The Assembly met at 2 p.m. The President (The Hon. D.E. Buffett) took the Chair and read the Prayer.
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CONDOLENCES

MR. BUFFETT: I call for condolences. Mr. Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: It is with regret that this House records the death of James Forest Young you passed away suddenly on 28 March 1983. Mr. Forest Young was Chief Flight Engineer of P near Wellington, and was on his last flight prior to retirement from the Department of Civil Aviation, Department of the New Zealand Air Ministry. His wife accompanied him on the flight of the South Pacific and they landed at Norfolk Island on Monday afternoon 28 March. He was taken to the hospital later that afternoon after medical attention and died that evening. The aircraft left the following Wednesday taking Mr. Forest Young home to New Zealand home for burial. To his family in New Zealand this House extends its sincere sympathies.

MR. BUFFETT: Honourable Members would you signify your assent to a motion of condolences by rising in your places in silence.

PETITIONS

MR. BUFFETT: Are there any petitions?

NOTICES

MR. BUFFETT: Are there any notices? Mr. Howard

MR. HOWARD: I don't have a notice Mr. President, but I would like to move without notice that the House record and send to Mr. Justice Fox its thanks for what he has done for Norfolk Island so far, and its best wishes to him for a speedy recovery.

MR. BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. Howard, is that a general motion of assent amongst us.

It is unanimously agreed, thank you.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

MR. BUFFETT: Mrs Gray.

MRS. GRAY: Thank you Mr. President, I will hold fire, it is a question I would like to put to you Mr. President as Executive Member for Education, Administration and Health.

MR. BUFFETT: Thank you. Any more questions without notice?

Mr. Jackson.

MR. JACKSON: One to yourself and one to the Minister for Finance.

I will put the one to the Minister for Finance first.

/785
Mr. Howard, on 4 August an amendment which I submitted to your Departure Fee Amendment Bill of 1980 concerning the exemption of school students who are continuing their education whether it be in New Zealand or Australia and who are over the age of 16 years, that they ought to be exempt from paying the departure fee. Now I don't know where the Bill is now, but in Hansard of that meeting on 4 August, you stated 'I am therefore in support of Mr. Jackson's idea that we should exempt school children who are going back to school from the Island from paying departure tax'. Those persons from the Tourist Bureau who collect the fee no nothing whatsoever about this amendment, even though it was carried unanimously on 4 August last year. The question is, why has this amendment not been implemented and the Tourist Bureau officials notified?

MR. HOWARD: I am surprised and troubled to hear the question I had no idea that it had not been carried through. The House meant to carry it through, there obviously is a mis-understanding some place or some button has not been buttoned. I will attend to it straight away and as far as I am concerned, going back to whenever that exemption should have applied if anyone has paid it, I think they should get a rebate.

MR. JACKSON: At the airport there is parents with children going back to school that are refused the exemption, and if you can clarify that I would be happy.

MR. HOWARD: My understanding of the situation was that exemption had been passed and was in effect and was being observed. I am surprised it has not but I will straighten it up.

MR. BUFFETT: Further questions without notice. Miss Buffett, Are there any questions without notice to any other Executive Members. No. Mr Sanders would you take the Chair.

MRS. GRAY: My question is put to the Executive Member responsible for Administration Education and Health and pertains to a visit which Mr. Ross Mallam made to the Island recently of the Housing and Construction Department, I believe it is still known as. What discussion did the Executive Member have with the representative of the Department concerning the making good of roads following the upgrading of the airport?

MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Deputy President, Mr. Mallam did have discussions with me concerning that matter and I did ask him when he could in fact send a representative to the Island who had been involved in the survey of the roads prior to the upgrading process. You will realise to come to some arrangements the roads had to be surveyed before the activity of heavy vehicles which has now happened and afterwards, and the previous survey of course was done and it now remains for the survey following to be done. At the time he indicated to me that maybe some 2/3 weeks before he could position an officer on the Island to carry out the survey in conjunction with our own works officers. I have not since that time had word from him to give me a definite day for the arrival of those persons.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. Buffett, Mrs. Gray.

MRS. GRAY: May I continue on the line of course.
One assume there was an allocation of moneys for that project by the Department, may I then ask what cost — or who paid for the by-pass road which was constructed at the beginning of the upgrading, and to what extent will the cost of that be subtracted from the total allocation.

MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Deputy President, the by-pass road was funded from a number of sources. It was an advantage to a number of people and that is why the source of funds were varied. It was of interest to the Norfolk Island Government to provide an avenue where heavy vehicle traffic was taken away from the school, and the intersection at the Burns Philip corner, and so it was in the Government's interest to find a by-pass arrangements. It was equally an advantage for the quarry of metal to have another road, so that he did not have to traverse that more hazardous area, and of course it was in the Australian Government's interest to also meet some of those costs. And so there were contributions, you might say from all of those areas, and just trying to rack my brain to give you a fairly detailed breakdown of the participation. Mr. Aafjes, the quarry officer for example, covered the cost of metal, not sealing, the road until — from the Cascade side until it came to the School paddock, and we — the Government — was responsible for the various fencing and making good of those arrangements. The Australian Government, if I remember correctly, met a good deal of the sealing costs through the School paddock, and Mr. Aafjes again was responsible for some of the earth moving arrangements. If my memory serves me correct they were the arrangements that were undertaken. I am not able to answer for the Australian Government as to whether they will subtract those funds referred to there from the overall amount applicable to the remaining roads on the Island, that might require some attention. It is my understanding however and I should be quite firm upon this, is that the Australian Government has undertaken to assist with the making good of the roads whatever that cost may be. That will be the approach taken by the Norfolk Island Government in negotiations to make good the roads that need to be done after the completion of the upgrading project at the airport.

MRS. GRAY: Regarding the installation, if one can call it such, of cattle stops in Burnt Pine, is that exercise still to be carried out at the completion of the upgrading operation?

MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Deputy President, the beautification of the Burnt Pine area is a project that has been on the Government's books for a couple of budget sessions now. It was earlier thought that funds should be provided so that this could be an area that could have added beauty but two things intervene, one was the airport upgrading project and it was thought it would not be feasible to in fact go to some considerable expense and trouble if in fact you were to have heavy vehicles rumbling through there that might in some way mar the project that you were about. It was thought to wait until that after that might be the more expedient process. The other factor of course was that of the provision of funds, and each member of this Assembly will know the constraints that have been applied in that particular area. We still have the financial constraint — the airport upgrading is complete. The Government in fact have not again addressed the matter of the Burnt Pine beautification which includes the cattle stops that Mrs. Gray has referred to. Has not again addressed to see how things stand, after all of the other things I have referred to have happened.
MR. SANDERS: Any further questions without notice. Mr.
Christian-Bailey.

MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: I have a couple to Mr. Buffett, I wonder if the
honourable member can tell me what the current
position is regarding the Mt. Pitt Management Plan, and also
what progress, if any, is being made with regard to the preservation
of the Green Parrot.

MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Deputy President, the Mt. Pitt Management Plan
I think I have reported on earlier occasion to this House as being
in this situation. A draft plan has been prepared - it has been
publicised, and I don't think I need to repeat that process, I think
that is well understood by members. What happens after that is
that public comment is sought, and that has been done, and this
comment has been collated by the Director of the Australian
National Parks and Wildlife Service who has carriage of the
preparation of such plan. Once those public comments have been
received and collated, they are then assessed for inclusion or
otherwise in the final plan. The last indication that I have had
from Professor Ovington, who is the Director of the Australian
National Parks and Wildlife Service is that on the return of Dr.
Coyne, who you will recall, has been a conservator stationed in
Norfolk Island for a couple of years, and just relinquished that
post and returned to Canberra, upon Dr. Coyne's return to Canberra
he would be involved in the finalisation of thatMt. Pitt plan,
and when that is done, Professor Ovington will come to the Island
to present it to us, and elaborate upon any of the writings that
are contained therein. It would then be available for the
Legislative Assembly to make its decision in respect of that plan.
I think that is much as I can provide in respect of the Mt. Pitt
plan of management.

In respect of the Green Parrot Survey, you will
recall that this House took a decision that it endorsed in principle
the plan, and having made that endorsement the Australian National
Parks and Wildlife Service would embark upon a programme of
preparation of some considerable detail and recommendations to come
forward again to the Assembly. That is continuing. Professor
Ovington did indicate to me that he would have hoped to have come
to the Island towards the end of February to have discussions with
members of the Assembly in respect of the continuation - the
progressing of this plan. You will realise that on the Australian
mainland there has been a change of Government and Professor
Ovington's commitment involved with the change of Government, within
his Department of course, has placed a great deal of demands upon
his time. He has indicated that he could not meet with us in that
time frame. He has written to me however saying that he would like
to try and progress some aspects of the plan otherwise we would
lose too much time, for example - he would like to continue to have
some talks with people in New Zealand who have conducted similar
programs so that the collection of data and information might be
still progressed although his speaking with us maybe delayed some.
I have indicated at this time that that would be helpful to the
course because I am mindful that the members of this Assembly have
endorsed that plan in principle, that we should do something about
the preservation of the Green Parrot. So in brief the plan that
has been earlier referred to by members of the Assembly is getting
along the track although some of the detail has lost a little time
because of unforeseen circumstances, but I am confident that the
project in fact is progressing and will go a great deal towards
achieving our aim which is that there be preservation of the green
parrot on Norfolk Island. I will continue to keep members informed.
MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: Further question, I don't know whether this should be directed to Mr. Buffett or perhaps to Mr. Howard. Anyway the question is that if consideration can be given at an early date for the construction of suitable garbage incinerator at Headstone.

MR. SANDERS: Mr. Buffett I think this is one of yours I believe.

MR. BUFFETT: I can comment upon some aspects - the money will have to be something Mr. Howard will need to address. Can I just say a couple of things in respect of garbage disposal, at Headstone, some of which I have said before both in the press and in this House. The commonly known area at Headstone is of course still being used for biodegradable type refuse. There are burning incinerators - 44 gallon drum type incinerators - a number of them on that site which is used to incinerate combustible smaller items that in fact might float or cause otherwise an unsightly hazard, both in that area and being washed into other areas of the Island. I must acknowledge that that is a make-shift arrangements at this time, until a more satisfactory burnable arrangement can be arranged. However hopefully it is meeting the need as it is at this moment. In addition to that there is another site in the Headstone area - it is more towards the Chapel side on top of the hill which is being constructed to accommodate large burnable items, large burnable to I suppose to small burnable that I have already referred to. This is now open and in operation. So the area can accommodate bio-degradable stuff small burnable stuff, such as plastic and the like and large burnable items. I have mentioned some of the short term measures which we will need to address, you will recall that earlier in this financial year we determined that there should be an incinerator for which funds were provided - I think in the vicinity of $11,000 which would in fact taken adequately care of our situation as we find ourselves now, for reasons which members will understand. Those funds could could not be expended and so we find ourselves without that incinerator and we have needed to go to the measures that I have just mentioned. I think it is still advisable to have some incinerator arrangement that can more adequately cater for needs, but that has to be a matter of examination of the funds available.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. Buffett. Any further questions without notice? Mrs. Gray.

MRS. GRAY: May I follow on perhaps that question, and ask what provision is currently being made to ensure that people do sort their garbage into burnables and non-burnables? I am referring in particular to a note circulated by Lester Semple, I have been unable to discuss it further with him, but I would like to know what provision is made to ensure that people are sorting their garbage.

MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Deputy President, there is encouragement for people to sort their rubbish into burnables and non-burnable bundles. As you will realise this is not something that is governed by legislation at this time, however there is very strong encouragement. Of course if people do have both in the one bundle then it has to go through the burnable arrangement which makes the incinerator situation more pressing. I am aware of Mr. Semple's business which he conducts on the Island and I might acknowledge at this time that Mr. Semple has made very valuable contribution to the arrangements for disposal of rubbish on the Island, he has shown a keen interest, and in fact has made a number of experiments...
of his own account and own expense to try and assist the project and he has in general been forthcoming with a number of suggestions which have been helpful and he continues to have sound interest. I know that he is trying to encourage his clients to in fact sort in to the arrangements that have been referred to but you will realise that many of the people who utilise a garbage disposal arrangement don't always comply totally with those requests, regretfully. I would encourage them to do so, because if they do so it makes garbage disposal arrangements on the Island more easier handled which is to the communities benefit. In short people are encouraged but it is not a legislative measure, regretfully some people still do not.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. Buffett. Miss Buffett.

MISS BUFFETT: Mr. Deputy President, I direct this question to Mr. Buffett, Executive Member for Administration, Education and Health and ask Mr. Buffett if he will give consideration to amending the Social Services Act firstly to exempt from the income of an applicant periodical gifts or other payments made by relatives of the applicant and secondly, to permit recipients of benefits to earn exempt income to enable them to establish savings to meet such expenses as overseas medical expenses and expenses related to medical expenses, such as air fares, overseas ambulance fees and out patient accommodation fees for those requiring medical checks before returning to Norfolk Island. I ask this question because those whose funds are exhausted and who may be able to by one means or another should be given lawful methods of re-establishing an essential contingency funds and it is my opinion that adjustment to the present Social Services Act 1980 needs to be affected in order for this to be made possible.

MR. BUFFETT: The areas of which — I should first of all say that payments in respect of the Social Services Act are of course governed by legislation and Miss Buffett correctly referred to the Act and refers to any amendments that might need to be made to that piece of legislation, should that be desired or required. She has made mention of a number of areas which she considers should receive examination and attention. I can see that some of these areas could cause difficulties to persons who in fact come within the purview of the Social Services Act. I am really not able to make an opinion at this moment as to whether such amendments would be acceptable to the Government or to this House. What I can say is that I would be very happy to collate the detail that is mentioned. I would like to have the opinion of the Social Services Board in respect of any proposals and I am aware that Miss Buffett is a member of that Board as is the Chairman of the Board who is Mr. Quintal who is a member of this House, and I would value the response from the Board. Following that it is thought appropriate to raise it with members of this House to see if they saw a need for some legislative change in the Act to which Miss Buffett has referred.

MR. JACKSON: Mr. Deputy President one to Mr. Buffett., concerning the Cascade Cliff. Mr. Buffett complaints regarding frequent rock falls from the cliff face over-looking the Cascade Jetty. This could have been brought about by heavy blasting in the quarry behind the cliff face. During lighterage operation there is many as 40/50 men on the jetty at one time or another and should a large boulder come down during these operations, I am certain there could be fatality, and may I add these rock falls took place prior to the recent heavy rain. The question is would you as Minister responsible arrange to have this cliff face inspected, or if you consider necessary, arrange with the Department of Housing and Construction so as they
could carry out a survey of the cliff as a matter of urgency.

MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Deputy President, the Cascade cliff has been a matter of some concern to the Government for some time, and have previously reported the situation to this House. Let me just point out a couple of difficulties and then respond to the question in more concrete terms. You will probably realise that the land in fact is upon a Crown Reserve area, and therefore the responsibility and in legal terms for what happens there lies with the Commonwealth of Australia. The difficulty with all this is that the Commonwealth nevertheless says to us, but if anything is to be done there, and it costs money, you have to pay. So you have that dichotomy, ownership in one hand and not accepting the total responsibility on that basis. However I have got to quickly say that despite that the Norfolk Island Government has not evaded its responsibilities. At the time of the commencement of the airport project, you may recall, the cliff was in fact surveyed and I have to give acknowledgement to the Australian Government in fact they provided that co-operation to conduct that survey through the Department - I think - then Housing and Construction. So a survey was carried out then. The result of that survey was that there might be some minor blasting to remove what was considered at that time, to be rocks that may fall in a short period of time and that is undertaken. After that another survey done which said it was safe as it could be. If we have now reached a stage, oh I should say, at the same time it was said that there should be some periodic surveys thereafter to ensure safety there. Now in fact if Mr. Jackson is saying to me that it requires attention now, I most certainly will forthwith arrange to have it inspected and ensure that for the best extent that we are able that Cliff face is safe for people who need to walk or drive or take whatever means beneath it.

MR. SANDERS: Any further questions without notice?

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

MR. SANDERS: I think the first one is in your name Mr. Buffett.

MR. BUFFETT: Yes, thank you Mr. Deputy President. Motor vehicles, I think that is the one.

The question which was asked of me by Mrs. Gray was this. 'Norfolk Island, dated 5 March 83 in the column 2222 stated that we have just received a list of some 500 un-registered motor vehicles.' The queries are - 'how many vehicles are there on Norfolk Island? how many are registered? how many plates from un-registered vehicles have not been returned? Having regard to the financial difficulties being experienced by the Administration, what steps have been taken to collect the outstanding registration fees and what steps will be taken to recover fees retrospectively. Legislation provides for the return of number plates and a fine for failure to do so. What steps will be taken to carry out this process?'

Mr. Deputy President there are registered as at 31 March 1983 2,031 vehicles and there are 315 unregistered as at that same date. Letters have been sent by the Registrar on 18 March 1983 and 27 plates have been returned from vehicles where registration has expired. Letters have been sent out on
occasions previous to that to persons whose registration were outstanding. It would be of note to members that section 86 of the Road Traffic Act of 1982 provides for the payment of a fee equivalent to 1/12 of the prescribed registration fee in respect of the vehicle for each month or part of a month that the number plate is not returned, after firstly the relevant vehicles ceases to be registered, or secondly, the number plates ceases to be valid, in respect of any vehicle. Section 7 of the Act does provide for the Registrar to recover any such fees in a Court of competent jurisdiction. And in addition to any penalty imposed under the Act in respect of failure to return the number plates as prescribed. No effect has been made at this time to recover the fees in the manner provided in Section 7, that is taking people to Court. It is intended that the Registration arrangements and payment of fees be first of all followed up in the first instance with the Police, and this is being done.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. Buffett. The next question is also in your name.

MRS. GRAY: May I ask a question to that please?

Is the Executive Member able to explain why the first issue of registration stickers were blue and the second red and the third blue? instead of a third colour?

MR. BUFFETT: No I have not studied the cromatics of the situation.

This one is about dogs. At this time Mr. Deputy President, I can provide some answers to that and I will do so to the best of my ability. The question is this, Mrs. Gray asks. 'What requirement exists for the registration of dogs, how many dogs are registered, has there been a drop in the number of registrations since the implementation of the higher fees, if so, by what number, and what provision exists for ensuring that dogs are registered?'

There of course is legislation requiring the registration of dogs. The number of dogs that have been registered since 1980 are these on an annual basis, as at 1 January. 1980 - 159, 1981 148, 1982 - 129, 1983 - 122, 1984 - 106. The new fees for registration came into effect on 1 July 1960, and only 4 of the registrations for the year ending 1 January 1981 were affected by that increase. Those are the statistics that I have at this time.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. Buffett. Do you have a supplement Mrs. Gray?

MRS. GRAY: Not really, I would like to ensure that the other questions are answered in due course, I think it is worth noting that Mr. Buffett has said that he has provided some answers.

MR. BUFFETT: I acknowledge that Mr. Deputy President.

MR. SANDER: Thank you Mr. Buffett.

MR. BUFFETT: The next one is in my name. Mrs. Gray asks again.

'What provision exists in Norfolk Island for persons in need of legal aid?'
The office of the Administrator has provided some information. This information is this. He says, 'I have been advised by the Attorney-General's Department that residents of Norfolk Island are entitled to receive legal aid from the Australian Legal Aid Office provided they satisfy the means and needs test applied by that office and the office considers that it is reasonably in all the circumstances to grant aid.' He enclosed a copy of the office's means and needs test and contribution guidelines. Mr. Deputy President, I table a copy of that document for the information of members. Further to that, he says, 'In determining whether it is reasonable to grant aid, the officer has regard to all relevant matters including a) the benefit that may accrue to the applicant from the provision of the assistance or the detriment that the applicant may suffer if the assistance is not provided; b) in the case of assistance to proceeding the likelihood of the proceedings terminating in a favour to the applicant. To ensure the office to consider the application for legal aid, it is necessary for the person or persons seeking legal aid to complete and application setting out relevant personal and financial information. A description of the matter in respect of which legal aid is sought and some indication of the merit of the claim. Application forms are available from the office of the Administrator.'

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. Buffett.

MR. BUFFETT: Question 41, stands in the Executive Member for Planning Tourism and Commerce.

MR. SANDERS: Mrs. Gray asks, is it a fact that the Executive Committee at its meeting on 26 April 1982 established a list of legislative drafting priorities in respect of the following matters: Water sewage and drainage, immigration, building, tourist accommodation licensing, dangerous drugs, radio and television, mental health and Island planning. Three matters have been dealt with. Would the Executive Member, if the Legislative Draftsman has received full instructions on any of the remaining matters, and if so, would he specify a) the matters and b) the present position in respect of these matters. Would the Executive Member advise the House if the list of legislative priorities has been revised since 26 April 1982, and if so, would he give the House details?

In reply to Mrs. Gray's question, there was such a list of priorities made by the Executive Member, the exact date it was made, I am not sure, but I believe the date Mrs. Gray quotes, the 26 April 1982, is probably correct. I like Mrs. Gray and others attended that meeting and I feel that rather than waste my time, Mrs. Gray should refer to her own notes or to Minutes of that particular meeting. Mrs. Gray is aware that the Immigration Bill is being held up because of a motion in this House by Miss Buffett needing clarification on the discrimination act which Mrs. Gray herself supported. Mrs. Gray is aware of the motion I brought before this House in an effort to control buildings. This motion was successful subject to regulations being approved by this House. On the matter of licencing tourist accommodation, I believe little has happened at this time, however the Tourist Board is ready to give to the Legislative Draftsman a draft proposal for accommodation grading. For Mrs. Gray's information I would like to inform her that the Legislative Draftsman has been absent from Norfolk Island for approximately 2 months and I personally have difficulty in matters drafted without him. With regard to Island planning Mrs. Gray should be aware that Item No. 3 of Orders of Today on this
Notice Paper today, reads Adoption of criteria in Coldham Plan in relation to land sub-division, which if passed by this House gives a good start on these matters. Finally, I am not aware if the priorities have been revised, I assume not.

MRS. GRAY: I wonder if the Executive Member is prepared to agree that sarcasm is the lowest form of wit.

MR. SANDERS: I do agree, but Mrs. Gray should also agree that this time wasting thing that she is getting into the habit of also bugs quite a few of us.

MR. BUFFETT: Mrs. Gray.

MRS. GRAY: If I am to return my retaliatory words into a question, is it not the function of a non-executive member to question the function of the Executive Members.

MR. BUFFETT: Order. I cannot interpret that as a supplemimentary question to the question that has been placed on the Notice Paper Mrs. Gray. I think we move on Honourable Members.

MR. BUFFETT: Papers, are there any papers? Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: I table financial indications for 8 months of current financial year that is period through the end of February, copies have been distributed to members. The result for the month of February was a short fall of $29,000 for the month. Postal and Philatelic revenue improved a bit over what it has been in recent months but still not up to our target. Customs is just in the month of February a bit over half our target. Liquor Bond Store is right on target just a shade over. For 8 months of the year we have had to consume $335,000 of the Island's savings from past years, of reserve funds have been necessary to be used to finance operations through the end of February this year. As an additional comment relating to the same general matter of finance, I have just received notification from the Administration that the cost of providing hospital and medical expenses for persons approved to have those expenses partly or wholly support is running well ahead of the amount of money we provided for the year as a whole. The Assembly provided $115,000 which was roughly what was needed in the previous financial year. We have spent virtually all of that through the end of March, which would indicate that that particular kind of expense is running maybe one third higher than it was a year ago, and I have not yet had a chance to look at all deeply into this question but it is suggested by the Administration that a further $35,000 may be needed to be supplied to carry that set of commitments through this financial year, through the end of June that is. I table that paper.

MR PRESIDENT: Thank you. Are there any further papers.

MISS BUFFETT: I am sorry I think I must be a little out of kilter with this... I am not permitted to ask a question pertaining to a Statement, am I or am I?

MR PRESIDENT: I would have no difficulty in accepting a motion that the paper be noted and then it may be discussed.
MISS BUFFETT: Thank you. I move that the paper be noted.

MR PRESIDENT: Thank you. Discussion Honourable Members

MISS BUFFETT: Mr President. Could I ask Mr Howard that he does, or has he taken into account that the medical benefits and social service side of things referred to in your Notice that this years requirements will essentially be more than last years in view of the fact that the Social Services Act didn't come into being until the First of August in 1981. It didn't become operable till then and there will be entitlements for a parallel length of time more this year than was short last year. In other words there would be nearly three months more requirement in this financial year.

MR HOWARD: My understanding of the situation is that these medical costs are not included in the Social Services Act. I think they are done as separate thing so that the comparison from year to year would, I think be valid, and what it means is that either the Hospital charges have gone up or more people are getting ill or there are more people who are entitled to be drawing on this kind of help. It is one of the three or a combination of them and I don't know yet what it is.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you. The Policy I think came in... there wasn't a Policy. I'll accept that answer though. Thank you.

MR SANDERS: Mr President I have the tourist arrival figures for March

INTERJECTION: Mr Jackson, Mr Brown

MR SANDERS: I'm sorry

MR PRESIDENT: Yes thank you. Is there any further discussion in respect of the motion that the paper be noted? No further discussion

Question put
Motion agreed

MR PRESIDENT: Mr Sanders, go ahead please

MR SANDERS: My apologies Mr President. I have the tourist arrival figures from the Government Tourist Bureau for March 1983. This March was rather a big increase from March of last 1982 but still 317 persons below March of 1981. I would like to table this.

MR PRESIDENT: Further presentation of papers?
Mr Sanders.

MR PRESIDENT: Mr President, I have quite a few documents from EastWest that I would like to table now and from Airlines of New South Wales. I don't think that there is
any point in discussing them now but the Members will probably want to discuss them later on in the meeting. May I table these now please. Thank you. Also later on in the Meeting is the Tourism Report. There is also a letter from the Accommodation Proprietors that I would like to table. Thank you.

MR PRESIDENT: Further papers to be tabled or presented Honourable Members. No.

STATEMENTS

MR PRESIDENT: Executive Member Statements, Mr Howard.

MR HOWARD: In December the Commonwealth Government enacted a Wages Pause Salaries and Wages Pause Act which was extended to Norfolk Island and to which some Members of the Assembly and Members of the Government reacted with some concern. Last month the Executive Members agreed on a policy concerning the extension of that Wages and Salaries and Wages Pause Act of Australia to Norfolk Island and I would like to quote briefly from that policy which has been furnished to the Administrator. The policy observes first of all that the Act extended to Norfolk Island but there was no prior consultation between the Commonwealth and the Norfolk Island Government concerning the suitability of that extension. Our Policy Statement then says that the Government of Norfolk Island believes that the Act in its application to Norfolk Island is contrary to the interests of good Government for the following reasons -

1. The Norfolk Island Government has responsibility for the public moneys and fiscus of Norfolk Island which are separate from those of the Commonwealth. Commonwealth legislation such as this Act having substantial impact on the proper management of Norfolk Island Public Moneys seriously impairs the ability of the Norfolk Island Government to discharge its responsibility properly. Next the funds used for the payment of Norfolk Island Wages and Salaries are raised by Norfolk Island and not by the Commonwealth. The proper use of those funds in accordance with the Norfolk Island Act 1979 is a matter for the Legislative Authority of the Norfolk Island Legislative Assembly and the Executive Authority of the Norfolk Island Government as conferred by that Act. Next the economy of Norfolk Island is separate and distinct from that of Australia. Legislation well suited to the economic management of Australia may be quite ill suited to the economic management of Norfolk Island. Next, the Norfolk Island Government has for a year been applying its own wage and salary restraint earlier and more stringently than the Commonwealth Government has. In effect the wages and salary pause has prevailed here since February 1982. This has affected not only the public service but the members of the Legislative Assembly and Government Ministers who have voluntarily declined to accept remuneration increases authorised by the Remuneration Tribunal. In February 1983 the Legislative Assembly enacted legislation which reduced the funds available for paying public service wages and salaries by 10% and at the same time accepted a voluntary reduction of 10% in the remuneration received by Assembly Members including Executive Members. When Norfolk Island economic conditions permit
to Fred Jowett, the Radio Station Engineer, to Mick Wood of OTC and to Clive Backhouse of the Department of Aviation as they may have pertinent comment to make. Once it is returned with their comment it will be referred to the Legal Adviser. The Administrator has asked that any representations which we may wish to make in relation to the Bill be made by the 22nd of this month. Therefore the Committee requests the co-operation of Members in this regard and ask that they assent to making their decision whether or not to support the recommendation of the Committee outside the forum of the House. Members would be asked to sight the legislation in the normal fashion through the good offices of the Clerk to the Assembly and the Committee asks that Members attend a short meeting to support or otherwise their recommendation such a meeting to be recognised by this House as an authorised departure from a general rule laid down by this House and referred to in Minute No. 7 of its meeting of the 7th April 1982.

MR HOWARD:     I move that part of the report be noted.

MR PRESIDENT:   The report be noted. Discussion.

MR HOWARD:     I would like to say that to the extent that that Commonwealth Legislation establishes or intends to establish laws that we could establish ourselves I intend to oppose it absolutely and I hope that every other member will as well. I do not argue the wisdom or otherwise of controlling the radio spectrum. Obviously it is something that has got to be done for the benefit of everyone but the Federal Parliament gave the Norfolk Island Legislative Assembly control over Radio and TV Broadcasting. They have already passed one law to do with the ABC which was a whole group of laws that encroached on the authority that they gave us in the Norfolk Island Act and they passed that over our heads. I opposed that at the time. The Assembly passed a Resolution expressing concern and unhappiness about what they were doing. Here it comes again. I think we ought to fight these things. The penny is beginning to drop over in Canberra in some Departments that Norfolk Island does as a matter of fact have its own little Government that has certain kinds of authority and I think we have to stamp on these infringements of our authority whenever we see them and this clearly to me is one so while we may be discussing it out of the open Assembly and it may not be on the radio I want to make it clear loud and publicly that I think we have to stop this kind of thing.

MR PRESIDENT:  Further debate. There being no further debate I put the question.

Question put
Motion agreed

MR PRESIDENT:  Any further reports. Honourable Members we move to Notices then.

NOTICE NO. 1 - EXEMPTION FROM PAYMENT OF CUSTOMS DUTY

MR HOWARD:     Thank you Mr President. I move that the House recommends to His Honour the Administrator that the goods specified hereunder be exempted pursuant to section 2B
of the Customs Ordinance 1913 from duties of customs, namely, 2 bulk LP gas tanks of 50 tonne capacity each, such having been imported by Boral Gas Limited for use in the construction of the LP gas terminal on Norfolk Island. The need for the motion Mr President is that I guess the tanks were so big that boral forgot to apply for exemption for them in the very long detailed list of equipment and bits and pieces that was brought in to build that bulk storage tank. Everything else on the list was passed as it should have been, it was the policy of the Assembly that that should be a duty free installation. The two biggest things in the installation they forgot to put on the list. They would now like them put on and I think they should be. I think there is no question about what the intention was which was that that installation should be duty free and while Members might like to collect a little bit of duty I think we have an obligation to make good an oversight here in order to keep proper faith with the understanding that that would be a duty free installation and I recommend the motion.

MR PRESIDENT: Debate Honourable Members. Mr Jackson

MR JACKSON: Mr President, before I commence I will say that I will support but I must have some comments regarding further exemptions. I recall that Mr Howard said, it may be 18 months ago that a long list of all items that was used in the installation of the boral's bulk liquid petroleum operation in Ball Bay but we heard a while ago of the $300,000 odd thousand dollars that we are down this year in our financial report by our Financial Minister. We also heard that Members of this Assembly especially non executive members who has not a large salary, $60 per week or something has just signed away, I just signed away another 10% of mine, but however, if the exemption of these two tanks will assist in keeping the cost of liquid petroleum gas down I support it.

MR SANDERS: I support the motion

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

question put
Motion agreed

NOTICE NO. 2 - LICENSING OF EAST-WEST AIRLINES TO OPERATE TWICE WEEKLY SERVICE BETWEEN NORFOLK ISLAND AND BRISBANE

MR SANDERS: I move that this House recommends the issue of a licence to East West Airlines to enable that company to operate up to two return air services per week between Norfolk Island and Brisbane in accordance with the agreement between Norfolk Island Airlines and East West Airlines dated 15 February 1983 subject -

(a) to Norfolk Island Airlines retaining its licence to also operate over the same route;

and
(b) to Norfolk Island Airlines, upon normal application, being issued with a licence to operate regular air services between Norfolk Island and Sydney.

Mr Chairman, Mr President, there has been rather lengthy communication between East West and the Norfolk Island Government.

MR JACKSON: Mr President, could I take a Point of Order at this stage please?

MR PRESIDENT: Point of Order Mr Jackson.

MR JACKSON: My Point of Order Mr President at this point, and the reason that I give, I have checked company records - also I was provided by the shareholders of Air Norfolk's letter to the Department of Aviation signed by 53 shareholders representing 93% of the total issued shares, and signatures of three members of this Assembly are on the list of those shareholders. They are Mr Bill Sanders, Mr Bernie Christian-Bailey and Mr John Brown. Also Mrs Gray has indicated at a meeting yesterday that she holds proxy shares on behalf of other persons. Therefore Mr President I seek your advise as to whether there be any direct conflict of pecuniary interest concerning the shareholders I have named regarding the motion now before the House.

MR PRESIDENT: Mr Jackson, this matter has been raised amongst members before this sitting. I am sure that probably all members will be aware of that and having that knowledge I have made examination of the legalities of the situation which are covered by the Norfolk Island Act under Section 39 (3) and (4) of that Act and also by Standing Orders of this House. Standing Order 139 and this has received legal examination by the offices that are available and as far as can be determined within that sphere there is no impediment from the strict legal position of view to those members participating and voting in this debate. The advice that has been offered to me I stress covers the strict legal position. Whether there are other factors which individual members would want to take into account that is purely for each individual member. That is as I see it Honourable Members.

MRS GRAY: Is it still in order for me to make an explanation Mr President on the assertion made by Mr Jackson.

MR PRESIDENT: It would not be at this time. You could seek leave at a subsequent time because we are almost in the middle of... we in fact have a motion before the House, to make a personal statement.

MRS GRAY: I can only at this stage object most strongly to the words that Mr...

MR PRESIDENT: Order Order. There will be an opportunity if you wish to make a personal statement Mrs Gray. On that basis Honourable Members we will continue the debate in respect of the motion that is before the House, concerning the airlines application. Mr Sanders.

MR SANDERS: Thank you Mr President. To satisfy Mr Jackson I would like to inform him that the value of my share...
holding probably buys the noubb on the toilet. Mr president. To continue this motion as what was put on the paper prior to the meeting that was held with Assembly members yesterday and prior to quite a bit of this correspondence that has arrived and been circulated. The main purpose that it went on in this manner was that it was a motion on the books and I would like at this stage Mr Chairman to open the meeting up and discuss same.

MRS GRAY: I leave it to advise from you Mr President as to when I am entitled to make the personal explanation however, at the moment I would like to move an amendment to the Notice that appears on the Notice Paper. Thank you, that the motion be amended by omitting all words after "THAT" (first occurring) and substituting the following -

subject to -

(a) review by this house at the expiration of 12 months and reconsideration at the expiration of 2 years; and

(b) the retention by Norfolk Island Airlines Limited of its licence to operate air services between Brisbane and Norfolk Island,

this House recommends the issue of a licence to East West Airlines to enable that airline to operate up to two return air services per week between Brisbane and Norfolk Island. This House is further of the opinion that it is desirable that upon normal application in that regard, and without prejudice to any existing licence held by East West Airlines, there be issued to Norfolk Island Airlines a licence to operate air services between Sydney and Norfolk Island.

Thank you Mr President. Perhaps just a word of clarification here. What I have sought to do in the amendment is eliminate reference in the original motion to the agreement between Norfolk Island Airlines and East West Airlines. I don't believe that that is a matter for the consideration or discussion by this House. That agreement was tabled under the restriction 'confidential' at the last meeting, therefore it is not something we can debate openly in the House, it is not something which the general public will be aware. I also sought to remove the provision in the original motion which made the issue of that licence subject to certain provisos, in particular if one reads the provision B of the existing motion fairly carefully, it could be seen, or an interpretation could be given of that the original motion that Norfolk Island Airlines was seeking to take over utterly and completely the Sydney run and that I believe is not the case. The application for the Sydney run will be made in due course by Norfolk Island Airlines as part and parcel of the arrangement which seeks to eliminate monopoly on the Sydney run and the Brisbane run. I am prepared to speak to my motion Mr President if it is in order at this time.

MR PRESIDENT: Mrs Gray, it is in order. I might say at this time that if you wish to weave into your address the matters that you feel should be responded to in earlier debate you are at liberty to do so.
MRS GRAY: I don't wish to weave them in at all. I wish to state categorically that I am not a shareholder of Norfolk Island Airlines. I held a proxy on behalf of a shareholder which enabled me to attend the meetings. I specifically sought that proxy to enable me to attend the meetings so that I might be as fully informed as possible on the issue which is before us. I have no pecuniary interests or any other interest in Norfolk Island Airlines.

MR PRESIDENT: Mrs Gray do you wish to continue.

MRS GRAY: Could I continue.

MR PRESIDENT: Mr Howard do you have a point of order.

MR HOWARD: No. I.

MR PRESIDENT: Then Mrs Gray has the floor. Mrs Gray.

MRS GRAY: Mr President. This is a difficult issue I suppose all the issues we have in this House are difficult in one way or another but this one is particularly so because there is information available to the Members which is not generally available to everyone living on Norfolk Island therefore, we might seem to make decisions here on this issue which are not necessarily based on facts that we will bring forward.

This is unfortunate. I hope that people listening to us today can understand that. I have certainly had alot to say to Members outside the House and I shall have alot to say this afternoon therefore I shall be as brief as possible if it comes out in note form I hope you will bear with me. Brian Gray came to Norfolk Island in September 1982 and at a public meeting he said that a daily service to Norfolk Island would be ideal. And I agree. Ideal for him maybe but not for those of us living on Norfolk Island. A daily service of an F28 out of Brisbane and or Sydney, at that time he was only talking about Sydney, would mean 25,000 visitors to Norfolk Island from Sydney alone, potentially. In a letter to Bill Sanders dated the 2nd March this year, Brian Gray said we confirm our willingness to control flights to the Island to the specified level of tourism which your Assembly may determine as the optimum for your tourist industry and the well being of the Norfolk Island residents. Now I suggest that that is a man and organisation which is willing to listen to what we, the people living on Norfolk Island want. Not just letting us know what is best for him. You might recall also the yelp that I made at a meeting fairly recently about mail carriage. I addressed the question to the Executive Member for Finance I believe suggesting that would it be possible for East West to carry mail as was necessary not as they felt as required and in fact within a matter of days we had an undertaking from East West Airlines to do precisely that. They had guaranteed a carriage on every flight of 100 kilos of mail and 10 kilos of newspapers. You might recall also that we were without newspapers for the duration of the election period in Australia. I might tell you that the East West people were unaware of the difficulties which were occurring at that stage. As soon as they were informed they did something about it. Brian Gray told us back in September 1982 that the second F28 would be due in November. It is due for delivery on the 19th November and is due in service on the 5th of December.
There's the backup that we have been asking for. We were very concerned. I personally was very concerned and expressed those concerns in the House about one plane to do the job. The second plane is due in service on 5th December. East West Airlines want to be the third National carrier by 1986. Now when Brian Gray was here last September he wanted to achieve that status by 1989. He is confident that he can knock three years off the time that he needs. I don't believe that those words are uttered lightly. I think that he will make it given reasonable economic conditions in which to operate. East West undertook that meeting to employ other carriers to shift freight backlogs should the need arise. He has done better than that. There have been a number of freighters this year alone in response to that need. It was a need expressed by members of the Chamber of Commerce, it has been a need expressed in the past and nothing has happened. Under Brian Gray it has. Mr Jackson over here will try and tell us that Brian Gray is trying to impress us and I will be prepared to agree with him. Agree with him absolutely and as far as I am concerned that is working. The image of East West Airlines on Norfolk Island has taken a tremendous lift under the new management and don't forget for one moment that those freighters go back empty at what must be enormous cost to East West and I call that dedication above and beyond the call of duty. Yes. It is impressive. Brian Gray told us that fares would be better by $20 to $30 and that we could get supersaver or Apex fares. East West call them supersaver, other people call them Apex. Advance Purchase Excursion Fares they are. They must contain a degree of accommodation. We can't talk about those things in detail because it is a matter under consideration by the independent air fares committee but those new deals are there. Recall too that East West carries a number of people to and from Norfolk on behalf of various community interests free, gratis, for nothing. That is another part of the new deal. What we have to decide right here and now because if we don't the Minister for Aviation will do it for us, is whether we want East West to carry passengers from Brisbane on a brand new F28-4000 or as will come forward later in the debate here this afternoon whether we want Ansett, Air New South Wales to carry passengers from Brisbane on an eleven year old F28-1000 an aircraft which does not have the flexibility of range which the model 4000 owned by East West does. And I would just like to come back onto my point here about the Minister for Aviation. Mr Beazley, Kim Beazley told us when he was here on the 28th March that he wanted a decision and a recommendation from us in two weeks. That time was up on Monday or Tuesday of this week so we are already running behind time if we wish to make a recommendation to the Minister. I have had a phone call to, a discussion with the Offices of the Administrator. They confirmed that the Department is anxious for our view and will decide the issue without our views if we don't hurry up. And that was a letter put on the 6th of April to us. So I believe that this fact of inflexibility with regard to the use of an F28-1000 is important. We are faced now with aborted flights
by F27 aircraft owned by Air New Zealand when conditions on Norfolk are poor. That's the same, exactly the same kind of problem which could arise with the operation of an F281000 out of Brisbane. Let me go on to another tack and talk about the selling of Norfolk Island. Let's suppose we took on Ansett and I mean that Ansett. It's Ansett we're talking about. Air New South Wales is part of the Ansett empire. John Hutchison, the General Manager of Air New South Wales is answerable to the Board of Ansett. John Hutchison is a nice guy, he's relaxed and knowledgable and I have no questions about him at all, but he answers to the Board of Ansett. Now I don't even know who's on the Board of Ansett, I know about Sir Peter Abels but I have no idea who else is on that Board and I doubt whether anybody sitting around this table today does either. I doubt that members of the Assembly or probably anyone in the community could pick up the phone and talk to Sir Peter Abels or the dozen or so other people involved in this operation. I'm prepared to bet that any member of this Assembly can pick up a phone and talk directly with the man at the top of East West Airlines. The man who makes the decisions alone, and I think that's very important. It's very important for Norfolk Island. It's a very personal operation we need. We don't want to take on the big ones. I'll refer to that a little later. But come back to marketing. Ansett has 100 retail outlets. That sounds great until you realize that Ansett sells lots and lots of packages for travel to island destinations. Many of the islands in the Barrier Reef, islands in the South Pacific through its affiliations with other airlines. East West Airlines does not fly to any other island holiday destination, apart from Tasmania, that's a very different kind of island to Norfolk Island. Therefore, they do not sell any other island destination. Let me raise another point. Norfolk Island Airlines began discussions with Air New South Wales a long time before their approach to East West or East West approached N.I.A. which ever way it happens, probably Immaterial at this stage. I'm reliably informed that Air New South Wales wasn't really very interested in Norfolk Island then, but since then East West has begun giving Ansett hurry up. It's started no frills services to various places in Australia. They've met with great success and they've begun to annoy Ansett. I wonder if that has anything to do with the sudden interest in Norfolk Island by Air New South Wales. We had information from the Department of Aviation that no other application had been made to operate the Sydney/Norfolk run and that was as late as November last year. November 1992, the run Sydney/Norfolk was up for grabs and nobody was interested except East/West. Why? Why didn't Air New South Wales try for that? Why indeed? Again, why the sudden interest in running a service Brisbane to Norfolk Island for Air New South Wales? I'm prepared to take a decision based on the information which is available to me. It's possible that something will come forward at this meeting of which I'm unaware. At the moment, I can only base my decision on facts written notes that I myself have taken at meetings with Beazley, with Fyfe, with Brian Grey, with John Hutchison. I believe that most of the information that's been forthcoming from all the airlines has been circulated to members. I'd like to feel that I've taken all those factors into account. I'm very cautious about taking on Ansett. I said at an earlier sitting of the House
I don't think we're equipped to control the big boys yet. 737's, cruise ships, Ansett. They all fall into the same category. Give us time. Give ourselves time to get organized, to cope with and control the big operators. The debate that we began at a recent sitting of the House, a debate which we will resume at this sitting, may give us those controls. At the moment, we have not got them. My motion supports East West. Better the devil we know than the one we don't. Thank you Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Honourable Members, before we take a vote in respect of the amendment that is already before us, is there any further debate. Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: Yes Mr. President. I don't agree with the conclusion that Mrs. Grey comes to. I think she's pumping for the wrong wireline of the two and I'd like to move an amendment, putting it the other way round, but Mrs. Grey has put her case in favour of East West and I think there may be others who want to do that and I don't want to try to shut off discussion of Mrs. Greys debate, but before we get to voting on hers, I would like to foreshow that I hope to be able to make and amendment to put the other question as well.

MR. PRESIDENT: Could I just put forward some procedural arrangements which I would like to follow. We have Mr. Sanders basic motion which is in fact relating to the East West operation. Mrs. Grey has proposed an amendment to that which is basically supportive of that but adding some further pieces to the motion. I would envisage putting that amendment to the House so that in fact it consolidates the East West case if you might like to put it that way and then I would want to allow further debate and I have had foreshadowed to me by Mr. Howard just now, that there will be a case put for the other side, and so then, that can be moved and the House will then have before it, the two sides which they may fully debate and then after full discussion, we may vote upon that. So I just let you know at this time that I will be calling shortly to vote upon the amendment, but that is not a vote to finalize the matter so that's the real point that I wanted to make. Further discussion.

MR. JACKSON: Mr. President, now I take your statement just now that debate now can take place on the original motion and the amendment to that motion.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mrs. Grey's motion, yes which is basically addressing the East West case if I can use those terms.
MR. JACKSON: Mr. President, certainly Mrs. Grey has gone into that for her namesake Mr. Brian Grey, but however, in discussing the original motion in its original content, it does not seem appropriate as seems to be expected in the motion that Norfolk Island Airlines be the bargaining point for the issuing of a license for East West to operate on the Brisbane/Norfolk route. Norfolk Island Airlines a type of aircraft suitable to the 960 miles Sydney/Norfolk run. A future role of Norfolk Island Airlines should be to continue providing a service between Brisbane/Lord Howe/Norfolk Island and Lord Howe and possibly a mixed operation as suggested by airlines of New South Wales in conjunction with the P28 jet operation. There is much talk of having competition on the Sydney route in particular. Direct competition by more than one independent operator on any route where frequency is less than two flights a day is not usually permitted by the licensing authorities. Separate airlines such as East West operating out of Sydney and Airlines of New South Wales operating out of Brisbane, will provide at least some form of indirect competition. Now here we are, we had a statement by Mrs. Grey asking this House and the general public to come to terms with East/West who in my opinion and in every other member's opinion around this table, has had this Government on and the community on as far as airfares are concerned. Ask any resident around this island what is the reason because there is a decline in tourists. What is the answer because of high airfares. Ask any tourist why they say they are starting to think about Norfolk Island high airfares. Ask any resident of Norfolk Island who wish to take his or her family for a holiday or visit relatives on the mainland why they can't go because of high airfares. It's good to see that Mrs. Grey poses Mr. Grey of his goodwill attitude to the people of Norfolk Island, it was only last September that at a meeting of the South Pacific Hotel when I attended a meeting there with Mr. Grey and other members of the Tourist Departments when Mr. Grey was definitely against in being questioned on stand-by fares. Mr. Keith Sutton, a little earlier than that was definite that there be no stand by fares for the people of Norfolk Island. Why has there been a change of heart? So quick. Why has there been this change? Because someone else has taken notice, someone else has lodged an application, why has there been in Mr. Grey's letter when he puts it to this Assembly in his letter to the Executive Member in planning, Mr. Sanders and he no doubt knew that this debate will come forward today, and I quote a part of his letter "It is a fact that we have operated a number of cargo flights during 1983 all of which involve us in substantial loss". Mrs. Grey has stated that but listen to the rest of it "and do believe that some consideration of this fact should influence Assembly thinking". Well good gracious. Here's a person that has taken the community of Norfolk Island on in high airfares, asking to influence my thinking along his lines. He's come forward and asked for more routes, he's asked to be included in the Brisbane run, where further strangulation and monopoly control if he was successful where the people of Norfolk Island would suffer the most. Mr. Grey goes on in his letter, he don't
want to stop on the Brisbane run he wants to branch out further in the Pacific. This is the Manager that Mrs Gray has proposed as a man of good will and wants to do good for the people of Norfolk Island. He wants the whole of the route. He not only wants Brisbane only but he is prepared and he is negotiating now to branch out between Norfolk and Auckland, and lets read what he says about it. I believe it will cost him very heavily financial. Other possibilities which has been raised is the possibility of the F28 operation between Norfolk Island and Auckland and the suggestion that East West Airlines would not be able to provide a service because of the investment allowance constraints however, I have had discussions with the Department of Aviation who have indicated that they will support our approach to the Treasury to obtain a concession against this allowance. I am confident that this will be forthcoming as similar concession has been recently promoted in respect of shipping and Mr Gray if he was successful in those three routes he will really put a rope right around our necks. And here we are, Mrs Gray has come forward with an amendment to the original motion asking this house to support East West flying out of Brisbane as well as Sydney and onto the Auckland Norfolk run. Let's have another look at this person that Mrs Gray has posed as a person of such good will. On the 18th January I received a letter and I believe that all other members have received the same letter from the shareholders of Norfolk Island Airlines, condemning Mr Gray on a statement that he made. They condemn Mr Gray as not telling the truth. Now I will quote part of this letter. As shareholders of long standing in Norfolk Island Airlines we wish to make it quite clear to you Sir. Now this letter is going to the Department of Aviation... that as at today's date Mr Gray has not approached or spoken to any one of us regarding our interest or otherwise in Norfolk Island Airlines. Now Mr Gray has stated and I quote his statement what he is supposed to have said to these shareholders "however, a recent visit to Norfolk Island indicates that the actual subscribing shareholders of that airline no longer have any real interest in the operation and would welcome the operation of East West Airlines over that route... It would appear that circumstances under which the debenture holder has gained control of Norfolk Island Airlines has significantly removed any allegiance which the shareholders may have felt for that Airline". Now there is further criticism in this letter towards Mr Gray. It appears that the man who wants the control of the whole tourist trade of Norfolk Island including Sydney route, Brisbane route and Norfolk to Auckland and return, second paragraph of this letter is one that challenges Mr Gray's credibility, and the letter goes on to the Department of Aviation where it states "we feel that... this is from the shareholders of Norfolk Island Airlines mind you... we feel that the Statement made by Mr Gray casts doubt upon his credibility and we particularly object to being misrepresented in an official application to your Department". Now I heard Mrs Gray oppose Reg Ansett's company as bogey men well I wonder who is the bogey man after those statements and official statements to Mr Gray. Mr President, I do believe we would be doing the Island and the community a disservice if we place the whole of the tourist trade to this Island in the hands of one monopoly group as East West. As far as Mrs Gray is concerned about her shares, I didn't make the statement in any facetious manner, that was her statement to us at the meeting where we discussed all these things yesterday, that she held
proxy shares for the means of gaining entry into the meetings of the shareholders. If she had said that she didn't own any shares.. but she did say yesterday that she owned shares. She didn't own shares but that she had proxy shares for the means of gaining entry to that:

**MRS GRAY:** Point of Order Mr President

**MR PRESIDENT:** Point of Order

**MRS GRAY:** I have given an explanation there is no such thing as a proxy share. You hold a proxy on behalf of a shareholder.

**MR PRESIDENT:** Yes I cannot accept that as a Point of Order Mrs Gray

**MRS GRAY:** Interjection

**MR PRESIDENT:** Mr Jackson, you of course do have..

**MR JACKSON:** Interjection

**MR PRESIDENT:** Order Order Mr Jackson. I just may clarify this. You will however, have the opportunity in the debate for participating and to put in any view that you may wish but I cannot accept that as a Point of Order. Mr Jackson

**MR JACKSON:** Thank you Mr President. Let us take another look at the fares. I know there have been some variation very conveniently I believe, the air fares up till yesterday was Norfolk Island Airlines Brisbane Norfolk Island, peak $560 return. Norfolk Island Airlines Brisbane to Norfolk return $516 off peak. East West proposed Brisbane Norfolk return and that mind you is unconfirmed up till yesterday is $422 return. That is the difference of $130 odd

**MR PRESIDENT:** Order Mr Sanders

**MR JACKSON:** THAT is a difference of $130 odd dollars..

**MR PRESIDENT:** Order Order. Point of Order Mr Sanders?

**MR SANDERS:** The only Point of Order I wish to draw Mr President is that those fares of East West were confidential

**MR PRESIDENT:** Yes. I can't accept that as a Point of Order. That will have to be a matter of negotiation between yourself and Mr Jackson

**MR JACKSON:** I have the papers here in front of me there is no confidentiality on it at all. However, I will continue

**MR SANDERS:** They were circulated on the basis

- Mr Chairman that they would be confidential
MR JACKSON: The proposed airfares and certainly Airlines of New South Wales didn't pose theirs as confidential or secret or any otherwise. It was open and they placed it in their letter.

MR SANDERS: Airlines of New South Wales didn't ask that theirs be confidential

MR JACKSON: Well why has East West asked that theirs be confidential and not Air New South Wales

MR SANDERS: Mr Buffett may I answer that to clarify the point

MR JACKSON: I don't wish to take on an argument...

MR PRESIDENT: Mr Jackson, just a moment please. Mr Sanders if I may give you the call so that you might put your views at the conclusion of Mr Jackson' address.

MR JACKSON: Airlines of New South Wales, in their letter which is in the hands of all members, Brisbane to Norfolk Island $430 return and that is not confidential, it is open in their letter, which is on peak fares of Air Norfolk Island is $130 less. Now a telex has been received this morning indicating a reduction in fares by Air Norfolk to be subsidised by East West. If I would add, a very convenient after the meeting yesterday when it was aired and these fares was placed on the table of disparity of the different airlines that would be running to Norfolk Island. However, the point that I wish to make Mr President is the latest telex that has been handed around has stated that East West will subsidise Air Norfolk and pick up the tab for the $130 difference should they be called upon to use that aircraft when they exceed their load or their passenger limits and may I quote that telex and this is a telex to yourself Mr President from Lionel Freedman, the man who is in receivership "After discussion with you today I have again contacted East West re Sydney Norfolk Route and they have confirmed that should passengers or freight traffic exceed the jet capacity they will use Norfolk Island Airlines on subsidised basis so that the Super King Air could operate ex Sydney or ex Brisbane at same airfares as the jet". Now what a backdown. What a backdown when it was exposed of this disparity of $130 difference. Are we as residents of this island will be called upon to subsidise that air fare reduction to Air Norfolk as we have been called upon to subsidise other East West fares and cut price fares all round Australia. The people of Norfolk Island are well aware of that. That we have been called upon to subsidise these fares that has been described in this House and I have described it myself as nothing else but extortionist compared to other routes on the mainland and here we are being asked to support a company, an airline that has been condemned not only by members around this table and each and every one of them has condemned at some time or other East West Airlines, but every resident on this Island has also done the same. And in no way will I support a proposal that gives East West a monopoly over the whole tourist trade that flows into
Norfolk Island.

MR PRESIDENT: Did you wish to seek the call from earlier comments that were made Mrs Gray

MRS GRAY: Oh I wouldn't waste my time Mr President

MR PRESIDENT: Mr Sanders did you wish to seek the call in respect of earlier comments that were made

MR SANDERS: Only a couple of points Mr President. It was the airfares from East West were marked confidential the reason being that because there was a difference in the fares to what exist at the moment, I don't think East West wanted it to be detrimental to the bookings that already exist. The airfares as quoted by Airlines of New South Wales indeed were not confidential.

MR. PRESIDENT: Further debate Honourable Members before I put the.

MRS. GREY: I will take Mr. Jackson to task on a couple of things he said Mr. President. In relation to the general debate, not my own argument with him. Um. Yes Mr. Jackson was saying that many of us around this table, in fact I think he suggested that all of us have levelled criticism at East West and I have been one of the prime East West bashers if you like to call it that and that's why I have been so delighted to have some response to the bashing that's been done by this Assembly and would like to highlight the fact that the grizzlies and complaints that we have had in the past, under new management, are beginning to be rectified and in particular, one must take up the point the Mr. Jackson brought up on standby fares, I will agree with you, many people have told us about and explained the difficulties of issuing standby fares. When you start issuing standby fares, it is said that it does not allow you to keep down the normal fares. Obviously, this is a whole new ballgame it is a whole new aircraft. Brian Grey has kept saying, everybody concerned with East West has kept saying that their fare structure would depend on a formula handed down by the independent airfares committee that has now been done. I don't know how to argue against Mr. Jackson about this fares question because it is something which is in the hands of the independent airfares committee. It's not a decision or a situation which is totally dictated by the airline. I give up on that one. However, the fact remains that standby fares have been offered. Just because Mr. Jackson has seen fit to break agreements of confidentiality I don't. Suffice it to say, that new fares, the new fare structure, the new fare range has been offered. Mr. Jackson also ignores in my motion the provision made by the first clause (a) review by this House at the expiration of 12 months and reconsideration at the expiration of two years. It is the first time to my knowledge that we have thought that Norfolk Island Government, that the Assembly or anybody else has thought to put into words some kind of restriction, some kind of method of being answerable to us, to the people living on Norfolk Island, and that I believe is the safety the safeguard against the problems that Mr. Jackson sees of East West flying out of more than Sydney. That oversight is in our hands. I think
that's never been done before. If the motion and I under-
stand, even the amended motion contains that provision.
It's essential and it covers that difficulty. Mr. Jackson
also referred to correspondence which was flying about
earlier this year. That's a habit of his and I've continually
protested of Mr. Jackson's use of correspondence, of documents,
of papers which have been by circumstance, rendered redundant,
and I'd remind him that not only members of this Assembly,
but the shareholders, the persons who hold shares in Norfolk
Island Airlines, the persons who were originally signatories,
to that letter you're talking about have had occasion to review
their earlier words concerning Brian Grey and I hope that is
made very clear in this House. Thank you Mr. President.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. President. Mr.
President I cannot support either Mr. Sanders' motion or
the amendment put in by Mrs. Grey. I cannot lose grasp of
an opportunity that has been given us to avail for the people
of Norfolk Island a two-fold benefit of fare reduction and
opportunity reduction that has will become available because
of competition. It is not, it has not been until competition
was so close that any reductions and good new deals as has been
referred to have been brought to light. I confess that at one
meeting, either in the first Assembly or this Assembly, I'm not
sure which, I did have a motion in the House voicing my concern
of the ever increasing airfares, and I called for negotiation,
I called for the, it would be for this Assembly, I called for
the Minister responsible to negotiate to see what could be done
regarding airfare reduction for the people of this island and
the two-fold part of it is how the airfare prices govern
our economy regarding the downturn in tourism and airfares have
played a most significant part in the downturn in tourism to
Norfolk Island. It is my opinion that East West will undoubtedly
run a very good service, continue to run a very good service from
Sydney to Norfolk Island. I cannot offer that the type of
aircraft offered by Norfolk Island Airlines, the Kingair or
Superking, pardon my ignorance of technicalities in aircraft
they are no opposition to a jet aircraft of the type that will
be flying here by East West. I'm quite happy that East West
will fly here, I'm sure that they will continue to do a good
job but I feel they will do a far better job Mr. President if
they are kept into line by having a reasonably good competitive
run from Brisbane, which the Kingair does not supply. They've
done a very good job and I believe Norfolk Island has done a
lot for tourism in Norfolk Island and Norfolk Island Airlines
has expressed their desire and indeed, their first application,
their application to the aviation department was for in
co-operation with Norfolk Island Airlines, whereas the application
from East West Airlines Mr. President, was in competition to
Norfolk Island Airlines and thereby, I believe those two terms
bear very essential points of which we must take notice. I
believe that every person in Norfolk Island, living in Norfolk
Island, the opportunity exists for far better flight service,
I believe that this economy stands to gain far more if we as
an Assembly recommend that airlines of N.S.W. be given the
licence to run in cooperation with Norfolk Island Airlines
from Brisbane to Norfolk Island. Thank you.
MR. HOWARD: I said a minute ago that I don't support either Mr. Sanders or Mrs. Gray's favouring of East West Airlines in that I intend to move an amendment putting it the other way around. I simply want to say now that I intend to support Mrs. Gray's amendment because I think it's an improvement on the original motion of Mr. Sanders, and if I turn out to be a minority I'd rather see it go through in Mrs. Grey's form than in the original form so I will be supporting Mrs. Grey's amendment when it comes to a vote.

MR. PRESIDENT: Further discussion in respect to the amendment Honourable Members. If there is no further discussion in respect of

MR. JACKSON: Mr. Howard foreshadowed earlier in his debate that he would be moving an amendment. will that be

MR. HOWARD: Interjection

MR. JACKSON: OK Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: Discussion Honourable Members in respect of this amendment. And I put the question. The question is that the amendment be agreed. Those of that opinion say "aye". Are there any abstentions? Mr. Brown abstaining. The ayes have it. Thank you. Further discussion Honourable Members. Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: Yes, I'd like to propose a very different amendment Mr. President. In essence, it is a proposal that we support Airlines of New South Wales rather than East West. It's a long motion, rather than reading it then explaining it, if its agreeable with you Mr. President, I will explain what I'm driving at first and then read the motion and I think the motion then follows from the background that I'd like to give first. Is that an agreeable way to go about it?

MR. PRESIDENT: Yes I'll accept it on that basis thanks Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: I don't think there's any question that anybody who has observed the workings of life on Norfolk Island over some period in time recognizes that competition is a good thing, where competition can be supported. There's some few fields in which Norfolk simply is not big enough to support competition but in fields where competition can be feasible, it always proves to be a good thing. I give the example of our having two banks on the island. I'm certain that everyone on Norfolk Island gets better service whichever of the Banks they use from the fact that there are two Banks and that each of the Bank knows that if they don't treat you well, you'll go across the road to the other fellow. I think there was a very clear demonstration of the value of competition during a period of time when we had two shipping lines serving
the island. CCC had been serving the island for some time and the Collier came on in addition, and for a period from memory of a year or a year and a half, something of that kind, the cost of ocean freight to Norfolk was held down in a way that everybody knows it would not have been held down if there had been only one line holding a monopoly on the service. Where competition is possible, where it's feasible, where a particular market will support competition, clearly experience of Norfolk Island tells us that the Assembly ought to support competitive operations, and it ought to guard against any vital services for the island becoming monopolized. That isn't always possible, but where we can, we should. Now East West and Air New South Wales have both applied to fly medium jets F28's between Brisbane and Norfolk and the Legislative Assembly has been asked by the Department of Aviation which is waiting impatiently at this moment, they need to make a decision. The Assembly's has been asked which of those two airlines the Assembly thinks would best serve Norfolk Island and I think the three quite different aspects that we need to look at, factual aspects when we begin addressing ourselves to the question of which of the two should we support, first of all I think you need to ask yourself, is one of the two airlines proposing a service that will be significantly better than the one the other airline is proposing? There are some differences between East West's proposal and Air New South Wales proposal. East West has a brand new plane. It has a larger plane than the F28 that Air New South Wales has. Air New South Wales has a smaller plane but that in fact allows it to propose a service starting out with two flights per week instead of one flighter per week and I think there is an advantage to the people in Brisbane. People on Norfolk who want to go back and forth between Brisbane, in having two jet flights per week to start rather than one. Now East West says that they will start with one and they hope to build up to two and they hope they can do that fairly soon if their promotion is successful. Air New South Wales says that they will start with two and they hope to be able to work up to three. Part of the reason behind that, part of the reason they can do that is that their aeroplane is smaller, a smaller version of the F28. Does somebody know exactly - fifteen seats fewer or it is on that order, than the new larger F28 than East West is getting. 25 seats smaller. Thanks. Now Air New South Wales has back up of Ansett promotion offices all through Australia, but as Chloe Gray points out East West has no other Islands for which to promote and you can go through details of many kinds in which there are differences between the two proposals from the two airlines. On balance it seems clear to me that while there are differences between the two the differences are not so overwhelmingly great as to put one proposal in the shade and the other one in the sun. I don't think either one is way out in front. My own view is that the Air New South Wales proposal would provide a bit better service than the East West proposal would but other people would take a different view and I think it would be difficult to come to the conclusion that one is so far in front of the other that it is just out of the question, you have only one choice to make. I think they are within a pretty close comparison of each other. Now the second question, which I think we need to take into account, we shouldn't, it shouldn't be decisive in our thinking but we ought to take it into account, and that is...
the future of Norfolk Island Airlines and the Norfolk Island Airlines shareholders. I think we need to take that into account for several reasons. First of all, Norfolk Island Airlines has done a tremendous job for this Island. It really has; I shudder to think what shape Norfolk would be in if it hadn't been for Norfolk Island Airlines in the past two or three years, long than that. They have done a marvellous marvellous job and while the shareholders of Norfolk Island Airlines have not got much say in the matter because their company is in receivership at the moment nonetheless they have a hope that the airline might come good and that they may be able to retrieve their investments and it will come to be worth something in the long run. And those people are electors of Norfolk Island, they are residents of the Island and I think we need to take into account their interests just the way we take into account the interests of all residents on Norfolk. As I say I don't think it should be controlling. Now the question is one of these two proposals, East West or Air New South Wales likely to benefit Norfolk Island Airlines very greatly and the other proposal likely to harm Norfolk Island Airlines. Now it is quite clear to me from the information that has been circulated to us that the answer is no. The shareholders of Norfolk Island Airlines have looked at it and they feel that East West would be preferable from their state of play but both the Chairman of Norfolk Island Airlines, Mr Brown and the General Manager/Receiver of Norfolk Island Airlines, Mr Freedman have said quite directly and honestly that they can live with either East West or Air New South Wales. They don't feel that Norfolk Island Airlines will survive and live with one and will die with the other. They have both said that they can live with either one. Now the third thing I think we have to look at in making a weighing of the two proposals is the question is one of the two airlines likely to provide significantly better maintenance or better pilots or better passenger assurance of operating standards and the clear answer to that is no. The Department of Aviation in Australia requires what are about the highest standards of operation in the world and Australia's marvellous air service safety record speaks for that. Whoever is granted a licence to fly the Brisbane Norfolk run will fly it in line with just about the highest standards in the world which are required by the Department of Aviation. So I don't think that that is a consideration for us. Now, looking at those three things is one of the two airlines proposing a much better service than the other. My judgement on that is no - there are differences but neither is massively better than the other. Secondly is one of them going to be marvellous for Norfolk Island Airlines and the other terrible for Norfolk Island Airlines. No. They are much of a muchness. Shareholders prefer one but they can live with either. And thirdly is there any safety question or reliability question and the answer to that is the Department of Aviation requirements will apply equally whoever gets the run, so, summing those up I come to the conclusion that either East West or Air New South Wales is going to give us, tourists and us an improved service between here and Brisbane and either one of them is going to work in co-operation with Norfolk Island Airlines and either one is going to make the extremely
high standards of the Department of Aviation. Now to my mind having checked out those three parts of the question you are then left with one area in which there is a really significant difference between the two proposals and that is the question of competition. If the Assembly favours the Brisbane run being licenced to East West we will be moving in the direction of the monopolisation of services between Australia and Norfolk Island. If the Assembly supports the licencing of Air New South Wales we will be moving in the direction of competition in the services between mainland Australia and Norfolk Island. Now we have to move one way or the other. We can't stand still in the middle. We are going to make a decision today and it is going to be a decision moving from our present situation either in the direction of more competition or in the direction of monopoly so we have to decide which of those two directions to move in.

Now Mr Jackson made a comment that there would be scuse me I'll see if I can find my notes, yes, he said that if Air New South Wales were to be handling the Brisbane run that that would provide some form of at least indirect competition. I think – and I put it to you – that it would provide very real competition and I want to site three ways in which it will do that. First of all there is a large and wealth area of Australia generally around the New England district which is about the same difference from Sydney as it is from Brisbane. There are alot of quite comfortably off people in that part of Australia. There is a good market there for tourists to Norfolk Island. If Air New South Wales, Air New South Wales, is flying from Brisbane to Norfolk and if East West is flying from Sydney to Norfolk there is no question that both those airlines will be reaching out to get the travellers from the New England area. They will be competing head to head directly with each other East West trying to bring those people down to Sydney and over to Norfolk and Air New South Wales trying to bring those same people up to Brisbane and over to Norfolk and they will be trying, both airlines, to make their airline more attractive than the other one so there will be that direct head on competition in that important region of Australia. Secondly, with two airlines, one flying from Brisbane one flying from Sydney, both of them flying F28 jets the Legislative Assembly and the Norfolk Island Government will have a standard of comparison for their performance which is factual. At the moment, up until now, if we or residents have had the feeling that an airline serving the Island isn't giving good enough service, we havn't had any real clear factual comparisons to make. We have had to make comparisons with, for example what the airfare is between Sydney and Alice Springs and then you have to start qualifying that comparison about yes, but you don't have to carry liferafts and yes you can land anywhere in that desert outback if you have to and so on and so on and you end up not really having comparisons that is direct at all. But with two airlines, one flying from Sydney and one flying from Brisbane, both flying F28's we would have a very real basis for making comparisons. Comparisons that would be real enough to make the Department of Aviation or the airlines themselves sit up
and take notice. We will be able to make those real comparisons between the two airlines and both those airlines will know it and each one will know that it is being compared factually with the other one. The third kind of competition will come if we are able, to get the Department of Aviation to agree to what Mrs. Grey has proposed and to what I also propose which is regular reviews of performance, and if in that review of performance, it's found that one of the airlines isn't up to scratch, then a renegotiation of that particular route. With those regular reviews it would be possible if one of the two airlines was doing a good job and the other was letting us down, for us to ask that in the renegotiation, that the airline doing the good job, take over both those jobs. Now both airlines will know that and they will be competing to see it doesn't happen. They will be competing to make sure they are not found wanting when the reviews are made. Australia has a two airline policy and it was established for exactly that reason in Australia to allow a comparison between two competing airlines, rather than having just one and wondering whether it's doing the right thing or not. Norfolk has a chance to create its own tour airline policy if we are supported by the Department of Aviation, and I don't think we should miss out on the chance.

The amendment that I propose is as follows:— That all the words after "that" in Mr. Sanders amendment or sorry in the motion as amended be omitted and the following words substituted. "the Legislative Assembly having carefully examined and debated proposals by East West Airlines and by Air New South Wales, for establishing scheduled jet aircraft services between Brisbane and Norfolk Island is of the opinion that (1) either the proposal by East West Airlines to establish a service commencing with one return flight a week or the proposal by Air New South Wales to establish a service commencing with two flights per week, would provide some significant improvements in the services between Brisbane and Norfolk Island. (2) both proposals include provisions for working co-operatively with Norfolk Island Airlines. (3) Either airline if examined and licensed by the Department of Aviation to operate a service could be relied on to meet the Department's exacting standards for reliability, safety and technical competence. The Assembly believes that the operation of medium jet services between mainland Australia and Norfolk Island by two separate airlines would provide highly desirable competition between the two and would provide a standard of comparison by which the performance of each could be judged. The Assembly therefore supports the licencing of Air New South Wales to establish the Brisbane/Norfolk jet service. The amendment continues. To promote the maintenance of a high quality of service, the Assembly proposes to the Minister for Aviation that all licences or scheduled services between mainland Australia and Norfolk Island be subject to periodic review of performance and two renegotiation in the event of inadequate performance. The Assembly proposes that such reviews be held at reasonable intervals, preferably of two years or alternatively, on six months written notice of request for review by the Norfolk Island Government. Inkeeping with the recommendation of 15th September, 1980 by the Parliamentary standing committee on Public Works concerning negotiations between the Australian and Norfolk Island Governments, the Assembly asks the Minister for Aviation
to draw to the attention of any airline providing services using the Norfolk Island aerodrome, the relevance in reviews of performance of the airlines effectiveness in first preserving the Norfolk Island environment and economy and next, in being responsive to the tourism policies of both the Australian Government and the Norfolk Island Government. That's the end of the amendment as I propose it. I want to draw a couple of points about it. First of all, the proposed amendment does not subject to anything. The one hard clear resolution proposed in this amendment is that the Assembly supports the licensing of Air New South Wales to establish the Brisbane to Norfolk jet service. I'm afraid that if we enact any resolution today that's subject to anything, that requires further negotiation or requires further talking, we may miss the boat altogether and I'm therefore proposing that we do not make our recommendation subject to anything. The resolution, however goes on and I hope in a reasonable way, and I hope in a way that would be accepted by the Minister for Aviation that asks him please to establish periodic reviews of performance and renegotiation in the event of inadequate performance. It goes further and it asks if the Minister will lay on each of the airlines, an awareness that there is a commitment on the part of the Australian Government to preserve the Norfolk Island environment and economy and further to draw to their attention, the fact that the tourism policies of the Australian Government and of this Government are important in deciding whether an airline is performing well for Norfolk Island or not. I commend that amendment to the motion.

MR. PRESIDENT: Debate Honourable Members.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. President. I would support Mr. Howard's amendment. I think it embodies that which is necessary. I am aware that there is another amendment, is there another amendment? I acknowledge the co-operation that's gone into this amendment because I know that as well Mr. Jackson has been discussing with Mr. Howard matters that are embodied in this amendment of Mr. Howard's. I agree with it, I believe that in agreeing with it the advertising outlets, that Airlines of New South Wales can offer are a great advantage to Norfolk tourist wise in the advertisement of Norfolk tourist wise the aircraft is a suitable size, the aircraft that they offer, the F281000 is a suitable size for that particular run which does not enjoy yet as many tourists as come through Sydney. The future of Norfolk Island Airlines, I'd just like to ask one question here, does this, yes, the Assembly therefore supports the licencing of Air New South Wales to establish the Brisbane/Norfolk jet service. Now then, there would be I hope an unwritten commitment here whereby Norfolk Island Airlines will be looked after. I take Mr. Howard's point and the point brought to all members by the President which has been discussed with Mr. Lionel Freedman that negotiations can be made with Airlines of New South Wales as well as East West Airlines so providing there is provision for Norfolk Island Airlines, I'm happy and I think it is unquestionable that it is the competition that will benefit the people of Norfolk Island most and it is
the competition that will benefit the tourists to Norfolk Island the most. And I support Mr. Howard's amendment thank you.

MRS. GRAY: Thank you Mr. President. Probably in my first comment I would like to address points 1 and 2 on this motion of Mr. Howard and yes I compliment him on it, it's extremely comprehensive and possibly such detail is necessary when making a recommendation to the Minister. I'd like to query in his point one, either the proposal by East West Airlines to establish a service commencing with one return flight per week. Now I'd like to make clear that in the original proposal to the Department of Aviation by East West Airlines, dated December, 14th, East West were already mindful of Norfolk Island's wishes because that paragraph very clearly states and I repeat that the letter is addressed to the Minister, the Secretary of the Department of Aviation, you might also consider the possibility that our operations be restricted in the initial stages to one service per week with an ability to expand to two services on those peak periods when such additional service might be required. Again, is East West Airlines trying to be co-operative not saying we want. Now that to me contrasts with this, or 1 come back to the motion before us, or the proposal by Air New South Wales to establish a service commencing with two flights per week. Now, we come back to a letter from the Administrator to this Assembly dated 6th April where you will see, that Air New South Wales have already put in and staked a claim for Saturday, Sunday and Wednesday, given the opportunity. Now this is where I wish to relate those two pieces of information to point two on Mr. Howard's motion where he says "both proposals include provisions for working co-operatively with Norfolk Island Airlines". Yes they do indeed on rather different levels and the shareholders of Norfolk Island Airlines are aware of those differences, that's why they've come out in favour of East West. What we have is a telex before us from Lionel Freedman which agrees that East West or East West have confirmed that should passenger or freight traffic exceed the jet capacity, they will use Norfolk Island Airlines on a subsidised basis etc. The telex has been read already here today. In other words, they are being most co-operative with Norfolk Island Airlines and I suggest directly with the people of Norfolk Island because let's not forget that the shareholders of Norfolk Island Airlines are people who live on Norfolk Island. Now, in the letter dated, forgive me, 31st March from East West, correction, in the letter dated 31st March from Air New South Wales under the paragraph heading "frequency" "as expressed to you on the island, our intentions would be to provide through an arrangement with Norfolk Island Airlines, a mixed operation where Air New South Wales would provide a jet service during the peak periods each week, and I'm reiterating, they've already staked a claim on three days. The Norfolk Island Airlines services are of course subject to negotiations with Norfolk Island Airlines. There we have it in the letter from the Administrator, Saturday, Sunday, Wednesday. I suggest to you wooo - they're spreading their wings already and this is what I am so so very fearful of, if I haven't expressed it clearly enough then I think that those points that I've just raised, might do it for me. Could I just
come down to paragraph which follows the paragraph numbered 3. "The Assembly believes that an operation of a medium jet services between mainland Australia and Norfolk Island by two separate airlines would provide highly desirable competition between the two and would provide a standard of comparison by which the performance of each could be judged." I cannot in my motion, claim to be providing a standard of comparison but my motion does provide for two separate airlines, Norfolk Island Airlines and East West from Sydney, Norfolk Island Airlines and East West from Brisbane. Yes, that's probably the only comment. May I just check your notes Mr. President with your indulgence? Yes I reiterate that the East West organization is prepared to temper the number of flights to island requirements than needs. Already New South Wales are throwing the muscle around. Yes, Mr. Howard said very real competition. I wonder at whose expense. I wonder if we get a dog fight between New South Wales and East West - possibly at the expense of Norfolk Island and I'd like to point out that in my opening words to the motion which I put before the House, I hoped that the strength of the use of the words "subject to" in my motion weren't quite as strong as those shown in the original motion which has now died so I suppose my point there really lapses Mr. President. Thank you, I'll conclude on that.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. President. I agree with Mrs. Gray that East West has indeed got a new image and I believe that they indeed give us very good service and I also agree with Mrs. Gray that Brian Gray has kept his word on everything that he said he would do and I support East West fully from Sydney. I'm aware that the Norfolk Island shareholders wish the agreement with East West to be the one that we agree with but I won't believe the shareholders are going to be disadvantaged either one way or the other, and I personally do not support a monopoly by any airline which would be I believe to the detriment of the residents of Norfolk Island. I support Mr. Howard's motion.

MR. HOWARD: I just wanted to respond to a couple of things that Chloe Gray said. I think, as I said before, we need to give a thought to the shareholders of Norfolk Island Airlines. I think we've got to give the main thought to Norfolk Island and in looking at the comparison between the two offices what I was reaching for in my own mind was a concern to see whether the Norfolk Island Airlines shareholders were being really badly done by under one of the two proposals and really well done by under the other. If it had been that, I think we should have given real weight to that difference. The fact that the Norfolk Island Airlines shareholders might do a bit better under one than under the other, I don't think can be persuasive or governing for us. I think we've got to think mainly of Norfolk Island and I think being satisfied in my mind on the basis of things said by people who know Norfolk Island Airlines far better than I do, that they can work with either one. My feeling is that we needn't worry about that aspect of it any more. I think we can then put that question aside. I think we have been responsible and been concerned
about Norfolk Island Airlines and its shareholders but having satisfied ourselves that they are not going to be badly done by whichever way it goes, I think we then need to think solely of Norfolk Island. Mrs. Gray seemed worried about a dog fight of competition between the two airlines. There are two kinds of dog fights you can have if that should come to pass. One would be theoretically, a dog fight of striving to drive the aeroplane with only one pilot or trying to buy cheap petrol or not blowing up the tyres fully or running the tyres too thin and letting the standard of operations deteriorate. The Department of Aviation is not going to let that happen, that is not on. That is not a dog fight we need to worry about, it's not one that we can even supervise, it will be supervised for us. Any Airline flying to Department of Aviation standards is going to be flying a first class airline. There might be a dog fight about wanting to swamp Norfolk Island with more tourists than we want. That's not our problem right now as everybody knows. Our problem is that we would like more thank you, we would like to get back to where we were a couple of years ago. We can't, in this action we're taking today do anything final to regulate the amount of tourists that come into Norfolk Island but I draw attention to the last paragraph of the motion as I propose amending it which asks the Minister for Aviation to draw to the attention of any airline flying here, the fact that in reviews of performance some of the things that are going to be looked at are whether that airline is preserving the Norfolk Island environment and economy and whether that airline is being responsive to the tourism policies of both the Australian Government and our Government and we haven't yet agreed to our tourism policies. I think we're a long way down the road to agreeing on them, it's the next item on today's Agenda to finish off, but when we broke off discussing those policies at our last meeting, this Assembly was in quite general agreement on the fundamental tourism policies and I think if the Minister will go with us on that last paragraph and I'm inclined to believe he will because I think it's reasonable and fair. I think we would then be in a position of saying to this dog fight of airlines wanting to bring too many people here, "sorry, you are both breaching Norfolk Island Government tourist policies, you're flooding the place and we don't want that to happen". I think they would give us a means of dealing with that. I'm concerned about preventing that. I think themotion as I put it goes as far as we sensibly hope to go in controlling.

MR. BROWN: Mr. President are you proposing to address this matter yourself?

MR. PRESIDENT: I had not considered that I would.

MR. BROWN: The reason for the question was I propose to move an adjournment of the question once everyone has had to say what they wish to say but I don't want to get to the stage of moving that adjournment until everybody has said whatever they wish to say.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think there may be one or two other Members before we come to that Mr. Brown.
MR. QUINTAL: In support of the motion, I wish to say that the reason for supporting the motion, one of the main reasons is the word competition. Mr Howard mentioned competition when we had the Kalia and the C.C.C. line running to Norfolk. On another occasion in the early history of Norfolk during the whaling days there was a petrol war on at the time and the price of petrol dropped from about, I think it dropped about 75% on petrol. The war was between two companies, petrol companies. That was a very good thing for Norfolk Island at the time. Whilst I do agree that the Norfolk Airlines has done a terrific job in firstly there were the pioneers who started the Airline between Brisbane and Norfolk Island under Charles Herman, the late Charlie Herman and they had been running since 75 and they have done a terrific job and we all know that they would prefer to have East West operate the line with them. I notice that Air New South Wales has made certain offers to Norfolk Island Airlines and also to some restrictions. I notice one of the restrictions they have imposed on the Norfolk Airline and that is Island Airlines will retain the right to continue to operate direct services between Norfolk Island and Brisbane during this period but only as agreed on by Air New South Wales under the following circumstances and that is a restriction in my own mind. Another thing that I have been concerned about and worried about accepting the Airlines of New South Wales and that is I have been wondering if it won't be very long before I wonder how much time would elapse before they probably will just run the Airline right out of business. I don't know whether this would happen at all but I would not like to see that happen. I do agree that whichever airline runs to Norfolk Island would be a very good one. I do not agree that East West should have both the run from Sydney to Norfolk and also the Brisbane run and maybe with a bit of luck they will get the New Zealand run. I feel that competition is a must for Norfolk Island and we will have to do the best we can to make sure there is opposition where opposition is needed.

MR HOWARD: In continuation of this debate I wish to say that if anyone were at some time to propose a motion that the debate be adjourned it certainly should be in all of our minds if that happened that we would probably be losing the chance that we have to make a recommendation at the Department of Aviation. They have waited for us, they wanted one last week please, we have got to get a recommendation to them if it is going to have any effect at all.

MR QUINTAL: I would agree wholeheartedly with that Mr Chairman especially as every member in this room has made up, has already made up their mind as to which way they are going to go, except for yourself. We haven't heard what you...

MRS GRAY: Interjection

MR PRESIDENT: Any further debate, Mr Jackson
MR JACKSON: Mr President, the point that influenced me a great lot was your call and the telex that you received or the phone call that you received from Mr Lionel Freedman, the General Manager of Norfolk Island Airlines, and if I am correct the message that you passed on to me that Mr Freedman stated that he could work equally with either one of the companies, either East West or Norfolk Island Airlines and in supporting Mr Howard's amendment to the motion, I do support it and I am certain that it will meet with the approval of the majority of the rest of us.

MR PRESIDENT: Further debate Honourable Members.

Mr Brown

MR BROWN: .. Mr President, but perhaps I'll have a go. Firstly Mr President I have done it before but I'll do it again. I will declare my pecuniary interest in this matter as I am both a Director of and a shareholder in Norfolk Island Airlines. Mr President, this is the first opportunity that this Assembly has had of any substance to advise the Department of Aviation in relation to air services to Norfolk Island. It certainly is important that we make the best of this opportunity and that in our consideration we consider every point that needs to be considered and we extract every bit of information that needs to be extracted. It would certainly be a pity if we made a decision today which was not as well informed as possible. The Airlines of New South Wales aircraft I understand is to go into service tomorrow, the East West aircraft I understand is to leave Holland for Australia in three days time so we are not yet in a position where we can look at the actual operation of these aircraft by either operator Air New South Wales has not yet started its F28 operation on the East Coast of Australia, and East West has not even picked up its new jet. It is my belief that there are a number of aspects which we really should look at before we make a decision. Someone has said earlier that the East West aircraft is a new aircraft and that the Airlines of New South Wales aircraft is eleven years old. Be that as it may I think it..

INTERJECTION: Jet aircraft

MR BROWN: .. I think you can say Mr Brown that that one has just left Norfolk Island

MR BROWN: Mr President, I believe that it would be of benefit to the Members of this House to actually see the East West aircraft in operation before we make a decision and that we can do on the 30th day of this month and I believe it would be of benefit to the Members of this House to actually see the Airlines of New South Wales aircraft in operation which as many members as so desired would be able to do on the Australian mainland at any time between now and 30th April. Some may have a worry that the 11 year old aircraft isn't quite up to the standard that the new aircraft is, others may want to prove the point that it does not matter whether the aircraft is 11 years old or brand new, it going to look exactly the same to the passenger and perform exactly the same job.
But in my view it would certainly be a pity if whatever decision we come to, is not a unanimous decision. If the Department is to really take notice of the advice that we give it, it is a pity if that is not going to be strong unanimous advice based on the very best of possible information. I believe we've got a long way to go with airlines of N.S.W. in our discussions with them before we will have their best offer. This Assembly has had discussions with East West Airlines over a lengthy period of time. We've had discussions with them on many occasions since the second Legislative Assembly was elected last year. We've received many letter from them, we've received many telexes. We have not had that degree of communication yet with Airlines of New South Wales. The General Manager, Mr. Hutchinson has been across to speak with the Members on one occasion. I think Mr. Sanders has had two letters, I think Mr. Sanders has had two telexes from Air New South Wales and those have been circulated to Members but that is not a great deal upon which we can base a far reaching decision such as that which we are looking at today. When I say that I think we've got a fair bit more negotiating to do, perhaps I should give a few examples. The fair quoted by Airlines of New South Wales is at the moment, a dearer fare than the fare quoted by East West. I've got little doubt that if we go back to Airlines of New South Wales and we say "listen there's a few more things we've got to get straight, you've got to sharpen that pencil, we don't think much of your fare. If they thought that dropping another ten or twenty dollars from the fare was going to be the key that opened the door, I'm sure we'd find the fare would change. Airlines of New South Wales have not yet said that they would introduce stand-by fares. East West stood against stand-by fares for a long time and it is in fact only as a result of the negotiations with Norfolk Island Airlines that East West has agreed to introduce a stand-by fare and medical fare but certainly, at this stage as a result of continued negotiations, East West Airlines has decided that it is able to offer stand-by fares, it is able to offer medical discount fares. If we go back to Air New South Wales and say "listen, there's room for a bit of improvement here", there can be little doubt that we might be able to have their offer improved a little further in that regard. Although Airlines of New South Wales have offered us the facilities of the Ansett network, I believe there is still a long way to go in our discussions with them, to move them to guaranteeing the maximum possible level of promotion for Norfolk Island so that as quickly as possible, we can get back to the 1980 tourist numbers of around 24,000 which we seem to regard as the desirable limit. Mr. President, we have had Airlines of New South Wales offer for just one week, from recollection, we had not, between ourselves discussed it until yesterday and we are discussing it here today. Mr. President, I believe that we're rushing it. I know that some Members have suggested that the Department of Aviation is waiting impatiently for our recommendation and I accept that that's the case, but I do not accept that they are going to go off and make a decision if we do not come to a
decision today. I believe that we would be able to advise them that we do not intend to make a decision until our next normal meeting on the 4th May, and by that time we will have had the opportunity to observe the East West jet in operation to Norfolk Island and those of us who may be interested will have had the opportunity to observe the Airlines of NSW jet in operation on the east coast of Australia. We will have had the opportunity for further discussions with Airlines of NSW and that we would thereby be as well informed as possible at the time we make the decision and hopefully, we would also be in a position to have that recommendation a unanimous one.

For those reasons Mr. President, I would move that the debate on this motion be now adjourned until our next normal meeting.

MR. PRESIDENT: Honourable Members I have a motion of adjournment and standing orders require that I put that motion without debate. I put the question of adjournment. Those of that opinion say "aye", to the contrary "no". Would the Clerk please call the House.

Ayes 3
Mr. Brown
Mr. Christian
Mr. Howard
Mr. Quintal
Mrs. Gray
Miss Buffett
Mr. Jackson
Mr. Sanders

Noes 6
Mr. Buffett

The noes have it. Debate continues Honourable Members. Is there any further debate in the matter.

MR. HOWARD: I'd like to compliment Mr. Brown for some of the remarks he made. I think we could do better. Maybe if we had the time, I honestly don't think we have the time. The Administrator wrote to the Chairman of the Executive Committee on 6th April and at the end of his letter that's a week ago, "I should add that I've also been advised that the Department of Aviation is anxious for review on the East West Airlines application to operate this service and may well have to decide the application without taking account of the Norfolk Island Government's views if any early response is not forthcoming. That's a week ago. I think we've got to move and move today. I wish we had longer, you can always do things better if you have longer but the time comes when you have to move.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. President. I believe we owe the people of Norfolk Island that we must pass an opinion. I believe that the Department of Aviation means what they say, I believe that a jet flight by East West from Sydney on 30th April will not convince me any differently that competition is the best thing to keep prices down on Norfolk Island and offer a far better deal to residents and tourists alike. Thank you and I think we should agree today.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. President. I believe that we should make a decision today and there is another matter that Mr. Brown raised which I thought was of interest was that he said he thought that it would be good if this decision was unanimous. I can hardly recall any unanimous decisions ever coming out of this Assembly.
Mr. Brown: Mr. President I intend to abstain from the actual vote but I do think that it's a pity that we are not ensuring that we've got the very best possible offer before us. I hope that Members when they do vote will understand that the motion, the amendment which is now before us is an amendment which will favour a dearer airfare, and a fare system which does not provide for either stand-by fares or medical fares. As I said, I propose to abstain from the vote but on those two bases alone, I'm amazed that the Members around this table were not prepared to seek a little bit of further information to enable us to do that much better.

Mr. President: There being no further debate, we have the amendment before us for voting Honourable Members and I put the question in respect of that amendment. Those of that opinion say "aye", to the contrary "no", abstentions Mr. Brown abstaining. The motion is carried in respect of the amendment. The amendment is carried. The amendment therefore becomes the motion Honourable Members and I put the motion, Mrs. Gray are you, is there some puzzlement on your part.

Mrs. Gray: Explain to me again what motion it is you propose before us Mr. President.

Mr. President: The House has just voted upon the motion, the amendment to the motion, Mr. Howards. And that has been carried.

Mrs. Gray: With the registration of Mr. Brown's abstention but no recording of the no vote.

Mr. President: In fact I asked if there were any no votes and there was no voice.

Mrs. Gray: Forgive me Mr. President, I did anticipate the House would be called. My apology.

Mr. President: If in fact you wish it to be registered, that can be arranged.

Mrs. Gray: I do.

Mr. President: Then in fact, Mrs. Gray records a "no" vote and Mr. Brown an abstention. Now the amendment becomes the amendment Honourable Members and we shall now vote upon the motion as amended. I put the question. Those of that opinion say "aye", to the contrary "no". Well then would the Clerk please call the House.

Ayes 6
Mr. Buffett
Mr. Howard
Mr. Quintal
Miss Buffett
Mr. Sanders

Noes 2
Mr. Christian
Mr. Brown

Abstentions 1
Bailey
Mrs. Gray

The ayes have it. That concludes Notice No. 2 Honourable Members.
I now call Orders of the Day. Order of the Day No. 1 - Tourism Report, Select Committee Inquiry and Honourable Members it is resumption of the debate on that matter. I shall read the motion "that this House considers the report of the Norfolk Island Legislative Assembly Select Committee inquiry into tourism. You will recall Honourable Members, that we in fact were going through the summary of recommendations at the conclusion of that report, and in the recommendations there were listed under 5, items 1 to 11. We had concluded if I remember correctly consideration of all of those matters and we are now to item 6 in respect of the summary of recommendations and there are two of those and then item 7, there are 7 of those. And so we resume consideration at 6(1). Debate Honourable Members.

MR. HOWARD: Thank you. With this part of the recommendations of the Select Committee report, we begin to get into matters which require more than policy. They require legislation. All of the first 11 matters that we consider at the last meeting, are really matters of the Assembly taking a point of view or establishing a policy. We now begin to get into a list of things which if the Assembly wants them to be done, it can do no more today than express its favourable view of the moment but nothing substantial can happen until legislation is drafted and brought before the House and the House will then vote how it wants to vote at that time and we are not in a position today to do anything binding on most of these matters. Both of the matters in Section 6 to do with the licencing of units and with the legislation of minimum standards would require legislation. There is a question that is a policy question in the first of those which is continuing the freeze on tourist accommodation. The Select Committee felt without any question that at the time this report was done, May, 1981, that the island had overbuilt with tourist accommodation and that if a reasonably high level of occupancy could be earned by all the people in the accommodation industry, 65%, 70% 75% occupancy that Norfolk Island would necessarily have to have a tourist number far higher than the committee thought was good for the island. Now since then, the level of tourism has dropped off a fair amount. It certainly would seem to me that the freeze on tourist accommodation ought to be continued and I'll stop there on that point and leave it to others.

MR. BROWN: I certainly agree with that recommendation Mr. President.

MR. JACKSON: One point that I noticed in the freeze on tourist accommodation and the one recommendation I noticed on the paper supplied by the Chamber of Commerce and they recommended that not to reissue surrendered licence and unlicences be forfeited or transferred to another accommodation proprietor. Well I like to register my strong objection to that proposal because my views is that if any licence become unregistered or anyone wish to surrender any licence that those licences surrendered should go to the person that who has previously applied and we are worthy in this House that there is some very
long outstanding applications from Norfolk Island residents to build, to enter, to build and enter into the tourist apartment trade so therefore it would be unfair, it would be unfair to transfer any surrendered licence to those persons now who have registered licence accommodation and operate in the tourist apartments so therefore I do believe that any surrendered should be put in a pool and given to the persons who has made previous application to build apartments.

MR QUINTAL: Mr Chairman I would like to agree wholeheartedly with what Mr Jackson has said because in 1964 three Norfolk Islanders applied to build units and they were turned down and beg your pardon '74 not '64, and they were turned down and some of these persons are still hoping that one day they could build units. After the applications went in in 1974 there has been allot of units built on the Island by both locals and outsiders without giving an opportunity for those persons who did the right think and applied, they were turned down and yet persons who went ahead and built without permission and got away with it, I feel that is wrong and an injustice has been done to some of these persons, I was one of them, to be quite honest, I could have had the money at the time but I do not have a pecuniary interest because I could not find the money to even build a room for a unit today but there are other two that probably would have the finance and I would feel that they should be given consideration.

MR CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: Thank you Mr President. I should like to declare my pecuniary interest. I would like to say something if I am permitted to do so. Thank you. I believe that the freeze on tourist accommodation must continue for the time being. Limiting the number of tourist beds will always be the most effective way of controlling tourist numbers however when a government feels that the time has come to start re-issuing licences the following things should be taken into consideration. Accommodation houses applying for licences should meet strict minimum standards in both facilities and quality of service. Some places whatever our tourist numbers would never enjoy good occupancy except in the heaviest peak periods and this is where they are forced to stay in sub-standard accommodation because no other is available, they then return home somewhat disenchanted. As I have said before consideration should be given to allowing and encouraging existing accommodation houses to upgrade their properties. This may mean allowing some properties to increase their number of beds because in many cases increasing the number of beds would make it a more viable proposition economically to provide a better level of facilities and service. It is one thing to talk about sharing the benefits of tourism but it is not a good idea to issue licences to anyone who by establishing a couple of tourist facts wants to make some extra money. Many have made this mistake. Anyone catering for tourists must show that they mean to go about it in a professional manner. Visitors must receive a high level of comfort and of personal service and this cannot
be done satisfactorily on a part time or halfhearted basis. When should this freeze be lifted. I do not believe we should even think about this until we have resolved a number of issues on the domestic front. For instance we must have made very positive progress in the area of sewage and water reticulation and that goes without saying. Secondly we must have developed far clearer and firmer policies with regard to planning zoning and building controls. I know that many even on this Assembly feel that such controls may hinder individual freedom and rights but we have already learnt to our detriment that the mushrooming type of development that goes hand in hand with the growing tourist industry can cause greater damage to the attractiveness of our Island and we all have to suffer the ill effects. If that is individual freedom then I would rather have someone telling us what we may or may not do.

MR HOWARD: I very strongly support what Mr Christian-Bailey just said. In commenting about what Mr Jackson and Mr Quintal has said about what happens to licences if they are forfeited. I just wanted to refer to what the committee said in its report on page 33. It said if some existing units fail to meet minimum standards or are withdrawn from tourist use for economic reasons we recommend against automatically allowing someone else to build an equivalent number of new units. We believe it would benefit the Island if the present amount of accommodation measured in beds and in units were reduced somewhat through natural attrition and we recommend that this should be allowed to occur. It will always be open to the Assembly to lift the freeze if more accommodation becomes needed to handle the desirable level of tourism. I simply wanted to draw attention to the committee's view that there is more than a healthy amount of accommodation on the Island now and we didn't think the Island needed more. We saw it desirable and beneficical to the Island if the amount of accommodation shrunk a little bit through natural attrition.

MR SANDERS: Is Mr Howard's intention to move this amendment as a debate?

MR HOWARD: Yes, will I speak to that. I have given notice of a very long amendment. The motion that we are discussing at the moment has no substantial effect. The motion is that this House considers the report, and if we vote on that motion it doesn't leave us anywhere. I therefore have put into the system and all members have a copy, an amendment that would change that motion to a detailed one translating the recommendation at the end of the select committee report into policy wording with some modification. And the modifications that I have made in the amendment as I have put it I would like to comment on at the time. My motion was that we go through discussing in the same style as we have been discussing right to the end of these recommendations. I then intended to introduce this long motion and pin down point by point what I hope we have agreed on in this discussions around the table in the last meeting and this one, but I hadn't planned to move it until everybody had said whatever he wanted to say. I don't mean to say that the bait would be shot off at that point I would expect there would be some.
MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. President. I cannot agree that surrendered licenses be transferred to other accommodation owners. I think that there should be a decision. I think there has to be arrived at a policy in this House as to who will be deciding what happens to the surrendered policies, surrendered licenses and I would hope that the committee consist of the Assembly and the Health Officer. I, as far as licensing by units as well as beds, I feel that a bedroom in a hotel would be categorised as a unit. Units will have to be categorised more clearly. A unit, if an accommodation place is going to be licensed by units, the unit will have to be categorised, that's right. Now I agree that we would have to continue the freeze on tourist accommodation, we're only dealing with this point by point, is that right? I agree with the Pitcairn Society's submission and I think that's all I have to say on this particular one thank you Mr. President.

MR. QUINTAL: Yes I do not agree that any surrendered license should go to other accommodation areas. I feel that there are persons that have applied for to build accommodation many years ago and they're quite capable of putting up buildings just as good as any building on Norfolk Island and if not better, especially one person who is a first class carpenter and who had many persons working for him besides having a lot of carpenters working for him, he also has a cabinet maker or did have and I would think he would be quite capable of putting up an accommodation equal to any on the island at present, if not better and I think that person should be given some consideration. In the past, as I've said before, there are persons that have thumbed their noses at the Government and just gone ahead and built them and they've got away with it, and in my opinion, those persons do not deserve to have accommodation at all but they've got away
with it and that is it, we can't do anything about it now and
I do not support this idea and this was the only recommendation
that I disagreed with when we were having the meeting with the
Pitcairn Society and which the Pitcairn Society submitted to the
Assembly and that was the only thing I disagree with.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you. I forgot to bring in a
point Mr. President here that I do regard those who have had
longstanding applications as being the ones to be considered
firstly to take up any licenses that are disused in other areas.
I think they should be given first consideration. I didn't
bring that point in thank you.

MR. BROWN: Mr. President, insofar as this
recommendation relates to discontinued licenses and surrendered
licenses, I certainly agree with what Mr. Howard says. It would
seem at the moment that if one listens to complaints of the
various accommodation proprietors around the island, there are
far too many beds already. That seems to have been the problem
several years ago when the Select Committee was looking at the
question also. There's no doubt in my mind that we should be
taking the opportunity to allow the number of beds to decline.
Once we have our licensing system working properly and we know
how many beds there really are and can prevent any further beds
being installed or any further units being built, well that is
the time when we should look at whether our number is still too
high or has fallen too low and it is only if at a subsequent time
we decide the number is too low that I feel we should be even
considering the question of how we should go about issuing further
licenses. For the moment, we don't need any further licenses,
we need to get rid of every license that we can possibly get rid of.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you there is another point here
do with licenses that I would think that some consideration
must go to the purchase of premises by people off the island of
premises that are licensed and we are further letting our
accommodation beds get out of, we're allowing those beds to
remain in the hands of people who are not residents and we
thereby are contradicting another portion of this, these
recommendations which state that accommodation premises or
tourist premises should be encouraged towards local ownership
and I think that's something we should bring forth to consider.
Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: Further debate on 6(1) Honourable
Members. If not, we move on to 6(2) and 6(2) says this,
legislate minimum standards of accommodation, empower inspectors
to suspend unit licenses on the spot. Debate Honourable Members.

MR. HOWARD: I again, draw attention to the fact
that that's not something that can be enforced by anything we
decide today. It's something requiring legislation and the
Assembly considers such legislation will decide whether they
inspectors should be empowered to suspend on the spot, or not,
that's something we can't really decide here today. The law
as passed by some future Assembly will determine that.

MR. BROWN: Mr. President, whilst I support the recommendation in general, I certainly would not support one inspector having the power to run around and willy nilly suspend unit licenses. As Mr. Howard says, that is a matter in relation to which legislation would be necessary. It is a matter which would be considered at a later stage for that reason but I would indicate that if I were present at that consideration, I would be supporting a means for suspension, I would not be supporting that means being simply an inspector being able to on the spot suspend.

MRS. GREY: If we're moving to point (2) Mr. President then perhaps it's in order to whizz through this quickly again. The Chamber was inclined to accept that recommendation and as was the Government Tourist Bureau. I think the Pitcairn Society covered it in rather broader terms and they're the only specific acceptances. Chamber of Commerce and Tourist Bureau. Thank you.

MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: Thank you Mr. President. I've already declared my interests but I'd like to say a few words on that. I strongly support the suggestion that we legislate for minimum standards of accommodation. I have already elaborated on this. However, to suggest that licenses should be suspended on the spot sounds somewhat harsh and an inspector should only be authorised to recommend to the Government that this be done. We should rather be looking at means of encouraging accommodation places to improve their standards and offer advice as to the best means of doing this. Owners however, must accept continued refusal to abide by acceptable standards will mean the loss of their license, either temporarily or permanently. Contravention of health regulations is of course another matter and may call for more urgent action.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. President. I note that the terms here are empower inspectors to suspend unit licenses on the spot. I would take that as a cancellation on the spot. However, if the legislation and the machinery is there, if there should be a health problem or any other problem come up, I don't know that this would be a very practical situation. I think I'd have to agree with Mr. Christian-Bailey that the matter be reported to the powers that be, whichever legislation allows the power to be. Minimum standards, I think you'd have to categorise, we will have to ensure that that is categorised very carefully as to how one will term minimal standards. I don't think that a large and comfortable and every kind of places of reasonable standard if the water, if there's no potable water in sufficient quantities. I think we shall have to categorise very carefully there and short of having brought in a full set of policies which I suppose I should have done, I think that's a very broad term but in general I agree with the first sentence and am inclined to disagree with the second sentence. Thank you.

MR. HOWARD: As a bit of reassurance to Miss Buffett, the Accommodation Proprietors and the Tourist Bureau have over the past year, year and a half given a tremendous amount of
consideration to that very problem, actually specifying
point by point what should be the minimum standards.
They're a long way down that road already. A great deal of
that work has been done and you're right, it is complicated.
It has to be done precisely.

MR. PRESIDENT: Further debate Honourable Members.
No further debate on item 2. Then we'll move to part 7 item
(1) which says "renew licenses annually, levy an annual fee
for each licensed unit". Debate Honourable Members.

MRS. GRAY: ...... as I have them before me Mr.
President. The Chamber of Commerce supported the principle of
levying a fee for accommodation on an annual basis, the Tourist
Bureau?(1) "If there is to be a revenue raising fee applied
to tourist accommodation, a similar levy should be applied to
restaurants, hire car operators, tour operators and other
tourist activities such as boat trips and horse-back riding.
The A.P.A. were faced with some degree of conflict Mr. President
because there's been a letter supported immediately prior to
the meeting which probably conflicts with what's here so I
suppose we'd better do them the courtesy of saying what they
said yesterday. Circumstances have caused us to review the
letter of 21st December, 82. We consider the tax
discriminatory as A.P.A. members are no different from anyone
else on Norfolk Island. You want me to read the whole thing
Mr. President? "We consider the tax discriminatory as A.P.A.
members are no different from anyone else on Norfolk Island.
We pay duty tax on all our food and cleaning items etc. and we
buy in greater quantities which adds to the revenue of the
Administration, so we are in fact an asset and not a pigeon to
be plucked every time someone else is looking how to get that
extra dollar. You will no doubt have noticed that some small
proprietors have called it a day to work without reward is
slavery. The Tourist Board and Bureau may talk in glowing
terms about all the tourists we can expect in the future. You
would only need to check the books of most proprietors to
confirm that the future is quite bleak with the high cost of
air fares we cannot see Norfolk Island being the chosen resort
of people who have not had the previous pleasure of a holiday
here which is a great pity for them and for us". It's signed
by the Secretary of the organization, the Accommodation
Proprietors Association. Yes that completes the comments I
have here Mr. President.

MR. HOWARD: I just wanted to observe that a long
time ago, a French Philosopher defined what the art of
taxation was. He said "It's the art of so plucking the goose
as to obtain the greatest amount of feathers with the least
amount of hissing" and the Accommodation Proprietors pigeon
is doing a great deal of hissing already and nobody's got one
feather yet. The time may come.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. President. I support
the Accommodation Proprietors. I don't believe that we should
be just putting levies or taxes on one part of the community.
If there's going to be, it should be overall but not just one
select body of persons.
MR. QUINTAL: I thoroughly agree with the comments that was made by Mr. Sanders.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. President. I believe that we should renew license annually, I agree with that, I agree that should levy an annual fee for each licensed unit and I agree that of course the fee should be decided upon. I would suggest a dollar a week or some such thing. I also agree that all licenses, not only in accommodation section, but of course then we're getting off course because we're handling the tourist accommodation fee but I will support that we should levy all licenses whether they be tourist accommodation places or not. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Mr. President: We already rip $5.00 off the tourist as he departs from the airport, I would not like to see his accommodation bill having a little piece on the bottom of it saying "your share of my annual licensing fee" so many dollars, I think there's too much of a tendency to rip what we can from the tourist. It already costs him enough to get here, it already costs him enough to stay here. As Mr. Sanders said, this is a discriminatory charge, there's no doubt in my mind that it would be passed on to the tourist, it's not something that the accommodation proprietor would bear alone, and although I certainly support annual renewal of licenses, I do not support any fee other than perhaps a $5.00 to $100 total fee to cover the cost of the annual issue of the license.

MR. CHRISTIAN-BALIEY: Thank you Mr. President. I support this recommendation. I have said before that annual registration fees should be levied and this levy should be based on 7% in my belief it should be based on 7% of one's current double nightly tariff, whether the bed is occupied or not. On my calculations, on today's bed or unit count, should contribute approximately $70,000 to Government revenue. It is my belief that a percentage level on tariff is a much fairer way of levying an annual registration fee than the 50¢ per night as was originally proposed. I know that there are many in the accommodation industry who would be opposed to such levy as an unfair tax on one section of the business community though I believe that an annual business registration fee for all other businesses on the island should also be considered. This annual registration fee could be based on a flat rate of say $50.00 per year for an owner operated business increasing in units of $25.00 for each employee employed by the business. My belief is that unless we are prepared to contribute directly to the public purse, a future Government might not be so prepared to provide a large amount of money for promotional purposes. Bargaining position for promotional money at budget time would be much stronger. I would like the estimates committee to look at this as a possible avenue of revenue raising.

MR. HOWARD: I'd like to draw attention again to the Select Committee's thinking in doing this. The Committee's view was that the amount of the fee should be high enough to discourage a proprietor from applying for or renewing a license unless he is seriously consistently in the accommodation business.
We do not believe it should be so high as to require any significant increase in the tariff charge to guests. Now how you find the balance point there is a problem that some future Assembly is going to have to decide. The Select Committee recommended a fee, not simply as a revenue raising measure. There were two other things that the Committee had in mind. One is that if, as a part of broad tourism policies, the freeze on accommodation is continued, and licenses issued to a fixed certain number of operators, that gives them a sheltered, if you like to call its sort of monopoly position and it increases the value of their properties. If you own one of the licenses and no more licenses are being issued, your license is worth something. And the committee felt that the Accommodation Proprietors should not get all of that windfall themselves but should pay some of it back to the common purse. Secondly, among the other important recommendations in the report are the establishing of minimum standards and a grading system and regular inspections making sure that the accommodation houses real tow the mark. There are going to be costs in doing that and we think that those costs ought to be paid out of the earnings of the accommodation houses so there are those two other aspects of it, quite apart from revenue raising. One was if you're increasing the value of their property, they shouldn't just keep that as a windfall all themselves. Secondly, they should carry some of the costs that ought to be spent in administering the industry properly.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. President. I find it quite unique that we're talking about around this table of screwing the accommodation proprietors when it was only just a couple of meetings back that our own members didn't even want to pay another cent more for registration of a motor vehicle. I find it really unique. Well it just seems to be the same as usual. Just so long as we can screw the other guy and just so long as we ourselves don't have to pay. Seems to be the standard system here doesn't it? Thank you Mr. Chairman.

MR. PRESIDENT: Further debate Honourable Members. Well that seems to have exhausted one. No. (2) and I shall read it "ensure that the Tourist Bureau monitors booking trends in comparison to the minimum desired tourist level. Uses direct promotion to maintain this minimum, does not otherwise" may be I've misread that, I'll just read those two again. Mine wasn't quite clear. "uses direct promotion to maintain this minimum, does not otherwise use direct promotion and funds this promotion" that's item (2). Debate Honourable Members. Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: The key part of that recommendation is that the committee recommended that public money be spent to pay for tourist promotion when the numbers were down below the desired level. That is something that has never until this current financial year been done by the government on any substantial scale. The Tourist Bureau has since it was established
been supported by some Government money and some Government money has been spent helping people get to Sydney or to New Zealand to do promotional work. This proposal is that it is a legitimate and sensible use of public money when the tourist industry on the island is down below the desired level to spend public moneys to try to bring it back up. That's the crunch of that one.

MR. SANDERS: Mr. President. I don't support this one at all. I believe that we should be promoting all the time, not just when figures are down. If we wish to have continued tourism on Norfolk Island which is indeed our life-blood, it has to be continuous, not just when you're broke.

MRS. GRAY: Thank you Mr. President. Mr. Sanders will be pleased to hear that the Chamber of Commerce agrees with him completely. They have in fact, split this recommendation into three. That is the three paragraphs in which it appears monitors booking trends in comparison with the minimum desired tourist level, uses direct promotion to maintain this minimum and does not otherwise use direct promotion. The Chamber's prepared to support the first two of the recommendations. The third was rejected as the Chamber believes tourist promotion should be carried out on a continuing basis. The Tourist Bureau, the Committee feels that ongoing promotion is essential to maintain a healthy tourist industry. At the moment, promotional efforts are generally directed towards increasing the number of tourists to a desirable level. Once this is achieved, future efforts should be directed toward improving the quality of affluence to tourists who do visit. This means identifying the best potential markets and then directing advertising and promotions into media which will specifically reach and attract these markets. The Accommodation Proprietors Association feels it is essential to increase promotion when the market is declining but we consider it also necessary to operate a continuous promotional campaign in order to even maintain a market. It is a fact that old tourists both die and fade away and we must always be seeking to replace them. Thank you Mr. President.

MR. CHRISTIAN-Bailey: I believe Mr. President the Tourist Bureau must have its finger on the pulse of the market all the time. It should carefully promote when there is an apparent falling off in tourist numbers and involve itself in low key promoting when times are good. One must always have one's name before the public. I believe that an early appointment of a Director of Tourism is essential to the wellbeing of the tourist industry. The person appointed must be professional in his field and be paid accordingly. This is in my view all part of an ongoing promotional effort not off and on situation. He or she would be the key person in ensuring that our promotional budget is sensibly spent and would be of great assistance to individual businesses in making sure that the thousands of dollars of advertising money they spend goes further. I do not underrate the work of members of the Tourist Board or Bureau, they are a dedicated team but a professional person who could spend their full time implementing board policy, co-ordinating and directing our promotional efforts would be a real asset. It is true that such a person would command a moderately high salary but
even now, we are rather at the mercy of advertising and public relations people and others whose fees are often quite high. Professional Director of Tourism would be able to make best use or by-pass these people. In carrying out Tourist Board policy, he would be able to negotiate on our behalf with the Executives of Airlines, tour wholesalers and others involved in the tourist industry.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. President. I believe that the necessity for a top level person as referred to by Mr. Christian-Bailey may be refused by the outlets offered to us by airline companies. I believe that the contributions being put into magazines by those contributing into the Tourist Board are also removing the necessity or such top level Director of Tourism as is mentioned by Mr. Christian-Bailey. I think that what will necessarily benefit us is that their top level advertising which we are already paying for for these services, will be bringing the more tourists here and it is the monitoring and the dispersing of those tourists. I do believe that we would have more control in the booking centre of whole these people are to be placed. I can't quite agree with spending large money on a top level tourist promotional tourist, he or she, I think if we make use of what we are already being given, even though we're paying for it, we will continue to grow. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Mr. President, I support Mr. Christian-Bailey's comments in relation to a Director of Tourism. With all due respect to the Tourist Bureau, I believe that the Tourist Bureau would waste in a year as much as a reasonably competent Director of Tourism would cost us and I would certainly support the concept that when times are bad we should provide funds to the Tourist Bureau to enable the island to be promoted, but in other times, when our numbers are reasonably adequate, the Director of Tourism is all that we would need. A decent Director of Tourism would be able to ensure that the airlines did their bit and that the airlines spent the money instead of requiring us to. There's no doubt in my mind Mr. President that a Director of Tourism is going to be found to be essential in Norfolk Island in the not too distant future, but I support this recommendation.

MR. PRESIDENT: Further debate on that point Honourable Members, then we move to the next which is item 3, No. 3, "investigate involving the Bureau in all bookings, investigate the Bureau's appointing one head Agent in each key city". Debate, Mrs. Gray.

MRS. GRAY: Thank you Mr. President. The Chamber of Commerce, it was felt that this recommendation should read "investigate the desirability or otherwise of involving the Bureau in all bookings" and for part (b) "it was felt that this recommendation should read 'investigate the desirability or otherwise of the Bureau appointing one head Agent in each city'. The Tourist Bureau, "The committee feels that any movement or direct selling by the Bureau in open competition with our Agent and wholesalers would be premature, we question whether such a move would ever be beneficial in promoting Norfolk."
The Bureau's position should be one of trying to make the Agents and wholesalers jobs easier by helping them in every possible way. We can assist with bookings, supply brochures, fact sheets and data and eventually publish and mail a monthly newsletter. There is much we can do to better educate existing sales personnel so that they will recommend and sell Norfolk as an attractive destination. That's it, thank you Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you, Mr. Christian-Bailey.

MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: Thank you Mr. President. I would not support the Bureau being involved in all bookings, other than what they are already doing in booking tours, restaurants and some accommodation in the visitors' information office. I don't believe the Bureau should appoint a head agent in each capital city but should play a supportive role ensuring that all agents and wholesalers selling Norfolk, are in travel, are properly serviced. Thank you Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Mr. President. I support Mr. Christian-Bailey.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: The reason primarily for the Select Committee having made this recommendation was the runaway trend in commission being squeezed out of the accommodation houses on the Island. I have got to support what the Chamber of Commerce says, of course, of saying that the desirability or otherwise of these things should be looked at. I do not know whether they are good ideas or not, neither did the Committee. The Committee thought that it might be possible if we could get eventually to the place where all bookings flowed through the Tourist Bureau, of being able to control the commissions being paid to a reasonable consistent amount rather than some people being ripped off for 30% and somebody else then for 35% which the Committee felt was a bad thing. The Committee saw the accommodation industry as being picked off one by one by hungry agents and felt that the Tourist Bureau could give them some protection if all bookings eventually did flow through the Bureau, that was the thinking behind it.

MR. PRESIDENT: Miss Buffett.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. President. I support Mr. Christian-Bailey's points there as he put before the Chair. And I see, I think human nature being what it is, a central booking agency in this situation wouldn't do much for the percentages. Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: Further debate Honourable Members.

MRS. GRAY: Sorry Mr. President, it might be in order here to add a couple of comments that, one at least which was put by the Pitcairn Society. They expressed - "The Society supports the moves by the Assembly towards the development of more specific policies in the important area of tourism and supports the idea of strong community participation in the process. The recommendations brought forward by the Select Committee on Tourism are various in their content and implications" and then they went on to group the recommendations as I have read them. A comment here from the Accommodation Proprietors.