Association. The Association strongly recommends the use of a public relations company to promote the Island, to obtain the most cost effective promotional benefits possible given that Norfolk Island could not afford an effective direct advertising campaign. The Tourist Board of course has the responsibility to advise the Government on promotion and we will continue to convey suggestions though our representative on it. That is all I would add thank you Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: No further in respect of that item. We move to the next. The next is item 4, which reads - "Improved tourist facilities, museum, litter cleaning". Debate. Miss Buffett.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. President. I really think this would be in the policy of the next Assembly because it is a big matter there isn't it. I suppose we could improve tourist facilities but it is a very broad statement.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Christian-Bailey.

MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: Thank you Mr. President. I strongly support this recommendation. We must continue to look at ways of improving tourist facilities. Our accommodation houses, restaurants etc., must be encouraged to maintain high standards. We must continue to improve our recreational areas with the continuing assistance perhaps of the Service Clubs. We must show that we care about conserving the natural beauty of the Island by keeping it free of weeds and litter. Norfolk has many wonderful assets which we can promote and preserve. We need better walking tracks through the forest and better roads to picturesque spots. We badly need a public bus service for those who do not wish to hire a car. We need better public toilet facilities, we need to beautify our shopping area and provide better parking facilities. The list could go on and on. Probably most of the people on this Island have good ideas about how we can improve things. We should be listening to these people and putting their ideas into action.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mrs Gray.

MRS GRAY: I haven't participated from a personal point of view in this debate because nine times out of ten probably 99.99% of the time Mr. Christian-Bailey has been expressing what I felt to be very worthwhile feelings and I certainly support him in things he is talking about now, as does the Chamber of Commerce who wish the recommendation to include the words "toilet facilities" and much as we may be amused by that comment it has come up time and time again in I believe any of the surveys which have been conducted on the Island and of course in this whole debate on tourism. We have reference to a couple of surveys made, in fact, 3 in whole, one of the residents, and a couple at least of the visitors to the Island. I say again, it comes up with monotonous regularity, it would be nice to be able to do something about it.

MR. PRESIDENT: Further debate. Nothing further on that point. Number 5 is "Support (and if necessary legislate for) grading of accommodation. Debate. Mrs Gray.

MRS GRAY: The recommendation accepted by the Chamber Mr. President and I do believe that is where the general comments
fizzle out in terms of specifics, as far as the other bodies are concerned.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Christian-Bailey.

MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: I support the recommendation, as I have said before.

MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you. Mr. Sanders thank you.

Any further.

MR. QUINTAL: I also support it.

MR. PRESIDENT: Yes thank you Mr. Quintal. That covers number 5. Number 6 which reads "Recognise that conservation and ecological protection are essential". Debate. Miss Buffett.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you. I support this concept very strongly the recommendation because there is a very long letter from the conservation society in support of conservation and ecological protection in Norfolk Island. Basically, they are our greatest assets, beauty and the clean air and if I may be permitted to, if it's a pretty long letter, I will just pick out the points here, that they do introduce the matter by saying, this is the Norfolk Island Conservation Society, "The main emphasis in this submission will be to try and define or stress the value and uniqueness from an environmental point of view and to emphasise the importance of these natural features and attractions to maintaining of a viable and stable tourist industry. In fact these natural qualities should be the basic attraction. Secondly after establishing what should be the basic attraction we will endeavour to present some guidelines in trying to determine optimum levels of tourist numbers and associated development that if exceeded will destroy the very thing people come here to see". I agree, I think most of us woul agree with that. "It is evident there are inherent contradictions involved in tourism that make it mandatory that careful consideration to all aspects of the Island's environment, if only for one important reason, the more unspoilt it is, the greater its tourist potential. It is hoped that the Norfolk Island Conservation Society does not appear to be opposed to tourism but that we as citizen conservationists are actually working to save the tourist industry from itself. Included with this submission are a number of listed quotes, or not tied in directly to the text of the submission, we try to be helpful and relevant to the subject.". They go on to describe that Island's deserve very special attention as part of the National Estate mainly because of their extraordinarily scientific interest. They often contain rare localised species and narrow endemics which make them of particular significance for the study of genetics, evolution, population dynamics and species interaction. Others represent remnants of mainland eco systems which elsewhere have been altered or lost and thus serve as a valuable reference yet others are breeding grounds for sea birds, seals and turtles etc. These are all very relevant Mr. President. Like most oceanic islands, Norfolk and Lord Howe Island are noted for the high degree of endemism in both their flora and their fauna. In fact the have been referred to as two of the most interesting oceanic islands in the world. As the description indicates, Norfolk Island is unique and interesting. There are not many sub-tropical oceanic islands can easily be visited and where a unique and interesting sub-tropical and tropical wild-life can be seen. So I think they are just a couple of
excerpts at this stage. They do suggest that in the book which is quite topical, in the book "The Great Pacific Rip-off" tourism has become an industry symbolic of scenic trespass over-use and environmental exploitation claiming to be a clean industry when compared with conventional industrial activity. Its traffic noises, jet exhaust fumes highway construction and reckless destruction of visual beauty are seldom mentioned when adding up the financial gains and how true that is. So I support that this and all Assembly should recognize conservation and ecological protection are essential. Thanks Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Quintal.

MR. QUINTAL: Mr. Chairman it is now 6 o'clock and getting real fraidy down ya!

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Jackson. I consider this recommendation to be one of the key points with a few others of this submission because may reasons because I recognize the conservation, ecological and the historical society membership could have been included there. Because it is quite clear with the report that Miss Buffett just gave that some of the Islands of the Pacific has found that tourism becomes a liability if it goes on unchecked and I do believe that this recommendation in this report gives some lead for all the Members, for all future members of the Government, to take lead on this and make sure that Norfolk Island a place where we can live and generations after us will be able to live in a place where we all love today.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mrs Gray.

MRS GRAY: Thank you. Number 6, Chamber of Commerce the recommendation was "Accept it". I would like to refer briefly to the report which reached us from Dr. Owen McCarthy following the survey of Norfolk Island residents and their attitudes towards Island management, development and tourism. In his summary and conclusion, I think one should note well the conclusion drawn by Dr. McCarthy following the survey and it was an interview survey of around half the permanent residents of Norfolk Island. It is concluded that permanent residents would strongly support Assembly policies which promoted tourism in a professional way but ensured that increased numbers did not put so much pressure on facilities that natural beauty and the peaceful way of life of residents was impaired. I think that probably sums up very accurately the words of members in the House today.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Christian-Bailey.

MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: I certainly recognize that conservation and ecological protection are essential. No-one with any real feeling for Norfolk Island would deny this. This is one area where we must balance a good effect of tourism against the bad in catering for the needs of tourists we must see that our natural environment is preserved. We must be especially mindful of this as tourist numbers grow for instance, tourists need access to the natural beauties of a rainforest but walking tracks must be carefully planned so that there is least amount of disturbance to the natural flora and fauna. Our visitors like to be able to travel around the Island but do we desire an endless proliferation of hire vehicles. Development without planning and controls could well bring about serious damage to our environment then Norfolk would lose some of the very attractions which bring visitors here. However I believe we as residents must also show we care about avoiding pollution and conserving our environment and then our visitors will respect our desire to keep Norfolk beautiful. Thank you.
MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: I was pleased to hear the words of Miss Buffett and Mr. Jackson and Mrs Gray and Mr. Christian-Bailey. There is no doubt in my mind that this recommendation is one of the most important recommendations in the whole report. The words that Miss Buffett used were "working to save the tourist industry from itself". And sadly in other parts of the world people haven't worked to do that and the tourist industry has started to destroy itself. I certainly hope by paying a lot of attention to this recommendation we will be able to save that happening here.

MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you. Further debate. I think that covers that item. We move now to item 7 which says "Broaden the Bureau's role". Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: No way Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mrs Gray.

MRS GRAY: Chamber of Commerce recommendation was accepted with the proviso that the words "in serving the tourist industry" be included.

MR. PRESIDENT: Any further debate. No further comment in respect of that. Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: I wonder if now is the time for me to put this long amendment of mine.

MR. PRESIDENT: Did you intend this be finalised this afternoon.

MR. HOWARD: I think it is up to the pleasure of the House Mr. President. Let me describe it. What I have tried to do is to combine the sense of the recommendations of the Select Committee, modified by comments that members had made up through our last meeting in a way that I think will be quite readily acceptable to the Assembly. I may be wrong, but I think it can be. If as a matter of fact this distillation of the recommendations into proposed policy form is going to lead to an immense amount of more debate perhaps we ought to leave it for another day and I don't strongly object to that but I think there is a good possibility that these proposals one by one would find 99% agreement around the Table and if we could reach that then we would have a policy and we would have achieved something. We would have something concrete instead of leaving us with a lot of deeply felt words in the air which were merely words. But I am happy to consider the wishes of the House however people want to handle it.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mrs Gray.

MRS GRAY: Thank you Mr. President. I would be supportive of Mr. Howard's words. I am extremely anxious particularly in the light of a motion passed earlier by this House which allows us a big airline company access to Norfolk Island and I am extremely anxious that we conclude and make very precise our feelings about tourism and establish a policy right here and now and I note that we are only running some 35 minutes passed Mr. Jackson's deadline of 5.30, or that is the one he is always accusing us of having, if Mr. Jackson is happy to finish it off.
MR. JACKSON: You speak for yourself Chloe.

MRS. GRAY: I am I usually do. Mr. President I am very much in favour of trying to get as much of this established as is possible tonight.

MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: I would support Mrs Gray in this.

MR. PRESIDENT: Further debate. Miss Buffett.

MISS BUFFETT: Mr. President. I don't intend letting this go through without a lot of comment. If it is going through this evening it will take a lot of time.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Mr. President. In fairness there are some items contained Mr. Howard's amendment about which I would like to give careful consideration and I really don't feel that I can give that consideration tonight. I feel that I do need to go back to look at the hansard of what some of the other members have said and although I accept what some of the members have already said to the effect that they would like to finalise the matter tonight I tend to go along with Miss Buffett but I don't think it is something which is capable of being finished that quick.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: Mr. President would be conceivable that we adjourn until next Wednesday; we also have that matter of Commonwealth legislation which needs to be discussed and the Administrator requires an answer before the 22nd isn't it, the date next Wednesday is the 20th and there is only two other matters on the list, the Coldham Plan and the slaughtering thing, perhaps the whole lot could be put on for next Wednesday and hope that it not very lengthy.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: I certainly wouldn't object to a week's delay; there are several ways in which in trying to arrive at what I think the Assembly wants I have taken a bit of a leap in the dark, I don't think big ones, but a bit of a leap in the dark and it may be that only a couple of members had a look at this before the meeting. Most members have not had a chance to study it, I don't think it's quite good enough for the Assembly to simply take my work that it is O.K., let's flash through it, I think that establishing these policies is terribly important, what I have had in mind from the beginning is that the Assembly I hoped would get to a point where it could agree on a list of policies that could be changed later if they wanted to be changed, but at least for the time being at least have something in writing so that we can hand to visitors to the Island if they are interested, and to prospective investors, hand to people in the tourist industry now and say "Here is where the Government stands on this industry" and I think that it is terribly important that we do it well and if there are two voices saying "Let us delay", Mr. Sanders proposes a weeks delay, I don't think a week is that bad.
MR. SANDERS: It is only because, Mr. President, that there is this other matter that we have to all meet on any how and I find that there is only two of these things in Mr. Howard's proposed amendment that I find offensive and that is 14 and 15, but I also believe that this policy ought, we ought to have a policy as soon as possible, even if it needs altering shortly.

MR. BROWN: Could I move Mr. President that we suspend until next Wednesday at 2 p.m.

MR. PRESIDENT: Before we do that maybe we could adjourn this matter just to complete the formalities. May I have that motion. Mr. Howard?

MR. HOWARD: I move that we adjourn this matter for a week.

MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you. Yes just the matter before us Miss Buffett. I put that motion. Those of that opinion say "Aye" to the contrary "No". Are there any abstentions. I think the "Ayes" have it. I now seek the motion of adjournment, suspension, until next Wednesday the 20th. Is there any further debate on that Honourable Members? Then I put the question, "That the House suspend until the 20th". Those of that opinion say "Aye", to the contrary "No"; are there any abstentions? The motion is carried that this House stands suspended until next Wednesday the 20th April 1983.
MR. BUFFETT: Honourable Members, this a continuation of a suspended sitting of last Wednesday the 13th April. This suspended sitting is now resumed. Honourable Members there are a couple of matters that will require attention before we pick up the matters which have been listed upon the Notice Paper. The first matter that I would like to attend to is advise from the Administrator in respect of two pieces of legislation that have passed before this House, and I will address them individually. First of all the Administrator has written in these terms to me in part - "On the 14th April 1983 His Excellency the Governor-General, pursuant to section 22(1) of the Norfolk Island Act 1979 declared that he withholds assent to section 4 of the Legislative Assembly (Amendment) Act 1983 and assents to the remainder of that proposed law. In accordance with section 24(1) of the Norfolk Island Act attached is a message stating the reasons for the withholding of assent to that part of the proposed law". And Honourable Members I will read that to the House and law it before the House. It is headed Norfolk Island Act 1979 - Message furnished pursuant to section 24 of the Act setting out the reasons for withholding of assent to section 4 of the Legislative Assembly (Amendment) Act 1983 - "The Legislative Assembly (Amendment) Act 1983 was passed by the Legislative Assembly on the 23rd of March 1983 and was reserved by the Deputy Administrator for the Governor-General's pleasure. The Governor-General withheld assent to section 4 of the proposed law and assented to the remainder of the proposed law on the 14th of April 1983, and this statement of reasons is furnished in accordance with section 24 of the Norfolk Island Act 1979. Section 4 of the proposed law provides for a change in the qualifications for enrolment on the electoral roll by enabling certain holders of temporary entry permits under the Immigration Ordinance 1968 to enrol. Assent was withheld from the proposed law on the following grounds - it would not be desirable to change the qualifications for enrolment on the electoral roll of Norfolk Island before giving expression to the wishes of the existing electorate for the holding of an immediate general election as requested by a majority of that electorate in a referendum held in February 1983", and that is dated the 19th day of April 1983. I lay that before the House Honourable Members.

MR. HOWARD: I move that the statement be noted.

MR. PRESIDENT: There is a motion that that be noted.

MR. HOWARD: We didn't really expect a very meaningful reason for dissent and we haven't got one. Could you read it again Mr. President I was trying to note it down and I couldn't catch all the words, I have "That it was not considered desirable to change the qualifications", can you ..

MR. PRESIDENT: I will read the paragraph which refers to reasons for assent being withheld, I will read that again.

MR. HOWARD: Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: "Assent was withheld from the proposed law on the following grounds - it would not be desirable to change the qualifications for enrolment on the electoral roll of Norfolk Island before giving expression to the wishes of the existing electorate for the holding of an immediate general election as requested by a majority of that electorate in a referendum held in February 1983".
MR. HOWARD: Thank you. I think first of all if anyone is uncertain where to pin the authority for that action, that there ought to be no misunderstanding in any body's mind that it was the Governor-General, he withheld assent but in such matters he is required to act as he is advised by the Executive Council of Australia. The Executive Council of Australia consists of senior ministers in the elected Australian Government which is a new Government, surely their thoughts would have been powerfully affected by the recommendations of our new Minister, Mr. Tom Uren, he is a new Minister, he had been to Norfolk Island only, so he told us, only once before in his life prior to his recent visit for a couple of days here, perhaps he made up his own mind, perhaps he believed that reason, perhaps he thought it was a bad thing to change the law. I find it extra-ordinary that the Australian Government would put itself in the position of enforcing harsher, more restrictive electoral laws rather than allowing them to be reformed. Norfolk Island has had restrictive electoral laws since the late 1960's, for good reasons, but it has been increasingly widely felt that our electoral laws were too restrictive and that they were unjust in the way that South Africa's electoral laws are unjust, in the way that American laws about the voting of blacks were unjust for generations. So this Assembly, passed by a majority of 6 to 3, a Bill that would make the electoral laws more just in our view and it is that particular part of the Bill based on an amendment that Mr. Brown put forward that has been rejected by the Australian Government. I think it ought to be clearly recorded in the minds of anybody who cares about Government on Norfolk Island that this Legislative Assembly tried earnestly to make the electoral law more just, less oppressively restrictive and that it was the Australian Government that refused to allow that to happen. I find it a little ironic that with the Norfolk Island Act having been in operation for 4 years now nearly with this Assembly having functioned on the whole I think with great credit to Norfolk Island, with the Assembly having considered a matter of this importance and debated it at length and having given its judgement, that the Assembly's judgement on what is essentially a local matter has been thrown out by the Commonwealth. It is ironic that at the same time as the Commonwealth is doing that the Commonwealth is in the course of procedures in which 250 Cocos/Malay residents of the Cocos Keeling Islands will be asked to vote as a Territory under Australia's authority whether they want Cocos Keeling Islands to become an independent country or whether they want it to be governed in free association with Australia or whether they want it to become part of Australia. Australia clearly thinks that those 250 Cocos/Malays are mature enough, sound enough, to make the fundamental governmental decision about their Island's future and yet the Australian Government almost in the same breath does not think that this Assembly is competent to form a sound and fair judgement about the local electoral law on Norfolk Island. I note the Administrator's statement with very deep sorrow.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Mr. President, I find this advice quite outrageous. To suggest that a widening of the franchise would cause any delay in the forthcoming election is with all due respect, a little less than truthful. Notice has been given that the electoral roll will close today and that is the only notice that would have had to be given had the franchise been widened. It seems obvious to me that there has been a desire to ensure that temporary entry permit holders in Norfolk Island don't get the right to vote and I question the reason for that. Some have suggested that such a change is undesirable because it would dilute the effect of the Public Service vote, I certainly hope that
was not the reason that was in the minds of those in the Australian Government who advised the Governor-General. However, temporary entry permit holders should not give up all hope at this stage because Mr. Buffett has indicated on a prior occasion that he will be bringing forward legislation to lift the immigration restrictions and allow temporary entry permit holders to move up to an enter and remain permit or eventually to residency so perhaps all of the temporary entry permit holders who are listening today will be able to sit back and wait for that to happen. I certainly feel today is a sorry day.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Quintal.

MR. QUINTAL: Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I was most disappointed that the Australian Government had disallowed temporary entry permit holders to stand for the Legislative Assembly. It just goes to show how much power the Assembly does not have. We are now faced with a situation which seems to me that for not the first time, but one of the first times that a minority government seems to be the ruler of the Island which I think is very disturbing and very sad. I have lived on the Island all, just about all my life, and today I am wondering where that word democracy has gone to. In my opinion, democracy does not exist any more and this is a very sad day for Norfolk Island when a new Minister could make a decision regarding our own domestic affairs and also to disallow something that the Assembly passed and I am very disappointed in the Minister who is responsible for Norfolk Island or anyone else who had any part in this sad affair.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. President. I have just a very brief statement, it is actually in the form of a condolence, and I would like to read it, "It is with deep regret that this House records the death of democracy. Democracy born on Norfolk Island in 1856, it had a child in 1979 called the Norfolk Island Act. From birth there has always been a festering sore called Tom Patterson. This festering sore turned into a cancerous growth with the appointment of Tom Uren as our Minister for Norfolk Island. This cancerous growth became terminal in April this year. I would ask the Members of this Assembly to stand with me in silence for 30 seconds in remembrance of democracy".

MR. PRESIDENT: Are there any other speakers Honourable Members. Miss Buffett.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. President. I wish to express my view as I did before that it was the timing of the amendment put through by Mr. Brown, I asked Mr. Brown to withhold that, or put it through as a separate Bill, at the time I feel that if genuine concern were for enfranchisement of the temporary entry permit holders in Norfolk Island that the amendment would have come through not as an amendment then but would have come through earlier for genuine enfranchisement of these people. It is my opinion that the Governor-General has acted justly and correctly as he has explained in that the amendment came in at a time which was an intrusion of the electoral roll boundaries. As I indicated, I would gladly debate the subject brought in independently as I feel there is merit in enfranchisement of temporary entry holders but the time factor would have to be given and I also agree that the time that we do have the machinery to enfranchise those who indicate a genuine desire to live in Norfolk Island and to take interest in Norfolk Island.
MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Christian-Bailey.

MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: Thank you Mr. President. I don't propose to say too much about this except Mr. President that I am very disappointed at the Commonwealth Government's decision in this; as I have said on an earlier occasion it is my belief that it is the democratic right of these people to be allowed to vote. Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Jackson.

MR. JACKSON: Thank you Mr. President. Firstly I completely disassociated myself from Mr. Sander's condolence statement. Members are well aware at the sitting in this House when the Minister heard arguments for and against this particular issue that is being discussed, Members think lengthy arguments matter of fact practically the whole of the discussion with the Minister took up two points, one concerning those of temporary entry permit holders having the right to vote after 2 years, and the other on the Legislative Assembly (Amendment) Bill concerning the public service. It appears that all that concerned the Members was to discuss with the Minister on his visit. I have always stated and I will continue to state because I was one who suggested that this issue should be decided by a referendum. This is not an issue that concerns only 6 members of this elected Assembly; this is an issue that will concern the whole future of this Island and no-one has made that move, it has been well known for the past week that the Governor-General has not assented to section 4 of the electoral Bill and there has been no move until today when the message came from the Administrator and read out in this House. Some of the Members have spoken on behalf of voting rights of the temporary entry permit holders and I am surprised that with myself and others around this area being Norfolk Islanders, all were born here on the Island and yet we have a Bill here before us this afternoon to follow on just after the tourist report Bill an immigration Bill, and amendment to our own immigration Bill that has been held up for the past 2 and a half years on one particular question and that question concerns the right of the people of Pitcairn descent. Now here we are here today jumping up and down, Norfolk Islanders, when our own people are being denied the same right to vote and I remind those of Pitcairn descent I am proud of it, and some of you were even prouder because you used the word that you are of Pitcairn descent for the purpose of getting elected in your policy statements but it appears that after being elected into the Assembly, you do nothing more about it, as matter of fact there has been moves, and I have already stated previously, there has been moves in this House to completely wipe off the statute books all words relating to those of Pitcairn descent. Now this is an issue that I challenge the Norfolk Islanders around this Table to come to grips with and stand up for their people. We will see how you stand up when the amendment comes before this House this afternoon so therefore Mr. President I will say again this is a major issue and the feeling within the community is not the same feeling with the 6 members who have already spoken here in favour of it. Let it be put to a referendum and see what the community and the electors say about it not just bring it in the House in the form of an amendment and hope for the best, and when the Governor-General refuses assent to it, sit here and take everyone else to task. Put it to the electors. That is all I wish to say on that issue Mr. President.
MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. President. I agree with Mr. Jackson that it is a major issue and I do not that it should have been decided at a secret meeting at the South Pacific Hotel just prior to the Minister coming down here, when those in attendance were our President, Mr. Buffett, Mr. Jackson, Miss Buffett, Mike King, Merval Hoare and Mrs Amy Bathlie. I do not believe that decisions of this Island should be handled by a minority at an unofficial meeting, secret meeting I think is the word Mr. Jackson is using.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: There is one matter that I should mention that does disappoint me in relation to the issue before us at the moment and that is that along with at least most of the other Assembly members I learnt that part of the Bill had been assented to and part of the Bill had not been assented to by reading an issue of the Norfolk Islander. I really do think it is time that the members of this House started to be notified of what has happened before the newspapers are notified. It is hardly an appropriate way to learn.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mrs Gray.

MRS GRAY: Thank you Mr. President. Mr. Brown has partially dealt with something I intended to bring up and I think it is highlighted by the statement that Mr. Jackson has just made. He said that it had been well known for the past week that assent had not been granted. I think Mr. Brown has told us that the first notification that many of us have had was in the Gazette. Mr. Jackson, in his address, has also challenged the International Convention on Racial Discrimination. I think that is something that most people in the world are beginning to abide by. Perhaps sometime, somehow, Mr. Jackson is going to have to recognise that and I would just like to say Mr. President, that the Governor-General has the power to advise or hand down such a decision. I don't really feel I can call him to task in that. I believe that he has been ill-advised. Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: Miss Buffett.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. President. I wish to raise an objection to being accused of attending secret meetings in the South Pacific Hotel with the Minister who clearly stated that he would be available to Members and the people of Norfolk Island who wished to see him.

MR. HOWARD: He did not.

MISS BUFFETT: And if I may be permitted to continue...+

MR. HOWARD: Never.

MISS BUFFETT: If I had been interjecting I would have been called to order. I hate to play bowls with you lot because you're bad losers.

MR. PRESIDENT: Any further participation in the debate that is before the House. Mr. Howard
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MR. HOWARD: Could Miss Buffett please tell us when the Minister invited the people of Norfolk Island to come talk with him.

MISS BUFFETT: ..........Judge in Court Mr. Howard ....

MR. PRESIDENT: Order Honourable Members we are debating a particular issue.

MR. HOWARD: Mr. President, I was not meaning to be rude I was seeking information it may well be that the Minister did invite the people of Norfolk Island and the Members of this Assembly to come to talk with him, if so, I was totally unaware of it and I was listening pretty closely and I wonder if Miss Buffett can tell us in what form or through what means that invitation was given.

MISS BUFFETT: I would be very glad to Mr. President. On two occasions, I heard that matter stated, one was at the airport when Mr. Howard was on the tarmac in the official party, and the other one I think was at one of the Hotels where there was a State reception. So unless you followed the Minister around who was talking with all the Members of the groups I think you will find Mr. Howard that you missed a lot that he may have said to people on the Island. Thank you Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Any further debate in respect of the matter that is before the House Honourable Members. Mr. Quintal.

MR. QUINTAL: I would like to make a statement that at no time I was invited to attend any meeting with the Minister, secret or otherwise and if, surely to goodness, if the Minister had invited persons to discuss any matter with him surely it would have been the Assembly, the whole Assembly and not part of the Assembly and a few of the residents and as far as secret meetings are concerned, we've been accused and abused of having secret meetings and it seems to me that the other party has been having secret meetings as well, right from start to finish, right up to now and I have also been present when there has been secret meetings by the opposition ... and they have been caught out by Quintal. I have the date and the times.


MR. BROWN: Mr. President. What has just been said has explained something to me and I am pleased that there is an explanation for it. It seems that most of the Members of the House were not aware that the Minister intended to speak with other groups of people before speaking with the Assembly, in fact most of the Members of this House were not aware that the Minister intended to invite Members of the Public to attend our private meeting with him, to some extent, that invitation may have been regrettable in that might not have allowed as full and frank a discussion with the Minister as some of us may have liked but it does explain why the Minister did not have as much as he really needed to complete his meeting with the Assembly. He was obviously busy with other meetings. It certainly explains why the Minister did not have the time to do any preparation sufficient to allow him to deal with the matters which had been placed on the agenda for our meeting with him and perhaps it is because he has been so busy in preparing his advice in relation to the Bill which is under discussion at the moment, that he has not yet had time to come back to us even at this
stage with any response so far as I am aware to any of the matters which were listed on the agenda. Fortunately now that this is over and done with, he may be able to sit down and come back to us with an answer to some of those questions which some of the Members around this Table feel are quite important questions and essential things to obtain answers to to enable us to be on going.

MR. PRESIDENT: Further debate Honourable Members.
Then I put the question - The question is "That the statement be noted" - those of that opinion say "Aye", to the contrary "No", are there any abstentions, the "Ayes" have it. I will also read Honourable Members, relating to that particular legislation the formal advice, what I have in fact read is the reasonings behind the refusal, I now read the, which I probably should have done in a proper sequence by doing this first, the Administrator's message in which he indicates that formal assent - I will read it - "His Excellency the Governor-General on the 14th of April 1983 withheld assent to section 4 of the Legislative Assembly (Amendment) Bill 1983 and assented to the remainder of that proposed law". And that message is also dated the 19th of April. What we have discussed earlier is of course is the reasonings that you will see. May I now turn to the other piece of legislation which I earlier referred to Honourable Members, and I read this message from His Honour the Administrator - "His Excellency the Governor-General on the 14th of April 1983 withheld assent to the Public Service (Amendment) Act 1983" and that is dated the 19th day of April 1983. I also read Honourable Members, in part, a letter from the Administrator which says this - dated the 19th of April - "On the 14th of April 1983 His Excellency the Governor-General pursuant to section 22(1) of the Norfolk Island Act 1979 declared that he withheld assent to the Public Service Act 1983 attached in pursuance with section 24(1) of the Norfolk Island Act is a statement of reasons for the withholding of assent to the proposed law". I turn to that particular document Honourable Members and read that - "Norfolk Island Act 1979 - Message furnished pursuant to section 24 of the Act setting out the reasons for withholding of assent to the Public Service (Amendment) Act 1983 - The Public Service (Amendment) Act 1983 was passed by the Legislative Assembly on the 16th of March 1983 and was reserved by the Administrator for the Governor-General's pleasure. The Governor-General withheld assent to the proposed law on the 14th of April 1983 and this statement of reasons is furnished in accordance with section 24 of the Norfolk Island Act 1979. Section 3 of the proposed law would, under certain circumstances, allow an officer or employee of the Norfolk Island Public Service who resigns from the Service to be re-appointed by the Public Service Board if he fails to be elected. There is at present no requirement for such a person to resign to be a candidate. It would also remove the present right of re-appointment of a person employed in the Public Service who resigned to be appointed to an Executive Office and was so appointed. Section 4 of the proposed law would remove the present right of Norfolk Island Public Servants who resigned to be Executive Members to be re-appointed to the Public Service when they failed to be appointed to an Executive Office. It would also remove the present provision whereby a public servant who is also a Legislative Assembly member is deemed to be on leave without pay when attending an Assembly meeting at a time when he would otherwise be required to be on duty. Assent was withheld from the proposed law on the grounds set out in the following paragraphs - Paragraph (a) In relation to section 3 of the proposed law, it is considered desirable that the present right of re-appointment of a person employed in the Public Service of the Territory who resigns to be appointed to an Executive Office be preserved. It is also unnecessary to
provide for re-appointment of an officer or employee of the Public Service of the Territory who resigns to become a candidate for election as a Member of the Legislative Assembly and who fails to be elected. There is at present no requirement to resign to become a candidate and it is not considered desirable to introduce such a requirement.

Paragraph (b) In relation to section 4, it is considered desirable that the present right of re-appointment of a person employed in the Public Service of the Territory who resigns in order to be appointed to Executive Office, but is not so appointed, be preserved. It is also considered desirable to continue to provide that where an officer or employee becomes a member of the Legislative Assembly he shall while attending a meeting of the Legislative Assembly at a time when he would otherwise be required to be on duty to be on leave with pay", and that statement is dated the 19th day of April 1983.

MR. HOWARD: I move that statement be noted.

MR. PRESIDENT: There is a motion "That the statement be noted". Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: They needn't waste all that typist's time really, they could just say - "We disagree with you". I am astonished at the last part of their reasons, that it is desirable to continue the provision whereby a Public Service Officer who is a member of the Assembly is while he is required to attend Assembly meetings deemed to be on leave with pay. The first Legislative Assembly members talked that one out carefully while Mr. Ellicott who was Minister at the time when the Norfolk Island Act was first coming into being. Mr. Ellicott said, certainly they should not be paid from two sources at once. Now I think the idea of a man being paid public funds to be in the Assembly and meanwhile drawing public funds for an empty desk over at the Admin, that he is not filling and meanwhile paying somebody else to fill that same desk for him is absolutely absurd. Why they consider that desirable to remain a mystery. I see nothing to recommend it, why anybody should be paid twice at the same time from two separate parts of the public purse doesn't smell very good. My understanding was that that had been stopped, my understanding, although I have never seen anything written about it, was that when in the First Legislative Assembly a member of the Public Service was also a Member of the Assembly that he did receive double pay for a while but once it got looked into and was thought about that that was undone. My understanding was that that no longer prevailed, it certainly shouldn't prevail in my opinion, I think it is a revolting waste of public money.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Jackson.

MR. JACKSON: Mr. President. I won't dwell on this issue too long but I am certain that that Member who belonged to the First Legislative Assembly that Mr. Howard refers to, and he was elected while being a member of the Public Service, he is still owed to my knowledge some $1100 so I cannot see what Mr. Howard is getting at, where they get two pays and double pays, if that being the fact why is this particular member owed this amount or hasn't been paid the $1100 same as everyone else. That's all.
MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN:

Might I again express regret that I read about this in a local newspaper, quite some days ago, and only today in this House, have I been formally told of what has happened. This is hardly the way to treat Members of the House. I am probably not all that surprised at the response to this Bill. I probably expected all along that Canberra would do their best to knock it out but in doing so, it's quite clear to me that they have gone against the only practice which has been found to work throughout the remainder of the Westminster systems. The Minister, when he was here, tried to explain his attitude by telling us that we were really much more similar to local government than to State or Federal Government and that in Australia a Commonwealth or State Public Servant can retain his Commonwealth or State Public Service position and at the same time stand for election to local government. I have always acknowledged that to be the case but I do not acknowledge that this Assembly is the equivalent to local Government. We have far wider powers than the average local government body. Certainly there are some very local government bodies on the mainland, the Minister referred us to the Sydney City Council, the Bankstown City Council. These two, which I believe are so large that at different times over the years the Councils have had to be removed and Administrators appointed and the Minister would be well aware of this history of those Councils but the Minister would also have been well aware that it might not be the case that a Member of the Sydney City Council, I'm sorry, an employee of the Sydney City Council can stand for election to his own Council, it may be that a Commonwealth or State Public Servant can hold down his position and stand for election to the local Government body but I have yet to see an instance where a local Council in Australia allows its own employees to stand for election to it, and the total ridiculousness of that situation would be evident to anyone who gave it deep enough thought. Some onlookers could gain the opinion from the rejection of the Public Service (Amendment) Act and from the rejection of the amendment to the voting legislation that there is a deep concern in Canberra to look after the Public Servants in Norfolk Island and to obtain for the Public Servants in Norfolk Island the maximum possible position of power, only time will tell if that is what behind it all. If that is the fact, then it is sick, if it is not the fact, then I would like to see what the other explanation is. The explanations which have been given here today certainly do not satisfy me.

Mr. Jackson mentioned that he felt that a referendum may be the appropriate means to deal with the voting question and at this stage, it would seem that he is right, the voting question has not been resolved by own legislation and so perhaps the next thing to try is a referendum and certainly in the case of the Public Service (Amendment) Act, an Act which has been passed in this House has not been assented to in Canberra perhaps the next thing to do is to put that question to referendum also, and it would seem that we have a very good opportunity to do this Mr. President with an election to be held on the 18th of May with all of the electors having to go to the polling booths on that day anyway it may be that without great additional expense, a referendum can be held to determine the community's attitude temporary entry permit holders voting and to determine the community's attitude to the Public Service (Amendment) Act.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Quintal.
MR. QUINTAL: Mr. Chairman, today was the first time that I heard about the turning down of this motion, I did read it in the local paper, but the local press has a habit of putting things in that are not at times quite true. Order please I am not going to take that interjection from you Jackson. The paper referred to is the Norfolk Islander, in one instance, they did say that I had said that I never said at all which was "I said that some Members in the Assembly put 40 hours or more into the work here as an Assembly member". It was misquoted and said that I had said that I put 40 hours a week in, but anyway the paper has that right and that privilege but it was disappointing to learn that the motion moved by Mr. Brown and passed by the Legislative Assembly in March 83 concerning the eligibility of public servants to stand for election to the Legislative Assembly of Norfolk Island and that it had been turned down by the Australian Government and I will say again it just goes to show how much power the Assembly really has when it does not suit the Australian Government. If the private sector had the same privileges as a public servant then I would agree that would be fair but in my opinion, it is not fair at all as there are a lot of people in the private sector who are quite qualified and capable of being members of the Assembly, because of some of the problems attached to their businesses and jobs they are denied this privilege that is given to the public servants. The Legislative Assembly has become a nearly full time job and as I stated in this Chamber some of the members put in 40 hours and some put in more. A public service employee can leave the public service anytime he or she feels like it and join the private sector. The average person in the private sector cannot leave the private sector and join the public service, it is a closed shop and I don't want to complain all the time about the public service, but not in all areas, but in many areas, the public service is overstaffed, overpaid and underworked. This is not the fault, always the fault, of the people concerned, it is the system which is wrong. I feel that this situation is most unjust, unfair and I am bitterly disappointed in the result that has taken place regarding this motion that was moved in March.

MR. PRESIDENT: Further debate. Mr. Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. President, only one short statement. I have never been a supporter of a minority group dictating the terms to the majority, I always thought the term for that was communism. Thank you Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Further debate Honourable Members.

Mr. Jackson.

MR. JACKSON: Mr. President, as I indicated earlier this Assembly spent lengthy and long hours debating this particular question with the Minister when he sat with us here on his visit. Similar statements has been said this afternoon were conveyed to the Minister here that morning when he spoke with the Members of this Assembly. The Members then failed to convince him then and on the question now that seems to be emerging of the financial situation for Assembly Members, especially those in non executive situations, when the Remuneration Tribunal held office here in Norfolk Island just after the election of the First Assembly, it was held in the Court Room downstairs, and the majority of all Members of that Assembly made submissions to that Court, I certainly made submission, and the submission I made, I made it in this House on a number of occasions. Mr. Quintal
has stated, a quite proper, that the workload of this Assembly is very different to the workload of the Council days. Now it is becoming more evident that if proper remuneration is not given to non-executive members, we will find exactly what Mr. Quintal said, that this Assembly will be held with those who can afford or who have other income, or wealthy people. I have stated this previously, if any of our people, the Norfolk Island people, thinks they, or wish they would like to stand and be elected to represent his or her people of this Island, the first question they will have to ask themselves, can I afford it. Now another question has emerged, most important question of all, is the employer, can I get time off to attend meetings. It is apparent now and I would say it is true that if Assembly Members, any Member working in the private sector, certain sectors, it would be difficult, most difficult to get time off to carry out their assembly duties so therefore one of the most important things in future Assemblies is not to deprive the people of this Island who wish to represent their people and allow the wealthy to come in and represent them is to make sure that adequate remuneration is granted to those who has to give up time or lose wages and it has been stated here before that, one of the other speakers didn't take me to task when I was in the public service, I was, I never got two pays as Mr. Howard indicated, I either lost money or made up my time in other areas, in other times, therefore no-one can afford to lose time, to lose money, and in that respect we must take stock of the situation of proper and realistic remuneration for those, as Mr. Quintal has stated before, in the House on previous occasions, that the demand far exceeds the .... in the Council days and in that respect I think we should look to what has happened today, we have had a official report and may I add again, that if that is the decision of the Governor-General, and we are speaking of his assent, or non-assent to the Bill, we cannot speak about any one else because that information came from the Governor-General and some of the comments here today has certainly made this Assembly and some of the community in disrespectful attitude towards our representative to the Queen, as far as the Governor-General is concerned.

MR. PRESIDENT: Order Mr. Jackson, there can be no reflection on the Governor-General's name in this House and I would not wish there to be any imputations that that has been done.

MR. JACKSON: Then I withdraw any remark but at the same time Mr. President there has been strong accusations of the ...

MR. PRESIDENT: Order Mr. Jackson, I have indicated how the debate in respect of the Governor-General's name should be conducted and that should no longer be referred to.

MR. JACKSON: President. Well then I conclude on that note Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Any further debate Honourable Members.

MR. HOWARD: I would simply like to re-inforce the point that you just made Mr. President in the mention that I made of the Governor-General, I was simply wanting to make sure that nobody misunderstood that he had done something wrong, he didn't, he is obliged to act as advised. Chloe Gray mentioned the Governor-General and said she thought he had been ill-advised, both of those comments are entirely appropriate and proper parliamentary procedure. I think you were right in calling Mr. Jackson to order, I think if anybody was misusing the Governor-General's name it was Mr. Jackson.
MR. PRESIDENT: Order Mr. Howard I would ask you to withdraw that remark.

MR. HOWARD: I withdraw that remark.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Quintal.

MR. QUINTAL: Yes Mr. Chairman. Mr. Jackson mentioned remuneration or would you prefer me to call you Jackson.

MR. PRESIDENT: Order Honourable Members I think we can in debate refer quite respectfully and with some dignity to each other in this House. Mr. Quintal.

MR. QUINTAL: Mr. Jackson mentioned remuneration. I feel that the Assembly is costing the Island probably more than $80,000 a year and to find extra money, I think is just too silly for words to find extra money to pay persons to encourage them to stand for the Assembly. After today I find that we very little say in our own affairs in my opinion and I feel the sooner that the Island goes back to the old system of the advisory council the better for Norfolk Island.

MR. PRESIDENT: Further debate Honourable Members. There being no further debate I put the question - the question is - "That the motion be agreed" - those of that opinion say "Aye", to the contrary "No", are there any abstentions, the Ayes have it. Mr. Howard you were to seek a call earlier in respect of making a statement.

FINANCIAL INDICATIONS FOR MONTH MARCH 1983

MR. HOWARD: Thanks Mr. President. The Accountant very kindly has pressed his timetable by a few days and I am able to table the Financial indications for the month of March which aren't ordinarily available until about the 22nd or the 23rd of the month, I table a copy of those, I have distributed copies to Members just as the meeting began. The results for March were not as bad as they have been in most previous months this year but we were still in the red by about $14,000 for the month. For three quarters of the year for 9 months of the year, despite the fact that we have held down expenses hard, we have had to draw on past savings to the tune of $352,000 to meet the expenses of the Government, that has been because our revenues are sharply off. The most striking figure on this whole sheet of financial indications for the 9 months is the comparison in postal and philatelic revenue in 9 months of this year as against 9 months of last year. We are for 9 months of this year 44% below what we had earned in 9 months of last year, that's postal and philatelic revenue. Nine months of this year that very important source of revenue, our largest single source of revenue has brought in $584,000. Last year in the same 9 months it brought in a million and forty eight thousand. I have no further comments on the statement Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you Mr. Howard. Mr. Sanders you gave me an indicator that you would wish to seek leave of the House in respect of presenting a Bill this afternoon.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. President. I ask leave of the House to present the Aircraft (Means of Operation) Bill 1983.
MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you Mr. Sanders. Honourable Members this is sought without notice, is leave granted. Aye. Leave is granted. Mr. Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. President. I would like to read the Bill if I may. It is fairly brief. I would also at this time like to inform the Members that it is not an urgent Bill. I think Members have only received this this afternoon. (Reads Bill) Mr. Chairman, Mr. President rather, this Bill has been introduced rather hurriedly and it stems from the many phone calls and conversations of this Island when the proposed schedule for the F28 of East West shows that additional flights other than those scheduled are expected to land on Norfolk Island at approximately 2.30 a.m. in the morning and depart at 4.30 a.m.. This, apart from being a rather noisy jet, unlike the 737, is going to cause the local population quite a bit of a nuisance. Also there is all the airport staff and the fellows on the fire engines, the tour operators, the accommodation proprietors, are all going to be terribly inconvenienced if these flights do become regular. I personally have no objection if there is a situation of a one-off but to be a regular performance, I oppose it. I recommend this Bill to the House.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mrs Gray.

MRS GRAY: Thank you Mr. President. I certainly accept the principle which the Bill seeks to express. I have a couple of immediate difficulties with it. In section 2, Restriction of Hours of landing and departure of aircraft, I do believe that the first paragraph which follows should be numbered (1) because you'll see that the following clause, the following section 3 in clause 1 refers to paragraph or subsection 2(1) and that subsection doesn't in fact appear. My suggestion is that 1 in parenthesis should appear before the word subject in 2. I seek your advice perhaps by reference to the Clerk.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Clerk does say that in fact that is an error that has crept in the typing of the Bill.

MRS GRAY: Fine so that clause then is numbered.

2 in brackets 1.

MR. PRESIDENT: And the following is too.

MRS GRAY: Pardon?

MR. PRESIDENT: There is 2 and 3 on page, the first page.

MRS GRAY: On the first page there is ....

MR. PRESIDENT: Yes, I see, can I just clarify this Mrs Gray. If you look at 2 which says in capitals "RESTRICTION ON HOURS OF LANDING AND DEPARTURE OF AIRCRAFT" and then it starts "Subject: " there should be a 1 in brackets before that.

MRS GRAY: Precisely my point Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Any further.

MRS GRAY: Yes, the matter of injunctions, I find rather amusing, I can see the practicalities, I am not sure about the expression, particularly, or perhaps I shouldn't buy into that one, that's something I should seek advice on but on first reading it, it would be rather amusing to have people flying around the place trying to
seek injunctions when there is the possibility of a plane, I presume that only refers to a scheduled intention to land. Yes. No comment. The other thing, may I take the opportunity...

MR. PRESIDENT: I should just point out Mrs Gray, I do not have carriage of the Bill as President of the House, and whilst I am happy to look at typographical errors, if in fact that has come about, Mr. Sanders has carriage of the Bill and he of course would no doubt wish to respond at an appropriate time.

MRS GRAY: Perhaps it is something to which I could draw the attention of other members of the House, they may see it in the same light. Mr. President, as the Bill has come about almost as a result of an article in or a piece which appeared in the Norfolk Islander may I briefly address that?

MR. PRESIDENT: If it relates to the Bill.

MRS GRAY: Yes it does specifically. As Mr. Sanders has mentioned, there was some aircraft scheduled for landing apparently, at rather strange hours. May I just, I sought clarification of that, that piece of information and in fact it was never anticipated that the message be passed through for general public awareness or discussion in fact there was a slightly message which was intended for let us say general publication, which indicated that East West intended to schedule such flights if and when required and that those flights should only be considered during the May, September and December school holidays with a maximum of 6 per year anticipated. I don't believe that the flights should be allowed at the times which have been suggested but I thought that some clarification might be in order there in that Mr. President it was not anticipated that that suggestion be ongoing schedule or timetable for East West Airlines and I think it is regrettable that that piece of information received the publicity that it did. Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: I think it is very fortunate that it received the publicity that it did or else we wouldn't have this Bill in front of us and I think Mr. Sanders is to be congratulated for having moved fast and getting something in action to stop this. The camels nose gets in the tent and pretty soon the whole camel is in the tent. I don't like the idea of 6 a year, if you say, alright, 6 a year are okay, they will soon have 6 a year because it will suit them. I like the idea of saying "no landings between 9 in the evening and 6 in the morning unless there is some special reason" and if there is a special reason, for example, carrying the school tour, once a year, twice a year, fine, but 6 a year, no, I support the idea of the Bill very much.

MRS GRAY: If I may Mr. President, thank you, yes certainly I support the Bill, I said that in my opening words but I thought it might be in order to give some indication of the circumstances which led up to the formulation of the Bill. I certainly support it.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Christian-Bailey.

MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: Thanks Mr. President, I too support the Bill and I too would like to congratulate Mr. Sanders for bringing this Bill before the House at this early stage.
MR. PRESIDENT: I would also support the Bill and I would also like to congratulate Mr. Sanders in bringing it forward so soon. The other thing is, there is a very respected resident on the Island who would be delighted about the restriction on hours of landing and departure of an aircraft, of any aircraft and that person lives in the Headstone area.

MR. BROWN: Mr. President, this Bill here is only before us for the first occasion today, it is not an urgent Bill so it won't be finalised today. I presume Mr. Sanders intends to refer the Bill to each of the airlines that operate to the Island and to each of the other major operators of aircraft to the Island, such as the company which operates the ferry flights of light aircraft from America through Norfolk Island on the way to Australia. The comment of each of those companies would certainly be of interest to us all. I am sure, I presume also that Mr. Sanders intends having some discussion with the Department of Aviation about this. It seems at first glance to me that we may be coming into conflict with the Department of Aviation in the event that that Department takes the attitude that it and it alone determines what is going to happen with aircraft and as far as the Norfolk Island Assembly is concerned, whilst it is going to ask for the Assembly's advice, it might not appreciate the Assembly making up its own mind and saying "This is the story". I am not certain what the situation is there, I don't know what there attitude will be but I presume Mr. Sanders will refer it to them. I will certainly be interested to hear the response from all of those bodies and in the event that the response from all of them is satisfactory I will certainly support it.

MR. HOWARD: It seems to me that comments from the airlines and from the Department of Aviation certainly would be welcome may well be constructive. I certainly don't thing that this Bill ought to be delayed while those bodies what to say or whether they should respond. We acted a week ago with more haste that some of us would have liked certainly, more than Mr. Brown would have liked, to make a decision on the Brisbane run and what airline we supported there, because the Department of Aviation was wanting an answer from us. I think it would be perfectly in order for us, for Mr. Sanders, to speak with the Department of Aviation and put a similar sense of urgency on them, that we responded to their wish for a view could they please respond to our wish for a view. As for the airlines responding, could you say Mr. President what is proposed in the way of the date for our next meeting, I was thinking that if this Bill will be coming back at that next meeting, and if it were known through this broadcast when the Bill would be coming back, that then the airlines would know how, what period of time they had to come back with comments. Are we meeting on the 4th, on the 11th?

MR. PRESIDENT: In fact that is a matter on the agenda Mr. Howard which has not been determined. What is to be proposed? Do you know?
MR. PRESIDENT: Well it is a matter I think that will have fairly wide ranging views and I think it will have to be determined at .... time.

MR. HOWARD: Well maybe the 4th, it may be the 11th, my feeling certainly would be that if the airlines want to comment, they have got a couple of weeks.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Jackson.

MR. JACKSON: Mr. President. I look at it differently to how Members has described this Bill. As a matter of laying on the Table or being an urgent Bill. And may I add, I also read about this in the paper on the weekend, my thanks to the paper responsible for drawing the public's attention to this particular scheduled time of the aircraft coming in at 2 o'clock in the morning and leaving at 4 o'clock. I am concerned that by the time we meet again we may have had some flights in while we are considering this Bill, I would request the convener of this Bill to really consider making it an urgent Bill and then delaying its effectiveness, making it effective from, to give them the other airlines time to consider what this Assembly means when they say "There will be no flights coming in from 6 o'clock in the morning or later than 9 o'clock at night". I am certain that we will, if that is the case, get all the co-operation from the Department of Aviation because when we examine a submission which I draw Mr. Brown's attention to, it is not quite true when he stated that we may not have an input with the Department of Aviation, on determining certain aspects of flights, transits and schedules, regarding Norfolk Island airport. One of the main recommendations from the Public Works Committee who met on Norfolk Island in June 1980 and they recommend the upgrading of the airport subject to, and this is what they said, in their report, the Australian and Norfolk Island Governments should negotiate to ensure that controls of tourism, transit air passengers, airline schedes and types of aircraft using Norfolk Island airdrome are effective in preserving the Norfolk Island environment and its economy. Now we have an input, a very good input, so therefore if we put this Bill off for any length of time, we may find ourselves in a position where East West is using Norfolk Island for its early morning flights disturbing the peace of the people of Norfolk Island, while using the aircraft because there is no doubt they wish to use the aircraft to fly normal flights on the other routes to Albury or Maroochydore while at the same time giving Norfolk Island the hurry up so therefore I do believe we should be concerned about these times that they intend and have stated that they intend flying into Norfolk, and in that way I do support the Bill but would ask the convener of it to consider the urgency of it, is it his intention to bring it forward in a fortnight's time, if this Assembly meets on the 4th May and in the event if it doesn't meet until after the elections, that is up to the Minister the convener to decide on what programme or what plans he has for this Bill. In any way I do one hundred percent support the Bill.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. President. I have no difficulty in making it an urgent Bill other than that I believe as Mr. Brown stated, that there are others that should have an input and particularly the Department of Aviation. Mr. Clive Backhouse
has indicated this morning that his Department would be co-operative on matters of noise or curfews whatever you call them but I do believe that the Department should be formally requested of their opinion and other airlines and yes it was my intention to circulate to these people.

MR. PRESIDENT: Miss Buffett.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. President. I indicated to the Minister responsible, Mr. Sanders, before the meeting, that I would support the Bill, was it to you, I beg your pardon, I might be fibbing, I did indicate in conversation, probably with the President himself that I would support the Bill and support it if it were to be put forward as an urgent Bill if necessary without intending any discourtesy whatsoever to the Department of Aviation who I feel, if the Bill were to be agreed upon as an urgent Bill, and put forward as operable until sanction had been granted for the Department it might be a satisfactory manner of handling it and in that respect, I would support Mr. Jackson's proposal and I support the Bill.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Mr. President, I understand Mr. Jackson and Miss Buffett to be saying "Let's tell them we are going to hang them today but let's not do it for a fortnight". I don't think that is quite the way we can go about it. Mr. Jackson, with respect, has misunderstood what I have said earlier. I earlier indicated a feeling that the Department of Aviation may feel that it is going to have the final say about aircraft operating hours into Norfolk Island rather than the Assembly. I certainly acknowledged that the Department of Aviation would be consulting the Assembly and that it would be listening to the Assembly's advice but we have not yet got to the stage where we can be totally certain that the Department will always follow our advice, we certainly hope that it will, we will certainly be trying to ensure that it does but whether we like it or not, we are not to that stage as yet. Members around this Table will recall that I was one person who was quite opposed to the upgrading of the airport. I indicated when that was being proposed I felt it would be opening the door to all kinds of problems, we seem today to have one of those problems. We are going to see hell of a lot more as the months go by and we have allowed the airport grading project to go ahead and to be completed, we have now got to ensure we do honour the promises of the First Assembly to ensure that the upgrading of that airport does not destroy the quality of the lifestyle here and that it does not allow the tourist industry to simply destroy itself but feeding greed upon greed. Thank you Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: I think one aspect of the proposed schedules that were published in the paper of arriving here at 2 and leaving at 4 point toward a rather unpleasant kind of situation, it would certainly sound as though what they are intending to do is to leave Sydney airport just before the curfews say they have to be quiet there and sit on the ground on Norfolk until the last time that they can leave and get in just after curfew is lifted in Sydney in the morning; in other words Sydney wants quiet during the night so that people can sleep but they are willing to wake Norfolk up twice during the night once when they arrive, and 2 hours later when they leave,
because they don't want to trouble anyone in Sydney. Now I think Norfolk has the same kind of rights to a decent night's sleep that people in Sydney do.

MR. PRESIDENT: Miss Buffett.

MISS BUFFETT: Thanks Mr. President. I realise that Mr. Brown is, having the position that he does with Norfolk Island airlines, which does fly evening hours on occasions, maybe concerned about this Bill going through fairly urgently but there is provision for out of hours operation should it be required in the Bill, as I read it.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Mr. President perhaps I should respond to that, I am not at all talking from the point of view of Norfolk Island airlines Miss Buffett; curfews operate up and down the east coast of Australia, Norfolk Island airlines aircraft are below the curfew noise levels and they operate into curfew airports 5 nights a week.

MR. PRESIDENT: Further debate Honourable Members. There being no further debate Honourable Members, then I seek an adjournment. Mr. Jackson.

MR. JACKSON: I propose the adjournment.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is "That the motion be adjourned". Those of that opinion say "Aye", to the contrary "No", are there any abstentions. The "Ayes" have it. Thank you.

TOURISM REPORT

MR. PRESIDENT: Honourable Members we now move to the situation of picking up the Notice Paper where we left off last Wednesday. We are debating the Tourism Report - Select Committees Enquiries into Tourism. We in fact had gone a good way through that report and the debate was adjourned. We pick up that debate Honourable Members. Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: Thank you before adjourning last Wednesday the Assembly had discussed and expressed feelings right through the list of recommendations in the Select Committee Report - is that not right - I think it is. And I had foreshadowed and circulated an amended form of resolution for the House to consider which I hoped would put into something to policy statement form the views concerning tourism that I think the Legislative Assembly is of a mind to establish. The amendment that I circulated at the last meeting had since been studied by several groups on Norfolk Island and been available for a week. I would like to move that amendment now Mr. President and it reads as follows - "The amendment proposes that all words after 'That' be omitted and the following words be substituted - 'The Legislative Assembly adopts the following policies towards tourism on Norfolk Island - 1. Tourism is recognised as the basis of the Island's economy."
2. Norfolk Island is to be regarded as primarily the home of its residents and not primarily as a tourist resort.
3. Norfolk Island's desired level of tourism is set for the time being as 24,000 visitors per calendar year. The Assembly recognizes that tourism has both good and bad effects and seeks the best balance between these. The commercial benefits of tourism should go mostly to Norfolk Island residents, rather than to non-residents. Local ownership of tourist facilities is encouraged and overseas ownership is not encouraged.
4. The most beneficial length of stay for visitors and for the island is considered to be ten days or longer. The Assembly does not seek an overseas financed international luxury standard hotel.
5. All weather activities are encouraged as the best means of levelling the seasonal trough in tourism patterns.
6. Airlines serving the island are encouraged and expected to maintain a well-informed relationship with the Assembly and the Government.
7. The Assembly asks the active assistance of the Department of Local Government and Territories and the Department of Aviation in exercising controls over tourism, transit air passengers, airline schedules and types of aircraft using the Norfolk Island aerodrome which will be effective in preserving the Norfolk Island environment and economy.
8. The quantity of tourist accommodation should be controlled by appropriate legislation and for the time being, should not be increased. Minimum quality standards for tourist accommodation should be enforced by appropriate legislation.
9. Draft legislation should be prepared for levying an annual fee on tourist accommodation for introduction if and when the Assembly thinks fit.
10. When tourism levels are forecast to be below the desirable level, public funds should be used for tourist promotion when tourism levels are forecast to be above the desirable level, public funds should not be used for such promotion.
11. The Tourist Bureau should continue to play a basic role in tourism services and statistics monitoring tourism policies and tourist promotion when necessary.
12. Public funds should be used to improve and maintain public tourist facilities and amenities.
13. A tourist accommodation grading procedure based on a local scale such as 1, 2 or 3 pinetrees should be implemented.
14. Conservation and ecological protection are recognized as essential, not only for tourism but for present and future generations of residents.
15. The Select Committee Report Norfolk Island Tourism dated May, 1981 and hansard transcripts of the Assembly's debates of 23 March and 13 April, 1983 are drawn to the attention of persons wishing certain data background and comment relating to these policies.
16. If I may Mr. President, there are three changes that I think should be made in details of wording because of either incorrect drafting on my part or incorrect typing by someone I'm not sure. As it reads, the Department has got its name turned around backward. It should be the Department of Territories and Local Government rather than Local Government and Territories. Four lines lower, also in item 11, the word aerodrome should be AERO rather than AERO and as we are continuing this debate today, the date 20 April, 1983 ought to be added in Item 20 to give a full reference. Could I suggest Mr. President, that the Assembly has debated most of the matters that lie behind these points, I wonder if it would be worthwhile for you to lead us through one at a time and see if there is descent to any of them, if there is not, take them as accepted until the motion is finally voted on but there may well be amendments that have come to people's attention over the last week.
MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you Mr. Howard. May be we should offer an opportunity to address the total motion or the amendment, prior to moving on to the individual items which I think is a practical way of approaching it.

MR. HOWARD: Remarks would simply be that there has been a wish on the island for years that we have reasonably clear policies on tourism. We've now reached a point after a lot of debate and after a lot of work by a great many people where I think we're getting close if any of this wording can be improved by modifications, fine, let's by all means do it but I certainly commend the motion and the idea by having a clear set of policies.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. President. Mr. Howard by this 2 page amendment of Mr. Sanders original motion that this House considers the report of the Norfolk Island Legislative Assembly select inquiry into Tourism has rearranged the first Assembly's select committee's recommendations as considered by the House at an earlier meeting on March 23rd. The 20 points of this amendment before us now do not indicate the methods by which such aims may be achieved. I don't say that this is anyone's fault yet but I do say that until a set of aims is substantiated by proposed methods of achieving those aims, not one of those 20 statements can be called a policy. How one goes about achieving an ambition is more important than the actual achievement of that ambition and we as an Assembly, brief though our term may be, informing a policy towards tourism for the benefit of the people of Norfolk Island and indeed for the benefit of the geographical physical island itself, must be clear in our minds that we are satisfied with the basic principles of how these ideas and aims will become policy. These 20 statements are not in themselves policies for each of these listed aims to become a policy and I'm not criticising the statements themselves, Mr. Howard has put them forward as the meeting has decided upon them and I acknowledge this and commend them that each one of these statements will have to be substantiated by a proposed course of action and it is that course of action which must come before the House for debate. The results of such debate could then become the policy adopted by the Assembly towards tourism, then and only then is the basis established for what can be truthfully called the Legislative Assembly policy towards tourism. Mr. Sanders approach to the whole matter was quite right in that his motion paved the way towards his ascertaining the Members' views of the first Assembly Select Committee report on tourism. I would say that Mr. Howard's amendment could be amended to say that the second Legislative Assembly agrees that the following list of aims would be a beneficial basis upon which to form an objective tourism policy for Norfolk Island. On page 18 of the Select Committee's report on tourism is stated that the Assembly should debate and determine clear policies as a guide in dealing with specific issues as they arise in the future. It goes on to say that residents are entitled to know clearly what the Assembly policies are. I agree with such statements but how can tourism be recognized as the basis of the island's economy when the wages and conditions of employment in most of the accommodation and tourist orientated services are such that local residents cannot afford to be employed by them as they cannot meet the ordinary living expenses necessary to a resident for dignified existence on this island. I grant that some businesses do pay very well and I do not comment upon them at all. As has been pointed out in the
letter submitted by the Pitcairn Society, there is a considerable difference between statements of principle involved in developing a tourism policy and the application of practical means to carry them into effect, they go on to say that in particular they do not consider recommendation 6 and 7 are adequate to ensure the successful application in practice of the statement set out in recommendation 5, and they end that paragraph in support of my view that they do not accept that the recommendation overall represent an adequate set of so-called policies towards tourism. They further go on to state and I agree that until the present unsatisfactory situation in the area of immigration is improved, there can be no assurance that the benefits of tourism will go mostly to residents. Regarding I then start Mr. President to go on to clause by clause debate on this matter, would you prefer that I wait until you put to the meeting whether it should be discussed clause by clause.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think it would be more practical if you are at that stage Miss Buffett that we handle it in that fashion. Are there any further comments from Members in the generalities of the matter.

MRS. GREY: Thank you Mr. President. I like Miss Buffett, have some difficulties in seeing what's expressed in this lengthy motion as being anything but an expression of ideals. I tend to agree with her that the acceptance of the motion will do nothing more than take the first step in recognizing that I am prepared to take it, I think that there will be changes in legislation and extensions of legislation which will follow from this. Regretably, so much of the time of this House is taken up in debate of motions instead of legislation. This is yet another example of it. Because we so desperately need some guidelines in our tourism industry, I'm prepared to discuss this as a meaningful statement of the wishes of this House but I would like to agree with Miss Buffett in the feelings that she's expressed that it really doesn't mean much. It may mean something and something is better than nothing.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. President. Perhaps then before I go on to those other points, if I could perhaps use an example why I cannot accept the whole set of statements as a policy in that, for instance, tourism can only be recognized as the basis for Norfolk Island's economy, if certain things followed. It is just a bare statement. It isn't a policy and it's how you go about achieving that aim that concerns us. It can only be the basis of the Norfolk Island economy for instance, one point could be that if the overseas income earned from the accommodation and other areas servicing those tourists were kept within the island economy to promote other local industries of farming, grazing, fruit growing, boost local production to help the economy because in actual fact the economy seeks to be a good viable economy seeks to have full resident employment, a high standard of living, good working conditions and a certain amount of other things and I do think we have to go point by point how are we going to adapt these things, these points; I cannot agree to a whole blank set without knowing which way we're going to go about each one.

MR. SANDERS: I believe that today we should continue with this matter and formulate some form of policy and I agree with Mr. Howard's up to and including paragraph 6.
MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: I will support this motion. Mr. President as a basis of a tourism policy. I had difficulty in two of the numbers but I feel that it is so important that we make some sort of start on this that I'm prepared to accept this at perhaps some later time look at some of the areas that I might have some difficulty.

MR. JACKSON: Mr. President. I find before us, 20 clauses that's been moved as an amendment by Mr. Howard for consideration. He proposed it at the last sitting on 13th of April. I find difficulty in some of the clauses and in the wording of some, in the total contents of others, I find that words such as "for the time being" well I couldn't accept that for the time being being a laid down policy for such an important issue as a tourism policy. Now, the word for the time being mentioned twice, clause 3 and in clause 12. Let us have a look at clause 3, Norfolk Island's desired level of tourism is set for the time being, 24,000 visitors per calendar year. Now I would have thought a laid down set of policy would have been a planned programme of say 3 years, 5 years, a set number of tourists because of our facilities to accommodate any more. Now we know we have difficulties in areas such as education, such as hospital, such as water supply and sewerage and the disposal of fluent, garbage disposal and you can go on and on and on and name them. Now when you get a clause inserted and ask me to endorse such a clause with words being in it "for the time being". When we look at clause 12, the quantity of tourist accommodation should be controlled by appropriate legislation and for the time being should not be increased. I would have thought that clause, that legislation should read "the quality of tourism accommodation should be controlled by appropriate legislation". And that is why, that is what the public is aiming for an expecting from this government, to come now with set rules of policies, not for the time being, not for later on or tomorrow, time being you can interprate as anything. On we go and say that I see the key issue of any policy to be laid down and legislated for the future tourist industry and for the people of Norfolk Island is invited in clause 2 where we have discussed this clause on a number of occasions, members has endorsed it as the key clause. Number 2 reads "Norfolk Island is to be regarded as primarily the home of its residents and not primarily as a tourist resort. Now I can see in these 20 clauses, there is indication where emphasis are being placed on tourism, where it says in clause 3 that we will hold tourists as 24,000 for the time being without further consideration of the items that I have mentioned such as education, hospital, sewerage and water. Clause 5, is a clause that concerned me also and its concerned members around this table who has bitterly complained of lack of work, job opportunities on this island. Members has complained that some of their familities had to leave the island because of lack of job opportunities and may I add in saying that because of the low standard of wages that is being offered in some certain section of this island and clause 5 reads "the commercial benefit of tourism should go mostly to the Norfolk Island residents rather than non-residents". Why is it then that lack of opportunity for jobs are so scarce and the reason for that, some of our people are too proud to work for some of the wages that is on offer and I do not condemn all of the private sector but we know the ones that are dishing out what I've described on many an occasion as slave wages. However, I'm like other Members who has spoken, I would like a closer examination of this paper, draft paper, especially when we look at clause 14 "draft legislation should be prepared for levying an annual fee on tourist accommodation. It should stop there but it goes on to say "for introduction and if and when the Assembly thinks fit" good gracious, when the Assembly thinks fit. Now we have
in clause 20, for further debate on this. I know it's been around for a long time but as Miss Buffett has pointed out, policies for our major income earner now at present and the sole one may I add is tourism and I don't believe that we should rush this any rational way because in 20 it clearly gives people who wish to consider any discussion that has taken place because in 20 reads the Select Committees Report Norfolk Island tourism dated May, 1981 and hansard transcripts of the Assembly's debates of 23rd, 13th and 20th April, 1983 are drawn to the attention of persons wishing certain data, background and comments relating to these policies. Now I'm sure that was put there and was put there which I'm pleased in the amendment because it gives other perhaps I would say that we have an election, we're on the eve of another election with three weeks off, a month, over three weeks and this is a very important issue. Here we have around this table, two members who's indicated that they're not seeking re-election, I'm only stating that the ones who's confirmed it, I'm not making wild guesses but at the same time, I consider it very important, when an election is practically imminent, it's right upon us. Should we not consider that they may be new Assembly Members coming that would certainly like input into this important document. We've certainly given it a good belting around and our final result is this 20 clause document. Now I will finish on that note and wait for other Members what they wish to say or the convenor of the amendment and come in at a later time.

MR. SANDERS: I don't know whether this is the appropriate time but I would wish your permission, like to read a letter that is self explanatory from the Norfolk *island Government Tourist Bureau and it starts off "Dear Mr. Sanders, the Members of the Norfolk Island Government Tourist Bureau Board wish to express their concern about comments made during the Meeting of the Legislative Assembly on Wednesday, 13th April. A clear statement was made by a Member of the Assembly that through not having a Director of Tourism the Board wastes as much money as a Director would cost. Having given careful consideration during the course of estimate preparation to the cost of a Director of Tourism the Board estimated that the cost conservatively at $63,000 per year. This is certainly not all salary but includes approximately $38,000 worth of associated expenses such as travel, accommodation, entertaining expenses, phones, cables and so on. Even if the statement was only in relation to the salary which would be paid to a Director of Tourism, it would then be an allegation that the Board is wasting a third of its promotional budget for the current financial year and the Board regards it as scarcely less serious. The inference that the Board wastes $63,000 per year is both mischievous and misleading. We would be grateful if you would make known to Members of the Legislative Assembly, our strong objection to such inferences. Should any member of the Assembly, or for that matter the community, have any doubts about the manner in which the Board conducts its activity, we would welcome those matters being raised with the Board through yourself as Executive Member with responsibility in that area. The Board is doubly concerned by the statement made as it was by the same Member who in fact appointed a current Board and provided much of the direction policies and objectives to which the Board has been working during this financial year. For your information and the information of other Members, who may be interested, we include a copy of the section from our estimates relevant to the position of Director of Tourism. It is with regret that we are forced to communicate with you in this way
but we could not allow the integrity of Members and conduct of the Board to be subject to inferences such as this without raising strong objection. Y ours sincerely signed Marcus Tilley, Chairman, John More, Deputy Chairman, Gordy Hancherow, Bruce Nicols, Rex Barrett, Geoff Bennett and Bernie Christian-Bailey M.L.A.

Perhaps Mr. President, I may read where the Tourist Bureau reckons that it was going to cost $63,000. Director of Tourism. A well qualified Director of Tourism would without doubt, fix up our immediate problems and ensure they never reoccur in the future. The workload of the Board would be eased enormously and the Visitors Information Centre could function far more effectively and efficiently. Due to the cost of the Director of Tourism has not been included in this year's estimates. A brief look at the cost is as follows:- "Advertising and recruitment, $3,000 removal expenses one way, $3,500, Annual Salary, approximately $25,000, 'phones and cables $2,500 travel assuming mainly free of charge some 50% $2,000, accommodation 180 nights at $85.00 nightly, $75,000, expenses and entertaining 180 days at $65.00 per day $11,000 is a total of $63,000. This is by no means exhausted - it makes a number of assumptions such as the Director would need to be off the island for roughly half the year. Most of his travel would be done free of charge on the airlines. Middle class accommodation is used, expenses and entertaining are kept to the minimum and the support facilities and secretarial services of the Bureau are used. Relocation expenses are estimated one way only. No gratuity at the end of the end of the contract has been included etc. etc. Over a period however, the savings could probably be made by dispensing with or decreasing the level of involvement by the Bureau's representative. During the first year, the Director would probably need to work with the Representative for a time, perhaps a saving of $12,000 might be achieved in the first year and a further $8,000 in the second year.

MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you Mr. Sanders. Any further debate Honourable Member in the generality of the matter?

MR BROWN: I am the person that that letter was aimed at, I find it an amazingly childish response and it is something that I don't intend debating at this stage. I think we have an election a short while ahead of us, let us get that out of the road, but if the Bureau would like to then put some questions to them through the Executive Member at that stage, I would happily do so. What I said was not a criticism of any of the individual members, I think the members of the Bureau do a pretty good job, it was recognition of the fact that the members of the Tourist Bureau are in general, persons who come from other walks of life who may be involved on one fringe of the tourist industry in their own businesses, but there is not one of the members of the Bureau, with all due respect, who could reasonably be expected to totally control the tourist industry of this island in a totally proficient manner. As far as I am concerned, the tourist industry is the backbone of the Norfolk Island economy, it is simply amazing to me that so much time has gone past without us looking for the most competent possible person to help us pull the industry together and run it. I am sorry that the Board has taken what I said in the way that they did, but so be it.

MR. PRESIDENT: Further debate Honourable Members?

Maybe we should start looking at the clauses in respect of this motion. Yes. Mr. Christian-Bailey I wonder if you would assist me?
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MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: Mr Buffett.

MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Acting Deputy President, I would like to make some general remarks also as other members have had an opportunity to do so in respect of the amendment to the motion that is in front of the House at this moment, which in fact will lead me to suggest another amendment. What is happening at this time as I see it, there has been tremendous public discussion, group discussions by various bodies on the Island in respect of this report. That is the May 1981 Report prepared by the Legislative Assembly Select Committee enquiring into tourism. I might say that great deal of discussion amongst various members of the community, and those bodies has been very helpful and has been very healthy and it has been very helpful and helpful to bring those suggestions and comments to this House and you will all know Mr. Acting Deputy President that during the course of the debate on this, Mr. Sanders or Mrs. Gray has brought forward various comments by these organisations, and we have had an opportunity to absorb them and to make some assessment upon them. What we are coming to now is basically some formulation of points that we want to proceed with having had the benefit of all that discussion. So basically what we are doing is reformulating tourist policies by this Assembly. We probably need to bear in mind the policy or policies of this report or recommendations of this report have in fact been considered, not in the same manner I must be quick to say, by the previous Legislative Assembly. So what we are doing to a point is revising the particular policy that arose out of that report from the first Assembly, and we are doing it by the process that I mentioned which is a healthy one. I think it is appropriate for this Assembly to have its views known as to how tourism should progress in the Island. In fact it is appropriate that this Assembly probably should in fact be guiding the industry of tourism on the Island and that would be the case, in fact, if in fact it was for one fact that is important. That is within a month of this Assembly will be called to an end and so I think there must be some hesitant in a body changing a policy with that time frame known. I have got to say that the work that has been done by this Assembly should not at all be lost. So what I would like to propose, and this really addresses the first paragraph in this particular motion or amendment that has been made by Mr. Howard. What I do propose to this House, Mr. Acting Deputy President is that we go through, as has already been suggested and make some decisions in respect of those 20 points.

Then in fact tidy it up in a neat bundle and say that it is the thoughts, it contains the thoughts of this Assembly and handle it in that form what it will to the new Assembly. Now that will do a number of things. It will take into account the tremendous amount of work, I have already said that that this Assembly has done. It will bring that to some natural fruition, in other words, it will not leave unfinished business, but it will recognise that the implementation of those thoughts will need to be done by the following Assembly and so it will therefore say to it, we have done this and the next step is up to you. The words I suggest to bring that into being is basically this.

We have this first paragraph Mr. Acting Deputy President, I think all of the first paragraph, that is all before Item 7 should be omitted and the words are not complicated by it brings it into the context that I have described. It now might say this.

Second Legislative Assembly makes the following recommendations towards tourism on Norfolk Island to the Third Legislative Assembly. Then the points are already listed be examined.
Acting Deputy President, I would be happy to do that.

MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: Yes, further debate. Mrs. Gray.

MRS. GRAY: Thank you, I would like to ask a question please, Mr. Acting Deputy President. Is there not an amendment already before the House?

MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: This is an amendment to the amendment.

MRS. GRAY: And may be put before the original amendment?

MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: Yes. Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Mr. President, Mr. Chairman I am sorry, I have difficulty in supporting Mr. Buffett's proposed amendment to the amendment. I believe it is time that the Legislative Assembly clearly came out with a defined tourism policy. Many people have had great difficulty in understanding what the Assembly's policy has been under, until now. This Select Committee Report was debated in Committee by the First Assembly over a period of 2/3 days. It was debated in Open House by the First Assembly over a period of recollection, 2 days and although if one were to read the Hansard of the First Assembly's open debate one would come to some conclusions. Mr. Howard's motion at that time to the effect that a printed tourist policy be made available to all who wanted it was lost. The First Assembly did not get to the stage of having a clear and defined tourist policy that was readily available to anyone who was interested. The Second Assembly will have had a life of only a little over 12 months but during a large part of that 12 months, the question of the tourism report has been before it. I think it would be irresponsible of us not to conclude our discussion on this report and I believe it would be irresponsible of us to not then make available to the public, a very clear and concise policy statement. Mr. Howard's amendment attempts to do that, Mr. Buffett's amendment, to the amendment, with all due respect, appears to say, this is what we think that we think but you might think something different so you have a look at it and let us leave it for the Third Assembly to set about a tourism policy. Mr. Chairman, tourism is the basic industry of the Island, I don't believe we can afford to let it go any longer without coming out with a clear defined easily obtained policy, and I believe that Mr. Howard's amendment, subject to the change that the members will no doubt make to it as it is debated, is the proper way to do this and I cannot, for that reason, support Mr. Buffett's amendment.

MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: Mrs. Gray.

MRS. GRAY: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President, neither can I. Nor am I able to support Mr. Buffett's suggested amendment. He used the words 'changing a policy' my immediate question is, what policy? If it was a matter of changing policy I may be persuaded to support his amendment, but regrettably there is no policy. I think it is necessary that we have one.

MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: Thank you. Mr. Howard.
MR. HOWARD: I have got to support some of the intent in Mr. Buffett's motion. There is going to be a new Assembly soon, that Assembly will decide what it will decide, it will then be the supreme body on Norfolk Island in governing. It is going to have a lot on its plate when it goes into business. It seems to be that if we were to support Mr. Buffett's proposal, we would only be handing the next Assembly, in effect, the same 1981 report on tourism plus our own thoughts and comments on them, plus Hansard for several sessions of Assembly debate and saying while we shoved it around for awhile, you have a go now and we hand them nothing clear and certainly hand the Island nothing clear. This Assembly cannot make policy that will tie the hands of the next Assembly. If we were to support the set of aims, objectives, believes, principals set out in this amendment which we are, that I have moved, if the Assembly today endorses that with such changes as seem intelligent, the next Assembly, if it wants to, on its first day of meeting, can deal with a motion to alter that list of 20 points anyway it wants to or it can throw them all out and start all over, if it wants to. But the points it, it does not have to. It is not left with one more unfinished job on the plate waiting for it. This at least for the time being would have been done. A policy would have been established, policies always have to be able to be changed in the light of circumstances, they cannot bind people for ever. But we badly need policy, I think this Assembly has debated the matter at great lengths and we have listened to the community with great care. I agree with what John Brown says, I think we ought to carry the thing through, I think we ought to come to a conclusion. I agree with Mr. Buffett that there is a new Assembly coming, if it wants to alter that in anyway it will have a perfectly free hand to do so and no difficulty. But we will not be leaving them with an uncompleted obligation.

MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILLEY: Mr. Buffett.

MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Acting Deputy President, I think taking into account a few things that have been said, I should clarify some of the issues. First of all I should make it clear that I am not proposing that the matter be not concluded, but unfinished business be left. I am in fact proposing that we do continue to look at all these points and to come to some conclusions upon them, and to finish that business. It has been suggested that might not be available to the public, I am not suggesting that at all, that can equally be made available to the public, as to this Assembly's thoughts on the matter. It is also been suggested that arising out of the first consideration of this report, that in fact, that there were no policies that evolved and that there was no printed document made available. That in fact is not true, as a result of the examination that Mr. Brown has described, there was a statement publicised in this House in fact on 2nd September, 1981 by the then Minister in which the policies that had been formulated then were described to the House and to the public generally and I am aware that the document from which he read was then available to anybody who enquired for same. And so in fact, what we are doing at this time is changing a policy whether in fact, this Assembly wish to pick up the policy that I've just referred to of earlier times, is entirely up to it and I'm not trying to influence that one way or the other. I accept that if there is no desire to do so, this Legislative Assembly is perfectly at liberty to do that, the only point that I do make is that it's not fair to say that a policy did not evolve from that earlier examination, and so to some extent this is a change of that earlier policy and that too is quite proper if that is thought appropriate but the point that I do make in going through that chain of events, is that we've only a month to go, in fact it's less than a month, a couple of days less.
than a month. This Assembly would be wise to be aware of the facts of that situation and being aware of the facts of that situation, I propose that in fact it do conclude this business that it certainly may make it available to the public if it so wishes and I think that is entirely desirable so the public can see what in fact was determined by this Assembly. Then bearing in mind the time constraint that I've earlier described, this is packaged together and put quite clearly to the next Assembly to say, that's how we think it should be handled and it is not in your court to take action on that. Because whether we like it or not, it does fall and the practicalities of life to the following Assembly to implement that and so what I'm proposing, is accepting what the practical facts are. In fact to do otherwise would be not recognizing what the facts are and so I think it is something that is worthy of consideration by Members of this House.

MR. HOWARD: Yes there was a policy statement made by D. McIntyre in the Assembly but if you ask anybody in the tourist industry around Norfolk Island what are the Government's tourist policies, everybody says we haven't got any, there aren't any, so one could answer such a person by saying why are you unaware that there was a ministerial statement setting down policy, "oh what Minister" "Duncan McIntyre" oh who he? Is he still the Minister? Does his word still go if somebody breaks the policy, where do we find him and complain about it. Ministerial statements on Norfolk Island have a long and unfortunate history of mabe not always being reliable. Assembly policies are something else again. I don't think we are changing or proposing to change an Assembly policy at all, we're proposing to establish for the first time, an Assembly policy on tourism. It will have more weight than any ministerial statement of the past ever could have had and people on the island will know that there are policies. If the next Assembly doesn't like them, thinks they're misguided in someway, let them in due course when they get to it, when they think it's important, let them amend it. That's as it should be. But I can't agree with Mr. Buffett that we would be determining anything. We would be simply duck showing.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I too would like to have this policy completed so that there is a policy. I do take Mr. Buffett's point that perhaps we are committing the new Assembly because as Mr. Howard has stated it would be very easy for the new Assembly to change anything that they disliked. I feel that we shouldn't leave anything unfinished and that perhaps we should formulate this policy so we can hand it to them at least completed.

MR. QUINTAL: Yes Mr. Chairman, I feel that we should do something definite and looking at the Norfolk Island tourism report on the Norfolk Island Select Committee inquiry into tourism and I must read out a passage from page 18 that Miss Buffett mentioned earlier. The Assembly should debate and determine clear policies as a guide in dealing with specific issues as they arise in the future. Such policies would naturally be subject to review and change when the present or future Assembly leaves, this should be done. I believe that we have spent long enough time on this report, also the community certain sections of the community has also spent a lot of time and we have had reports from quite a few different organizations and I think it's about time we did something with it and with those words I would ask that the amendment be put. The question is that the amendment be put. Those in favour say aye. The ayes have it.
MISS BUFFETT: We didn't get a chance to say no. Mr. President may I say that I thought we were going to be dealing with this amendment or are you coming into Mr. Buffett's amendment. The amendment to the amendment?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the amendment to the amendment be agreed. Those in favour say "aye". To the contrary "no". Will the clerk call the House.

AYES 3  NOES 6
Mr. Buffett  Mr. Howard
Ms. Buffett  Mr. Brown
Mr. Jackson  Mr. Christian-Bailey
Mrs. Grey  Mr. Quintal
Mr. Sanders

The amendment to the amendment is lost. Any further debate on Clause No. 1 "Tourism is recognized as the basis of the island's economy".

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President. As I probably stated before, for if the statement, I've just lost the thing, that tourism is recognized as the basis of the island's economy were the case, to make it a policy we would have to fill in how tourism is regarded on the basis of the island's economy. Now for instance, what instrument would declare tourism to be recognized as the basis of the island's economy, how would we envisage that being substantiated, how could it be substantiated until provisions are made to keep within the island economy the income earned from outside tourism and we will have to, these are the policies that we will have to arrive at as we go through debate this afternoon. Members are going to have to come out with how they intend establishing these points, not just statements but as policy. If tourism is going to be recognized as the basis of the island economy, how then can it be argued that most of the employment in the tourism world is taken by non-resident people. It would be my opinion that conditions would have to be made in tourism so that residents can accept the employment offered otherwise it's purely a tourist resort. If those benefits aren't going to go to the residents of the island, it can't be based as the island's economy so I'd like to ask the mover of the amendment to enlighten me as to how he would go about this and then I would have a better understanding of it, not just a statement of how he intends adopting that statement to become a policy. Thank you.

MR. HOWARD: With respect, I think Miss Buffett is trying to solve all the world's problems in a couple of hours and you can't do that. The question that we're looking at is a very simple question. It's not anywhere near as complicated I think as Miss Buffett fears it is. It's for the next Assembly to decide how to carry these things into effect if in fact they continue to agree with them. The question that's facing us right now is a very simple one. It's proposed that the Assembly agree that tourism is recognized as the basis of the island's economy. You agree or don't you agree? Everybody on Norfolk Island agrees, you're not being asked to do one thing more than say "yes I agree with that or no I don't agree with that". You don't need to answer 100 other questions as well. There's only one question before you and that's it and it's as simple as can be.
MR. JACKSON: Mr. Chairman, one question to Mr. Howard does Mr. Howard take into account the revenue from the liquor bond and the revenue from the Philatelic which is not solely all brought in by tourists. Tourists I would say do purchase liquor but Philatelic has been one of our major revenue earners, now the majority of that comes from overseas. Now I can't describe the philatelic income as being solely on the tourist side. Surely some explanation should be given on these two points and leaving out the customs duty now there is a duty on food, the residents of this island must contribute something in this way and to this effect on this particular question on customs duty has been placed on food linked up with the two that I've named, liquor and philatelic. That's my question.

MR. HOWARD: Mr. Jackson can be obstructive as we try to deal with this if he wants to be, that's his privilege. The question has nothing to do with the Liquor Bond or with philatelic sales or anything of the kind. The question is does this Assembly agree that tourism is recognized as the basis of the island's economy or does this Assembly not agree with that. That's all there is to the question.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman I thought that we'd already debated the basis of all of the matters in Mr. Howard's amendment and that really, all that we've got to look at today is to go through each individual item and very quickly ensure that it expresses what was the general consensus of all of the Members around this table when the matter was debated during the recent meetings and as Mr. Sanders indicated earlier that he has no trouble with matters 1 through to 6. I'm exactly the same and I would think that most of the Members around this table would be exactly the same. Perhaps we can expedite things by moving on to each individual item and getting it done.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. Chairman, in answer to the question is tourism, recognized as the basis of the island's economy. I would have to say that it cannot be recognized as the basis of the island's economy unless it supports the island economy.

MR. HOWARD: There's a very easy way to clear up this apparent confusion about what we're debating and that is to vote on item 1 and I ask that the question be put.

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

MR. SANDERS: Mr. Chairman could I amend that by making it one through to 6 and including 6. Is it the wish of the Members to vote on individual clauses as we go through.

MR. QUINTAL: I do believe most of us agree on No. 1, we've been through it before and tourism is recognized as the basis of the island's economy and I think we all agree and other organizations that have submitted and gone through the report and, discussed it at length and also we have and I agree and I feel it's about time it was put to the vote otherwise we'll be here until midnight again or until very late in the evening arguing about nothing.
MR. PRESIDENT: Item 1. Members, those in favour say aye to the contrary no. The ayes have it. Clause No. 2. Norfolk Island is to be regarded primarily as the home of its residents and not primarily as a tourist resort. The question is that clause 2 be agreed those in favour say aye to the contrary no, the ayes have it. Clause 3 Norfolk Island's desired level of tourism is set for the time being as 24,000 visitors per calendar year, those in favour say aye. I'm sorry, debate on clause 3.

MR. JACKSON: Mr. Chairman I listed this clause in my summing up to the amendment earlier in the piece and I do believe that for the time being there should be replaced by a more suitable planning on tourism what I suggest is that either the three years or five years recommendation from this Assembly three years or five years and that is my proposal, I won't make it a firm one at present but I listen to further debate but I just cannot see any value in the word for the time being because this has been placed in it was not in the recommendation of the initial tourist report not to be found anywhere for the time being and that is the reason I think more concrete proposal there is more evident.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. Chairman I disagree with Mr. Jackson as we previously discussed with Mr. Buffett's saying that we should not be omitting a new Assembly. The new Assembly may wish to change that figure to whatever takes their fancy. I agree that it should be for the time being, I support No. 3.

MRS. GREY: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President. An argument that I have put many times in this house and I won't let this opportunity pass to put it again, the arbitrary figure of 24,000 is less than an ideal way of controlling Norfolk Island's tourist figure. Let me quote from the Lord Howe Island publication from an introductory passage to the booklet. It's a booklet rather similar to the one which many tourist destinations in Australia produce and I quote "an ever vigilant Lord Howe Island Board ensure protection from exploitation and over development with a maximum of only 400 visitors on the island at any one time what a magnificent statement to be able to make and how much better for Norfolk Island if we were able to make the same statement if only a certain number of people are going to be present on Norfolk Island in it's tourist population on any given day and it's a battle I will continue to fight. I will continue to support this section of the motion, interestingly enough on the basis that Mr. Jackson's prepared to reject it. I accept it only because it says "for the time being". Thank you.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President. I agree with Mrs. Grey's statement about rather than 24,000 in a year that the number of people on the island in any one time is more to the point conservation wise because a lot of people at any one time can do a lot of damage, far more damage than the impact can destroy what people are coming here to say. It could the control of numbers can spoil so much about Norfolk Island. Also in no. 3 I won't continue dwelling on the point but I just wish that there were some idea put forward on how the proposers envisage controlling these things and a this point I would ask Mr. Howard, through you Mr. Chairman does he have or is there indication in in any way of how this control will be effect. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Howard would you care to answer that.

MR. HOWARD: Yes the Select Committee came to the
conclusion that we almost couldn't control it because things had been allowed to slip for too long. The old Council said 20,000 a year, Nimmo recommended 20,000 a year. Butland recommended 20,000 a year and with all that lively bunch of words that all those people said and wrote, we sailed right up to 24,000 and nobody even blinked. The Select Committee concluded after, and if you read the report, you'll find that the report goes into some detail and into that problem about how you do control and the various possibilities that the Committee looked at. We came to the conclusion that one of the first things you have to do is say what you think is the ideal level and find ways to try to hold it to that but if you don't start out by deciding what you're trying to establish you'll never get anywhere. You just go round and round and round. Rather than saying "let's don't have an agreed limit for the time being and agreed desirable number of 24,000 let's put that off let's not decide" you're just continuing the lapses of the past 8, 10, 12, 15 years that have ended up with no tourism planning on Norfolk Island. As to Mrs. Grey's comment and Miss Buffett's about the ideal answer being the number of people on the island at any given time, if you read articles written by environmental and conservation experts around the world who've thought about this problem you'll find they don't agree with you. You'll find them writing about the way footsteps wear away spectacular ruins in Rome and you'll find people writing about Norfolk Island saying "each visitor when he comes here wants to go down to Kingston". Now if we have visitors staying here an average of three days and we have an average of 600 people on the island at any one time or if you want to have a maximum you know what the maximum is it's 1200. We can put that many people in beds, have 1200 people at a time staying here for three days and you're going to have something like 150,000 tourists, each one of them going down to Kingston and the damage to Kingston and the damage to Captain Cook Memorial and the damage to the top of Mt. Pitt the traffic up and down. Mt. Pitt Road is going to tear this island to pieces and I put it to you that's not in the Select Committee's conclusion possible to find any simple clear ideal way of limiting it. The proposal for 24,000 is based on the assumption that people will continue to come here for about 9 days on the average, it's simply a target, it's at least taking a stand, it's something to work toward. I think it makes sense to agree that "for the time being" we think that's the right number.

MRS. GREY: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President I think the time to put forceful arguments for and against this matter is when legislation comes forward seeking restriction on beds on Norfolk Island. Thank you.

MISS BUFFETT: Thanks Mr. Acting Deputy President.
I had read the report and I asked Mr. Howard through you the question in mainly seeking what had been, whether he or any Members had decided that there should be a quota system or how it would be brought in.

MR. QUINTAL: Mr. Chairman I disagree with Mrs. Grey and Miss Buffett. I think as Mr. Howard has just mentioned that when we had 24,000 visitors in one year, I don't think the Island noticed them at all. One good thing about tourists is they move around the island and the only place that seem to be overpopulated at times is around the shopping area due in my opinion to the business places of the people that work for the businesses on the island they seem to want to park their vehicles outside the businesses and that creates a kind of congestion but apart from that there doesn't seem to be any problem so I therefore support No. 3.
MR. CHAIRMAN:

The question is that Clause No. 3 be agreed. Those in favour say aye, to the contrary no. The ayes have it. We move to clause no. 4 Honourable Members.

"The Assembly recognizes that tourism has both good and bad effects and seeks the best balance between these. Debate Honourable Members

MR. QUINTAL:

Mr. Chairman I feel that that should be put because I do believe the full Assembly does agree with No. 4. I can't see anyone objecting to it at all. It would save time if it was put.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The question is that clause 4 be put. Those in favour say aye. Agreed. Clause 5, Honourable Members, "the commercial benefits of tourism go mostly to Norfolk Island residents rather than to non-residents. Debate.

MRS. GREY:

Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President. It would have been, I believe, desirable for the words "commercial benefits" to have been defined and along with that, the words "non-residents" it would be possible to stretch the mind, to call into question the value to the tourism industry on Norfolk Island of its transitory workforce.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Honourable Members.

Thanks Mrs. Grey, further debate

MISS BUFFET:

As far as I see it the words mostly would cover Mrs. Grey's question, would it not.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The question is that the question be put. Those in favour say aye. To the contrary no. The ayes have it. Clause no. 6 Honourable Members. "Local ownership of tourist facilities is encouraged and overseas ownership is not encouraged". Debate.

MISS BUFFETT:

Yes, I think there's absolutely no indication Mr. Chairman as to that being anything but a pile of words and that's all I've got to say about it.

MR. HOWARD:

I'll respond to that. That's not just a pile of words. It's an unusual and extraordinary statement for any island to make if this island wants to make it, if this Assembly wants to make it. Almost every place you go around the world, Government's are inviting foreign investment, they are seeking overseas investors, they want more overseas investment, it is an assumption on the part of the tourist developer that governments want them to come in and build on their islands and in their countries. If we don't want that, saying so is a most unusual and informative thing to say to them. I don't think we do want to be encouraging overseas ownership, and I think that its a very significant thing that we say it. It's not a pile of words its a most unusual thing to say.

MISS BUFFET:

Thank you for your answer. Thank you through you for Mr. Howard's answer but why I see it as a pile of words as earlier last year I put a motion to the House to try and discourage overseas ownership of property and I gained absolutely no support whatsoever so until these statements are substantiated they are worthless.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Further debate. The question is that clause 6 be agreed. Aye? Against? The ayes have it. Clause 7. "The most beneficial length of stay for visitors and for the island is considered to be ten days or longer. Debate.
MRS. GREY: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President. This at the moment is yet another expression of opinion. I would like Members to consider the addition at the end of the sentence of the words or beg your pardon, full stop, another sentence, "this length of stay to be encouraged" otherwise it is purely an observation, an opinion. If we were to move any closer to this becoming a statement of policy then I would like to move the addition of these words... do you mind, point of order Mr. Chairman, I think it's against standing orders to consume food or drink in the House. May I please seek to move that amendment, the addition of the sentence 2.7, "this length of stay to be encouraged".

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any debate on Mrs. Grey's amendment to Clause 7, Honourable Members.

MR. HOWARD: I'm quite happy with it.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. Chairman, I intend to move an amendment that the whole thing be deleted as it's an opinion and the words read "just tourists should be encouraged to stay longer" which is approximately what Mrs. Grey is saying.

MR. BROWN: I agree with Mr. Sanders. I don't know that any of us sitting around this table can really say what is the most beneficial length of stay for a visitor. I'm sure that if any of us have spoken to a dozen departing visitors who have been here for varying periods of time we will get possibly a dozen different responses from them, some people come for a week and would loved to have stayed for two weeks, others come for ten days and feel they've been here far too long, it's a very subjective thing and I'm sure that we don't really know the answer to it here. I would be far happier with supporting Mr. Sanders proposal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Miss Buffett you have the call.

MISS BUFFETT: I'm happy for Mr. Quintal to clarify what he's asking first before I come in.

MR. QUINTAL: Could we have Mr. Sanders' amendment again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The amendment is Mrs. Greys.

MRS. GREY: The additional sentence, "this length of stay to be encouraged"

MR. CHAIRMAN: "Be encouraged" be added to clause 7.

MISS BUFFETT: Mr. Quintal was supporting Mr. Sanders.

MR. QUINTAL: I was seeking clarification of Mr. Sanders' amendment of the amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those in favour of Mrs. Grey's amendment say aye.

MR. QUINTAL: Mr. Chairman, before turning down Mrs. Grey's motion or supporting it, could we have Mr. Sanders amendment because I didn't get the gist of it.
MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Sanders want to omit the clause 7. We're calling the House on Mrs. Grey's amendment, that is the words "be encouraged" be included at the end of clause 7. Clause 7 to read "the most beneficial length of stay for visitors and for the island is considered to be ten days or longer be encouraged".

MR. HOWARD:

I think Mr. Chairman, I think Mrs. Grey's amendment was adding a whole new sentence saying "This length of stay to be encouraged".

MR. CHAIRMAN:

This length of stay to be encouraged, right.

AYES 3
Mr. Howard
Mr. Christian-Bailey
Mrs. Grey

NOES 6
Mr. Buffett
Mr. Brown
Mr. Quintal
Miss Buffett
Mr. Jackson
Mr. Sanders

The noes 6, ayes 3, the amendment is lost. Further debate on item 7.

MISS BUFFETT:

Thank you Mr. Chairman, I believe that clause 7, if anything could be deleted. I'm happy that it stays there but I would prefer it be deleted because I believe that the tourists themselves judge their length of stay, I think if they want to stay three days or ten days, we should accept that and make them happy while they're here for a short or long stay.

MR. HOWARD:

If I could give a bit of background on that. The Committee felt it was worth touching on this point because there are pressures that are very strong for shortening the length of stay. The principle pressure comes from airlines. The shorter people stay, the more seats the airlines are able to sell to Norfolk Island. They therefore, try to promote short stays. They also find that it's not very surprising that they can sell a short stay cheaper than they can sell a long stay, they can sell you a package to Norfolk Island for $600 and get you over here and back and you can stay four days. If you stay 12 days, they've got to charge $900 and maybe they don't make the sale, so there's pressure from the airlines always to shorten the length of stay and the Committee felt that there were disadvantages to the island and to most tourists, if the stay keeps being shortened, one of the things that the Committee felt was that visitors to Norfolk Island, people who like the place and not everybody does, but people who like the place, often develop a very personal feeling of affection about Norfolk Island, and the Committee felt that that is not something that develops in three or four days. Three or four days stop is part of a trip with 6 other stops in it and you can hardly remember where you were on a given day. The Committee felt that encouraging people to stay long enough to get to know the place, to feel a real partiality for it was good for the tourists and good for the island and felt that the airline pressure towards shorter and shorter and cheaper and cheaper packages, was in the airlines interest but not in the island's interest so that was the reasoning behind it. That's why the Committee felt it was worth saying something.
MRS. GREY: We're speaking for or against Mr. Sanders amendment? No we haven't put it yet? Righto. In which case I will, well alright I'll say my bit first, fair enough. The reason that I would be prepared to wish the ten days suggestion to stay and that's why I maybe forced to vote against an amendment that Mr. Sanders has foreshadowed is that it does assist precisely in our discussions with airlines about the ideal scheduling of aircraft and if we do make a commitment to ten days or longer, being that ideal I think we've have just an added piece of information to put before airlines in seeking their co-operation with airline scheduling and that's why regrettably, if Mr. Sanders puts this "encourage longer stays" as being the motion, I must decline from supporting it.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I move that 7 as it reads be deleted and replaced with "tourists should be encouraged to stay longer".

MR. CHAIRMAN: The amendment is that clause 7 be deleted and replaced by "tourists be encouraged to stay longer". Debate Honourable Members.

MR. JACKSON: Surely Mr. Chairman that the tourists themselves will decide their length of stay. It's all very well for us to wish they stay longer as the motion reads, as the amendment reads but there's others within the community, especially where Mr. Howard has pointed out, the airlines would like to see a person stay on the island between 4½ to 5 days so they can turn them around quicker. There is other establishments who gave evidence into a tourist inquiry that also would like to see shorter stays so that they can turn it around, turn their turnover around quicker but the thing we've got to watch in this shortening the stay is that we may find ourselves where we have adopted a ceiling of 24,000 if we shorten the stay down half the time that's been recommended, and the aircraft continue to sell the package deal, we'll find ourselves in a vicinity in the vicinity of somewhere between 40 and 48,000 tourist a year and that's what we should guard against. If there's no provisions in this list of clauses, we should make sure that we do not encourage airlines and others, especially airlines to fly package deals here for shorter stays, because they'll be back quick and lively again for another load and in that way, I've expressed that a ceiling of 24,000 would be exceeded, and in that way I would support clause 7 that recommends, ten days or longer.

MR. HOWARD: Mr. Jackson's put his finger right square on the point there that if because of airline or other pressures, the stays start shortening, there are then going to be other pressures on the island to raise the number of tourists that we want and what Mr. Jackson's talking about will happen and we'll say "no we don't want 50,000 tourists this year, we need 75,000 because they're only staying three days and the whole island is going to change.

MR. SANDERS: The visitor is obviously entitled to do exactly as he pleases. You'll notice in my amendment that the emphasis on the "encouraged". Thank you Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Mr. Sanders amendment to clause 7 be agreed. Those in favour say "aye" to the contrary "no".
Would the clerk call the House.

AYES 2
Mr. Brown
Mr. Sanders

NOES 7
Mr. Buffett
Mr. Howard
Mr. Christian-Bailey
Mrs. Grey
Mr. Quintal
Miss Buffett
Mr. Jackson

MR BROWN:

Done like a dinner.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
The ayes 2, the noes 7. The noes have it. Further debate on no. 7 as it stands. Those in favour of item 7 say aye, to the contrary no. Would the clerk call the House.

AYES 7
Mr. Buffett
Mr. Howard
Mr. Christian-Bailey
Mrs. Grey
Mr. Quintal
Miss Buffett
Mr. Jackson

NOES 2
Mr. Brown
Mr. Sanders

The ayes have it. We'll move to clause 8. Honourable Members. The Assembly does not seek an overseas financed international luxury standard hotel. Debate.

MR. HOWARD:
Could I comment on that please. That wording is one that I modified. There's been a lot of concern about the Assembly, about the Select Committee's original recommendation which was no thumbs down on an international luxury standard hotel. There's been a lot of comment in the community that no, wait a second, what if local people want that, what if local people want to upgrade to a really superior standard, we ought to encourage that, so I've reworded it in two important ways. First of all, I've included the words "overseas financed" and I think that was essentially the Select Committee's view that an internationally luxury standard hotel probably could be only financed by overseas capital so I've included those words and I've then said that the Assembly does not seek, it's different from saying the Assembly would ban or would bar, that's up to a future Assembly but it says the Assembly does not now seek an overseas financed hotel of that kind.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Thank you Mr. Howard. Further debate Honourable Members on clause 8. The question is that clause 8 be agreed. Those in favour say aye, to the contrary no. The ayes have it. Clause 9. "All weather activities are encouraged as the best means of levelling the seasonal troughs in tourism patterns". Debate Members.

MR. BROWN:
Mr. Chairman, all weather activities would be a wonderful thing but I don't know that we can say they are the best means of levelling the seasonal trough. If it were to say that they are a means of levelling the seasonal trough, then I would happily agree with them, but there's no doubt in my mind that there are a lot of other means of achieving the same thing and for that reason I would move that the words "the best" be deleted and replaced with the word "a".
MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Brown moves that "the best" is deleted from clause 9 and the words "a" replaced. Debate on Mr. Brown's amendment.

MR. HOWARD: I'd like to move an amendment to Mr. Brown's amendment which is the additional word "legitimate" that additional word be added so it would say "all weather activities are encouraged as a legitimate means of levelling the seasonal trough". The Select Committee's point here was that we shouldn't tell people that it's summer time all year long on beautiful Norfolk Island and come up and we can guarantee you fantastic weather. If we kid people that way, we'll pay for it and I think the additional of the word "a legitimate means" would carry that point with it.

MR. BROWN: Thanks Mr. Howard, I'm happy to incorporate that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Alright, Mr. Brown's amendment now includes the words "as a legitimate means of levelling the seasonal trough in tourism patterns". Further debate.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. Chairman, could I through you, ask Mr. Brown to elaborate on his statement, there are other means, you know we might be on quite different wave lengths and perhaps Mr. Brown may care to answer me and he may not.

MR. BROWN: Firstly, whatever we did, we would only be able to do it in an honest fashion as Mr. Howard quite rightly said, if you represent something to be quite wonderful whereas in some months of the year it's not, that does backfire on you and I'm certainly not talking of gambling casinos or anything of that nature but there's no doubt in my mind that with the advent of jet aircraft Norfolk Island could look to a significant convention market for example and that I would see as being something different than the creation of all weather activities.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further debate on Mr. Brown's amendment. The question is that Mr. Brown's amendment to clause 9 be agreed. Those in favour say "aye", to the contrary "no". The ayes have it. Clause 10. The question is that clause 9 be agreed as amended. Those of the opinion say "aye", to the contrary "no". The ayes have it. Clause 10. Airlines serving the island are encouraged and expected to maintain a well informed relationship with the Assembly and the Government. Debate.

MRS. GREY: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President. There's been a suggestion that the words "and the Norfolk Island Government Tourist Bureau be placed at the end of that sentence. I'd be interested to hear other Members views. Debate Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: I'd be disinclined to water it down that way myself. The point of this proposal is that until very recently, until 6, 8 months ago, there was very little working relationship between the airlines that served the island and the Assembly or the old Council, the airlines on the whole just didn't stop to think about the Assembly at all. They have now begun thinking about it so is the Australian Government and that's the point of emphasis there. You could go on forever, you could say well informed relationship with the Assembly and the Government and the Tourist Bureau and the people of Norfolk Island and the businesses houses
and the Travel Agents and on and on and on. The point is this Assembly and the Government of Norfolk Island want to stay wired in with those airlines and we are expecting them to make good of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further debate, Mr. Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. Chairman, did Mrs. Grey move that as a motion. I would like to move it as a motion, "and the Norfolk Island Tourist Bureau" at the end.

MR. JACKSON: I would like to, not as an amendment or an amendment to anything else, I would like Members to consider "encourage and" "encourage and" was deleted and no. 10 reads as such, "Airlines serving the island are expected to maintain a well informed relationship with the Assembly and the Government" and with the deletion of "encourage" we put a bit of teeth into it and say that we expect you to maintain a well informed relationship with the Assembly and the Government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sanders has moved an amendment so we'll deal with Mr. Sanders amendment first, "and the Norfolk Island Government Tourist Bureau" be added. Further debate.

MRS. GREY: I'm delighted to have Mr. Sanders put it as a motion Mr. Acting Deputy President. It allows me to speak against it. I'm going to suggest that the airlines are inextricably involved with the Dept of Aviation and that kind of consultation can only be between the Assembly and/or the Government and those bodies and therefore, I would not support the amendment as put by Mr. Sanders.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further debate to Mr. Sanders amendment.

MR. HOWARD: No I don't support it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the amendment, Mr. Sanders amendment be agreed. Those in favour say "aye", to the contrary "no", I think the noes have it. Mr. Jackson do you wish to move your amendment.

MR. JACKSON: I don't wish to move it as an amendment I only asked the Members to consider it, to put more teeth in it, that they are expected not encouraged or anyway like that, but they are expected to maintain a well informed relationship with the Assembly and the Government.

MR. HOWARD: I'd like to move the deletion of those two words "encourage and" so it says "airlines are expected to maintain".

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Howard has moved the amendment. To omit the words "encourage and" from clause 10. It now reads "airlines serving the island are expected to maintain a well informed relationship with the Assembly and the Government". Further debate. The question is that is Mr. Howard's amendment to clause 10 agreed. Those in favour say "aye", to the contrary "no". The ayes have it. Clause 10 agreed. Those in favour say "aye", to the contrary "no". Clause 10 as amended be agreed. Clause 11. "The Assembly asks the active assistance of the Department of Territories and Local Government and the Department of Aviation in exercising controls"
over tourism, transit air passengers, airline schedules and types of aircraft using the Norfolk Island aerodrome which will be effective in preserving the Norfolk Island environment and economy. Further debate.

MR. JACKSON: Mr. Chairman I would suggest and go so far as moving a motion to have this clause deleted in preference for what the Public Works Committee, Parliamentary Works Committee recommended here on the island when they discussed the upgrading of the airport. In the tourist inquiry report, it was stated on this particular question, it appears that the stipulation, I'm moving up to an amendment and I would like to move the following sentence after this. It appears that the stipulations about airport control made by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on public works will not be given any legal force, however, we believe those stipulations accepted by Parliament, have considerable moral flaws and should not be forgotten and those were the words of the person who conducted the inquiry. They recommended that the Australian and Norfolk Island Governments should negotiate to ensure that controls of tourism, transit air passengers, airline schedules and types of aircraft using the Norfolk Island Aerodrome are effective in preserving the Norfolk Island environment and economy. Now I do believe if we use that particular sentence it's a bit more teeth into this document coming from the Public Works Committee that investigated the recommendation for the upgrading of the airport and that was their actual words in moving a motion that that passage takes the place of number 11. All number 11 be deleted.

MR. HOWARD: The wording of 11 is that is originally on the paper of course was taken directly from that Public Works Committee Report and it carries it one step further and now asks the assistance of our Department and the Department of Aviation to do that, to do that very thing. Controls over tourism, transit air passengers, airline schedules and types of aircraft used in the Norfolk Island Aerodrome which will be effective in preserving Norfolk Island environment and economy. I think the point Mr. Jackson is making is a good one, I had it in mind, and I worded it that way. I think we should echo those words but I think we want to take one little bit step further and say "we now ask those two Departments to make good", carry it out.

MR. JACKSON: Unfortunately Mr. Howard has added a few more words outside of the context of that actual statement by the Committee that investigated the upgrading of the airport and there is some moral aspect to this if we use the words that they gave in recommending the upgrading of the airport and this is their actual and factual words that they used in the support of recommending to the Australian Parliament that the $6781 be spent in upgrading the airport, so therefore, the reason for that Mr. Chairman is because I consider there is a moral aspect in this coming the Government of Australia, whichever Government it is that this was a Government of the Select Committee, the Public Works Committee comprised of all parties, there was labour politicians, liberal politicians, country party politicians and they comprise the working committee that met at the school in June of 1980 and that
was their actual recommendation and they are the words because I say that because as I've indicated it has some moral and ensuring aspects to it but here are the words that when they investigated the inquiry on the island, this was the words that they actually used "that to ensure that the Norfolk Island and Australian Government controls tourism, transit and schedules and types of aircraft using the Norfolk Island Aerodrome and I do believe that without getting into arguments about the usage of words, the actual words in this No. 17 would be more acceptable than the one perhaps Mr. Howard intends to place in there and has added a few more words.

MISS BUFFETT: I see Mr. Jackson's point Mr. Acting Deputy President and I do support it.

MR. HOWARD: My only misgiving about it is that it takes us back to zero. The Public Works Committee recommended that the Norfolk and Australian Governments should negotiate these controls. Now we've begun doing that already when there were applications for the Brisbane run, the Department of Aviation turned to this Assembly and said "we want your advice please" and they told the airlines "we're not making a decision until we've heard from the Norfolk Island Assembly. Now I think if we simply use those same words again, it implies that no such controls have begun to be late, that we are starting from zero, I think we've advanced since then. The wording as you see it on the piece of paper, perhaps it could be strengthened in some way but perhaps if the word "active" were changed to "continued" "ask the continued assistance" maybe that would be making the point better. We've made some progress in that direction already. That's the point that I'm trying to make.

MR JACKSON: Mr Chairman, the point that, as I indicated, I don't want to get into an argument about it, because perhaps they both mean the same thing, but I thought perhaps that that actual factual words that was used by the Works Committee would be a more basic argument to say well here it is. Here is what you recommended. Your combined Parliamentary Party Committee recommended at the time and those factual words was used and it starts off, and, sure, Mr Howard is correct, we have commenced to negotiate with the Department of Transport on the last Sitting when we debated the type of aircraft and the carrier to be used on the Brisbane run but it clearly states in the opening sentence, it says the Australian and Norfolk Island Governments should negotiate, so there is no difference in meaning in perhaps your words Mr Howard. But the point that I am taking is that if we use their words now here it is. You said that the Australian and Norfolk Island Governments should combine together, well...

MR HOWARD: Through you Mr Chairman, I am trying to talk back and forth with Mr Jackson on this... yeah... what if it said the Australian and Norfolk Island Governments... what if it said the Australian and Norfolk Island Governments should exercise, rather than negotiate, exercise controls over tourism and so on

MR JACKSON: Okay, as you know, I'm easy

MR ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Is Mr Jackson's amendment agreed,
MR HOWARD: As he and I just were talking about modifying it or as it was originally put?

MR JACKSON: Give me those words again please,
through you Mr Chairman

MR HOWARD: The Australian and Norfolk Island Governments should exercise.. now if you strike out all the original words until you come to the words 'control' so it would then read, the Australian and Norfolk Island Government should exercise controls over tourism, transit, and so forth

MR JACKSON: I accept that Mr Chairman

MR ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Is the amendment agreed Honourable Members

Question put
Amendment agreed

MR ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Is Clause 12 agreed? A quantity of tourist accommodation should be controlled by appropriate legislation and for the time being should not be increased. Further debate Honourable Members. The question is that Clause 12 be agreed

Question put
Question agreed

MR ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Clause 13. Minimum quality standards for tourist accommodation should be enforced by appropriate legislation. Debate Honourable Members. The question is that Clause 13 be agreed

Question put
Question agreed

MR ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: We move to Clause 14 Honourable Members. A draft legislation should be prepared for levying an annual fee on tourist accommodation for introduction if and when the Assembly thinks fit. Debate Mrs Gray.

MRS GRAY: Thank you Mr Acting Deputy President. I took an opportunity to circulate an amendment which I would like to put to that Item 14. That the words and other appropriate businesses serving the tourist industry be inserted following accommodation so that the motion now reads.. draft legislation should be prepared for levying an annual fee on tourist accommodation and other appropriate businesses serving the tourist industry for introduction if and when the Assembly thinks fit

MR ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Further debate on Mrs Gray's amendment Mr Sanders

MR SANDERS: Thank you Mr Chairman. I oppose any levy on any one section of the community.

MR ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Further debate Honourable Members. Mr Brown I think called first.
MR BROWN: Mr Chairman, I am happy to see draft legislation prepared for us to look at but my feelings are somewhat along the lines of Mr Sanders. I don't see any justification for continuing to simply rip off the tourists for every dollar we can get from him. He's already shown us that he's a little bit sick of that sort of thing and we continue to attempt to pluck every possible dollar from him we are going to find that he will just stop coming here.

MR ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Further debate on Mrs Gray's amendment

Mr Jackson

MR JACKSON: On Mrs Gray's amendment. Well I am certain that I will oppose it, because here is an incidence, a clear example of what we debated in the opening remarks on this document, when it was assessed that we should make the decision and not leave it for the incoming Assembly. Well here is an example in this clause where we are not sure, we are not sure at present whether it should be done, or it should not be done, and we now have left it for someone else, which the wording reads, draft legislation should be prepared for levying an annual fee on tourist accommodation for introduction and when the Assembly thinks fit. So therefore, it appears that the incoming Assembly will be burdened with this Clause 14. If it is carried, and I intend supporting it.

MR ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You are supporting Mrs Gray's amendment?

MR JACKSON: I am not supporting Mrs Gray's amendment.

MR ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Any further discussion?

MR BUFFETT: Could you just read that amendment again? I gather there are others who didn't hear it.

MR ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Item 14 as Mrs Gray amends it, with the words, and other appropriate businesses serving the tourist industry be inserted following accommodation, so that the motion now reads, draft legislation should be prepared for levying an annual fee on tourist accommodation and other appropriate businesses serving the tourist industry for introduction if and when the Assembly thinks fit. Mr Sanders

MR SANDERS: Thank you Mr Chairman. I would like to move a further amendment and the amendment to read, that paragraph 14 be deleted completed.

MR ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have to vote against it, we are dealing with Mrs Gray's amendment. Miss Buffett

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you, I am speaking to Mrs Gray's amendment. Is that right? Thank you. I see justice in Mrs Gray's point Mr Acting Deputy President, but I feel that it is a matter that her amendment is a matter for separate legislation altogether.

MR ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Further debate on Mrs Gray's amendment. The question is that the amendment be agreed.
Question put

The House voted -

AYES, 4

Mr Howard
Mr Brown
Mr Christian-Bailey
Mrs Gray

NOES, 5

Mr Buffett
Mr Quintal
Miss Buffett
Mr Jackson
Mr Sanders

The amendment is lost

MR ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT:
Mr Sanders

MR SANDERS:
that paragraph 14 be deleted

MR HOWARD:

MR SANDERS:
it be deleted

MR ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT:
agreed

Any further debate on Clause 14?

Thank you Mr Chairman. I move

All he has to do is vote No

I would still like to move that

The question is that Item 14 be

Question put

The House voted -

AYES, 7

Mr Buffett
Mr Howard
Mr Brown
Mr Christian-Bailey
Mrs Gray
Miss Buffett
Mr Jackson

NOES, 2

Mr Quintal
Mr Sanders

MR ACTING DEPTY PRESIDENT: We move to Clause 15. When tourism levels are forecast to be below the desirable level public funds should be used for tourist promotion. When tourism levels are forecast to be above the desirable level, public funds should not be used for such promotional use.

MR HOWARD: I would like to offer a comment on that. There has been a lot of concern in the community about this second half of that proposal, that when tourist levels are forecast to be above the desirable level, public funds should not be used for such purpose and people who have spoken to me have said that even when you are full up with tourists, you need to continue doing some, printing of brochures, attendance at trade shows that sort of thing, just to make sure that people remember that Norfolk Island is there. Without necessarily trying to coax people to come straight over on an aeroplane and come right now and I simply wanted to say that if the feeling of the House goes that way I think it would be just about as effective if you stop this one half way through and leave it, as simply to read, when
MR. CHAIRMAN: Further debate Mr. Howard. I support the amendment, I think it makes sense. I take Alice Buffett's point, if there's no money in the Bank, you don't spend it and you sure don't, and there may well be times when tourism is down and we would like to spend money on tourism and we just haven't got the money, that may well be. It seems to me if I noted it down right that Chloe Gray's amendment allows for that. If I have it right, can I read it out and you can tell me if I'm right or not. Oh you've done it thanks. "The Tourist Industry should be constantly monitored so that appropriate levels of public funding for promotion may be decided. If there's no money in the Bank, the appropriate level is zero I think.

MISS BUFFETT: My view is that there should be a set promotional amount annually that is not exceeded as would be incorporated in the subsidy for the Tourist Bureau. How do Members think about that?

MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Acting Deputy President. Mrs. Chloe Gray's amendment, I think better describes what should happen than the existing item 15. We all know that item 15 at this time says, "when it's up, you don't have to worry and when it gets below a certain level, then you should put in the money. It is my view that you have got to give a constant degree of attention and that means ensuring that you do put Norfolk Island's name in promotional spheres on a constant basis and I consider that is what Mrs. Gray is saying and I support that on that basis. On the matter of public funds, public funds can only be expended if this House actually endorses that Supply Bill and so I think there is a control there, in fact we don't have the money and it comes before the House to spend it, then it can be clearly seen that that is the situation and I would assume that in that situation it would not be forthcoming and so there would be that sort of control. I think the proposed amendment better fits the task than the earlier promotion promoted by Mr. Howard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you Mr. Buffett. Further debate on Mrs. Gray's amendment. The question is that Mrs. Gray's amendment be agreed. Those in favour say "aye" to the contrary "no". The ayes have it. We move to clause 16 Honourable Members. It reads "The Tourist Bureau should continue to play a basic role in tourism services and statistics, monitoring tourism policies and tourist promotion when necessary. Debate Honourable Members.

MRS. GRAY: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy President. There has been a suggestion that the use of the words "an active role in tourism services and statistics etc." be used rather than a basic role in tourism. Happy to throw it into the ring for comment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further debate on clause 16.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I do believe that the beginning of clause 16 where it has "the Tourist Bureau should continue to play" it should be "The Norfolk Island Government Tourist Bureau should continue to play an active role".
MR. HOWARD:    I support that. I think it's quite sensible. It's a footnote really.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further debate. You wish to move that as an amendment. Mrs. Grey moves that clause 20 be deleted, I'm sorry, the number 20 be deleted and starts off "the Select Committee's report etc. etc. Those of the opinion say aye, to the contrary no, the ayes have it. The question is that the clause as amended be agreed. Those in favour say aye, to the contrary no. The ayes have it. The question is that the motion as amended be now agreed. Those in favour say aye, to the contrary no. The ayes have it.
MR. PRESIDENT: Honourable Members we are at Order of the Day No. 2, Immigration (Amendment) Bill 1982 and we are at the detail stage.

MR. SANDERS: Is this that, the definition of "resident", is that the one we are referring to?

MR. PRESIDENT: Yes it is. Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: With respect, it seems to me that this Bill would at this stage be sub-judice having regard to the case presently before the Supreme Court of Norfolk Island and that in any event it may be something more appropriate for early consideration by the new Assembly rather than finalisation by this Assembly and in the event that Members do agree with me I would move that it be adjourned.

MR. PRESIDENT: Yes would you just like to hold the adjournment motion Mr. Brown otherwise I would need to put it straight away as you will realise. Mrs Gray.

MRS GRAY: Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: I wish to support what Mr. Brown said.

MR. JACkSON: Mr. President, where I would interpret this Immigration (Amendment) before us it is a different criteria perhaps to the one that Mr. Brown referred to. I do not believe there is any racial discrimination in this particular amendment that is being brought before us by Miss Alice Buffett and if it is appropriate I would like a ruling on it because if it isn't of a nature of racial discrimination then I think we should proceed with it.

MR. PRESIDENT: Could I just make one observation. It has been indicated to me that Miss Buffett wishes to move an amendment that amendment may change the complexion of the matter which is before the house, it may be appropriate for Miss Buffett to actually do that so that the House can see then what is before them and if then we could look at the context that has just been mentioned. Is there any difficulty in that Honourable Members? Miss Buffett.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. President. I seek to move an amendment to my previous amendment and Members have been previously circulated with a copy of this amendment I intend moving, which in clause 4 "Declaration of a person to be a resident - section 12(1) of the Principal Ordinance is amended by omitting paragraph (a) and substituting the following paragraph - (a) by a person who at the time of his birth had at least one parent who was - (i) a resident; and (ii) domiciled on Norfolk Island". Mr. President, this revised amendment will confirm the status of resident upon the child of a resident born elsewhere whether resident parent intends ultimately to return to Norfolk Island. When the 1968 Ordinance was being drafted there was never the intention to exclude from automatic residency those children born off the Island, off Norfolk Island, of parents one or both who were resident on the Island irrespective of where they were born provided they were residents. Such a case happened purely by oversight and accident. This simple amendment that I have before you will correct the accidental error for all. Three most classic examples of residents
who leave their Island home for long periods are quite normal. There are those who go away as children to further their education or gain a trade and though undoubtedly domiciled in Norfolk Island marry whilst away, have their own children and don't or can't return immediately to Norfolk Island and one or more of their children may turn 18 years of age whilst they are off the Island. As the 1968 Ordinance still stands those children born away and having attained the age of 18 years of age, are not automatically Norfolk Island residents. Secondly there are those residents who for economic reasons have lived away and one or some or all of their children have been born away and one or some have not had the opportunity to achieve residency before turning 18 years of age and they too have no permanent right of residency even though their properties and kin folk are here. And thirdly there are those who accompany an oldest child to either the mainland for education reasons and whilst living there for longer than they intended and perhaps for security of permanent employment or business or professional benefits have additional children whilst away and those children turn 18 before the family return permanently and the children born away are disadvantaged. One most important category last but by no means least is the category who voluntarily left this Island to enlist for military service in either mainland Australia or New Zealand, some of whom were not born on the Island because of medical reasons or shipping schedules and who upon returning after a life long yearning to do so find that a new law has unintentionally but very definitely deprived them of their residency, that by convention was irrefutably theirs when they left. Those examples I feel would be sufficient to cover my points and even in Australia, the Australian Citizenship Act allows, Mr. President, for children born of people who are residents while they are temporarily living out of the country. I think it is only commonsense that a child born off Norfolk Island to a parent or parents who are or are of Norfolk Island residents should essentially be automatically a resident itself whenever he or she chooses to come to its homeland. That is the situation anywhere and to state that the child's possession of Australian citizenship itself sufficient is not the case because what is the use of the whole of Australia to a person whose property and kinfolk and cultural roots are in Norfolk Island. I feel that to further adjourn this debate would be wrong in that the Ordinance must be corrected for the benefit and re-establishment of those who have been, are at present and will be in the future, unjustly disadvantaged by an anomaly ridden Ordinance which should have been rectified before. Thank you Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you Miss Buffett. That is the amendment that has been spoken of with explanation. I think Mrs Gray your hand was first.

MRS GRAY: Yes Mr. President. Miss Buffett is expressing a sentiment with which I find it difficult to argue. However there is still a suggestion of a declaration of right based on descent.

MR. JACKSON: There is nothing on descent at all.

MRS GRAY: That is a matter which is currently under consideration in the Supreme Court, the matter of descent and racial discrimination. I do not believe that this debate should be continuing at this time.
MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Jackson I think first.

MR. JACKSON: Mr. President, the matter which Miss Buffett addresses does not come into any category of descent, the word descent Mrs Grey should be put right out of your mind for this particular question because it could mean that yourself any child of anyone else as a resident, a child of a resident born off the Island. Now there is no word of descent, it is only a resident, no suggestion there is any racial discrimination, you are a resident and should in the event that any person who is a resident regardless whether they have lived on Norfolk, born on Norfolk or they have come and taken out immigration status under the 1968 Ordinance and became a resident, if they had to leave the Island a child is born away off the Island for any reason that we have named frequently, complicated pregnancy or whatnot, Miss Buffett has named a lot, those children are protected as long as one or more of their parents are declared residents, so therefore the Pitcairn descent does not come into it. Although there is people within that category but this opens up the field as I see it, our Miss Buffett has presented it, opens up the field so that it includes all children that are born off the Island of a parent who is a resident, he or she, not a descent, therefore I must support the amendment placed before this House by Miss Buffett.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: If I understand the meaning of the word "descent", the amendment is about descent not about Pitcairn descent, but "descent" means who was your father, who was your mother, that's what this amendment is about and there is a serious legal question in my mind, whether the amendment runs contrary to the part of the Racial Discrimination Act which says, and it lists what it means by racial discrimination, and part of it says, 'any distinction made on the basis of descent", I think that means who your father was or who your mother was, not whether your of Pitcairn descent. Now whether the question is one we shouldn't touch because it is related somehow to a case in the Supreme Court is a question I cannot answer, it doesn't seem to me that it is, but I sense legal trouble there I think we ought to get a clear answer to from the Legal Adviser or somebody before we ..

MISS BUFFETT: This was drafted by him.

MR. QUINTAL: I do not intend to support the amendment. If it had mentioned Pitcairn descent then I would support it but in the past we have had some residents on the Island who are real ratbags and their children in some cases have been worse than they are and I would hate to see some of those persons come back to the Island. We must face up to facts we don't want to allow that kind of a person ever to come back if possible and I would not support it on those, because of that, but I would support the idea if the word Pitcairn descent was used

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. President. I don't support the amendment on the basis that I do believe it discriminating. I believe that as it stands it is a matter that tangled up with the Court at the moment, but I believe that the original motion as it stood without the amendment is not discriminating and I believe that it could pass today without it infringing on any laws.
MR. PRESIDENT: Miss Buffett.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. President. I wish to read from the Australian Citizenship Act Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Miss Buffett, I think before we go on to address the further substance of the motion we should just get some general consensus as to whether the matter should proceed on a sub-judice basis, should or not proceed on a sub-judice basis. Is there any other member who would wish to address that.

MR. JACKSON: Mr. President, it appears now that to clarify the situation we must find a definition and find some definite meaning of the word descent or a resident. Now I take Miss Buffett's amendment as that of a resident. Now surely a resident of this Island which, if we want to use Pitcairn descent, and I do not intend using it at present, because of the case pending in the Court, but this particular question addresses the meaning of a resident which at present, if you want to assess the situation, the resident, the people who has come and taken out residency on the Island, and the persons who was born here and automatically made a resident, they are about 50/50. Therefore this particular amendment is not setting aside one against the other, every one on the Island who is a resident at present are embodied, as I see it, in this amendment so therefore I can not see where there is any close attachment to the case before the Court. The case that is before the Court is of a person who is not a resident. This amendment clearly states that, its asked to amend section 17 of a person who is a resident, and that is the definition as I see it.

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Christian-Bailey.

MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: Mr. President, I support Miss Buffett's sentiments on this but I'm rather unclear as to the question. I'd like that clarified before I'd be prepared to support it.

MR. PRESIDENT: On the sub-judice question, it is one which all Members will need to cast an opinion and I think it can be best expressed if you wish to proceed with it or not and that can be decided on a motion of adjournment.

MR. HOWARD: I'm not competent to have an opinion as to whether legally it's sub-judice for us to discuss it or not but I am convinced that in the Supreme Court case, Mr. Ellicott speaking for the Norfolk Island Government, clearly was saying that if the racial discrimination act was thought to apply to Norfolk Island in certain ways, that he did not agree with that. Now whether the Judge will decide on that question remains to be seen. He may decide the case on totally other grounds and not deal with that question but if he does deal with that question and if the Judge decides that it is lawful for Norfolk Island to have its own laws of this kind, never mind Australia's laws, then I think we would have a clear path to looking at this amendment and either going with it or not. I think there's a question in the air while that case is being weighed is to whether we will run into trouble if we pass this and I think if we wait for the verdict, we may have an answer as to how it would be one way or another so while it may not be improper for us to discuss, I think there's something to be learnt from the case that bears on the issue we're dealing with.
MR. PRESIDENT:          Miss Buffett.

MISS BUFFETT:           Thank you Mr. President. It looks as if I won't gain any ground with this amendment; I will just point out here that the question Mr. Howard has brought in was to do with Pitcairn descent which this is not and this doesn't cover descent by race but however will accept the motion of adjournment, I would move that the matter be adjourned if I may.

MR. PRESIDENT:           This motion before the House is that the matter be adjourned and I put that question forthwith. Those of that opinion say "Aye", to the contrary "No". Would the Clerk please call the House.

| Mr. Buffett | Aye |
| Mr. Howard  | Aye |
| Mr. Brown   | Aye |
| Mr. Christian-Bailey | Aye |
| Mrs Gray    | Aye |
| Mr. Quintal | Aye |
| Miss Buffett| Aye |
| Mr. Jackson | Aye |
| Mr. Sanders | No |

The result of the voting Honourable Members is the Ayes, 8 the Noes, 1, The 'ayes' have it. Thank you.

MR. QUINTAL:           As the time is just on 6 o'clock and we have a lot more to get through - and de es fraidy side after dark and I would suggest that we adjourn until next Wednesday afternoon.

MISS BUFFETT:           Have we not only got one matter to discuss, the Coldham Plan.

MR. PRESIDENT:           There are 2 matters on the programme.

MISS BUFFETT:           Coldham and slaughter.

MR. PRESIDENT:           Discussion Honourable Members, the motion is that we adjourn until next Wednesday.

MR. QUINTAL:           Mr. Chairman the one matter will take a very long time and that is the one on the Coldham Plan and we will not get through it tonight, I think it would be far better to make a new start next Wednesday afternoon and try and get the matters finished at the next meeting.

MR. PRESIDENT:           Suspension until next Wednesday afternoon?

MR. QUINTAL:            Yes suspension.

MR. PRESIDENT:           Further discussion. Mr. Sanders.

MR. SANDERS:            Thank you Mr. President. If this matter is to be deferred why can't we do it tomorrow. We are getting further and further away and closer to the election. I believe that these matters ought to be cleaned up.
MR. PRESIDENT: We do have a motion that it be next Wednesday at this time. Any further discussion Honourable Members. Then I put the motion, those of that opinion say "Aye" to the contrary "No", are there any abstentions. All in favour except Mr. Sanders who is against.

MR. HOWARD: May I ask as we will be meeting again next Wednesday afternoon for a leave of absence from the meeting, I will be in Sydney for 12 days but I won't be here next Wednesday.

MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you. Leave is granted for that, is that alright, yes, thank you. Leave is granted. Adjournment then Honourable Members can I put that motion that this House adjourns until next Wednesday the 27th at 2 p.m. Those of that opinion say "Aye", to the contrary "No", Mr. Sanders "No", this House stands adjourned until next Wednesday, suspended until next Wednesday the 27th at 2 p.m.
MR PRESIDENT: Honourable Members, this Sitting is resumed from last Wednesday, 20th of this month at which time the Sitting was suspended. Two matters in fact, remain on the Notice Paper. Orders of the Day numbers 3 and 4. Before we commence this afternoon Honourable Members I would like to make mention of one matter. You will recall Honourable Members that within recent times we have had a visit by Air Chief Marshall Sir Neville McNamara who is Chief of the Defence Force Staff. The Administrator this morning kindly presented to me so that it might be brought to the attention of Members the plaque which has been presented by the Chief of the Defence Force Staff acknowledging his visit and his preparedness to meet with and speak with Members of the Legislative Assembly and I will arrange that to be hung with the other shields which hang in the Committee Rooms of the Legislative Assembly.

I would also like to make mention that within recent times there has also been a plaque of a similar nature which has been presented by the Shipping Company, C.C.C. with the best wishes of M. Cordier, the principal of that Shipping Line and presented by his agent in Norfolk Island, Mr Geoff Bennett and that plaque will be similarly hung with the others. Honourable Members before calling Notice No. 3 Miss Buffett has sought approval to make a personal statement. Leave is granted. Miss Buffett

PERSONAL STATEMENT
CORRECTION OF STATEMENT

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr President. Mr President, in a letter published in last Saturday's Norfolk Islander, I referred to the six standing during an incident in this House on the previous Wednesday. Since then a member has informed me that I counted incorrectly because she did not stand. My statement will be corrected to say that only five stood. Thank you.

MR PRESIDENT: Honourable Members I call Notice No. 3 which relates to Adoption of criteria in Coldham Plan in relation to Land Sub-Division. Debate is resumed on that matter. Mr Brown.
ADOPTION OF CRITERIA IN COLDHAM PLAN IN RELATION TO LAND SUBDIVISION

MR BROWN: Thank you Mr President. The Coldham Plan in general I support. It is some years old at this stage, it does need some review. The proposal before this House would provide for that review. However, I have been informed that Mrs Gray intends to move certain amendments to the motion as it is presently before the House and rather than my speaking any longer at this stage it may be appropriate if those amendments are put to the House.

MR PRESIDENT: Thank you Mr Brown. Mrs Gray, would you care to have the call on that debate.

MS GRAY: Yes thank you Mr President, I am happy to do that. It is a fairly lengthy motion as Members will be aware. What say you to the value of reading the whole thing again?

MR PRESIDENT: I think that would put things in its proper context, yes please.

MS GRAY: Very well. The motion as it stands on the Notice Paper reads – That the following policy shall apply in respect of Land Use Planning. –

(1) That –

(a) the criteria set out in the document entitled - 'Scheme Statement, Code of Ordinances and Plan for the Territory of Norfolk Island'.

prepared by Harrison & Grierson & Partners, (the 'Coldham Plan') shall be the basis of governmental and Administration policy in relation to land use planning; and

(b) the Executive Member for Planning, Tourism and Commerce shall, as necessary, examine the criteria in the Coldham Plan and submit variations he proposes to meetings of all members of the Legislative Assembly for approval; these meetings being recognised by this House as authorised departures from the general rule laid down by this House and referred to in Minute No. 7 of its meeting of the
7th April 1982; and

(c) a reference to the Coldham Plan means the Coldham Plan as varied under paragraph (1) (b); and

(2) That for the purpose of implementing the criteria in the Coldham Plan, the following policies shall apply in respect of applications to subdivide land or to build or alter buildings -

(a) that -

(i) in respect of the subdivision of land, - where the Administrator has received an application under section 5(1) or 11(2) of the Land (Subdivision) Ordinance 1967 and has referred it to the Legislative Assembly for consideration, the Executive Member for Planning, Tourism and Commerce shall inform the Administrator the application is not recommended for approval unless the Executive Member has satisfied himself that -

(A) if the proposed application were granted the resulting sub-division would comply with all the criteria in the Coldham Plan; and

(B) the size and shape of the parcels into which the land is to be sub-divided and the purposes for which the parcels are to be used are suitable; and

(C) the method of access to each parcel is adequate for the purposes for which it is to be used; and

(D) any increase in the use of existing public roads which provide access to the land it is proposed to sub-divide will not be excessive or undesirable; and

(E) the sizes of the parcels in the proposed subdivision will be suitable having regard to the size of the other parcels of land in the vicinity; and

(F) the nature of the terrain of the land it is proposed to subdivide and the surrounding land renders the proposed sub-division suitable; and

(G) in appropriate instances - adequate provision will exist for the disposal of sewage from each separate parcel; and
(H) no undesirable effect will be made by the proposed subdivision on the ecology of the land proposed to be subdivided or adjacent land or on the general character of the ecology in Norfolk Island; and ...

then we proceed to little (ii), Mr President, this in effect was amended at our meeting of 2nd February, shall I quote it as it was amended?

MR PRESIDENT: Yes please, as it stands before the House please.

MS GRAY: (ii) in respect of building applications --

(A) the Building Board shall recommend to the Executive Member for Planning, Tourism and Commerce that an application should be refused unless the Board is satisfied the resulting building will comply with the criteria in the Coldham Plan; and

(B) the Executive Member for Planning, Tourism and Commerce shall refuse an application when recommended to do so under sub-paragraph (A).

Mr President, I propose three amendments. Should we... would you like me to put them all in one movement or are we going to proceed through a detail as far as the motion is concerned.

MR PRESIDENT: I had thought that it might be appropriate to put them all together Ms Gray, but I am very happy however the House so wishes to examine it. Alltogether. Please proceed.

MS GRAY: Thank you. The first amendment is to paragraph (1)(b). My amendment would seek to omit that paragraph as it appears and substitute the words -

"(b) the Executive Member for Planning, Tourism and Commerce shall, as necessary, examine the criteria in the Coldham Plan and submit variations he proposes to the Legislative Assembly for approval."
In moving those words Mr President the reference to "meetings of members of the House are recognised as authorised departures from the general rule..." in other words, we are seeking to put an amendment which asks the Executive Member to examine the criteria and submit the variations he proposes to the Legislative Assembly as such, not to meetings which would be held outside the House. That is the first amendment.

The second amendment, comes under ("a") (a)(A) which reads, "if the proposed application were granted the resulting sub-division would comply with all the criteria in the Coldham Plan; and"

It has been pointed out that on some occasions in some sets of circumstances the criteria within the Coldham Plan conflict. Therefore I ask that those words be deleted -- "all the criteria in" and the motion then becomes -- "if the proposed application were granted the resulting sub-division would comply with the Coldham Plan"

The third amendment which I would propose is to the final sub-division of the motion as it stands before us, under the heading, little (ii)(A)(b) and I ask that all words following "application" that is, be deleted, that is, "in respect of building applications" then delete paragraphs (A) and (B) substitute the following words -- "it is the opinion of this House that the public interest requires that buildings in respect of which the approval of the Executive Member is required should comply with the criteria set out in the Coldham Plan with respect to buildings and that the Executive Member in considering building applications should have regard for such criteria in determining whether to grant an application".

It has been pointed out by our Legal Adviser, Mr President that the two paragraphs as they stand, the second paragraph in particular permits the Executive Member to the findings as it were, or the recommendations of his Board. I don't believe, or I am advised that in law, that is not a desirable situation, hence my amendment which seeks to amalgamate the sense but bring it into a more lawful set of words. Those are my three proposed amendments, Mr President.
MR PRESIDENT: Thank you Mrs Gray. Mr Sanders

MR SANDERS: Thank you Mr President. I support Mrs Gray's amendments.

MR CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: I too, support Mrs Gray's amendments

MR BROWN: Mr President. In my view the amendments effect an improvement as it is before the House and I certainly support them.

MR PRESIDENT: Thank you. Any further discussion Honourable Members? Mr Quintal

MR QUINTAL: I support this amendment also Mr President

MR JACKSON: Mr President. There is no doubt that this motion that was first brought into the House on the 2nd February of this year has been delayed and put off through the Notice Paper, perhaps at some times the meetings being overloaded. It has always been my contention that a full set of planning for Norfolk Island is a paramount need for our Island. We had in 1981 a planning bill that was introduced into the House. This very lengthy document of some 300 odd pages met with a lot of contentious debate because it did infringe on some of the traditions of this Island. Some of the long standing land divisions and interference with customs as well as traditions. But unfortunately, this document was modelled from the old English Planning Legislation. Now I took that to task right from the very beginning, because I have always maintained, and will continue to maintain, that planning laws for Norfolk Island should be modelled under the conditions to suit the conditions of Norfolk Island. Not the conditions of any other country. Now my main contentions against introduction of various motions, pieces of legislation flowing from the First Legislative Assembly right up to this present day has been no interference with the traditions and conditions that exist at present until proper planning has been brought out to
suit the conditions of this Island. If we need to use the Planning Bill that was introduced into the House in 1981 as guidelines, not as those modelled under English Legislation but use it as a planning guide to suit the Norfolk Island conditions. The Member for Planning at that particular time, was Mr Duncan McIntyre. He had the carriage of this proposed legislation, and it met, as I have stated previously with a lot of contentious debate, and Mr Howard... I'm very sorry he's not here today, he sought leave... but we had the same views on this particular piece of legislation because if I can quote from a memorandum that Mr Duncan McIntyre sent out to all members in answer to Mr Howard, Mr McIntyre said that Mr Howard argued that legislation was not appropriate until the plan has been prepared. Now that is my view also. We must have a plan. I have always argued that a motion in the House putting a blanket over the whole of Norfolk Island is not my version of the plan for Norfolk Island. It is quite easy to make a designated area similar to the Kingston and Arthur's Vale designated areas. I supported in the House on the 2nd February, the first part of Mr Sanders original motion because it dealt with another contentious issue, that has caused a lot of problem on the Island, that is, the situation of land subdivision. Fully realising that we must have some guidelines I accepted the Coldham Plan as that guideline but what concerned me in the original motion was in the end of Mr Sanders Coldham Plan there was inserted a (ii), in respect of building application and exempt buildings. Well I queried this right from the beginning because to me, to the Legal Officer and to others, if it had have got through the House on that particular day it would have been the end of any exempt buildings that is exempt at present and the amendment that I placed in was accepted. Now we find that Mrs Gray has placed another amendment in to amend this original (ii). Looking at that amendment for the first time some quarter of an hour ago, and I have been assured by Mrs Gray and others around this table that it meets the satisfaction of our Legal Officer, the one point that concerns me is to have an amendment put here in front of me with the word and statement that
it has met the approval of the Legal Officer. Well fair enough. It appears that it will have the same effect as the amendment that I placed in on the 2nd February. The one thing that I must make quite clear in supporting this amendment, and I wish the residents of Norfolk Island to be clear on this particular issue also, that this amendment requires only those who have to apply as it is at present, for application to build. Those dwellings who are exempt at present continues to stay exempt, and for that reason Mr President, I will support the amendment.

MR SANDERS: Would it be appropriate now Mr President, to put in one other small amendment on page 2., being 2(a)(i) on the final line where it says "executive member for Planning, Tourism and Commerce shall inform the Administrator the application is not recommended for approval unless the executive member has satisfied himself that" Mr President, I would like to move that after the word "member" and before the word "has" should be inserted the words "has gazetted the application and"

MR PRESIDENT: Mr Sanders we do have one amendment in front of us, it may be more practicable if we could tidy that one and then examine the other one

MR SANDERS: I think Mr President there is probably little or no disension with this, it could be convenient to members to agree that it all go in together

MR PRESIDENT: That would depend upon the mover of the motion

MS GRAY: Yes, if it is in order for me to absorb that particular amendment as well so that it may simply be put to the vote on all of them I am more than happy to do that

MR PRESIDENT: Fine. Then we will tackle it in that way. We now continue to address the amendment to the amended motion including that particular phrase that Mr Sanders has just read Further debate Honourable Members. Miss Buffett.

MISS BUFFETT: The two first amendments I... the first part of the amendment seems quite alright. As a matter of fact all four portions now... I feel that this amendment from what I have absorbed
at this short notice is it appears to be an improvement on the original motion. I think it is. I also feel Mr President that where successive Assembly's are passing on ministerial responsibility from time to time, that the Minister responsible does need a policy before him. There is an acceptance of the matter that concerned me earlier as has concerned other members that those buildings that were exempt before this came into the House are still exempt. Those people are protected. I feel that in this day and age and time of continual change that this motion before us now in the amended form is acceptable to me and I shall support it. Thank you.

MR PRESIDENT: Any further debate Honourable Members

MR SANDERS: Mr President. I move that the question be put

MR PRESIDENT: Yes. That may not be necessary if Members have exhausted their participation.

QUESTION PUT
Motion agreed unanimously

MR PRESIDENT: We will now vote on the motion as it has been amended Is there further debate on that Honourable Members. Basically, we are still talking about the same thing.
Question put
Motion agreed unanimously

SLAUGHTERING (AMENDMENT) BILL 1983

MR PRESIDENT: We move to Notice of the Day No. 4. There is sought that this Bill be withdrawn from consideration Honourable Members. Is that agreed?

MR QUINTAL: I would be happy if it was withdrawn Mr President
Agreed
MR PRESIDENT: That in fact Honourable Members, completes the program that has been set down and which we have been on for three afternoons as you will recall.

I have had indicated to me by Mrs Gray that she would seek to move a motion Without Notice and you might care to explain that Mrs Gray so that it can be seen by Members

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE

MS GRAY: Thank you Mr President. And I would seek leave of the House to move a motion which allowed the Estimates Committee to report at a sitting in May. The motion passed by the House on the 2nd March committed the Estimates Committee to report to the House not later than the 30th April as the House will not I believe sit before the end of this month, I would seek that the time for the Estimates Committee to report be extended to the next sitting of the House which I would anticipate to be in May so could I put that motion that the time for the Estimates Committee to report be extended to the next sitting of the House.

MR PRESIDENT: And the wording of that particular motion has been placed before Members?

MRS GRAY: Yes it has Mr President

MR PRESIDENT: Is leave granted Honourable Members for that motion to be brought at this time

Question put
Leave granted

MRS GRAY: I seek to put the motion

MR PRESIDENT: Any debate Honourable Members. There being no debate

Question put
Motion carried unanimously
NEXT SITTING DAY

MR JACKSON: Mr President I move that this House do now adjourn and that his Honour the Administrator convene the next Assembly meeting as soon as practicable following the general election on May 18th.

MR PRESIDENT: Debate Honourable Members.

MR BROWN: Mr President, I certainly do not support that motion. I have no doubt in my mind that this Assembly should sit again during May. The community will want to hear the report of the Estimates Committee which is to be handed down at that meeting. Members of the House and the community will want the opportunity to hear the response to questions on Notice and Questions Without Notice which will be submitted for that May meeting. Members of the Community will want a last ability to assess those members of the Assembly who are intending to stand for re-election and there is no doubt in my mind Mr President that it would be quite wrong of us to simply not sit again. We definitely should sit during May and I would move an amendment that this House at its rising do adjourn until the Wednesday, 11th May at 2 p.m.


MR CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: I support the amendment.

MR JACKSON: Mr Deputy President, in speaking to the motion that I just placed before the House for its adjournment I consider that we are on the eve of an election and any outstanding or important issues could be dealt with after the election. I am aware that Mrs Gray has sought leave for the Estimates Committee to report to the House but we have an election on the 18th of next month. A mere three weeks away. Now in quoting what Mr Brown just said that the electors will want to assess the members who are seeking election this time. Well I am certain that they have had plenty of opportunity and plenty of time to assess the members over the past eighteen months, so I consider that not a very valid argument towards the motion however I placed the motion in because it was my view that
going into an election we should continue meeting week after week right up til the eve of the election and that is why I put the motion in but the Administrator can convene a meeting as soon as practicable following the election on May 18th.

MR QUINTAL: I wish to support the amendment Mr Chairman. We are the Government until we go out of office and we are not out of office until the new members have been sworn in and I support the amendment.

MR DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Miss Buffett

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr Deputy President. I come in on one comment I picked up on Mr Brown's reason for amendment. I believe that the public has already assessed this Assembly as has been indicated in the last two referendums and I do not support the amendment.

MR DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Any further debate. The question of Mr Brown's amendment be put

Question put
The House voted -

AYES, 5
Mr Brown
Mr Christian-Bailey
Mrs Gray
Mr Quintal
Mr Sanders

NOES, 3
Mr Buffett
Miss Buffett
Mr Jackson

The question that the motion as amended be agreed

Question put
Motion carried

MR SANDERS: I seek a motion for adjournment

MR BUFFETT: I move that this House do now adjourn

MR DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Any debate Members. Mr Buffett
MR BUFFETT: I would like to say some words about our present situation in Norfolk Island and what the future may or may not hold for us. We were set on the path to self government four years ago - four years this August Mr Deputy President and we have had transferred various powers and the balance remains with the Australian Government. During last year we have had this process interrupted and we refrained from pursuing transferring of further powers and the negotiations appropriate thereto with the Minister of the day and this decision was taken because of our own internal governmental difficulties. For the past 18 months or so there has been highlighted a number of activities which encouraged and in some instances, tended to force people into divisions and attitudes of confrontation in Norfolk Island. We have the old bogey of Islanders and Mainlanders, and that has been highlighted on some occasions; that in some instances between Australians and New Zealanders. Within the life of this Assembly there has on occasions been pursual of motions which I have considered promoted some divisions between public and private sectors in the Island. With the change of Government in Australia there have been attempts in Norfolk Island to place people in political party associations in either a liberal or labour camp, in relationship to Australian politics when in fact, probably neither may represent the full spectrum of benefit or otherwise for Norfolk Island.

And I made those examples, Mr Deputy President, to show the examples of division and divisiveness that have of late, existed. I am probably regrettably not just talking about divisiveness not just in the political arena of Norfolk Island. The political divisiveness has been driven into homes, wedges between families, between friends, and I think to some extent the social character of this Island has been endangered. We speak much of endangered environments of flora and fauna and related aspects, I do say Mr Deputy President that we should not ignore the human relations so essential in any community and especially one so small and isolated as Norfolk Island.

None of these things that I have mentioned, these attitudes, can be healthy for Norfolk Island and if we are to run our own affairs in a satisfactory manner we need to do better than we have been doing. Whether we do or not depends upon us. Whether we have the capacity to work in reasonable harmony within bodies such as this Legislative Assembly and in the community generally, with give and take and mutual respect for the attitude and dignity of individuals, or will
we continue to have a divisive and confrontational attitude.
Mr Deputy President, at a time when a new Minister has just visited us, and I think he has clearly said to us, 'What progress are you making there in Norfolk Island? How are you getting on? How are you managing your affairs?' When we consider how can we best advance the well being of the Norfolk Island community I think we need to make a conscious effort to foster a co-operative and a unified effort of all people in Norfolk Island. I think we should be more ready to understand the needs of others and their point of view, to see things in the context of what is best for the total community instead of maybe, of an individual or a part of the community. Because I think only by this means can we show proper daily management of Island affairs and only by this means can we regain credibility to get underway again, progression towards self government in Norfolk Island. I am absolutely convinced Mr Deputy President that we can do it and I know that others in this Island are of the same view, but what remains is for us to muster the collective will to really carry it out.

MR DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Have you got more Mr Buffett. Any further debate. Mr Brown

MR BROWN: Mr Deputy President, at noon today nominations closed for candidates for an election for the Third Norfolk Island Legislative Assembly. Some fifteen candidates have been nominated and they come from various sections of the community although none are temporary entry permit holders to whom the right to vote was very simply denied by the Governor-General on the advice of the Australian Government. Some are Public Servants. Members will recall that the Governor-General has not yet dealt with this House' recent motion which would have had the effect of requiring a public servant to resign from the public service before nomination for election to the Assembly. The Governor-General on the advice of the Australian Government has refused to assent to the recent bill which inter-alia provided for re-employment of such public servant candidates if unsuccessful and for removal of the present anomaly whereby a public servant having resigned to take executive office
would forever retain the right to return to the public service if he ceases to hold such executive office. It is clear to me that those advising the Governor-General have not understood the roles of the public service and the Legislative Assembly in Norfolk Island. Clear definitions of these roles will need to be effected by the next Assembly. Now is not the time to pursue that debate, but the possible problems as a result of such a wide exercising worker participation will already be apparent to many of the clear thinkers in this community. Be that as it may the present laws intended to allow public servants to stand and the Returning Office who has fulfilled his duty in ensuring that all candidates are in fact legally eligible. I congratulate all those who have put themselves forward for election Mr Deputy President. I wish them all well. But I would express regret that three of our present members will not be standing for re-election. These members have been subjected to harrassment and abuse and to damage to their property as a result of doing their best in this House. Such mafia style behaviour by a dissident few must be brought to an end if the community is to have the best possible range of candidates for an election and if this community is to have the best possible Legislative Assembly controlling its affairs. There will be a number of crucial issues confronting the next Assembly. For example, how will the budget be balanced? will there be a vast increase in taxation? will there be the introduction of income taxation? and on we could go? Mr Buffett has hinted at the word "consensus". An idea that was recently tried by Mr Hawk in Australia which is presently being tried by Mr Wran. The ideal of consensus is nothing new. And certainly consensus in Norfolk Island would be a wonderful thing. Like Mr Buffett, I feel that it well may be possible but we should not kid ourselves that it can be possible before our major problems have been resolved. This present Assembly has made substantial progress towards resolving a number of those problems but Mr Deputy President, without solving those problems first we will not have the opportunity of consensus.
MR DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Thank you Mr Brown. Any further debate. The question is that this House do now adjourn.

Question put
Motion agreed unanimously

ADJOURNMENT

MR DEPUTY PRESIDENT: This House stands adjourned until Wednesday 11 May 1983 at 2.00 p.m.

House adjourned at
on 27 April, 1983 until Wednesday 11th May, 1983 at 2 p.m.