MRS. GRAY: Thank you Mr. President. May I just make mention of a matter which occurs with regularity on the Notice Paper unfortunately, under Order of the Day - the Headstone Committee, final report, as this is likely to be the last sitting of this Assembly, may I ask members and those who may be curious to recall that a draft Headstone Report was tabled on behalf of the Headstone Committee at its sitting on 16 February, at that time recommendations were made, and passed for further action, to you, Mr. President, as the Executive Member responsible. The notice has been left on the Notice Paper to enable formal presentation of the printed report. Unfortunately, the report is in the hands of Greenways Press, and has been for some time, I regret that it is not possible to present it at this sitting.

MR. BUFFETT: Thank you Mrs. Gray. Further report. There being no further reports we will move on.

NOTICES

MR. BUFFETT: Notice No. 1

Airport Upgrading

Mrs. Gray

MRS. GRAY: Thank you Mr. President. I would like to move the following motion Mr. President.

That this House appreciates the professional quality of work and management by Australian Government and Departments and by the contractors in the recent upgrading of the airport on Norfolk Island, and expresses thanks to all who contributed to the successful carrying out of the project.

If I may speak to that Mr. President. The motion speaks for itself, however I wish to add some words taken directly from the address given by the Minister for Aviation, the Honourable Kim Beasley at the official opening of the airstrip on Monday, 28 March. Mr. Beasley said that time, and I quote.

"With the opening of the new runway, the benefits to the Island will be several. It will allow regular public transport services by jet aircraft, flying time on these services will be almost half. The services will be more comfortable and of course jet services will improve Norfolk Island’s competitiveness as a tourist destination during periods of heavy competition and depressed economic conditions." Mr. Beasley added, "the development of the airport to medium jet standard has cost about $7.5 million the work has been completed about 2 months ahead of schedule and I offer my thanks and congratulations to those companies and people involved. To Kaipara Excavators Limited of New Zealand, the principle contractors and their contract manager Mr. Ray Kemptborne, to Island Industries and Gerry Aafjes, to Higgins and Sons Limited and Bernard Higgins and Cordukes and Hugh Baxter, to Mercedes Limited and Rex Barnett, to Howard Christian and to office of Mr. Beasley."
Mr. Beasley also expressed his thanks on behalf of his government to all residents of the Island who had been involved with the project. He paid tribute of that time to Ben Christian, who was for many years airport foreman and senior groundsman. Mr. President, I think it is about time this House placed a formal motion of thanks to those people, and I commend this motion to members.

MR. BUFFETT: Debate Honourable Members, Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: I think while we are considering this particular subject, and I am delighted to have Mrs. Gray bring such a motion forward that we ought to reflect just for a second on how fortunate we are. We and the whole Island have been, when you put your mind back to the when we were looking at the airport upgrading programme beginning to start, we along with a lot of other people were quite worried about the disruption, the danger, the possible threat to life and property that would be involved in the carrying of all that metal from one end of the Island to the other. They were genuine concerns, about whether there would be serious road accidents, or deaths or so forth. The whole thing, as far as I can tell went very very smoothly and I think we are very lucky for that and I think we ought to give a bit of thanks for good luck too.

MR. BROWN: Mr. President, I fully support this motion, especially I would like to thank our own Norfolk Island airport staff and also Ray Kemphorne and his team from Kaipara Excavators, for their efforts to keep the airport operating during the upgrading proceedings. Especially I should thank Ray because without his complete co-operation the airport would not have been able to be kept open for the Heron operations during the intersection closure, we would not have been able to get mail during that time, people would not have had the ability to move off the Island in the event that they really needed to, and the Island economy would have suffered further, over and above the suffering that it was already going through. I am pleased that one of the last things this House is doing is bringing this motion forward.

MR. SANDERS: I also support the motion. I very much support what Mr. Brown has just said, and I also support the good luck bit that Mr. Howard mention. Thank you Mr. President.

MR. JACKSON: While I agree that we should commend all that is included in this motion for the good work they have done, however we must remember that just on $7 million was made available to them to upgrade that airport and that money came out of the pockets of the Australian citizens, and may I add while we are throwing around it would be a change if we were to recognise our own local tradesmen for their qualified and professional tradesmanship work on the Island. Some of the local dwellings and projects that have been built over the past could make any anywhere. This building we are in is a clear evidence of some of the skills and professions that we have here on the Island, another is the Engineers Cottage that is about to be restored, and the amenity block behind it is a credit to their profession and skill. Amenity block will service the residents, tourists alike it is a master piece. Therefore this motion
position and be able to understand one another better if we were to recognize those that is on the Island that carry out work in a skillful manner. Because it is times when the old saying goes, charity begins at home, and if we neglect these people, and whilst I have agreed in this motion, I don't think we should neglect our own. I have no problem in supporting the motion.

MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: I support the motion Mr. President, and thank Mrs. Gray for bringing it to the House, I would also like to remind the House and Mr. Jackson of the mere pittance the $7 million is when compared against the $90 million over the next 3 years that is coming out of the pockets of the Australian tax payer to Papua New Guinea.

MR. BUFFETT: Thank you, further debate. Miss Buffett.

MISS. BUFFETT: I compliment Mrs. Gray upon this motion and support it, it is very nice to end this rather torrential session of a year of this government with a thank you to the Australian Government by a way of change.

MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Sanders? No further debate Honourable Members.

The question is that the motion be agreed, those of that opinion, say aye

Aye To the Contrary - no
Are there any abstentions,
The Ayes have it.

NOTICE NO. 2

MR. BUFFETT: Boeing 737 aircraft
Mr. Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: I move that subject to satisfactory findings of a new Environmental Impact Study, this House has no objection in principle to the introduction of Boeing 737 aircraft on the Norfolk Island/New Zealand route.

Mr. President, I did not intend to dwell on this, it is simply - the question is simple, do we in principle have any objections to 737's flying here, if we do, we should say so now, so no more time and money is wasted preparing proposals for us, if we do have any objections, then we can reasonably, if we do not have any objections, then we can reasonably move onto the next stage of asking for a firm proposal so that the question can be considered in detail before a final decision is made. As I say, the question is simple, do we in principle object to 737's?
MRS. GRAY: Members will be aware that I seek to put an amendment to the motion, is it in order to put that now?

MR. BUFFETT: Yes, if you would care to Mrs. Gray.

MRS. GRAY: I would like to suggest an amendment to the motion which would entail the words following 'that' first appearing being deleted and the following substituted.

Subject to satisfactory findings of a new Environmental Impact Study, based on a level of operation to be proposed by Air New Zealand and received by this House, this House has no objection in principle to the introduction of Boeing 737 aircraft on the Norfolk Island/New Zealand route.

If I may address that Mr. President, it may take my quite some time, I am glad Mr. Sanders did not want to say much because I am afraid I do. There was a motion before the House on 16 February, which said - that this House being of the opinion that the operation of 737 aircraft to Norfolk Island may be advantageous asks the necessary Environmental, beg your pardon, asks that the necessary Environmental Impact Study be undertaken.

At the time of that debate, I want to in the next few minutes address about 4 basic issues, Mr. President, I will make that clear before I start into it. I want to address Hansard and the motion which was passed in the House in February, I want to address a letter which was tabled at that time from the Administrator which came from the Department of Aviation. I wish to make reference to some notes I personally made in discussion with members of the Department of Aviation, and I want to raise some technical questions in the throws of that, and finally I wish to put a plea to Air New Zealand, if I may begin.

During the debate on 16 February, I said, "it is a little like chicken or the egg, depending on which one has to come first. I am a little loath to commit the Australian Government at this stage to what must be massive expense, what at the moment I see is a whim of this House." I think at that time also I said that I have an open mind, I still do, and I continue my quote. "I can be convinced as easily as the next but I have jet to be convinced that we have the right to request the Australian Government to carry out an Environmental Impact Statement." Now we get down to a use of words Mr. President, because there is a difference between an Environmental Impact Assessment and an Environmental Impact Study or Statement. Now the motion passed in the House in February called for an Environmental Impact Study to be undertaken, but let me plead my case. Let's refer to that letter which was tabled in the House at that time dated 26 January, it deals with the 737 issue so other members may have it with them.

The letter came from the office of the Administrator and was in fact quoting a letter from the Department of Aviation, which I learnt subsequently was written by a guy called Bruce Wadden, and I will refer to him later. Let us to go to 1, 2, 3, Paragraph 3. The final couple of lines of that letter say - and they were talking about the 12 non-scheduled operations per year by Boeing 737 aircraft which would be permitted by the Department of Aviation, and the advice was given to the House on the understanding that such a level of operations would not require an Environmental
Impact Assessment, small "assessment. Subsequent advice however is that even this limited level of operations would require Environmental assessment to determine the need or otherwise for a full environmental impact statement, and therein lies the difference. At the time of that debate, as I have already said, I was loath to commit the Australian Government to what I recognised as being a considerable amount of money to carry out an environmental impact statement. Now, the motion was passed by the House on 16 February, members will recall that Mr. Beasley visited the Island on 28 March and in this room, although the meeting was not broadcast, they might recall that Mr. Beasley said that he had not yet received a request for an environmental impact study. There was a bit of head nodding, and carrying on, I am going to suggest that the reason the Department of Aviation at least Mr. Beasley and Colin Freeman who was hear with him, had not heard of the request by the Norfolk Island Legislative Assembly for an environmental impact study was because our Department in Canberra new full well that there was no proposal for the study to consider, there was no proposal to be assessed in order to call for an environmental impact statement. Even this limited level of operation would require environmental assessment to determine the need or otherwise for a full environmental impact statement. I hope Mr. President, that I am making that clear enough, there is a difference between an assessment situation and a study, or a statement obviously comes at the end of a study with capital s.

As late as yesterday afternoon, speaking with the Administrator's office, they still await advice from Canberra in respect of this issue, so I suggest again that the reasons nothing is happening is because nothing can happen because there is nothing to start with. Let me come back to my conversation I noted with Bruce Wedden, I noted him as the gentleman who originally wrote the letter which was passed onto us by the Administrator. He is the First Assistant Secretary of the Domestic Policy Division of the Department of Aviation and as luck would have it, he came over here on 28 May - I beg your pardon, he came over on the weekend, Saturday 30 May when the F28 arrived, I am confusing the numbers. I had an hour with him on Saturday night and I explained there seemed to be some difficulties and he said, and I quote him "you don't have an EIS until you have a firm proposal", he also said, "an EIS comes after a proposal is received". He went on to tell me that the proposal is assessed, that is where I really started picking up the difference between an assessment and a study. The proposal is to be assessed, the questions to be answered are - can it be done at no cost; what requirements for traffic control and pavement improvement; what additional aids will be required; and when these questions are answered there is a recommendation or not for an environmental impact statement. So the assessment on the proposal must be made first, once the assessment has been made, there is a recommendation whether or not to carry out an environmental impact statement, which I have already suggested probably costs quite a few dollars.

There are 4 main areas for consideration in this question and I put them forward not because people here on Norfolk will be making the decisions about them, but because there is so little factual information coming to light in the community, and I suspect that we are equally at fault for that, because we all sit here and talk about things that we know a lot about, or something about and people in the community have no idea of what we are talking about, so in an attempt to rectify that if nothing else, Mr. President, I seek to make some facts known, and there are 4 basic areas, I have already said.
Number 1, bilateral agreements, something which will be decided by the Australian and New Zealand Governments, nothing to do with us.

Number 2, the need for an environmental impact statement, I think I have covered that reasonably well. It requires a proposal to be furnished to the Department of Aviation an assessment will be made and a recommendation given.

Number 3, airstrip capabilities. That is another one for the Department of Aviation to sought out.

Let me give you some factual information, and once again we refer to the letter from the Administrator which came from the Department of Aviation, and on 2nd page, top paragraph there is reference to an additional 400 millimeters of fine crushed rock being necessary. Let us quote it - "upgrading to permit unlimited operations by Boeing 737 aircraft would require an additional pavement strengthening of 100 millimeters of fine crushed rock". Now let us just stay with that at the moment. I have not got a calculator handy but the strip is 1,890 meters long and 45 meters wide, and it sounds to me like an additional 8.5 thousand cubic meters of additional material, something like $30 or more per tonne. I cannot do that conversation, maybe some of our mathematical people around the table can do it while I am talking. It is known that the center 30 meters has suitable strength for unrestricted use, the outer 7.4 meter sections will be adequate for occasional use - this is where we get on to this difference of occasional and regular use.

I asked Bruce Wedden and Dick Thompson, they were both here and both from the Department of Aviation, Dick Thompson is the New South Wales Regional Director of the Department of Aviation and this is the question I put to them. At what stage does a service cross the line from occasional to regular? They pointed out that any regular scheduled service is regular. Kim Beasley said, in answer to a question put to him by Greig, any regular schedule - two flights per week - does not constitute a dispensation situation. So once an aircraft service becomes regularly scheduled, it becomes a regular service, it is no longer an occasional service. So that is the situation as far as the pavement depth factor is considered, that is known in the jargon as PDF and you will see those figures floating around all over the place.

The Department of Aviation say that we will have to add another 100 millimeters of fine crushed rock before you can use the strip for regularly scheduled 737's. That was point number 3.

Point number 4 - is the need for additional aids. Greig Quintal asked the Minister for Aviation, Kim Beasley, is a control tower necessary for 737's? The Minister answered, "a number of additional aids are necessary, including a control tower." I made a point of putting the following question to Bruce Wedden. What would the aids additional to a control tower be? His reply, they might be instrument landing systems, international distance measuring equipment, and additional navigation aids. As far as I am able to ascertain, those are the major factors which will be taken into account by an assessment. The bilateral agreement, the environmental impact statement, the airstrip capabilities, and the need for additional aids. They are the points to be considered in an assessment which may, or may not lead to an environmental impact study.
It is true that Air New Zealand has requested an amendment to International Airline Licence No. 204, seeking authorisation of a Boeing service to Norfolk Island. That request falls into the first category which I mentioned on my list - that is a bilateral agreement and out of our field. This House should now have a firm proposal from Air New Zealand which can be considered by the assessment process. Such proposal should give information concerning the aircraft type and other technical details in respect of weight, tire pressures and so on, it should probably state how often it is proposed to fly the aircraft in and out of Norfolk and at what times, and how many passengers will be carried, so the Norfolk Island Government can similarly assess the situation and perhaps make recommendations as it sees fit, such questions as: how much freight, mail and newspapers will be carried. The latest telex tells us and I quote "the cargo carrying capacity of the Boeing 737 is approximately 5 times greater than that for a F27, although passenger load will tend to affect the cargo capacity." The question is, given a full load of passengers, baggage, mail and newspapers, how much freight will you carry and how much is it going to cost per kilogramme. What fare structure do you propose.

They have sent a telex which says in effect, if we can fill the plane every time we can fly we will be able to reduce fares by 10% to 15%. That begs the question, how much money do you intend spending on promotion of Norfolk Island so that you may in turn fill the seats? At a meeting the other night, Bill Sanders claimed that no one else had to put forward proposals for consideration - that is not true. Proposals by East West were put to whoever was interested to listen at a public meeting held in September last year. Dick Buswell and John Williams met with Assembly members on 18 March this year to give further detail, and as Bill well knows, Air New South Wales sent us a proposal for operations out of Brisbane. Air New Zealand has asked the Australian Department of Aviation for permission to fly a 737 to Norfolk Island. The Department of Aviation has referred the question to the Department of Territories and Local Government. They have told the New Zealand Department of Transport and input from Norfolk Island Government is necessary, that is pretty clear, - the question now is. Why have we not heard from Air New Zealand? all we have so far is a spate of propaganda in the local papers, some wrong figures being quoted in respect of 737's and F27 together with a handful of telex asking the Assembly to support Air New Zealand in their wish to fly 737's to Norfolk Island.

Finally my plea, Mr. President. Dear Air New Zealand, please send us a proposal.

Thank you.

MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: I would like to reply to Mrs. Gray on a few matters. I don't believe we can commit the Australian Government to anything. Mrs. Gray has gone into a lengthy debate on how much it is going to cost for metal and all these other matters, I was not aware that she was an engineer or any of us, but we can request them to do an enquiry, but we cannot commit them. It is not my intention and never was it at any stage to tell the Department of Aviation how to run their business. If this Assembly acknowledges the need for
MR. BROWN: Mr. President, I have been confused by one of Mr. Sanders' earlier comments, when he said words to the effect, so no more time and money is wasted making proposals to us. Mr. President, I have not seen a proposal from Air New Zealand, and so I am not sure where they have been wasting time and money and making such proposals to us. Mr. Sanders also said, if so, we can move onto the next stage and seek proposals. With respect, Mr. President, I think seeking such a proposal is the first stage, and when I held Mr. Sanders' portfolio I sought such a proposal from Air New Zealand on a number of occasions, despite many letters and telephone calls, no such proposal has come forward. There has been a welter of misinformation on the subject. Mr. Snell of Air New Zealand's local agents recently stated in the newspaper that the all-up weight of the Boeing 737 was only something like 4,000 kilos above that of the F28. Subsequently he said in the paper that he had been wrong, but he did not correct what he said, he did not say that he had been wrong by almost 20 tonnes. I believe we should have a proposal from Air New Zealand, it can be done in little more than half an hour, it is nothing complicated, but I believe Air New Zealand should pay us the courtesy of putting up such a proposal before they expect us to spend our time assisting them.

Air New Zealand has campaigned through its local agents through the Norfolk Island, through the Rotary Convention and through Mr. Sanders. It has spent quite a deal of time, but it has really said nothing other than, we would like to fly 737's to Norfolk Island, but as I said, in little more than half an hour, much less time than it has already spent, could have put up a proper proposal. After all as Mrs. Gray has already said, such a proposal is in fact necessary before the Environmental Impact Assessment can be given and that is a pre-requisite to the Environmental Impact Statement. Mr. Sanders has made mention of the fact that the dispensation has been given to, against the control tower requirement for an F28. That is quite correct, it has been given, although dispensation against that requirement for an F28 is not unique in Australia. There are 8 or 9 other ports in Australia which have such a dispensation for F28's. There is 1 port in Australia which has a dispensation to allow me flight operations.
control tower requirement for a 737. So there is a clear distinction here and it is a problem the Department of Aviation is having to face up to. Mr. President, I commented at a previous meeting about the desirability of having all of the relevant information before us before we make a decision, can I go back to our decision about the Brisbane/Norfolk Island route.

The Assembly members felt that they had to make a decision on the spot despite the fact that they did not have all of the relevant facts before them. I abstained from that debate, and from that vote save for the fact that I did seek to adjourn the matter so that we could obtain that information. That was information, such as, what was the maximum fuel capacity of the Airlines of New South Wales aircraft? and what problems would this cause in the event of unfavourable winds or bad weather in Norfolk Island or Brisbane. We should have ascertained whether it was a fact that on days when the Norfolk Island airport has an ultimate requirement, that is a requirement that sufficient fuel be carried to progress to another airport in the event that a landing cannot be achieved, and this can apply solely because of cloud cover, not requiring bad weather on the ground, and which can in fact, Mr. President, occur quite frequently. In most circumstances, isn't it a fact that the aircraft would not legally be able to leave Brisbane. These are questions which should have been answered, and far more satisfactory guarantee, than the verbal assurance of one employee.

MR. BUFFETT: Are you raising a point of order?

MR. HOWARD: I am, I am asking if it is relevant?

MR. SANDERS: I am Mr. President, this matter has already been debated in the House, and I don't believe it is relevant at this time.

MR. BROWN: Mr. President, I am illustrating the reason that members of this House need to have all relevant information before them before they make a decision, and I am illustrating some of the problems that can occur when it is not done.

MR. BUFFETT: Yes I understand that you are making that point Mr. Brown, I think it has been adequately made, if you could continue in a relevant manner.

MR. BROWN: Mr. President, no decision in principle or final about 737's should be made until all the facts are at hand. As I said, I have written to Air New Zealand and telephoned them on various occasions since mid-1982, seeking some of that information, for example, fare levels, freight rates, promotion levels and certain technical information regarding the aircraft. As I said, no reply has been received, Mr. Sanders has been to see them on several occasions, on two of those occasions I gave him copies of my correspondence to take with him, still no answer. My most recent letter only last week, has at this stage not even been acknowledged.
F27 fares being applied to a 737 service. The 737 is a much more economical aircraft to operate than a F27, and is even more economical than an F28. It is easy Mr. President to get a warm inner-glow from someone saying let's have 737's. But let us get a sensible proposition to be put to us first. You will recall Mr. President, that the unanimous agreement of the First Assembly was that the Boeing 737 was too large an aircraft for Norfolk Island. Many of the members around this table will be aware of the concern that is held by the environmental groups on the Island, and other groups on the Island as to this aircraft. Once an environmental impact statement has been received, the environmental questions can be properly and coolly assessed, but one thing would be too late at that stage, if we don't get from Air New Zealand a proposal and negotiate the very best possible deal that Air New Zealand is prepared to give us in the event that 737's are allowed to fly here, then there is no possibility Mr. President, that once we have already given our agreement the proposal will be improved. The time to get the best possible proposal is before we reach an agreement with them. I believe it would be irresponsible to form an opinion on 737's without first obtaining all of the information, once that information is at hand, I believe it would be appropriate for the new Assembly to then make a decision. If I was a member of that new Assembly I would have quite an open mind, I don't have an objection to the aircraft provided it comes within all the other criteria, but I am not prepared to support a motion such as this today.

**Mr. Buffett:**

**Mr. Howard:**

Mr. Howard.

**Mr. Howard:**

It seems to me that we pass the amendment that Mrs. Gray has put that it is going to flush out the kind of information that Mr. Brown is asking for. I think we need that information before a decision can be made, and the amendment seems to be the way to get the information - I move that the question be put.

**Mr. Buffett:**

I would need to put that if you put that to me.

**Mr. Howard:**

I have just made that motion, it can be voted down.

**Mr. Buffett:**

The question is -

That the motion be put

Those of that opinion say aye

Contrary - no

Clerk, please call the House.

**Clerk:**

Mr. Buffett.

**Mr. Buffett:**

No.
MR. HOWARD: Aye.

CLERK: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: No.

CLERK: Mr. Christian-Bailey.

MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: No.

CLERK: Mrs. Gray

MRS. GRAY: No.

CLERK: Mr. Quintal.

MR. QUINTAL: Aye.

CLERK: Miss. Buffett

MISS. BUFFETT: No.

CLERK: Mr. Jackson.

MR. JACKSON: No.

CLERK: Mr. Sanders

MR. SANDERS: No.

MR. BUFFETT: Result of the vote Honourable Members.
Ayes 2
No 7
The Nos have it.
Miss Buffett.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. President. A number of organisations, experts, and individuals presented submissions to the Department of Environment in response to the draft Environmental Impact Study showing concern with respect to the proposed airport upgrading. There was considerable input from people of Norfolk
Island. At one stage, it looked as if equipment was coming available which would not necessitate any major upgrading, saving the Island from further unnecessary scarring, tree cutting, high noise and acoustic vibration on the Chapel, Bishops Court and the Rectory.

The final Environmental Impact Study was made public in 1980, and opportunity for further comment was given. The Department of Environment gave approval for a medium jet airport based on the F28 or HS146. A news release by Mr. Nixon, Minister for Transport and you, yourself as then Chief Minister of Norfolk Island, was made and published in the 'Norfolk Islander', Saturday 24 November 1979, and I quote:

'The Minister for Transport and the Minister for Home Affairs, Mr. Bob Ellicott, today announced that the Government had approved the introduction of jet services between Sydney and Norfolk Island, and agreed, in principle, to the upgrading of the Norfolk Island airport as soon as possible.'

Then a news release from the then Chief Minister in Canberra, states:

'Mr. Buffett was in Canberra this week for discussions with the Minister for Transport and the Minister for Home Affairs. The Minister said, modern jet transportation is necessary for the viability of Norfolk Island's tourist industry which in turn is the present basis of the Island's economic self-sufficiency. Medium size jets, such as, the F28 and British Aerospace 146 are suited to the Norfolk Island service, in that they combine a faster and more economical service. The Norfolk Island Government is pleased that the airport work investigation will now commence, and that there will be local participation to settle environmental aspects.'

Now no sooner, Mr. President, the seal has dried on the runway, and we have people around the Table wanting larger Boeing 737's operating on a regular basis. When many local people show concern that pressure may be placed by Air New Zealand to operate the 737, if the airport was upgraded, they were told it was only designed for medium jets, and if they did not have suitable equipment, they would have to relinquish the run to those who did.

Let's look at what some of the experts have said in the past. Louis A. Challis & Associates. I remember Mrs. Gray, I think earlier in the House asking to see the Challis Report. He has put out two reports, and Louis A. Challis & Associates, No. 714-72 of 1972, Investigation of Aircraft Noise During Visit of Boeing 737 At Norfolk Island, shows a measurement of 122 Perceived Noise Level Decibels near the Mission Chapel, and that is just to quote one example. That measurement converts approximately to 112 decibels A Scale.

A further Challis report in 1979, in response to the Draft Environmental Impact Study of the same year, entitled 'Analysis of Acoustical Factors Involved In The Upgrading Of The Norfolk Island Airport to Jet Standards', stated on page 12 - It can be positively stated with justification that to contemplate the introduction of any aircraft that produces the level of any habitable area of the Island in excess of 100 decibels A scale, it totally unjustified.
'Maximum noise level at any habitable location should not exceed 90
decibels A Scale'. Section 43 of this report on standard 1955,
gives the reason on page 8, last paragraph, which states 'Norfolk
Island would be designated as an R1, which Mr. President is a very
low ambient noise area, for which there will be no additional
correction to the base level because of its unusually quite
characteristics. It is this feature, above all others which makes
Norfolk Island different to those locations where evaluations of
jet aircraft noise or any aircraft noise and even community noise,
have been carried out in America. It is this factor which negates
the validity of the conclusions based on the mainland noise
conditions which have resulted in the any noise exponent forecast
25 contours as being stated as acceptable in either America and
arbitrarily in Australia. Comments in the Environmental Impact

Comments in the Environmental Impact Study by
J.L. Goldberg, Principal Research Scientist, National Measurement
Laboratory, C.S.I.R.O., page 22, states,

"The decibel scale also ignores the low
frequency components below 50hertz which add to the disturbance by
inducing building vibrations".

Mr. President, I understand that the longer an
aircraft is, the worst this type of vibration. Some of the members
should stand in the flight path near the chapel and experience the
F28, 4000 medium jet landing on the runway. It is understandable why
the Department of Transport, with the recent charter of the longer
B737, was required to approach and take off over Kingston. The
Boeing 737 is too large and unsuitable for the Norfolk Island
environment. It is between 5 and 10 decibels higher in noise level,
than the F28 4,000. The airstrip parameters are listed at 28 load
classification number, and 40 pavement depth factor. I understand
the load classification number requirement for the Boeing 737 is
between 40 and 50 pave depth factor.

The people wanting 737's aircraft in my opinion
had ample opportunity to put their case when submissions on the
Environmental Impact Study were called, and also at the Public Work
Committee hearings. The Pitcairn Society, the Conservation Society,
the Flora and Fauna Society, and other individuals made submissions
at various times leading up to the final decision to upgrade for
medium jet standard, and here we are with a motion over-riding the
considerable research, and at great expense, that went into the
final decision, and in fact flouting Australian Environmental
Legislation. The Qantas/Air New Zealand contract ends in October,
I believe, and it is my opinion that if any concern wants to make
money out of Norfolk Island, they must only be permitted to do so,
in a manner which will not permanently ruin the very attraction of
this magnificent gift of god on which we live, and share with other
creatures, apart from human being. I mention that because in the
vortex of one of the Boeing 737's that came over just recently,
a white tern was caught up in the vortex out in the Mission Paddock
area and was killed, destroyed, and that is only one instance. The
people of this Island have consciously preserved the beauty and
tranquility of their homeland for generations, and I will take far
more convincing than what has been so far put to me, that the
economic conditions and standards of living of the permanent residents
will plummet down-ward if Air New Zealand not be permitted to fly
a regular Boeing 737 service here.
It is my opinion, Mr. President, that with in view of the lack of a proposal that has been put forward by Mrs. Gray and Mr. Brown here, in view of lack of proposal from Air New Zealand, I think this matter can only be put before the next Assembly, and I don’t think any decision should come from this Assembly. Thank you.

MR. BUFFETT: Thank you.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. President. Air New Zealand representatives are prepared to give a proposal, they were in actual fact going to be on Norfolk Island yesterday, but the reason that they are not here is I rang them up and suggested that the timing was very wrong with the new election coming up, and on matters of the proposal, I did not think those decisions should be taken by this Assembly. All I am asking is that we consider it, in principle, to find out whether indeed it is even worth these fellows coming here. They have a tentative date for arrival, which is the 21/22 June, which is just after the new Assembly has been formed, and indeed they will answer any questions in relation to their proposal that members may wish to ask at the time.

I am amazed Mr. President, that with Norfolk Island having a real economic financial problem, that the members of this House are not even prepared to acknowledge, in principle, that if the Environmental Impact Study is OK, that in principle, they would agree. I just find it too incredible to believe that the potential of resolving our problems is just around the corner, and this Assembly is not even prepared to look at it.

MR. JACKSON: Mr. President. Most of the other members made comments on certain issues that I wish to raise because I have studied the final Environmental Impact Statement 1980, and also the First Assembly’s submission to the Works Committee, Parliamentary Works Committee, and no way in the report of either the 1980 final Environmental Impact Statement or the First Assembly’s submission could I find any recommendation, or suggestion for 737. Neither could I find in the recommendations of the 29 submissions that were put to the Parliamentary Works Committee supporting 737. There is options being placed in the final impact statement on certain recommendations, and I must agree with Mrs. Gray’s statement earlier in the debate that there has to be legislation because the statement goes on to say, introduction of medium jets will reduce the travelling time to 27 hours from Sydney. It goes on further to say, that there is possibility that aircraft larger and noisier than F28, for example, the 737 of Air New Zealand or BAC111 of Air Pacific, may be subsequently suggested for operation into the upgraded airport. However, the statement goes on, the introduction to Norfolk Island would first require compliance with current environmental legislation - for instance regarding the need for production of a separate environmental impact statement.

We go on with other options of the nature of how the airport was to be upgraded. If the airport was to be upgraded to take anything more than medium jets, it would have cost in the vicinity between $12 and $14 million, now that was in 1980, and at that time the recommendation was for medium jets for the upgrading cost.
for Norfolk Island of about $6 million, and now there is the
difference. The persons that I mention in the May submission, the
29 persons were very interesting to read some of their submissions.
If we have a look at the Chamber of Commerce submission, goes on
to say, the advantage to the people, industry and trade of Norfolk
Island far out weighs any possible disadvantage to the environment.
It is necessary to replace existing aircraft with up-to-date types in
order to maintain the present quality and frequency of airline
facilities. Mr. Nobbs, he says, and I believe he spoke on behalf of
an organisation, if the noise level associated with Boeing 737 are
lower than other aircraft mentioned in the E.I.S. and then Qantas
should charter a Boeing 737 from Air New Zealand. Now is that not
exactly what we are after, if it is found that to be less. That is
what the motion is asking for, perhaps not the members.

The Tourist Board takes it a bit further, and
they state that the Norfolk Island should have the right to finally
decide which airline may use the airport, and types of aircraft used
and the timetable. Whatever aircraft is finally decided upon should
be the quietest possible.

The main question with my debate at present, it
is that 3 or 4 meetings ago a motion was moved by Mr. Sanders, in
this House, and after lengthy debate the motion was carried with one
abstention. Now it concerns me now, what has happened to that
motion, has Mr. Sanders followed it up? I have never heard any
report back in the House where the motion is, is it still here, is
it still in Mr. Sanders' office, is it still with the Administrator,
or has it been handed on to the responsible parties? I do believe
in the early debates that took place for the upgrading of the
airport, and assurance was given to the people - and of the 29
persons, and organisation that made submissions, they made
submissions along the line, some made submissions that the airport
should not be upgraded, should be patched up and smaller aircraft,
such as Dash7 and others to be utilised. I have mentioned before in
this House that I attended many of those meetings because at the
time, I was not sure until that assurance was given that the Norfolk
Island airport would be upgraded to accommodate medium size standard
jets. I do believe that assurance should be honoured.

It is certain that we need further information
from New Zealand on what it their intentions, because at an earlier
meeting, the previous Government, the Minister who attended the
opening, turned the first soil on the airport of the upgrading,
Mr. Fife, had a question put to him in the Committee Rooms on 737
- he said it maybe possible for one a month. Well we know that is
unsatisfactory if it is ever to be considered. Then it has been
suggested that perhaps one a week. When we look at if it is possible
for one a week, that would only bring in say, an average of 110
passengers per trip, of 6,000 or little more tourist a year. It only
goes to state that Air New Zealand wants unlimited flights into
Norfolk Island. It has been said by Mr. Sanders and suggestion just
before I started to speak, that here we are - the introduction of
our downturn in tourist trade, the introduction of 737 will be the
saviour. Well it is still in our memory when we heard that the
reduction of imports, duty on cigarettes and booze would be our
saviour also, that tourist would flock here to buy cheap cigarettes
and grog. We know that is not a reality, that has gone gone by the
board. What concerns me is that there has been debates, there has
been environmental impact statements made, and the airport has been
upgraded to accommodate certain aircraft, and if there is no...
that I don't know, he is asking me to vote subject to a satisfactory finding of a new environmental impact study, subject to it. This House has no objection. Well I am afraid I cannot be a party of a suggestion of that nature, I do believe that our formal motion that I mentioned that was before this House three or four meetings ago, that was quite sufficient to put the chain of events in course. I cannot support the motion before us placed in by Mr. Sanders.

MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Quintal.

MR. QUINTAL: Thank you Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to support the motion moved by Mr. Sanders. It is also my belief that the majority of the people on the Island would like to see the 737 come into Norfolk Island, and I for one would like to see them come. We talk about noise from planes, the noise factor from the 737 is only for a very very short period of time - 3/4 minutes, if that, then we have the Andovers that come in, and they scream for long lengths of time, as a matter of fact they remind me of cats making love at night with their noise. I think probably if we could get over this problem of the environmental impact statement, or study, I think that would be a step in the right direction. The 737 can fly direct from the South Island to Norfolk Island, they do not have to refuel, from Auckland direct, or the South Island, Auckland to Norfolk, and they are a comfortable plane to travel in. It is my belief they are most suited to Norfolk Island needs because of the fright capacity and the amount of passengers they can carry, and Norfolk Island is badly in need of tourists at this time, and now is our chance to get more tourist to the Island, and it looks likely we will be getting less and less as time goes on. I support the motion.

MR. BUFFETT: Miss. Buffett then Mr. Sanders.

MRS. BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. President, I really think too much emphasis is being put on how many extra tourist the 737 can carry, because Air New Zealand has had considerable difficulty filling the F27, and as far as the long distance haul required, I feel that long range tanks fitted would have covered the bill, but I still not at yet convinced that I could change my mind.

MR. SANDERS: I wish to reply to Mr. Jackson. He continually distorts the motion that is being put, the number of aircraft that I have requested, not so much as me requesting, but Air New Zealand has requested, and it has never even been stated as unlimited. The number of flights that they require is 2. Mr. Jackson's other question was, what has happened to the last motion passed in this House, was it still in my desk, was it with the Administrator? I would like to clarify that one. The afternoon following the Assembly meeting, I personally gave it to the Administrator, who in turn sent it to the Department in Canberra, there is stayed for quite some considerable weeks, and when Mr. Beasley, our Minister for Aviation was over here, I asked him what had happened, and at that time, he still had not received it. On the informal meeting with the Administrator on the following Thursday, he informed us that it had at that stage got to the Department of Aviation.
MR. JACKSON: I thank Mr. Sanders for that information, if I had been made aware, had Mr. Sanders reported that in the House, I certainly would not be questioning where the motion was.

MR. BROWN: Mr. President, Miss Buffett has hit the nail on the head, she in another way said a nice big aeroplane on its own will not solve all of our problems, and she is quite right. We should not panic because of the present economic problems. As the world economic situation improves, particularly the Australian and New Zealand situations improve, so to will ours, but let us not create a terrible problem for the future purely because some people are panicking at the moment. We should remember that we only need 8,000 more tourists to be pushing through our limit recently agreed of 24,000 a year. What will happen then? Will we then be told by Air New Zealand, that unless we allow them to operate a few extra 737 services they will not be able to maintain their fares at present levels, and will we then be urged to increase our limit from 24,000 to 30,000 simply so the Air New Zealand fare can be whatever it is they want to charge. Mr. President, I am quite prepared to consider with an open mind a proper 737 proposal put to us by Air New Zealand. But without such a proposal, I am not prepared to lay aside the unanimous agreement and the assurances of the First Assembly. Until such a proposal is before us, I am not prepared to support either Mr. Sanders' motion or Mrs. Gray's amendment. In my view, Air New Zealand are treating us like a mob of cow-boys, I would like to think we are a little bit smarter than that.

Norfolk Island has a reputation for hospitality I am sure that whether Mr. Sanders' motion is passed or not, when the Air New Zealand gentlemen come here in June to put their proposal they will be well treated. Thank you Mr. President.

MR. BUFFETT: Further debate, Mr. Sanders.

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

MR. BUFFETT: The question is - That the question be put Those of that opinion say aye.

Aye To contrary no, any abstentions. The ayes have it.

I put the question. The question is - That the amendment be agreed Those of that opinion say age.

Aye To contrary no,
CLERK: Mr. Buffett

MR. BUFFETT: No.

CLERK: Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: Aye

CLERK: Mr. Brown

MR. BROWN: No

CLERK: Mr. Christian-Bailey

MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: Aye

CLERK: Mrs. Gray

MRS. GRAY: Aye

CLERK: Mr. Quintal

MR. QUINTAL: Aye

CLERK: Miss Buffett

MISS BUFFETT: No

CLERK: Mr. Jackson

MR. JACKSON: No

CLERK: Mr. Sanders

MR. SANDERS: Aye

MR. BUFFETT: Result of voting Honourable Members.
Ayes - 5 Nos - 4
The ayes have it.

before I put that question?

We turn to the motion as amended; any debate

I put the question -
That the motion be agreed, as amended
Those of that opinion say aye

Aye

Contrary no

No

Clerk please call the House.

CLERK: Mr. Buffett
CLERK: Mr. Howard
MR. HOWARD: Aye
CLERK: Mr. Brown
MR. BROWN: No.
CLERK: Mr. Christian-Bailey
MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY Aye
CLERK: Mrs. Gray
MRS. GRAY: Aye
CLERK: Mr. Quintal
MR. QUINTAL: Aye
CLERK: Miss Buffett
MISS BUFFETT: No
CLERK: Mr. Jackson
MR. JACKSON: No
CLERK: Mr. Sanders
MR. SANDERS: Aye

MR. BUFFETT: The result of the voting
Ayes - 5 Nos 4
The ayes have it.
That the motion as amended, is agreed.

NOTICE NO. 3

MR. BUFFETT: There are preliminaries to No. 3 Mr. Sanders
I wonder if you would be kind enough to take the Chair.

PUBLIC ACCOUNT EXPENDITURE BILL (No. 5)

MR. SANDERS: Members I have a message from the Administrator.

In accordance with the requirements of section 25 of the Norfolk Island Act 1979, the Administrator recommends the making of the attached Bill, entitled an Act to authorise additional expenditure from the Public Account of Norfolk Island for the service of the financial year ending 30 June 1983, dated 6 May 1983, and signed by the Administrator.
I have to report that the Business Committee has met and declared the Public Account Expenditure Bill (No. 5) 1982/83 is an urgent Bill in accordance with Standing Order 158.

MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Deputy President, I present the Public Account Expenditure Bill No. 5 of 1982/83, and I move that the Bill be agreed to in principle.

MR. SANDERS: The motion is that the Bill be agreed to in principle. Mr. Buffett.

MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Deputy President, thank you. This Bill is to seek additional supply to the extent of $35,000 to cover for the remainder of this financial year, that is basically 3 months, payments of hospital, medical expenses associated with approved persons under the welfare services arrangement, that exists in the Island. There were of course money provided for this purpose in the budget that is covered by this financial year, that is from July 1982 until June of this year. You will probably realise that it is difficult to predict the occasions in which people will be hospitalised, especially if they are in the more elderly category, and therefore the assessment, whilst it was the best that could be done at that time, did not in fact account fully for this financial year.

To give you some idea of the range of monthly payments that are needed to be made in this particular area, they range from something like $6,500 in some months, to almost $21,000 in other months, they vary considerably. The funds which have been provided and which in fact total $115,000 in the earlier budget, have now been utilised and this is a predicted amount, and I have to say too that it is a predicted amount because it is not possible to predict exactly or state categorically, what this figure will be in the following 2/3 months, 2 months really. But that of $35,000 is one based on the best estimates that are available at this time, and it is for that purpose, to cover people who are approved in the welfare services of the Island, a service which members of this House will know is one that gives compassionate care for people, especially as they become aged and assistance as their income dictates, it is an income tested arrangement, for payment of their hospital and medical bill expenses, and I commend the Bill on that basis to this House.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. Buffett, is there any debate.

MR. JACKSON: I fully support the Bill and recommendation that is put before us by Mr. Buffett, and I have no hesitation in supporting the Bill.

MR. QUINTAL: I also support the Bill Mr. Chairman, and if we have to find the money, then we have to find the money.

MR. HOWARD: I think we have no choice but to support it, the money must be found, the benefits have been established. I wonder if
as it seems to have changed from last year. The amount that was supplied for this year - $115,000 was just slightly over what was paid in these benefits in the previous financial year, it looks as though this year it is going to be almost exactly one-third more for this year than last year. Are more people getting these benefits, have the hospital charges gone up to make that kind of difference, I wonder if Mr. Buffett can shed any light on what is causing this, and is it something that is likely to continue in the future?

**MR. BUFFETT:** It is difficult to say whether it will continue. Let me just quote you some figures so that you will see what I am talking about. In the last financial year the amount spent was something $112,000 and in fact this year we have provided something like $115,000 and it is additional to that which is being sought this afternoon, in respect of the Bill that I am promoting. I have already indicated to the House the range of monthly payments that need to be made, and it is difficult to predict when people will be ill. Yes, there have been adjustments in charges at the hospital in respect of treatment there. If my memory serves me correct, there has not been significant change in the number of people who have been approved as persons, you will realise that some people enter the list and some people come off the list for reasons that would be obvious. Just because there is a set number on the list it does not dictate that the number of times that they might need to attend the hospital or doctor for medical purpose. It really is difficult to pin down the real reason for the increase in this year for the reasons that I have explained.

**MISS BUFFETT:** Thank you Mr. Deputy President, I fully support the Bill put forward by Mr. Buffett, it is essential and there is no question of it. My observations indicate to me that perhaps the census could enlighten Mr. Howard as to the age groupings over the next few years.

**MR. SANDERS:** Thank you Miss Buffett, any further debate. The motion is that the Bill be agreed to in principle.

The Ayes have it.

Is it the wish of the House to dispense of the detail stage.

**MR. BUFFETT:** I move that the Bill be agreed to.

**MR. SANDERS:** The motion is - That the Bill be agreed to All those of that opinion say aye.

Aye

Contrary

The ayes have it.
NOTICE NO. 4

MR. SANDERS: I have to announce that the Business Committee has met and declared in accordance with Standing Order 158, that the Public Moneys (Amendment) Bill 1983 is an urgent Bill.

MR. HOWARD: I present the Public Moneys (Amendment) Bill 1983, and I move that it be agreed to in principle.

MR. SANDERS: The motion is -
That the Bill be agreed to, in principle.

MR. HOWARD: The Bill has 2 main objects, both to do with the way in which the accounts of the Island are drawn up, both intended to make sure that we can follow and continue to get the benefit from the Hungerford style of accounts presentation.

The first provision in this amending Bill, that is significant is in paragraph 5 - its proposed new section 32 (a)(2), little (a). Sorry I am making a mistake. I gave the wrong paragraph reference.

The first is on page 1 of the Bill and it is section 3(2a), which says, that the Executive Member shall create a Head of the Trust Fund for each prescribed undertaking of the Administration for the purpose of holding and accounting for the property of that undertaking. This would not represent any change in the way the accounts have been done in the past. The Administration undertakings, the Electricity Service, Telephone Service, Lighterage Service, Liquor Bond, have been accounted for as heads of the Trust Fund. It has been pointed out to us, both by Hungerford and by our own Legal Adviser, that what we have been doing, although it is useful is been improper. We want to be able to go on doing that, we want to be able to go on accounting for those undertakings as separate compartments of the Trust Fund.

Paragraph 3(2a) changes - proposes to change the Public Moneys Ordinance so that we can continue to account for the undertakings in that way, but have the legal clear authority for doing so.

The second provision of the Bill is in section 3(b), and it proposes something new which was recommended by Hungerfords and which does not exist in the present Public Moneys Ordinance, which is that when liabilities have been incurred by the Administration, but have not been paid at the end of the year, the money that has been voted by the Assembly to pay for those obligations should be set aside at the end of the year into a suspense account. When the bill for those services does come in the bill should be paid from that expense account. The importance of accounting in that manner is that the costs belonging to each financial year will then appear in the accounts for that year, and we will avoid the distortion of our accounts which is very often occurred in the past, when a very large expense belonging to a year is not billed to us until the next year is underway. The classic example of this, and it has confused our accounts for years, is the billing for education services from New South Wales. One of our very major expenses, and there have been years when the accounts for that year have only included half a years education
That causes tremendous distortions in the financial accounts showing how the Administration performed in a particular financial year. This provision would make it clear that if the bill for some of the education services during a year had not come in by June 30th, the money that had been voted to pay that cost, would be put into a suspense account and charged to that financial year, and when the bill did come in, money would be taken from the suspense account and paid. I think that explains the essential purposes of the Bill and I commend it being agreed to in principle.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. Howard, is there any debate?

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you Mr. Deputy President. I have a couple of questions to ask on this matter. Mr. Howard says that there is a distortion which confuses the in the minds of some, the accounts as they are being kept by, for instance, having no account received by the Administration at a particular current year. May then a new distortion be created in fact by the creation of a suspense account and also the interest accumulated on that expense account, over the period of time, the distortion being one of giving the idea that in actual fact we do not have the money, that we in actual fact we do have in the suspense account. I don't feel that this bill is necessary, I don't feel comfortable with the Bill. I do believe that if one Assembly has agreed to the payment of certain commitments that there must be something vastly wrong if another Assembly were not to. I also bring to notice of members that the Hungerford, Offer system of accounting, whilst an internal one of this Assembly, is regarded by the Auditor-General as internal, I believe that the Heads of undertakings as already set up in the books of the Administration are satisfactory, I do not believe that at this stage of this Assembly, the last sitting day, that this Bill should be put before members as an urgent Bill and I am not comfortable in the amount of executive discretion that this piece of legislation, if passed, would grant to an outgoing Executive Member, or any other Executive Member at this stage when the elections are due in a week. Mr. Deputy President, I do not agree with the Bill.

MR. HOWARD: I will try to deal with the points Miss Buffett raises, if I can, I wish I could get some clarification on the last point she made. She said, she was not happy with the amount of executive discretion given to an executive member. I wonder if she could explain what discretion is given to an Executive Member that is worrying here?

MISS BUFFETT: Apart from the fact that this Bill has, we had been circulated with the Bill on Monday, then there is an amendment which has come to the Table today at 2.00 when we all sit around here, I think it is too large a matter to change the Public Moneys Ordinance, expect us to pass it without legal interpretation for us. We should have been given the time to seek legal advice. To get back to Mr. Howard's question, this Bill, if passed, and must be by the very motion if it goes through as an urgent Bill, would provide a transitional validation provision which, if accepted, will validate what has been done in the past, but it is...
the necessity for the trust account created to come before this whole Assembly of members. The supply that will be called for, or should be called for for a specific item, or for those undertakings, will by-pass the normal arrangements of having to have an appropriation act passed through the House, and I believe at this time, the week before the elections, is not an advisable situation.

MR. HOWARD: I still don't understand what executive discretion was worrying Miss Buffett, but I will not press that point. If Miss Buffett feels there really is such a thing, I hope she can make it clear. I am distressed to hear Miss Buffett say that the Hungerford, system of accounting is only an internal one and it is regarded by the Auditor-General as internal. I wonder if Miss Buffett can tell me her source for that view.

MR. SANDERS: Miss Buffett, are you prepared to reply?

MISS BUFFETT: Yes, thank you. It is my opinion, from the statement today, or the letter read today by the President of the House, that I will have to take back what I say there. I do believe that the Auditor-General's Department is perfectly happy with the situation of the heads of expenditure, with the heads of these undertakings, the business undertakings of the Government are provided for in an accounting manner satisfactory to the Auditor. I don't think this Bill should go through without the comment of the Auditor General's Department, we will reduce it down to that. I feel very uncomfortable that this Bill should go through without first asking the Auditor-General's Department for their comments.

MR. HOWARD: There are some mis-understandings, I think in Miss Buffett's view about the accounting on Norfolk Island, and whose it is, and what role the Auditor-General has in it. It is none of the Auditor-General's business how we keep our accounts, it is our business. The accounts have been kept on Norfolk Island for donkeys years in a way that was so confusing, so full of items that needed explanation before anybody could understand them, that they were very close to useless. I have seen - going way back into the Norfolk Island Council days, members of the Council look at pages and pages of accounts, and obviously tried to understand them and failed, and finally in frustration just put them aside, and way, well somebody must have looked at them, I suppose they are OK. At last we have got a system of accounting devised by Hungerford, Hancock and Offner, that members, and the public can look at, and read and understand, and we can see what the financial performance of the Administration has been and we can see what the financial position of the Administration is. That has never before been possible without extensive cross-questioning of the people who keep the accounts. Accounts should not have to be explained, they should be self explanatory.

I want to remind Miss Buffett that this form of accounting has been recommended to us by the auditing firm, the auditing firm, who audit the Auditor-General's office. It has not been done by some little back of burk operation, it has been done by the firm that audits the Auditor-General's office. I think it would be a tragedy for Norfolk Island if we back-slid on these
accounts and returned to the previous style of accounting; if this Bill does not pass today then 1982/83 accounts will be done in the old style once again, and no-one will know what happened. I strongly support this Bill.

MRS GRAY: I certainly agree with what the Bill does. I am always, and Mr. Howard knows this, always very wary of urgent Bills, lengthy ones, the ones we have just handled a matter of necessity not so much so. Because I am wary of urgent Bills I took the time and trouble to seek some professional opinions on what the Bill sought to achieve. Those professional opinions supported this piece of legislation. I would have liked to have had the Governor-General's opinion too — beg your pardon the Auditor-General's opinion. Perhaps I can go to a report an extract from a report furnished to us dated March 1982, from that Department which says, under the heading Annual Financial Statements - 'the form of the Administration's annual financial statements was found to be in need of extensive revision with a view to setting such action in train, this office has offered to provide the Administration with a schedule suggestions and observations for better disclosure through an improved financial statement format. The Hungerford, Hancock, and Offner report certainly provides an improved format. I can see that the difficulty which this Bill addresses is one which puzzles me and I hate to say it, has puzzled a number of members of this Assembly in the debates that have taken place in the last 15 months. In particular the difficulties dealt with amounts of money that was still owed at the end of a financial year and yet were not being taken into account. You will see on page 3 of the Hungerford, Hancock and Offner report provision for expenses relating to prior years not paid at the 30 June 1982, $195,978. It seems to me that is how far out the figures made up to the end of 1982 were out. As far as I am concerned, reading them and trying to work out what we owe, this is the first time that those figures have been clearly stated so that I can understand the situation as it really was at the end of June 1982. It is those floating amounts of money that Mr. Howard has sought to catch in this net, document and attribute or debit to that year, the year in which they were allocated. I am prepared to support the Bill, I have taken the advice which I consider necessary which is professional in the field of accountancy, and further advice from legal advisers — I don't think I can add to that Mr. Deputy President.

MR. CHRISTIAN-BUDDY: I support the Bill, I believe the passage of this Bill today is absolutely essential.

MR. BUFFETT: Mr. Deputy President, the Bill as it has been described by Mr. Howard does appear to be reasonably straightforward and it does contain what appear also to be some helpful provisions. If it was just that I would probably have no difficulty in it, but I probably harp to the words that Miss Buffett said, I don't feel comfortable about it, and I will endeavour to explain why. First of all the provisions of this Bill are based upon the Hungerford, Hancock and Offner report. Yes I have had the opportunity of seeing that, but if I remember correctly it has not been tabled in this House. It is not a document that has been available in public exposure long enough that perhaps members of the community or maybe those
said about the situation so that the community can also be consulted as to what their thoughts are in respect of how the accounts should be handled. Let me acknowledge from the outset however that there is greater room for improvement in the so-called traditional way of handling the accounts, the tradition being over the past good number of years. I can accept that that need to be revised and can be made more legible to the layman or to the average person who might have the opportunity to look at them. But I make this point there are those difficulties, it has not been a repertoire handled in that manner. It has been mentioned that figures have been presented to us in a lucid way and it has been said that this is based on the Hungerford method. Well we have seen many years which had the existing legislation to cover I don't see why we cannot look at this year's on exactly the same basis. That in fact will give us time to go into this in greater depth. We are addressing what I think is acknowledged as one of the principles of legislation on Norfolk Island, the Public Moneys Act which controls the public purse in Norfolk Island, and I have some aspect of not being comfortable to use those words again. To have a Bill presented - as you will see from the heading amended as lastest as today, 11 May 1983, to be presented to us on the basis of being passed today, an urgent Bill. If we are examining one of the principles of legislation one needs to give it mature thought, I have mentioned some of the difficulties in being able to do that, and I don't feel that I have a responsibility to come to this House and give immature opinions on a slap dash basis, on a piece of legislation which has considerable importance. Let me also acknowledge Mr. Deputy President, that it may be after mature examination for me to think that those provisions are perfectly alright, but until there is opportunity to properly examine it and have consultation with people who are knowledably in this area I have a hesitant view about supporting it on an urgent debate.

Mr. Sanders: Thanks you Mr. Buffett. Any further debate?

Mr. Jackson: I attended the Executive Committee meeting when this piece of legislation came before the three executives. There was not unanimous decision then, theret was some enquiry that the Attorney-General's - Auditor-General's Department should be their view should be considered. This piece of legislation has been around Mr. Howard foreshadowed it quite awhile ago, and yet no views from the Auditor-General's Department has been canvassed. Mr. Howard's excuse is that it is none of their business, well I would have thought for the other members, and certainly my views on such a piece of legislation, an amendment would have cleared the minds - cleared the air of some members around this table including myself. This piece of legislation amendment may quite in order, but what concerns me and is worrying the reason for the urgency of it. I am prepared to support the amendment if it took its normal course if it is table today and left for the normal month where it could be considered, members then can seek the advice because certainly it has just come into our hands - I got mine yesterday and Miss Buffett has indicated I found an amendment to the amendment this afternoon, so I do believe in all fairness this Bill should not be dealt with as an urgent Bill and if I am forced to vote on this Bill, and for that reason I cannot support it.
MR. BROWN: Mr. Deputy President if today was not the last meeting of this Assembly I would go along with what Mr. Jackson has said, I think that urgent Bills should be restricted as far as possible. In this case as members we have had for some time the Hungerford, Hancock and Offner report and system of accounts available to us. I have spent quite some time looking at them and I have satisfied myself about this form of accounting. I fully agree with Mr. Buffett's desire to have all of the possible information available to us so that we can give it all our full consideration and a well informed decision. In this particular case - as to that I have spoken at length already today, but in this particular case I have fully satisfied myself about the Hungerford system of accounts, I can accept the need to deal with this matter as an urgent matter, if it is to be dealt with by this Assembly. If a future Assembly does not like it, it can after all change it but at least a future Assembly would then have to be saying we are not satisfied with the Hungerford system of accounts we want something different. I see no harm being done and some advantages being obtained by supporting it.

MR. SANDERS: Is there any further debate? Miss Buffett.

MISS BUFFETT: Thank you, I wish to ask through you why the urgency of this Bill, and why the creation of a fund that would by-pass the normal appropriation act method and if appropriation does not have to be sought, how does Mr. Howard propose to pre-empt the figure which he has to transfer before the actual Bill comes in, I am thinking in large amounts that he has mentioned, for instance, in school salaries, also in larger amounts perhaps in philatelic. It worries me that sums can be transferred out without appropriation having come before the members. Why should this have to go through as an urgent Bill today?

MR. HOWARD: Miss Buffett made 4 points just then. She asked why the urgency, the answer to that if the Bill is not passed to the 1982/83 accounts may not be able to be prepared following the Hungerford procedure we may slip back to the old system which in my view would be a tragedy. Secondly, Miss Buffett asks why create a fund that would by-pass the normal procedure, no fund is being created that would by-pass any normal procedure. Funds could be put into the Suspense Account only if they had been voted by the Assembly and approved by the Assembly but had not been paid out by the end of the year. Thirdly, Miss Buffett asks if appropriation is not sought, how can the Executive Member for Finance pre-empt the money, the answer is he cannot pre-empt the money without appropriation. Appropriation would exist it would have been given by the Assembly, and finally she said it worries me that there would be the dealing with money without appropriation. She need not worry because no money will be dealt with without appropriation.

MISS BUFFETT: I have another question to that please. When this was being explained at the Executive Meeting, it was said that the day to day expenditure could be handled more expeditiously through a trust account and not through the more bureaucratic procedure of an annual appropriation act.
MR. HOWARD: I think Miss Buffett is confusing 2 different things. That remark did not have anything to do with the Suspense Account, it had to do with the accounting for undertakings. The revenue fund as a whole is accounted for on a cash basis, a cash basis is not a suitable means of accounting for the undertakings and they have not been accounted for in past years on a cash basis, but on an accrual basis, making them separate heads of the trust fund makes it clearly and positively lawful to continue dealing with them, not on a cash basis, but on an accrual basis where income and expenses applying to the year are shown as part of that year whether as a matter of fact the actual dollars had been paid or received as the year ends.

MR. SANDERS: Any further debate. There being no further debate, the motion is -

Aye

Contrary

No

Clerk call the House please.

CLERK: Mr. Buffett

MR. BUFFETT: No

CLERK: Mr. Howard

MR. HOWARD: Aye

CLERK: Mr. Brown

MR. BROWN: Aye

CLERK: Mr. Christian-Bailey

MR. CHRISTIAN-BAILEY: Aye

CLERK: Mrs. Gray

MRS. GRAY: Aye

CLERK: Mr. Quintal

MR. QUINTAL: Aye

CLERK: Miss Buffett

MISS BUFFETT: No

CLERK: Mr. Jackson

MR. JACKSON: No

CLERK: Mr. Sanders

MR. SANDERS: Aye
the detail stage?

Aye

Against

The motion is -
That the Bill be agreed to.
Any debate?
All those of that opinion say Aye

Contrary

Clerk call the House please.

Mr. Buffett

No

Mr. Howard

Aye

Mr. Brown

Aye

Mr. Christian-Bailey

Aye

Mrs. Gray

Aye

Mr. Quintal

Aye

Miss Buffett

No

Mr. Jackson

No

Mr. Sanders

Aye

Mr. Sanders

The ayes - 6
noes - 3
ORDER OF THE DAY NO. 2

CUSTOMS (AMENDMENT) BILL 1983

MR. SANDERS: Resumption of debate on motion - that the Bill be agreed to in principle. Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: The purpose of this very brief Bill is to comply with a request from the Commonwealth Government, that the Norfolk Island Customs Ordinance prohibit the importing of machine guns. The Bill was introduced with some wording saying that semi-automatic firearms were to be prohibited imports but it made it clear that that meant semi-automatic firearms of military type. We learnt that there were objections from the Commonwealth about the inclusion of those words 'of military type'. We have gone through a great deal of explaining and telexing and discussing backwards and forth through the Administrator's office. I now have a letter before me from the Administrator referring to this discussion - I won't read the letter but it concludes with the words 'if the Assembly remains of the view that the words - of military type - should be included in the Bill it would not be objected to by the Police Ministers Council'. So Australia is happy and the Bill as it was introduced clearly can now be passed and now will be assented to by Australia. It is one that they have asked us to enact, clearly it is a good law, it makes sense and I recommend that it be agreed to in principle.

MR. JACKSON: I move that the question be noted.

MR. SANDERS: in principle.

All those of that opinion say aye.

Contrary no.
The ayes have it.

MR. HOWARD: I move that the detail stage be dispensed with.

All those of that opinion say aye.

I believe the ayes have it.
The motion is that the Bill be agreed to.

All those in favour

Aye.

Against

The ayes have it.
ORDER OF THE DAY NO. 3

POSTAL SERVICES BILL

MR. SANDERS: Mr. Jackson, I believe you have resumption of this one.

MR. JACKSON: The Postal Services Bill 1982 has been around for some considerable time and I am certain all members have had the opportunity to examine it. It takes the place of the Postal Service Ordinance and lays down certain conditions, offences and other matters pertaining to the Bill. I have discussed this Bill with those persons associated with the Postal area on Norfolk Island and others, that is associated with the postal department and there is very little opposition, one particular person considered that a master or a captain of a plane would be unduly penalised if they were found guilty of an offence against a section that they did not keep the mail in a proper condition and delivered at the right place. However examination of the Bill in detail it is found that the mail on board a vessel in compliance with the requirement under this section, whether within or outside of Norfolk Island, it includes the owner, the agent and the master of the vessel are each guilty of an offence against this section. So in actual fact it isn’t only the master of a vessel it is the owner and agent would be involved if the contractor undertaken to carry the said mail is not delivered at the place, destination or if the mail is not unloaded for any other reason than what has been specified when it was taken aboard, and I have no opposition against the Bill and I am prepared to support it.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you Mr. Jackson. Mr. Howard you were going to move an amendment, do you wish to do so.

MR. HOWARD: Shall I do that now, or do we need to agree in principle. I am happy to do it now. Section 11 - as Mr. Jackson says this Bill has been around for awhile and has been very carefully examined by everyone concerned directly concerned with the handling of the mail on Norfolk Island. I think it is well regarded as a Bill, I think it is a good one. It has continued to be scrutinised right up until yesterday, and yesterday one more improvement was seen. Section 11 as it stands in the Bill as we originally had it before us, was wording saying - nothing in this Act shall be taken as imposing on the Administration any obligation to repurchase postage stamps it has sold, or accept stamps as payments. Someone twigged just yesterday to the fact that of course we must accept stamps as payment of postage and we would be wrong to say we can’t, nothing obliges us to accept them as payment of any kind. I therefore want to move an amendment to that Section 11 (2) - so as to make it read as follows:=-

'Nothing in this Act shall be taken to impose on the Administration a duty to repurchase or to accept as payment, accept as payment of postage in respect of the transmission of a postal article. Postage stamps sold by the Administration or letter cards aerograms or other articles sold by the Administration on which the Administration has cost or printed a representation of or design resembling a postage stamp indicating an amount of postage.'

It is one last little refinement in the Bill.
MR. SANDERS: debate?

Thank you Mr. Howard. Is there any further
The question is -
That the amendment be agreed.
All those in favour say aye

Contrary
The ayes have it.
The question is -
That the Bill as amended be agreed in principle.
Those of that opinion say aye

Contrary, I believe the ayes have it.

Is it the wish of the House to dispense with

The question is -
That the Bill as amended be agreed.
Those of that opinion say aye

Contrary no, I believe the ayes have it.

MR. HOWARD: I move -
That the House do now adjourn

MR. SANDERS: The question is -
That the House do now adjourn
Is there any debate?
Those of that opinion say aye

Contrary, I believe the ayes have it.

This House stands now adjourned.