the first two recommendations of the Select Committee are two of the most important in the report, that we all depend on tourism has been strongly demonstrated recently when even the public sector suffered as a result of a drop in tourist numbers.

MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you. Further debate on the first point. Miss Buffett, thank you, Mr. Jackson, yes thank you, Mr. Quintal, thank you. Right, no further debate on the first point thank you.
I'll read it just to ensure that it's clear. Ensure that all its policies regard Norfolk primarily as the home of its residents and not primarily as a tourist resort. Debate Honourable Members.

MR. CHRISTIAN BAILEY: I support this recommendation most strongly Mr. President. All government policy in respect of tourism should be framed with this recommendation in view. It is not a contradiction to recommendation 1 because of the things that we as residents value the most, for example, our present relaxed lifestyle and the natural beauty of the island are the very things that have made Norfolk an attractive place to visitors. Therefore, we should concentrate on preserving the essential character of Norfolk, its peacefulness, the hospitality of its people and our natural historic assets. Then Norfolk Island would not only remain a good place to live but a good place to visit.

MRS. GREY: Once again, the organization I mentioned on point 1 support this No. 2 recommendation Mr. President.

MR. SANDERS: I also support it.

MR. HOWARD: I'd like to make some comment about it. I don't want to reach forward into No. 3 but there is a relationship between No. 2 and No. 3 that some people may not have thought through. There's no point just resolving pretty words here and expressing flowery feelings, unless there is meaning in what we're saying. Mrs. Grey I think it was, said that the Society of Pitcairners said "how are you going to ensure that it remains the home of the people that live here primarily" now if you go back to the body of the report on that particular question, ensuring that this remains the home of its people primarily and not primarily a tourist resort, the supporting argument that led up to that conclusion dealt with the relationship of the transient population to the permanent population and the committee concluded that on a simple statistical basis, it is arguable that Norfolk Island would be primarily a holiday resort and only secondarily a place for the people of Norfolk Island to live, if the transient population measured in numbers on the island at any time were to exceed 50%. In other words, that's one of the key ways that the committee was measuring the reality of that phrase. Is it primarily the home of the people who live here or is it primarily a tourist resort and the committee said, if on a given day, more than half the people on the island are transients, then may be it's become primarily a tourist resort and only secondarily a place where people live. In 1980 with 24,000 tourists or so the proportion of the population on the average through the year was 60% residents, 40% transients so we're getting not too far away from it being 50-50. The committee felt if you crossed that 50-50 line, its then no longer primarily
the home of its residents, it's primarily a tourist resort so there is a relationship between the number of tourists on the island and the number of transients on the island and the number of permanent residents. By transients we included the holders of temporary entry permits who apparently did not intend staying on the island, people who were genuinely here for a year or six months or something and then shooting through. We included in the permanent population the T.E.P. holders who apparently wanted to stay here permanently so when you talk about it being primarily the home of its residents, the Committee says to you "there's a mathematical way of measuring that which is important. I support very strongly this recommendation No. 2 that it should be primarily the home of its people.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. President. It is at this point in reply to Mr. Howard that I would say, it is most essential that any Assembly handling this matter ensure irrespective of figures of tourists that the policies that are formulated within this Assembly, ensure that Norfolk Island is primarily the home of its people, so that the industry supports residents and not vice-versa.

MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you. Further participation in the debate. No. "Right well we'll continue to No. 3.

MR. HOWARD: Do we agree Mr. Buffett.

MR. PRESIDENT: No, but there's not a vote taken on each but I gather that each Member has the opportunity to express their view so in fact it records and the following steps can be taken in accordance no doubt with whatever evolves out of that because I only have one motion in front of the House as you will realize. Now I move to the next one Honourable Members No. 3., and I will read it "relate future tourist growth to resident population as a percentage not exceeding the present figure. Debate. Mr. Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. President. The Accommodation Proprietors Association do not agree with No. 3 if I may read what I have on it. "We agree that the concept of endeavouring to maintain a relationship between population and tourist numbers (subsection 3) could provide a useful guideline for planning purposes. It should however be realized that a future decline in population may be the result of factors in no way connected with tourism and if so, it would be no advantage to the economy to endeavour to restrict the tourist industry. I support the opinion of the Accommodation Proprietors, I disagree with Mr. Ed Howard that the figures should be related to the population on Norfolk Island, so I do not support No. 3.

MISS BUFFETT: May I ask Mr. Howard why the main reason for his proposal in this - you and Mr. McIntryre. Please, if he would answer it, it doesn't matter if he can't.
MR. PRESIDENT: Would you like to call Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: Sure. Sure. As the report says, the committee felt that transient people take a different view of a place than the permanent residents do. In our discussions I made an example that we talked about. If you're a person passing through, and you want to build a Bar-B-Q and you can't find any timber, you'd break a branch off a tree and that gives you a Bar-B-Q and you're gone. If you live nearby, you look at that tree every day as you go by; you don't rip the branch off because you like that tree. Now that's maybe an over-simplification of it. We believe that people who permanently live in a place, care more about it, have different kinds of interests than the people who are just passing through. The people who are passing through, look for an amusing, different refreshing kind of a holiday or a way to pass a bit of time but their attitude towards the place is different, and what they want out of it is different than the permanent people would. Our feeling as a committee was that if Norfolk gets to the point, let's suppose the 1980 proportions were reversed. Suppose the population of the island were 1500 people, and suppose on the average, there were 2500 tourists on the island each day, our feeling was that that would have change Norfolk Island from being primarily a place where people live to be primarily a place where tourists flood in and have a good time and shoot through and we thought it was desirable that the number of residents always be more than the number of tourists. Now I take the point that A.P.A. make. If in some future generation, if a lot of residents want to move away from the island because are crook but you can attract tourists anyway, I don't think that you'd want to cut down the number of tourists at that point, and I would expect an Assembly of that day to modify this particular view, but assuming that the population doesn't go down, assume that the population either stays where it is or increases, the committee's view was that the total number of tourists should be allowed to grow and grow only as the number of residents increased, that partly was a reflection of the point that Miss Buffett was making which is that the tourist industry ought to be a support for the residents, if you have more residents, you need more tourists to support them and the committee felt that if the residential number is increased, yes let tourist numbers increase as well, but simply to increase tourism and increase and increase it while the residential number stays the same, we were afraid that would before very long, tip the scale and it would be a place mostly full of tourists and only secondarily for the people that lived here. Does that explain it.

MR. BROWN: Thank you Mr. President. The question of numbers of tourists is a question that concerns a lot of people. It was a question that was quite widely debated in the period leading up to the decision to upgrade the airport. Many people were of the view that the upgrading of the airport would lead to more and more pressure from Accommodation Proprietors to increase their number of beds so that they could make happy the airlines who would be wanting to increase their number of flights and the airlines would be very persuasive because they would be saying "look we realize that we promised fare reductions if the airport
was upgraded but what we hand't taken into account was that our daily service would reduce to one that only went twice a week. We've really got to get up to a daily service before we can offer you fair reductions. There are all kind of problems that were considered by people at the time, and words used by Mr. McIntyre in this House on 15th October, 1981, I think were quite relevant. When he said "In the absence of control, we haveno answer to anybody who criticizes the new airport on the ground that it represents the floodgates of tourism. We've no answer to anybody who asks us how we intend to protect our environment and our island and it's beauty from an excess of visitors; How we intend to provide the facilities that would be necessary if 37,000 people suddenly came to the island in terms of water supply and sewerage and matters of that kind. We would have no answer at the moment, therefore, the Government is staying with the policy outlined in the statement and the controls specifically referred to there, and the freeze on accommodation is one of them" He went on. It was obvious then, there has to be a limit put on tourist numbers. If we were to allow tourist numbers to increase in proportion to an increase in residential numbers, we could end up with a very substantial increase in tourist numbers, that we couldn't do much about. We can control population numbers to some extent through our immigration policies but only to some extent. The first Assembly had difficulty in accepting this recommendation. It decided not to accept it at that time. I accept what Mr. Howard has said that this recommendation does tie in substantially with the previous recommendation, but unless this recommendation were to be widened to add words to the effect, but so that the total tourist numbers using accommodation do not exceed $25,000 per year based on present bed nights, and perhaps go a little further and make provision for a factor to apply in the event that bed nights decrease, unless we were to do that, I feel that we should not at this stage accept the third recommendation. I indicated earlier that I did not believe that if average bed nights reduced by one half we should double our allowable number of tourists. It may be that if bed nights reduced by one half, we would be safe in increasing by 25% our number of tourists. I don't have an ideal factor to put before the House but I believe that that is something that would need to be investigated and would need to be agreed upon and that those things should be included in recommendation No. 3 before it is accepted by the House.

MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: Thank you Mr. President. I believe that unless we are able to control our tourist numbers to the desired levels, our present living standards on Norfolk Island could well be at stake. I therefore support this recommendation but with some reservations. We may well be able to support the larger number of tourists as a percentage of our residents population, Lord Howe has shown that it can be done, we may need to re-think what is our desired level of resident population with a much larger population the costs of Administration Services, sewerage and water reticulation electricity to name a few services that people have come to expect and take for granted, could be shared among more people, and therefore, be less of a burden.
MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. President.
I reckon that we would have no difficulty in controlling
tourist numbers, so long as the airport is never classed
as unlimited for 737's and for the P28's. While ever there's
not a tower there, dispensation would have to be given by the
Department and I believe with the co-operation from the Depart-
ment, we could control the amount of flights, which in turn
would control the amount of people.

MR. HOWARD: I totally disagree with what
Mr. Sanders said, up until the last couple of words. He said,"with co-operation from the Department, we could control", now
that's a very big "if". Are we going to get co-operation from
the Department. I hope we will. I hope we will. We are
certainly getting far more co-operation from the Department
of Aviation in the past six months than ever the island had
before. I think the fact that there is people applying for
the Brisbane to Norfolk run and the Department of Aviation
is telling them, the Department will not make a decision until
it knows what the Norfolk Island Government thinks, is terrific,
I think that's an immense step forward, but if you think that
airport with P28s coming to it, can't provide more tourists
than we want, then you'd better get your calculator out. If
you start flying two or three full P28's in there every day and
if you start flying the 737 every day from New Zealand, you're
going to have 75,000 100,000 tourists. We can be inundated.
The airport is not a restriction, it is not a limitation.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. President.
With reference to the letter from the Department that said
that unlimited P28 flights was something like 70 a week,
obviously we don't want that, and unlimited 737's was 40
per week. My understanding of the matter is that Air New
Zealand only require 2 not 40, and while they was on
dispensation and the same applied for the P28's, I believe
that we could control, with the co-operation of the Department.

MR. BROWN: Mr. President, I agree with
Mr. Howard, anyone who thinks the airport offers us a means
of controlling tourist numbers to Norfolk Island, is in my
view, a long way from being correct. Many people, prior to
the upgrading of the airport, took the view that the airport
in it's previous form was one of the best protections that we
had, and once the airport is up and able to accept larger
aircraft in whatever numbers they may come, there would be
inevitable suggestion that we should allow more and more flights,
and inevitably, unless we find some other means of control, the
upgraded airport itself would be the cause of our downfall. I
realize that the Department has written to Mr. Sanders and given
him a definition of unlimited, but many less than 40 flights of
a 737 would create disaster as far as Norfolk Island is concerned
in my view, and many less than 70 flights of an P28 would
create similar disaster. I cannot see that we will ever be able
to exercise sufficient control over the airport to control the
number of tourists that come here. How's any Assembly in the
future faced by an airline executive who says "listen, I'm going
to have to put my fares up by 30% unless you let me double my number of flights" how is any Assembly Member in that position going to easily say no. He's going to have a terrible amount of pressure put on him. I think that we need a lot of controls other than the airport. Sure, if we can get sufficient co-operation from the Department of Aviation to enable us to have control over numbers at the airport, that would be wonderful, but I think that the likelihood of that is very remote and I think that if we go back and have a look at the evidence of just one airline, we look at the evidence of just East West Airlines to Sir John Nimmo's Royal Commission, East West suggested at that time that they intended bringing 40,000 tourists a year to Norfolk Island by 1980, they didn't manage to do so but that was their intention then and it was not until recent weeks that East West has indicated that they are even interested in listening to this Assembly's view that tourist numbers will need to be controlled once they start to rise again. If East West has another change of management at some stage in the future, we may well be back to East West's earlier views, 40,000 a year just out of Sydney alone. I don't know what the views of Air New Zealand are, I don't know what the views of any of the other airlines who are presently making application to come to the Island are. The airport is a tremendous danger to us, we need to have other ways of solving the problem.

MR. HOWARD: I want to try a little harder to see if I can't put this recommendation No. 3 in a little better perspective. The hardest and the biggest question that was put to the Select Committee was "what is the desirable level of tourism on Norfolk Island". We wrestled and wrestled with that. We listened to dozens and dozens of people giving us their views and here's what the Committee finally had to say on what the desirable level of tourism on Norfolk Island is. First of all, the Committee said "the desirable level cannot be measured exactly by any single statistic but should be judged" and I stress the word judged and that means by the Tourist Bureau of the Day by the Assembly of the Day, it should be judged in terms of total tourist numbers, the average length of stay, tourist density at any particular time and the level of tourists spending on the island, in other words, the Committee felt that if tourists start spending less and less, maybe you want to have a little bit more tourism to make up for that, or if tourists start spending very well, maybe you don't quite need quite so many of them. We thought there was some connection there. The Committee went on to say "the Government should do nothing to reduce tourism below that level, the Government should take an active role in seeing that tourism is promoted if it tends to fall below that level". Now that was at a time when we had not idea that there was a drop coming, but the committee said "if it does drop, promote it back up to that 1980 level of about 24,000", then the Committee said "further growth in tourism may be harmful". The Government should monitor trends watchfully and it should make reasonable steps that are available to restrain rapid growth. Now at the time of the report, about 1500 permanent residents, about 24,000 tourists for the year, about 900 transients on the island on a given day, the Committee felt that ratio is about right. If in the future, the residential base should grow because future Assemblies want it to grow, then maybe there's an argument for increasing the total number of transients on the island and letting tourism grow even more, but the committee's feeling was while population remained
at about 1500 permanent people, tourism shouldn't be allowed
to go much beyond 24,000, and we saw a connection between the
two and I still think that connection's important. I think if
you let go of that and say "what the hell, let's promote as
many tourists as we can", we'll swamp the place and it'll be
a holiday resort, that's what it will be.

MR. JACKSON: Mr. President. Here we are
debating a very important question of control on tourism.
Listening to the debate, I must agree with Mr. Brown and
Mr. Howard, that this clause does give control to the growth
of tourism. Mr. Sanders opinion was an open slather and I
wholeheartedly disagree with it. We are also placing a freeze
in some way to hold the tourism back to the level of 1980.
Now in appendix 5 and 1, and I'm only using this as an example
of control on tourism Mr. President, continue the freeze on
tourist accommodation. Now the Members of this Assembly are
fully aware of many comments I've made on this particular clause,
because we are giving protection to those who operate in the
tourist departments now. I'm happy to support that clause,
while the freeze continues because it's a means of controlling
tourists and recommendation 3 does exactly the same thing.
I also agree with Mr. Howard that if tourism drops, well you
promote it up again, but if once again we see where the present
accommodation with 70% can accommodate 37,500 tourists, if we
open the floodgates on No. 3, well in no way, in no way as Mr.
Brown has indicated that in the debates leading to the
upgrading of the airport was ever that indication given because
if any indication had have been given that this unrestricted
flights and unrestricted tourists coming to the island, well
certainly, the residents would have stepped in but these
recommendations as I see number 3 clearly, as a means of
controlling tourist growth and keeping it at the level, at the
level, a reasonable level that has been recommended to the 1980
level. With any relaxation in any way, any relaxation in the
lifting the freeze of the tourist accommodation, any relaxation
on number 3, and making open slather for unlimited aircraft to
land at the airport well that in respect will be opening the
floodgates with the influx of tourists that this island cannot
accommodate.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. President.
I think Mr. Jackson is having difficulty with his hearing
again. He says that I used the words "open slather", that
was not a statement of mine, I suggested that Air New Zealand
wanted 2 737's per week. It's been discussed probably that
the maximum amount of F28's that would ever get here would
probably be five flights per week. If Mr. Jackson can twist
that around to open slather, well I suppose he could because
it's right up his alley, but No. 3 reads "relate future tourist
growth to resident population as a percentage not exceeding
the present figure". It's just been discussed around this
table that approximately 24,000 persons is a desirable figure.
What happens if half the population wishes to go away for medical
reasons or schooling or something or other. Has that been
suggested that we cut the tourist trade too? I don't support No. 3.
MR. HOWARD: I'm certain that if that happened, if half the population went away for some reason that the Assembly would be discussing it and would have more problems than simply recommendation No. 3, and I think they'd make reasonable decisions and in the best interests of the island, and I don't think we have to build in precautions about that. I hope it's a very unlikely possibility. I'd like to point out that there is no recommendation in this whole list of recommendations on what might be considered the most important question put to the committee which is "what the desirable level of population" or sorry "desirable level of tourism" we did not include that as a specific recommendation. It's on page 17 from memory of the report, the comments that I read a few minutes ago, that comment preceded the committee setting out all its recommendations. Recommendation No. 3 is the closest of any other recommendation to the committee's view on what is the desirable level of tourism and the best way the committee could put it was about as it was in 1980 in relation to the amount of permanent population in 1980 but the committee felt if population, permanent population grows over the years, there may then be an argument for increasing tourism to support that decreased population, but while residential population stayed about the same, the Committee's feeling was, hold tourism down to no more than it was in 1980, so that recommendation No. 3 really is the closest you'll find in any of these to a recommendation on what the desired level of tourism is.

MR. BROWN: Having heard what various members have said in relation to this recommendation, and on the understanding that the figure which is referred to when the recommendation talks of the present figure, is in fact the tourist figure for the 1980 calendar year, and recognizing that the recommendation does talk of a percentage not exceeding that 1980 calendar year figure and that it does not necessarily commit the Assembly to allowing the tourist numbers to increase in the event that population numbers increase, it simply says that it shall not be higher than the present figure, it doesn't say it necessarily shall continue to be as high as. On the basis of that, I think that I can now support that recommendation.

MR. PRESIDENT: Further debate on recommendation no. 3. No further debate Honourable Members thank you. We move to no. 4 which says this "recognize that tourism has both good and bad effects and requires the best balance" Debate Honourable Members.

MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: Well I support this Mr. President, in my view it needs little comment. I support the recommendation.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mrs. Grey we you seeking a call. No? Just waving your hands in the air?

MR. BROWN: I certainly support it Mr. President.

MR. HOWARD: I think it needs support only as a defensive shield for future members of the Assembly and the
Tourist Bureau. There will always be some people in the commercial community who say "we should do xyz because it's good for tourism" and they will think that that's the complete argument and that settles it. Now by adopting this recommendation, we put future Assemblies and the future Tourist Bureau in the position of being able to answer such people by saying "Just a minute, tourism is both good and bad", "let's look at both sides of the coin, let's don't automatically support things just because they're good for tourism", that's the point of it.

MR. SANDERS: I support it.

MR. JACKSON: I also support this recommendation but I would emphasize that in developing this particular question, that we have the minimum bad effects that we can get instead of any, the maximum good effects instead of the maximum bad effects is what the tourist higher figures that are brought to the Island or above the 1980 figure, that the maximized by the good effects that could come out.

MRS GREY: Thank you Mr. President. Just again, on behalf of the Chamber of Commerce, A.P.A., Government Tourist Bureau and the Pitcairners, they too accept this recommendation.

MISS BUFFETT: I'll support it thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you. No further debate Honourable Members thank you. We move to no. 5 which says "ensure that the benefits of tourism go mostly to residents". Debate.

MR. BROWN: Mr. President, there's no point in having a tourist industry if all of its benefits are going to go to people that live away from Norfolk Island. I think that this is a very important recommendation and it's one that I fully support.

MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: I too fully support this recommendation Mr. President.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. President. The Chamber of Commerce, the Accommodation Proprietors, the Pitcairn Society and the Norfolk Island Tourist Bureau, they also support it and so do I.

MR. BROWN: Mr. President, there's probably another aspect of this that should at least be stated. Tourism is an industry in many parts of the world, but the tourist industry has also brought problems in many parts of the worlds. I think I've mentioned on a prior occasion, Atlantic City in the U.S. which has recently been revived at a Casino city, but those who have gone
and looked at what has happened in Atlantic City are reported to have found that Atlantic City on the surface is booming, but when they've looked a little further, they've found that the people that used to live there, have all had to move because they just couldn't afford to live there any more and so the local people were driven out and that was the cost of the success of the Casinos being introduced to Atlantic City. Similar comments are made about the results of the tourist booms in Hawaii and Fiji where amongst tremendous parts of the local populations, there is extreme poverty, despite the apparent wealth that surrounds those islands in the tourist industries, and I think it's very important that we avoid those problems in Norfolk Island, this is part of recommendation 2, and it's part of recommendation 5 and I think that it's extremely important.

MISS BUFFETT: I support Mr. Brown's comments thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: No further debate thank you. I move to no. 6 Honourable Members which says "encourage local ownership of tourist facilities and discourage further overseas ownership" Debate

MR. HOWARD: I was overseas when the policy committee of the first Assembly debated all these recommendations and arrived at their views and I don't have the benefit of knowing what that debate covered. The policy committee of the first Assembly apparently knocked out the last five words of that recommendation and in other words, they did not want the policy to say "discourage further overseas ownership" they simply wanted to say "encourage local ownership of tourist facilities". I feel that those last five words are important. I think they're important because the most usual thing you find all around the world is that virtually every country you go to is encouraging foreign investment. They invite it, they subsidise it, they do everything they can to attract it and it's the assumption of people in the tourist world, that governments are just all reaching out, begging them to come invest their money. I think it's important that if Norfolk does not have that view, that we say we don't, that we say, we are not shopping for foreign investment, we would like the tourist industry to be financed locally please, and when outsiders who are used to being welcomed all over the world because they've got a pocket full of money, when they come here, my feeling is that the Executive Members of the Assembly for example who may meet some such person when he is looking possibly to invest money in Norfolk Island, I think the Executive Members ought to say to such a person "You know we are not very hot on foreign investment here". You would have to show us very good reasons why this is a good thing for Norfolk Island. Just because you've got investment doesn't mean we love you, we're a little afraid of you. Now what's in it for Norfolk? What can you do for us, show us more than you've shown us and I think those last five words are important.
MRS. GREY: Mr. President. I wonder if Mr. Howard can give us any thoughts or indications as to how he would hope to achieve that. This discouragement of further overseas ownership.

MR. HOWARD: By saying just the kind of thing I was just talking about when someone writes a letter, suppose the Zip Hotel Corporation of Brazil sends a letter to Norfolk Island Government saying "we are considering five possible resorts where we might want to install a new Disneyland Childrens Camp. We would invest $7M. What benefits do you offer us and to whom should we apply. I think if that were the policy you would write back to these people and say "we don't especially welcome overseas investment, if there is some particular reason why it would benefit us or why it would be a good thing for the island, we'll look at it, but generally we don't encourage it. That's the only way I know to discourage.

MRS. GREY: Thank you Mr. President. I still have difficulty with it, I'm trying to extend my mind particularly to the area of airlines, and so many airlines have hotel affiliation and I'm trying to directly relate that to this statement here. Well me may some time, somehow, have an airline interested in flying to Norfolk, it may wish to set up an hotel. How do we stop them?

MR. HOWARD: Well, we've got half a dozen ways of stopping that. Such a thing needs approval of the Norfolk Island Building Board and the Building Board makes recommendations to the Executive Member and if it's not in the interests of Norfolk Island that Ansett build a 500 room hotel and we don't want them to do it, we say "sorry, no permission" "no go", there are ways of stopping that if you want to stop it. This particular recommendation is stated in a more general way, it would say to Mr. Ansett "look you might like to have a hotel wherever you fly, we don't much like that idea, we'd rather have local people own the hotels if you don't mind". Now if you want a better hotel, may be you can get up a local syndicate and go in on a 40-60 basis with them or something. You might look at that. But we like local ownership, we don't like foreign ownership. That's the point of the recommendation.

MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: Thank you Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the views that Mr. Howard has just expressed, with regard to the last five words that were left off that recommendation 6. I believe that we would need to tidy up our immigration laws somewhat before any policies supportive of recommendations 6 can have any real effect but I do support the recommendation.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. President. I support Mr. Howard's full recommendation there, including the last five words, I agree that we should encourage local enterprise, discourage overseas ownership, particularly in airline hotel ownership which would stop the benefits of tourism going mainly to residents. I think actually the discouragement of hotel ownership type accommodation in the island generally, would be advantageous and that smaller
groupings of accommodation be far more successful.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. President. The Chamber of Commerce, the Pitcairn Society, the Accommodation Proprietors and the Norfolk Island Tourist Bureau, they support No. 6 and so do I.

MR. JACKSON: Mr. President, if we look at the situation that exists at present and look at the question of the support of local ownership, and with the recommendation of the first Assembly, and discourage further overseas ownership. Now I see that with businesses and apartments that has changed hands recently, if the cost of those apartments was somewhere in the realistic price, certainly, it could be purchased on the island. I'm not saying that Hotels and those types could be purchased locally, so therefore, to knock out the last words "well we'll discourage anyone coming in and purchasing those businesses". That I do believe that in some instances there has been a degree of drifting away and encouraging local ownership of these businesses because some of the ones that are already sold and gone, they've placed a price on their apartment that can only be purchased by someone with plenty of money from overseas, because when a local resident look at it viably to see what his returns what he's going to pay for it, well he's actually being priced out of it. What has been commonly stated that some of these buildings has changed hands and overseas buyers has come in and bought it for the simple reason of gaining entry onto the island. Now I'm not saying against any those that's comes in but when ownership pays a big price, foreign ownership pays a big price, he expects some quick returns and he starts cracking the whip, so therefore, I honestly believe that we would sell more of these apartments that come on the market locally if a more realistic price was put on them, and then in that instance, we would discourage and prevent overseas and discourage any further overseas ownership.

MR. HOWARD: I ought to make a distinction because there might be some misunderstanding as to what the committee meant by this recommendation. The committee didn't consider that if somebody in Sydney or in Auckland came to the island and bought a block of flats, and at the same time settled on Norfolk with the intention of settlione here and becoming a resident if he could, the committee didn't consider that as overseas ownership even though the person initially came from overseas. What the committee was feeling should be discouraged was some company in Sydney owning a hotel on Norfolk Island and running it as an absentee owner. Our feeling was that if somebody is allowed to move here and buys into a business and then settles down and lives here, that the committee didn't really object to the that. The committee did object to investments coming in that then sucked the money back out of Norfolk.

MR. PRESIDENT: Further debate Honourable Members.
MR. BROWN: I support the recommendation in its full form Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Fine, thank you Honourable Members. We move to no. 7, which says "resist trends to shorter average stays". Debate.

MR. BROWN: Mr. President, the first Assembly resolved to amend that to say "tourists should be encouraged to stay longer". Frankly, I think that that means the same as resisting trends to shorter average stays. I think that we would do well to ensure if we can, that the average stays remains around its present 9½ to 10 nights. If that occurs, we will not have people pressing us to allow double the number of tourists because average stays have reduced by half or might be expected to do so. There are clear benefits in keeping the stay up around its present length. There are benefits for the tourists also. There are perhaps two types of tourists. Perhaps what we have is a vacation rather than a tourist and the sight of the person jetting off for a few days here and a few days there and a few days somewhere else on a world-wide 7 day holiday, is all too familiar in this world. Perhaps that's what a tourist is. Perhaps the vacationer is rather someone that comes for a leisurely stay of a week or a week and a half to actually enjoy living in a particular community. Perhaps in some cases to even contribute to the community while doing so. But someone who's prepared to accept the community for what it is or is not going to want to have the whole system changed around in so that he has everything that he had where he came from and I think all these things are to be considered in assessing what we regard as an appropriate length of stay and so I support no. 7 in its present form that we should resist trends to shorter average stays.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. President. The Chamber of Commerce, this recommendation was unacceptable and should be with the recommendation that tourists be encouraged to stay longer. The Accommodation Proprietors comments was "Subsection 7 suggested the trend towards shorter stays should be resisted. We prefer concept of encouraging longer stays but realise that we must inevitably accept whatever future trends the market may dictate. Total cost is a vital factor in the selection of a holiday destination and its duration, and as mentioned earlier, Norfolk's competitive position is weakened by the comparatively high airfare component. It should also be realized that vacation trends are changing. Annual holidays in Australia are four weeks duration is lending itself to a trend towards two holiday breaks per year of less than a fortnight's duration. This important sociological change in lifestyle patterns should be recognized." The Norfolk Island Tourist Bureau, their comment is "although we agree that longer stays are desirable, we don't support the phrase "discourage the promotion of short visits". We agree that longer stays should be promoted and are endeavouring to do so. If the trend is towards holidays of shorter duration, we don't feel we can or should attempt to reverse such a trend."
MRS. GREY: Thank you Mr. President. Based on the submissions put to us by the Chamber of Commerce, the A.P.A. and the Government Tourist Bureau, I circulated a suggestion that that recommendation should perhaps be expressed in the positive rather than the negative as it is in the existing recommendations and that comes out to be I think almost exactly; in fact I think it's literally word for word of that which the first Assembly came up with, and that is tourists be encouraged to stay longer. Mr. Brown might confirm that. I think it is.

MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: Thank you Mr. President. I do not believe that we should promote to resist shorter average stays as recommended in the report. The market place should decide this. First timers to Norfolk on a short stay on say five to seven days, often return to holiday on Norfolk staying 10 to 14 days the second time around. These people, knowing what to expect, usually make the happier visitor. It is my experience that people on say, a 14 day package holiday find in Norfolk, not to their expectations have too much time to spout their dissatisfaction to all and sundry on the island. I personally would prefer the visitor who says on leaving, "seven days on Norfolk was far too short, we must come again".

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown, did you want to respond.

MR. BROWN: No Thank you Mr. President.

MR. HOWARD: The reason that the select committee included that recommendation, is that there were at least at that time, and I think they will probably continue, two very strong pressures for shortening the stay. One is for the shopkeepers, the others from the airlines. The shorter the stay, the more the airline can sell seats and that's what they're after. The shopkeepers on the whole think that they clip a visitor about as hard as they can clip them in the first three days he's here, and after that it doesn't matter. Now there are pressures from those two groups, always saying, "let's have shorter stays, let's have people come for a long weekend to Norfolk Island". The committee felt very strongly that if that, if we just went happily along with that trend and it came to pass, that something very important would be lost and what would be lost would be the kind of people Mr. Christian-Baily was talking about who want to stay a while and settle into the community and get a feeling for it. People who want to come back rather than the people who hardly even know where they were if they'd just gone for a long weekend. They hardly see more than the pub where they're staying and a couple of shops.

MRS. GREY: Thank you Mr. President. I feel obliged to come to the defence of the Chamber of Commerce on that issue. I take Mr. Howard to issue on the words he used about shopkeepers wishing to have people stay shorter times. Nothing could be further from the truth as the discussion at the Chamber of Commerce revealed, and in fact it was that organization which said "this recommendation was unacceptable and should be with the recommendation that tourists be encouraged
to stay longer". They in fact want people to stay longer, because in the end, they recognize that that is a far better proposition for Norfolk Island, so I do protest.

MR. HOWARD: I can respond only by saying that I was referring to the impression that the select committee got at the time, based on the evidence that came to us then. It may well be that it's a result of the discussion about tourism last couple of years, that people in the Chamber of Commerce have come to a different view, and if so, that's fine, I'm glad they feel that way.

MR. PRESIDENT: Further debate, no. 7. No further debate on no. 7. We'll move to no. 8 which is "recognize that Norfolk does not need an International luxury standard hotel". Debate.

MR. SANDERS: In reply to that, the Chamber of Commerce, "The Chamber believes that Norfolk Island does not need an international luxury standard hotel as a new enterprise, however, it believed that any accommodation proprietor who felt so inclined to upgrade his existing facility, to international standard, should be supported and encouraged". The Norfolk Island Tourist Bureau also replied to that one "If any of our existing accommodation establishments is interested in upgrading their facilities, to international luxury standards, they should be allowed and even encouraged to do so. We agree that we should resist the intervention of outsiders to establish such a facility". There was comment on that from the Pitcairn Society. "The Society supports this recommendation, however, we are not opposed to provisions of higher quality of accommodation on the island, such as was proposed some months ago for the development of the Paradise Hotel site, provided the comment of recommendation 6 is kept to the fore, the Society continues its opposition to the provisions of legalized gambling for tourists on the island in any form".

MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you. Further debate.

MR. BROWN: I certainly agree with Mr. Sanders, Mr. President, that it is desirable that existing accommodation owners be able to upgrade their premises if they so desire. However, there are many ten minute experts who would come to this island and would tell us that what we need is a luxury first class international standard hotel. And to enable those experts to not have very much of their time wasted, I would have no difficulty in accepting recommendation 8, that we should recognize that we don't need an international standard luxury hotel. It's my belief that we don't. We would certainly benefit from the existing accommodation houses upgrading themselves if they desire to and are able to afford to do so but we certainly don't need anyone thinking that we have a desire for an international luxury standard hotel to be erected here.
MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: Thank you Mr. President. It is my belief Mr. President that Norfolk Island does not need an international style hotel, neither does it need hotels claiming to be of international standards but failing to offer standards of service expected of international class hotels. Rather, I believe, existing accommodation houses should be encouraged to upgrade their properties, this may mean that some existing accommodation houses should be allowed to increase their number of beds in order to make the provision of extra facilities, such as a swimming pool, recreation area and a restaurant, a more viable proposition. I therefore support recommendation 8.

MISS BUFFETT: I support recommendation 8.

MR. JACKSON: I also support recommendation 8, but I strongly object to one reason that the three members on the select committee for their reason for making this recommendation. I believe it's an insult for the people of Norfolk Island on one of their recommendations in opposing and I will read (e) in their recommendation in opposing this. It states that "we believe a deluxe international standard hotel requires staff with a great deal of civility and self effacement, those qualities are unlikely to be provided by residents of Norfolk Island and outsiders who provide them are unlikely to fit in well with the island". Now I should believe that part of the report should be completely struck off that to say that our people lacks civility and self effacement and that the people of Norfolk Island, the residents of Norfolk Island in those words, are not fit to service an international hotel, and that people brought in from outside to work in an international hotel is unlikely to fit in well with the island.

MR. BROWN: Mr. President, I can assure Mr. Jackson that I've stayed at a few so-called deluxe international standard hotels and it's certainly no insult to anyone in Norfolk Island to be told that they are not survile and self effaced but that's not a criticism, that I interpret is quite a compliment to the people of Norfolk Island and people that work at that sort of place, aren't people that I'd like to mix with and I'm sure you wouldn't like to mix with them either.

MR. HOWARD: What Mr. Brown says is correct. I think there is a misunderstanding of what the Committee intended by those words. We didn't think in a report of this kind that it would be suitable to use the words "crawlers" but that's what we were talking about. What we were saying here was that a deluxe international standard hotel is got to be full of crawlers. People who are sucking up to you every place you go and holding their hand out for the tip and "yes sir, yes madam, yes sir, yes madam". It would make you SICK and it doesn't fit on Norfolk Island. That's all we were saying. There's certainly was no intended insult to the people. We were saying that's not
what the people of Norfolk are like - don't try to make them
behave that way.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. President. I
remember this coming up in the first Assembly and I accept
Mr. Howard's explanation of that.

MR. QUINTAL: When I read this paragraph or
(e) I looked at it in the same light as Mr. Jackson did and
I believed that it meant what he said, so I'm glad the explanation
has come forward.

MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you Honourable Members.
We move to No. 9 which says "Accept that seasonal peaks and
troughs cannot be substantially levelled. Debate.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. President. The
comment from the Chamber of Commerce on this is "The Chamber
believes that this recommendation is negative and therefore
not acceptable". From the Pitcairn Society, "we support
recommendation 7 but seen no reason why efforts should not
be made to encouragea increase in off season tourism and
therefore, we oppose the recommendation no. 9. The Norfolk
Island Tourist Bureau's reply "The Committee disagrees with
the findings of the Select Committee report in the area of
seasonal troughs. We feel these can be filled or at least
filled to a greater extent and at present, by promoting (1)
special interest groups, (2) small business conventions and
(3) our mild winter weather to areas that generally suffer
from colder conditions. For example, special interest groups
during the winter to encourage visits of squash players, bridge
teams, chess enthusiasts and hold seminars in island history,
stamps collecting, etc. during warmer weather such as November;
February and March encourage gun shoots, visits from flora
and fauna groups, tennis and golf players, underwater carnivals
fishing etc. small business conventions, promote Norfolk as the
logical meeting place for groups which draw from both Australia
and New Zealand, try for groups of 100 or less, preferably 50
to 75, that is in number, not years, offer special rates to encourage
these groups in our off-season periods. I'm sorry, this is a bit
difficult Mr. President, it's a photo-copy and it's a crummy one.
Visitors from colder climates promoting Norfolk as a warmer spot
that the South Island of New Zealand or in Melbourne and is not
the summer because we are warmer and we havemany repeat winter
visitors to prove it. We should select our markets carefully
and be sure we make no exaggerated claims regarding weather.

MR. HOWARD: The Select Committee would have
agreed with almost all those comments. I'm bound to tell you the
way the recommendation is worded in the listing of recommendations,
is really not a true and fair reflection of what you read on pages
27 and 28 of the report which deal with that subject and I would say
that it was not the view of the committee that seasonal peaks and
troughs cannot be substantially level. The committee's view was
that it is a mistake to promise people that if they come here in
July and August, they're going to have lovely weather. They aren't.
They're likely to get frozen to death and most of the places they stay don't have bar heaters and it can get pretty cold. Yes you can attract people during those periods by squash tournaments for example - wonderful idea. Gun Club tournaments, may make all the sense in the world. There are lots of things people can do and the Committee really was emphasizing that its those attractions that we can promise and then make good that we should use and try to fill those troughs, rather than kidding people about the weather.

MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: Thank you Mr. President. I find it difficult to accept that seasonal peaks and troughs cannot be substantially levelled. Careful promoting directed at the known periods troughs, coupled with common interests group activity can usually produce the desired numbers. February 1983 was a classic example. The Gun Club International Shoot together with the promotional efforts by the Tourist Board, aimed at levelling the known February troughs produce the best February on record. It is my belief that a year-round fare should be applicable from Australia as is the case from New Zealand. It is my opinion that a peak fare during the holiday times does nothing for Norfolk's image as a tourist destination and discriminates against families who are generally only able to take their holidays during the school vacations. East West Airlines introduced the peak and off-peak fare on taking over the service of Norfolk Island from Qantas in an endeavour to eliminate the troughs. However, if anything, the problems of peaks and troughs worsened and it worsened because of the almost non-existent level of promotion by that airline.

MR. BROWN: Thank you Mr. President. I believe that a lot can be done to level out the peaks and troughs. Several Members have already said that one important thing is honesty in marketing and there's no doubt about that. If you're not going to be honest in your marketing, you won't exist for too long. But one thing that I have certainly found in my experience to be a fact in relation to marketing on Norfolk Island is that price sells. In the quieter periods of the year, you need one of two things. You either need something like a gun club shoot or you've got to be prepared to drop your price, and when we have a look at what has historically happened when a price to Norfolk Island has been dropped, I can certainly say that in the Brisbane market, where 10% has been knocked off the price for a particular two or three week period or a particular few flights, there has been a definite response to that lower price, and when we deal with airlines and when we deal with accommodation houses and we suggest this to them, there is one fact that we should bear in mind. It costs a lot of money to have an aeroplane sitting on the ground, you still have to pay your lease fees, you still have to pay all of your pilots; you still have to pay all of your office staff, you still pay the same insurance, you still pay the same air navigation charges. It costs a lot of money to have an aeroplane sitting on the ground. To put it in the air costs you a few bob more to pay for fuel, you use up a few hours of your engines so you have to have an engine overhaul maintenance provision, you use up a few of your maintenance hours so you have to put a few bob away to pay for the schedule maintenance on your aircraft, but in particular low weeks of the year, you may find that you are better off flying at what you would normally call at a loss rather than simply sitting on the ground.
and if the airlines that fly to Norfolk Island don't have a whole heap of other things to do in the quiet Norfolk Island periods, then it is quite reasonable for us to say to them, "listen, our community needs a reasonable flow of tourists through the whole year. We don't want a whole heap in the peak periods and very few in the off-peak periods. We want a reasonable flow, and if you blokes are going to fly out to here, we expect you to tow the line, and so in some of these months of the year, you're going to have to drop your price. And it's reasonable for us to say the same sort of thing to the Accommodation Proprietors. They pay the same mortgage payments to the Bank, they may be able to put off a few staff when times are quiet, but basically, they are still stuck with a large part of their costs, whether their establishment is full or empty and if it is to the benefit of the whole economy and the whole island that these troughs be levelled out to some extent, then I believe it is reasonable for us to say to them "we expect you to tow the line during these periods too". And so I believe that if we're honest in our marketing, if we can in the very lowest of months improve our price, even though it may be a price which you could not operate for the whole of the year but a price which for that particular period is better than nothing at all, and if we look to special interest groups, such as the Gun Club Shoot, well I believe we can do a lot to fill those troughs.

MR. SANDERS: Mr. President, I neglected to read the Accommodation Proprietors remarks. In relation to sub-section 9 "we would draw attention to the highly successful efforts of other resorts to increase off-season traffic. An example is Tasmania which has reported a best ever winter season as a result of an effective promotion campaign. If we present ourselves effectively, we could expect to do likewise. If our presentation is honest, we should have nothing to fear. I support what Mr. Brown says and the A.P.A.

MR. HOWARD: At the beginning of the discussion on this report, Mr. Brown went through the views of the Policy Committee of the first Legislative Assembly and he read out some wording that that Policy Committee adopted in preference to the wording of No. 9. I wonder if he could read it again.

MR. BROWN: Yes - the Policy Committee amended No. 9 to read "all weather tourist activities, sorry all weather activities should be developed to eliminate tourist peaks and troughs, and in that form, the recommendation was accepted.

MR. HOWARD: Mr. President, if there's a machinery way for doing it, I would like to find a way to alter the wording of the recommendation No. 9 to the wording that Mr. Brown just read out. Let me give you my justification for doing that. The Select Committee Report up through to the page that we're looking at now, appendix 4, up to the appendices, correction again, appendix 2, appendix 3 and appendix 4 were prepared by Duncan McIntyre on his own without consultation with
John Ryves and me, I think John was off the island and I think I was off the island and it was a matter of a last minute wrapping up of the whole thing to get it into print so it could be presented to the Assembly. My belief is that if the Select Committee had looked at the wording of No. 9 as you see it there, it would have changed it to something more like what the first Assembly Policy Committee voted on and I think it's in a way a disservice to the Assembly to vote against if it's going to. No. 9 which is a recommendation worded in a way that the Select Committee I don't think would have supported itself, and if there's any way to do it, I would like to see the wording of that recommendation changed to the way the first Policy Committee adopted and let this Assembly consider those words, rather than the words you're looking at there.

MR. PRESIDENT: I'll read the words that have just been read so that members may cast their opinion upon it. "All weather tourist activity should be developed to eliminate seasonal peaks and troughs". Would Members like to give their view upon that.

MRS. GREY: Thank you Mr. President. Once again, the paper I circulated as a result of reading the submissions from the groups we've mentioned so often, the words very simply "Develop promotion aimed at levelling peaks and troughs". Same story, slightly less complex.

MR. PRESIDENT: Further debate, Miss Buffett.

MISS BUFFETT: To the first Assembly's recommended wording which Mr. Brown has read out thank you.

MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: Could you read it again.

MR. PRESIDENT: Yes, I'll read it again. "All weather tourist activities should be developed to eliminate seasonal peaks and troughs".

MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: I would have no difficulty Mr. President with this new wording.

MR. BROWN: Mr. President, I believe we should be adding a little to that wording though because as it now stands, we would be making no reference at all to promotions aimed at reducing those troughs and I feel that we should be making reference to promotions specifically aimed at filling the troughs as well as the development of all weather tourist activities.

MR. HOWARD: I'd support that if the word "honest" were included. It's a point that Mr. Sanders was making and you were making as well. Dishonest promotion is bad. And the idea of things are down subpromote it, tell them how well
wonderful the weather is when its pouring rain and freezing? Ah ah no.

MISS BUFFETT: Mr. President, thank you, you can't predict the weather but I do feel that we do have resources and amenities that are not promoted as much as they could be or as advantageously as they could be and essentially they must be promoted truthfully, that our winters are at a certain average type of climate and that in July and August it is cold and it does rain.

MR. PRESIDENT: So in fact, what we're talking about now Honourable Members is all weather tourist activities and honest promotion should be developed to eliminate seasonal peaks and troughs.

MR. HOWARD: I don't like the word "honest". I think "truthful" is a better word.

MR. PRESIDENT: Any further debate on that particular point.

MR. BROWN: I certainly agree with a "truthful" promotion and development of all weather tourist activity should be developed to eliminate tourists peaks and troughs Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Any further debate. Thank you we move to No. 10. "Develop an active relationship with airlines".

MR. HOWARD: I would like simply to say that at the time the Select Committee made its report, that did not exist, it hadn't existed ever that we could see. Since then the improvement in that particular thing has been out of sight. I think that that's the result of hard work by a number of people on the Assembly, it was needed, it's being accomplished.

MR. SANDERS: Yes I support it Mr. Chairman but the Chamber of Commerce puts 10 and 11 together and they say that these two recommendations were discussed jointly and were accepted.

MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: Recommendation 10 Mr. President says we should develop an active relationship with airlines. Once again, particularly in the area of promotion, there's been a most gratifying degree of co-operation between the Tourist Board and the airlines because we have been willing to contribute our share, some of the airlines seem to have adopted a more enthusiastic approach to advertising Norfolk Island. Norfolk Island Airlines have over the past couple of years carried out a most vigorous program of promoting Norfolk Island. Their efforts have most certainly had results. They are the only airlines servicing Norfolk Island and whose passenger figures
show any growth. I certainly support recommendation 10.

MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you. Further debate.

MR. SANDERS: The Pitcairn Society's comments on this one - the wording is such that the Society supports this recommendation as far as it goes. However, we are strongly of the opinion that preferential support and encouragement should go to the island owned company, in particular we would argue that active support be given to this airline in its attempts to obtain licenses to operate the Melbourne/Norfolk/Noumea/Norfolk and Wellington route.

MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you. Further debate. No further debate. Thank you. We move to No. 11 which says "seek Department of Transport and Department of Home Affairs' help in influencing airlines".

MR. HOWARD: I'll amplify that a little but as to the Committee's intentions in making that recommendation our feeling was that the first line of trying to get the airlines functioning the way Norfolk needs them to would be to talk with the airlines and develop a good relationship. The point of recommendation 11 was that if that co-operation was not forthcoming from the airlines, we should then lean hard on the Department of its Aviation now and the Department of Home Affairs to push our case for us. They are now doing that. The Department of Aviation is saying to East West and to Airlines of New South Wales, sorry we won't comment on your application until we've heard from the Norfolk Island Government, that's exactly what this was, the kind of thing this was aimed at.

MR. BROWN: I support No. 11 Mr. President.

MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILLEY: I support 11 Mr. President. I refer to the Pitcairn Descendant's Society's paper on the report whereby the Society believes that the recommendation is too weak in its present form. I believe we should be more active in negotiating with Canberra on a Government basis to ensure that transit air passengers and aircraft are effecting in preserving the Norfolk Island environment and economy. Thank you.

MR. SANDERS: I was just going to read the Pitcairn Society one Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Good thank you. Further participation. No. Right thank you. That completes the part that relates to 5. We now move to 6 and 1 of 6 says. "Continue the freeze on tourist accommodation, license by units as well as by beds, continue only
those licenses which are now actively used and not re-issue surrendered licenses. Debate.

MR. BROWN: Mr. President. We've finished the first 11 recommendations in relation to which there is reasonable consensus and they didn't perhaps take us too long. We've got a further 9 recommendations to deal with, some of these I expect will be quite lengthy, I notice that it is almost ten to seven, I wonder whether the members would prefer to suspend the meeting at this stage.

MR. HOWARD: I was going to suggest the same thing Mr. President. There is also a logical break at the point we have now reached. The first 5 recommendations were absolute fundamental philosophies, 6 through 11 are general principles, from now on we get down to nitty gritty specific recommendations which are recommendations of the moment and I think we've reached a logical breaking point. I think it would be helpful if it could be done if there could be a vote, I'd be happy to move a motion by leave if I were given that the Assembly endorse the first 11 as amended and get that package done and behind us and at our next meeting, then carry on with the detailed recommendations from there.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Howard, the motion that is before the House is this "that this House considers the report of the Norfolk Island Legislative Assembly's Select Committee inquiry into tourism" that is the motion that will need to be disposed of in the first instance.

MR. HOWARD: Surely we're going to do more than simply consider and then say "well we have considered" and that's the end of that, surely we'll want to arrive at some conclusion.

MR. PRESIDENT: Of course, that is entirely up to Members. What I need to ensure is that the first motion is disposed of and that is the motion that we are addressing at this moment.

MR. HOWARD: Perhaps we leave that then to the next sitting but I would support the idea.

MR. PRESIDENT: May I just suggest without any wish to be pushy about the matter - you may wish to go through the entire discussion and at the end of that, dispose of the motion that is before the House, and then you may wish to bring forward specific motions in respect of parts that we have discussed but that is entirely up to Members of course but it would seem tidy from the Chair's point of view.

MR. HOWARD: Rather than suspending we have a heavy week next week and Assembly Meeting I think the following week. I wonder if we are going to discontinue here whether we shouldn't adjourn but ask that this get high treatment in the business paper for the meeting two weeks from now.
MR. PRESIDENT: May I just mention to Members if we are talking about an adjournment, and I think that would be the more practical arrangement, we would normally sit on the first week but in fact, that is an extremely busy week for a number of reasons. Members are involved in a number of activities, the Supreme Court sits in that week and there are a few things that would be most demanding. A number of Members have spoken to me about this matter and the suggestion is that we in fact may adjourn until 13th April which is the following week.

MR. HOWARD: I'd be happy to move with leave that the House do now adjourn until 2 pm on 13th April.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that the House at its rising adjourn until Wednesday, 13th April, 1983. Is there any discussion Honourable Members. Right, before we get onto that, may I have an adjournment of the Tourism debate.

MR. HOWARD: I'll move it.

MR. PRESIDENT: Fine, those of that opinion say aye. The ayes have it. I will now put the question that the House at its rising adjourn until Wednesday 13th April, 1983, those of that opinion say aye, to the contrary no, are there any abstentions, the ayes have it. And I seek a formal motion that the House adjourn.

MR. HOWARD: I move that we do now adjourn.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that the House do now adjourn. Any debate. The question is that the House do now adjourn. Those of that opinion say aye, to the contrary no, the ayes have it. The House stands adjourned until Wednesday, 13th April, 1983 at 2 pm.