

Honourable Members, this morning we commence with the Prayer of the Legislative Assembly

Prayer

Almighty God we humbly beseech Thee to vouchsafe Thy blessings upon this House, to direct and prosper our deliberations to the advancement of Thy glory and the true welfare of the people of Norfolk Island

Presentation of Petitions

Presentation of Petitions, are there any Petitions this morning?

Notices

MR PRESIDENT: Notices. Are there any Notices this morning?

Questions Without Notice

MR PRESIDENT: Are there any Questions Without Notice?

MRS SAMPSON: Thank you Mr President. I address these questions to Mr Christian. The top of page 25 in the Norfolk Island Waste Management Discussion Paper says "the first thing Norfolk Island should do with glass is to import aluminium cans". As the Minister for the Environment could Mr Christian state whether he takes responsibility for the increasing pollution on the Island caused by the gradual change to bottles containing beer realising that cans do not break and are being recycled

MR CHRISTIAN: Mr President no I don't accept responsibility for the increase in pollution. There are however some recommendations made by the Waste Management people. This will be discussed by Members of the House as a total package, not just pulling out one small part of it and certainly if ways can be found to minimise the importation glass into Norfolk Island without taking away peoples personal preferences or packaging preferences then that is something that we can look at in the future

MRS SAMPSON: Thank you. Another question for Mr Christian. Could the Minister please advise this House of the status of the MOU on Philip Island

MR CHRISTIAN: Mr President I'll take that one on Notice Mr President so as not to give any misleading information

MRS SAMPSON: Thank you Mr President. I address these to Mr King. It is obvious from the front page of last Saturdays paper that non-executive Members of this Assembly were excluded from the meeting with Mr Snowdon. Are future meetings such as this to be conducted on the same restrictive basis, thus prohibiting these backbenchers from having any input or direct contact other than to channel their concerns through an executive member who may not bother to raise such issues if they conflict with their own opinions

MR KING: Mr President the preference of course for the meetings between Norfolk Island people and the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister Mr Snowdon, our preference was that all Members be involved. That preference was echoed by Mr Snowdon and understandably so his preference was for government to government discussions. Now all Members of this House are simply not Members of the Government thus the meetings on that occasion were confined to the four Members of the Government with Mr Snowdon and his staff. What we have negotiated in respect of future meetings is that a proper agenda be prepared, proper papers be prepared for those meetings and those papers will be circulated among the non executives of this House for their comments so it is in that fashion that non executives will be able to have an input in future meetings

MRS SAMPSON: Thank you Mr President. I have two more also related to the same issue. Could the Minister advise this House if one of the issues discussed with Mr Snowdon and reported as "exploring the possibility of developing a Community Development Plan which would assess social and community infrastructure needs on Norfolk Island" is a euphemism for looking at introducing further welfare services such as unemployment benefits and similar handouts

MR KING: No not at all. It's a fairly wide interpretation placed on those words Mr President. It simply means that we need to go about the business of developing business plans, financial plans and community plans for Norfolk Island. This House over the fifteen or fourteen years of self government hasn't done a great deal towards future planning or medium or long term planning and that is all that simply means, that we must get on with the business of making some medium and long term plans and trying to assess and evaluate what our future needs will be and how we might cater and provide for those needs

MRS SAMPSON: And the last question to Mr King. Could the Minister please advise this House when the reported meeting between the Secretary of the Department and the Legislative Assembly took place when the matter of 99 year leases was discussed

MR KING: I'm sorry. I might ask that you repeat that question

MRS SAMPSON: Could the Minister please advise this House when the reported meeting between the Secretary of the Department and the Legislative Assembly took place when the matter of 99 year leases was discussed

MR KING: No I can't offhand but if it is of particular importance although it's past history I'll certainly find out. Excuse me Mr President. I may have something to add to that. If I could add to that I understand that the report in the Norfolk Islander on that point was in fact wrong, there was no such meeting

MR BATES: My first question is for Mr Christian the Minister responsible for liquor. An Editor's note in the Norfolk Islander of the 25th June claimed that on good authority beer was soon not to be imported in cans and went on to criticise this decision. Could the Minister inform the House if such a decision has been

made and if so by whom

MR CHRISTIAN: Thank you Mr President. The short answer to that is no, no instructions, no decisions or anything of that nature has been taken or made in regards to beer being imported into Norfolk Island in bottles rather than cans. I really don't know where the paper got the information from

MR BATES: Another question for Mr Christian again with his responsibility for liquor. At the previous meeting I asked the Minister if any special liquor licences had been issued to allow local manufacture of liquor. Could the Minister inform the House if any licences have been issued since that meeting and does he intend to make the conditions of the licences known publicly

MR CHRISTIAN: Thank you Mr President. Two licences have been issued and a third application is being processed now, the first one that was issued to the Norfolk Island Brewing Company for the brewing of local beer, the second one is being issued to a company that wants to blend spirits and liquors. They haven't exercised their right to take the permit up yet but I have no problem with the conditions laid out in the permits becoming public knowledge. There are a number of ways which the public could view these permits. They could go along to the Community Services Manager and request to see them or alternatively I could maybe table them in the House and I'll talk to Brian at a later date about such a measure

MR BATES: Thank you Mr President. I have a few questions for Mrs Lozzi Cuthbertson, Minister for Health. Is the Minister directly involving herself in the day to day operations of the Hospital rather than funding and implementing policy changes in keeping with her executive authority

MRS LOZZI CUTHBERTSON: Mr President I am very much concerned with the way policy is implemented at the hospital and its implications on the welfare and condition of particularly the older people whose stay in hospital is for an indefinite period of time. That must involve some examination of procedure and the way things are done by the staff at the hospital and to this end I have developed a discussion paper which I am sending out to each nursing staff member today and I have arranged a meeting for next Tuesday to meet with the staff members to discuss the content of that policy paper and to hear of their input on that paper and of any other concerns they may have

MR BATES: Following that question, sections 9,10, 11 and 12 of the Norfolk Island Hospital Act refer to the development, review and implementation of a strategic plan for the hospital enterprise. Is there such a plan and if not why not

MRS LOZZI CUTHBERTSON: Thank you Mr President. At present there is only a draft of such a plan, a very inadequate draft I may add for the general statements and in my opinion setting out very little direction for the future and the development of proper policy and guidelines for the staff and for the running of the hospital. I've said some of these things to the Director and she has indicated that she will work on improving that draft plan. Eventually that draft plan has to be submitted to the Health Advisory Council who will also make an input in it and when it is finally in a proper condition it will certainly be published

MR BATES: Thank you Mr President. The final question may have been partly answered but the question is, the Minister has expressed a desire to improve conditions at the hospital especially for geriatric patients. This is commendable and has wide support. Does the Minister intend to implement policy and fund policy

through the use of a strategic plan

MRS LOZZI CUTHBERTSON: Some of the policy and procedural changes that will flow from the changing policies I do not anticipate will require a great deal of funding just simply required to do things in a different way. I hope eventually that certainly these policy changes will be reflected in the strategic plans and we will work towards that end

MRS ANDERSON: Thank you Mr President. I have a question for Mr King. When playground equipment was installed at the Norfolk Island Central School a quantity of topsoil had to be removed. Topsoil has been requested and is now desperately needed for the maintenance for the running track at the school oval. Can the Minister please advise why the topsoil was removed from the school and where it was delivered to. Can he also be assure the people of Norfolk Island that this valuable asset, the new school oval built to international standards to which many members of the community contributed so generously and of which they justly proud, will not be allowed to deteriorate further. Can he please guarantee that the necessary topsoil will be supplied without further delay

MR KING: Well firstly Mr President I haven't got the faintest idea where the topsoil went from the playground excavation. I will certainly make some enquiries and find out. It just amuses me to ponder why I wasn't asked in an informal fashion if Mrs Anderson is really serious about finding out an answer because I don't happen to know what goes on from day to day with such matters but nevertheless I'll find out. I've expressed from time to time a very keen interest in maintaining the standards of the international classification of the sporting oval at the school and I intend to do whatever I can to ensure that that status or classification is maintained. I have made a request that topsoil be set aside from the works in which the Administration people are involved. I understand that some has been delivered up there. Perhaps there's not the quantity that's required. Topsoil is simply not available on a day to day basis but I'll continue to make enquiries to make sure that hopefully sufficient topsoil is available to maintain the oval

MRS ANDERSON: Thank you Mr President. I have a question for Mr Bennett. Could you advise us what progress was made during your recent discussions in Sydney regarding phonecards for Norfolk Island

MR BENNETT: Thank you Mr President. Firstly let me say that there have been two series of meetings about phonecards in Melbourne last week and in Sydney yesterday. I intend to advise all Members of the outcome of those discussions and will report to this House in due course. The decision to replace the coin phones with card phones was taken some time ago and having taken that decision there were a number of difficulties with just going out and buying card phones and getting cards made. The simple fact is that the card phones required for Norfolk Island requires software that will allow the cards sold in Norfolk Island to be used only in Norfolk Island and that no other cards sold from outside Nations to be used in our machines. The successful operating agreement with Telestra allowed us to overcome the high cost of software to allow us to use phonecards and as a result of those successful negotiations we proceeded to order phonecards the objective being that in time card phones will replace completely the existing coin phones. It's proposed to launch phonecards some time in September. There will be three denominations a \$5.00 c card, a \$10.00 card and a \$20.00 card and following advise from issuing authorities of phonecards there's been a fair amount of attention paid to the style of the cards the theme on the card to ensure that collectors are attracted to it. Members will be aware that there is a world wide increase in

demand for phone card collecting by people who hitherto may have collected stamps or coins or both and many have departed from stamps and collect phonecards, many of the stamp collectors collect phone cards as well. The demand for them worldwide is unbelievable. The statistics from Europe recently showed that the market is growing at 60% per year. There are some 18,000 registered collectors with the Telestra Organisation, Telecom in Australia and it's growing at the rate of 40 per day. Obviously the opportunities for Norfolk Island are very great as an issuing authority about to launch its first edition the phone cards there is very wide interest already. There's been no official announcement it's just the grapevine has got around and a number of dealers have phoned Norfolk Island and a number of written requests for cards so demand is quite high. Most Members are probably aware of what the phonecard is and I would suggest that most in the community may know, it is simply a piece of firm plastic that looks like a credit card that slips into a telephone machine and replaces the need to put coins in to make a call. There is a credit on the card and the credit is used up as you use the telephone. I just want to go on a little bit and talk about the style and because of our interest in trying to attract international collectors to these cards and to make the impact on the first edition as great as possible we decided that there will be a Bounty theme for the initial cards, or two of the cards will have a Bounty theme and the third will be the classic scenic shot from Queen Elizabeth lookout looking across Kingston. Significantly the language on the card will be both in the Norfolk language and in English. On the back the instructions to use the card will have English instruction and then the Norfolk language and on the front of the card instead of the work phonecard being PHONECARD it will be FOENKAAD and already that has surprised alot of the dealers in Australia for a start and excited them. Mr President in the throes of assembling the best marketing strategies there has been these discussions that Mrs Anderson referred to. Obviously we don't have the access to marketing consultancies here and because of the enormous benefits that might flow to Norfolk Island if we get it right we have taken the time to talk to people who have been involved in the marketing of phonecards both consultants and dealers alike to make sure that the strategy that we apply for the first edition is the best that we can do on that occasion. In the long term it is expected that thee revenue from phonecards will be a significant revenue earner for the Island. Most of the collectors buy mint cards which means they are paying \$5, \$10 or \$20 or collectively \$35 for a set of cards and they do not redeem that value by using them in the phone box so it's a rather unique way of printing money in a way, you put a value on them and people then paste them into albums and the like. There is also a demand world wide for used cards and the trade tells me that used cards from Norfolk Island will be perhaps of more value than the mint cards simply because the number of cards that will be used in our telephone boxes will be far less than other issuing nations by virtue of the fact that local telephone calls are free and it will only be ISD calls that are made on the cards so that will create a bit of interest for local people to make sure than any used phonecards that appear in the box are delivered to dealers, allowing them to cash in on it. As I mentioned earlier I will appraise all Members of the fuller details of this exciting venture and will also be keeping others informed as we get down to the stage of launching the first set of cards. The artwork is at the printers now, the printing process has an eight to ten week lead time, the launch date as I mentioned is scheduled for September so there will be plenty of time to both show you the finished artwork and to explain the you the strategies for both marketing and our issuing policies in good time

MRS ANDERSON: Thank you Mr President. I have another question for Mr King. In an article which recently appeared in a Sydney paper and which was reprinted in the Norfolk Islander it was stated that the population of Norfolk Island is 2,300 most of whom are avid beerdrinkers. At the time of the recent election it was a

generally held view that the population was some 1500. This is an increase of 800 or about 53%. Can the Minister for Immigration please advise where all these people came from and where they are now

MR KING: Mr President they come out of the trees at night-time to drink beer. I'm sorry. Forgive my flippancy. I think when making calculations for the purposes of determining the consumption rate of beer and like one needs to take into account the average number of tourists on the Island in any one day and that figure comprises the average number of tourists on the Island at any one day during the year

MR ADAMS: Thank you Mr President. The question is to the Minister for the Public Service, Mike King. Could the Minister inform the House if in recent times he approved the application for three people paid from the public purse to go to Canada and to be paid one weeks wages and yet retain their leave entitlements for this period and on what basis was this approved

MR KING: Mr President yes special leave with pay is granted from time to time in the Public Service, as it is I might say, in the private sector. In this particular matter I received on the 6th June a recommendation from the Public Service Board that special leave with pay be granted to three officers to participate in the Commonwealth Games in Canada in August. The Public Service motion read "that recognising the world wide importance of the Commonwealth Games this Board is prepared to endorse the granting of special leave with pay to the three people in anticipation that they would use every effort to promote Norfolk Island. Now that was the recommendation after due consideration of the Public Service Board. Although Mr President it is a unique decision here in Norfolk Island it is not uncommon throughout the world for employers both in the private and public sectors to grant similar leave to employees participating in international sporting events. The Commonwealth Games is a prestige sporting event which will attract world wide media coverage. The Norfolk Island Flag will be flown and we are fortunate Mr President to obtain this type of exposure in the world arena. The Norfolk Island team is comprised of three types of persons, self employed persons, private sector employees and public sector employees. In most cases income of self employed persons will not be effected by short term absence from Norfolk Island. In the case of private sector employees it is not known to me how many have been granted paid leave, that is a matter between those participants and their employers however, I would encourage private sector employers to adopt the same approach as the Public Service Board has on this occasion. It's not only a matter of good employer/employee relations it's a matter of encouraging sporting activities and of recognising the value of flying the flag of your own country. It has been suggested to me that perhaps earlier Norfolk Island's sporting representatives should have been granted similar leave, well I can say two things to that Mr President, first that no applications were received or made and second that if they were received then I would consider as I would think the Public Service Board would, the status of the event in the international sporting arena and the extent of media coverage likely to be gained at that event so in summary Mr President yes I did make such a decision, the matter was considered fully by the Public Service Board and recommended to me, there was no additional cost to the public purse arising out of my approval and the telling factor was the enhancement of Norfolk Island's profile on the international stage. If I may I would table Mr President the motion of the Public Service Board and my approval

MR ADAMS: Thank you Mr President. Supplementary to Mike. Are all Members of the Public Service to be made fully aware that this facility is available to them when they are in a PR and flag-waving role

MR KING: I think we just have Mr President

MR ADAMS: Another question to Mike as Minister for the Public Service. As people showing the flag and being paid from the public purse are being recognised financially and in light of good employer relations could the Minister please explain why the staff at the Tourist Bureau who show the flag year round are not paid overtime and are not compensated for the use of their own vehicle when used for Tourist Bureau business

MR KING: Well I can't explain that. I do appreciate from time to time that a review needs to be carried out on terms and conditions and I can see that that is an area where terms and conditions of employment need to be looked at

MR ADAMS: Question for the Minister for Education Mrs Nadia Lozzi Cuthbertson. In recent times there have been increasing reports that certain school children are selling and using narcotics in the bush adjacent to the Banyan Park Playcentre. Could the Minister advise the House if she has been notified of these reports and if not could she give an undertaking to enquire into them and resolve the problem

MRS LOZZI CUTHBERTSON: Thank you Mr President. No I had not received such reports. May I ask Mr Adams, is he sure it is narcotics that are being used

MR ADAMS: Marijuana was the term yes

MRS LOZZI CUTHBERTSON: Well, that's much more reassuring. I certainly will make enquiries about it and report back to Mr Adams and to other Members of the House if they so wish

MRS SAMPSON: Thank you Mr President. These ones are for Mrs Cuthbertson mainly on education. Could the Minister please advise any results that have been obtained from investigating alternative education options other than being tied to the New South Wales Education Department

MRS LOZZI CUTHBERTSON: Thank you Mr President. I have received one letter indicating that we could possibly explore other ways of organising our education needs apart from through the Department of Education in New South Wales. I have not explored any possibilities outlined in that letter because firstly we have a Memorandum of Understanding from the Commonwealth that ties us in to the New South Wales Department of School Education so we would have to negotiate some latitude on that first but secondly there are so many advantages to continuing obtaining our education package through the New South Wales Department of Education that it should not be given up too lightly. At the moment we are in the process of trying to negotiate a change in the teachers salaries, I think it would be as well to see how that negotiation progresses before we do anything else

MRS SAMPSON: Thank you. As the value of the Eldon Foote Scholarship was advertised at approximately \$7000 which includes room, board and airfares, could the Minister explain her comments that overseas public education would cost much more than a figure of \$8000 that was suggested in the last meeting

MRS LOZZI CUTHBERTSON: Thank you Mr President. I do not know the value of the Eldon Foote Scholarship is worked out but certainly from my information about how much boarding school fees come to and the cost that parents have to meet when they send their child to boarding school that value certainly seems understated. The

figure often being quoted is in the vicinity of \$12,000 per annum. I'm willing to check this out but I really do not see the purpose

MRS SAMPSON: If I may make a supplementary question. I was talking about overseas public education I wasn't talking about private boarding schools

MRS LOZZI CUTHBERTSON: But you have to find accommodation for your children. Accommodation that is safe and accommodation that you trust and if you don't happen to have family in the city where you send your children what else are you going to do with them

MRS SAMPSON: What progress has been made in creating a school council for the Norfolk Island Central School and what would be its role and what benefits would it provide

MRS LOZZI CUTHBERTSON: A Committee has been meeting for some time to develop a charter for the Council. I believe it is almost complete. The Charter is very much along the same lines as school councils are conducted in New South Wales and other parts of Australia. It will have a role in advising on policy in the school and giving parents and citizens of Norfolk Island a say in the direction and perhaps the aims of education in Norfolk Island. Schools in other parts of Australia and the world I understand are more and more involving the citizens to support their schools and that have an interest in the outcome of the education that is offered in the schools in the long term planning and setting aims and directions for the school itself and oversighting how the results meet those objectives and plans and it's time that Norfolk Islanders also have more say in their own education systems to such a council

MRS SAMPSON: And the last question to Mrs Cuthbertson. Are statistics available on crimes and misdemeanours by juveniles and young adults and if not can they be obtained for the last five years and tabulated by age, group, type of offence, sentence given, repeat offence and any other breakdown that will assist in assessing the problem and be provided on say a six monthly basis

MRS LOZZI CUTHBERTSON: Mr President I will take question on notice and endeavour to supply the information accordingly

MR PRESIDENT: Any other Questions Without Notice Honourable Members? We are concluded with Questions Without Notice Honourable Members

Presentation of Papers

We move to Papers. Are there any Papers for presentation this morning

MR BENNETT: Mr President in accordance with paragraph 41(2)(a) of the Interpretation Ordinance 1979 I table the Airport Charges Amendment Regulations 1994

MR PRESIDENT: Thank you, and further Papers this morning

MRS LOZZI CUTHBERTSON: Mr President I am required to table directions given by me under section 20(4) of the Norfolk Island Hospital Act 1985 and accordingly I table a direction so given by me to the Director, Mrs Jane Bataille on 25th May 1994

MR PRESIDENT: Thank you, further Papers to be tabled this morning. No further papers

STATEMENTS

MRS LOZZI CUTHBERTSON: Mr President I would like to set the record straight with regard to a number of allegations made in the course of Questions Without Notice at the last meeting of this House. The tenor of a number of questions placed by Mrs Sampson at that time implied that I had misrepresented events in my statement to the Norfolk Islander on the 11th June 1994 on the matter of the fees for years 11 and 12. In fact my statement was a fair account of events and there are documents to prove it. Mrs Sampson alleged that far from the decision to abolish the fees being unanimous as I reported I reached it without giving other Members of this House the opportunity to express their views. Mr. President that is an unfair accusation as minutes of the relevant meetings demonstrate. Unfortunately I did not have those minutes with me at the last Sitting of this House but I have checked them since and invite Mrs Sampson to check them as well to establish the facts which sadly she failed to do so before the last Meeting. Mr President I referred to a paper dated 11/5/94 which I circulated and was clearly marked for discussion at MLA's meeting of 16/5/94. That paper was headed Years 11 and 12 School Fees and it set out how to proceed to abolish those fees and to negotiate a change in teachers salaries. The Minutes of the MLA meeting of 16/5/94 showing that paper was in fact discussed and that Mrs Sampson was present. The only significant comments recorded of that discussion read "Mr Bennett pointed out the demolition of Years 11 and 12 fees in this and next year would acquire additional funds to be found to meet the existing 1994/95 commitments. It goes on to record that Members agreed on the wisdom of addressing the question of localising teachers salaries at the same time as the issue of abolishing years 11 and 12 fees". It is worth noting

Mr President that at the next MLA meeting held on 3 June 1994 Mrs Sampson did not challenge the accuracy of the Minutes of the previous meeting. Are we to assume that she did not express any disagreement on what I proposed to do or that she did not think it important that such dissent be recorded in the Minutes. Considering her very spirited stand since for a strongly held belief it does seem strange the minute taker failed to note it, had it been voiced on the 16 May 1994. The third document that Mrs Sampson should check are the notes taken by the Secretary to Government of a meeting he and I had with representatives of the P and C on the 1st June 1994. Here, I want to say quite categorically that I had no meetings with the P and C before that date and it was only on the 1st June 1994 that I informed them that the MLA's had agreed Grades 11 and 12 should continue to be offered at the Norfolk Island Central School, that summonses for outstanding fees for the 1994 school year would be withdrawn provided all parties agreed to meet their own costs and that fees for grades 11 and 12 would not be levied in the future but that the summonses for the 1993 fees would be pursued. Mrs Sampson may check the accuracy of this sequence of events whenever she pleases, in fact, I hope she does because I am certain nothing else is going to convince her she made a mistake about when she heard of my meeting with the P and C and exactly when I confirmed its input to her.

The date I did so was on the 2nd June 1994 when we met for the 9th Budget related meeting of MLA's in less than one month, it was then I made the statement Mrs Sampson claims I made seventeen days earlier. When she challenged me about it at the last meeting of this House I also confused exactly before which meeting I had made it but the documents I mentioned do not. I can easily understand Mrs Sampson's memory lapse but I cannot understand why she did not at least check with the P and C as to exactly when our one meeting to date has taken place. If we go into semantics no disagreement is not strictly equivalent to unanimous decision so I will concede not choosing a sufficiently exact word but I firmly believe my account of events to the Norfolk Islander reflected what really happened. The other matter about which I wish to comment is Mrs Sampson's accusation made in her question to Mr King as leader of this House that as a new Minister I have been

allowed to waste large chunks of public money on personal preferences. Surely she knows that as an executive member I share executive authorities for all matters listed on schedules 2 and 3 of the Norfolk Island Act 1979 and that is what gives me authority to do my job not the leader of the House but what I find most worrying is how badly Mrs Sampson has failed to understand the will of the voters as expressed by them in the last election. Surely it is obvious that this group of people is here rather than another group because the voters of Norfolk Island expressed amongst other things a choice about the policies they wanted their government to implement. It is not by some fluke that most MLA's share my way of thinking about fees for years 11 and 12. By working on the abolishment for fees for years 11 and 12 I'm not merely indulging a personal preference, since I announced my intention to stand for office and after the election I heard from innumerable members of the community who want those fees scrapped, who are concerned to see that all of our children have a fair start in life, no matter the financial position of their parents nor the ability of those parents to organise their finances so that they may send their children overseas to complete their education. It is facile in the extreme to dismiss such a direction from the people as a seeking of popularity and personal preference, thank you Mr President

MR BENNETT: Mr President just a brief statement about mobile trunking radio. During the last week a representative from Tate Electronics visited the Island to install the base station from which will provide the ability to use mobile trunking handsets or vehicle mounted radio units. Mr President this project has been around for a while, in fact I made a statement in this House on 21 July last year which announced the Government's wish to get involved in mobile trunking radio and at that time I had mentioned that the Government decision had been influenced by two principle factors and that they were the pressing need for uniform communications in the disaster and emergency planning situations and particularly at the Norfolk Island Airport as a result of the rationalising of the Rescue and Fire Fighting Unit to a Modified Aerodrome Emergency Plan. There were also identified at that time efficiencies within the Public Service that could be gained by the use of mobile trunking radio by some of the personnel who have a job to perform that takes them out of the office for long periods of time. Mr President the second principle factor was the revenue possibilities as a result of the mobile trunking radio option as opposed to what was an option a dedicated closed system for the disaster and emergency group exclusively. Mr President in this weeks Norfolk Islander I expect that there will be a press statement made by the Manager of Telecom which will say alot of what I've said and also put into place the charging regime for the mobile trunking telephone. There will be a need for Regulations to be made and these will be attended to in the next short while. Mr President basically there will be a connection fee of somewhere between \$30-50 that will be determined sometime today. The concept of an annual rental is being considered to be abolished simply because the people who will be asking to be connected will own their own units rather than the present system of telephones where the Administration own the telephone sets and run the wires to your house, there is no wiring connection, there is a facilitation or an enabling process to allow a handset to be used in our system and it's a very quick process. The charges for telephone calls off the Island from the mobile sets will be as they are for a normal telephone. There will be one additional cost and that is a mobile phone to the public switched telephone network, that is, through the exchange. From your mobile phone to your house or from a mobile phone to another telephone there'll be a charge of ten cents per minute, thirty cents per three minutes and that is the charge designed to in the long term, offset the cost of alot of the installation of the base station. Mr President I think that it's a very interesting development for Norfolk Island. I reflect you back to the early days of wondering whether it was the right thing for Norfolk Island residents to walk around with a mobile phone

on their hip and thought that that was something that occurred in Sydney or in Auckland or major cities but when you think about tradesman who have a number of workers out in various parts of the Island it's a super efficient system to have instant contact with them over alot of things. You can apply that same thought to the Administration, some of the areas in works perhaps Forestry and it simply is allows alot of time to be saved in the delivering of resources human or material to jobs and the like. There will be fairly strict control and guidelines issued to control the use of them in the service and this will be dealt with shortly and the conditions will be very similar to those that apply now in the policy and guideline that deals with the use of telephones. There will be restrictions on those units that are in either Administration vehicles or with personnel and not all of them will have access, for example, even the public switch network so you may have a truck or a person who has a mobile phone whose only connection is with his base which is the works depot or with his boss. Others, depending on their need for use will have access to the public switch network and some may well have access also to ISD to take either an incoming ISD or make an ISD call. The latter class will be relatively few in number. Mr President the plan is that Norfolk Telecom will not be the retailer of the handsets, this will be a service provided by the private sector. I understand that there are at least two agencies now held by people in the private sector and those persons who wish to acquire a mobile telephone can acquire both the unit and the future servicing of that unit from that section. The Administration's need for mobile phone 's base station or handheld will be obviously supplied by Norfolk Telecom who have access to them themselves and they will service their own. I'll leave it there thank you Mr President

MR KING: Thank you Mr President. I wish to make a statement about Immigration or more precisely a statement as a result of an immigration decision that I've made in recent times. A decision which is perceived and which I acknowledge as being probably the most unpopular immigration decision made in the history of Norfolk Island immigration legislation. A decision for which I have been subject to criticism and comments over the past few days, a decision for which I will continue to be criticised and receive adverse comment for some time to come, a decision which has caused ructions in my social and family life. A decision however which I do not resile from. The immigration system Mr President is not a perfect system and will never be a perfect system. Decisions made under the system will never be acceptable or popular to everyone in the community particularly in the area of the permanent population intake, that is, general entry permit issue. The system regretfully will fail to accommodate some people who might have made excellent members of the community and who might have made a valuable contribution to community affairs and unfortunately it will from time to time accommodate people who make a less than satisfactory contribution. People who are self interested and people who clearly do not assimilate well into our small community but Mr President, certain things need to be stressed and understood about immigration and any decision taking process. It must be understood firstly that immigration is a function of government which is a shared responsibility, shared between Norfolk Island and the Commonwealth and that in taking decisions under the Immigration Act that the rules of natural justice need to be adhered to. It needs also to be understood that decisions are reviewable either under the appeal processes or under the judicial system. Decision makers here under the Immigration law should not be called upon to take decisions unless those decisions can stand up under the reviews that I have just spoken about. Because the function of immigration is a shared responsibility Mr President it therefore follows that it is a function for which the Commonwealth has a major degree of oversight and that's important then to conduct our immigration affairs in an inscrutable manner. If we don't observe the rules of natural justice Mr President, if we don't give opportunities to comment, if we don't give reasons for decisions, if we fail to take into account all the

relevant considerations or if we take into account irrelevant considerations or factors then our decisions will ultimately be overturned either by appeal or by judicial review. That Mr President for reasons that it is a shared function of responsibility will have adverse effects not only on my credibility but the credibility of the Norfolk Island Government in the eyes of the Commonwealth. That of course would severely undermine our aspirations for self government or the continuing devolution of authority to Norfolk Island so whilst Mr President I don't like personally some of the decisions that I take I'll nevertheless take them in accordance with the law and in accordance with the rules of natural justice and proper administrative procedures because I might happen to dislike the person, a person involved intensely doesn't come into it. Mr President I'm not going to risk my credibility and I think it's reasonable that I don't hold out the Norfolk Island Government to ridicule but there are some checks and balances which are available.

Firstly Mr President if Members don't like the way that the law and the policy operates or the results of the implementation of the law and the policy then it is open to Members to review those laws and those policies. I've already pre-empted that there will be a major review of immigration law and policy and some of the aspects of law and policy which have resulted in some popular decision may well be capable of being addressed and redressed. Mr President the other check or balance that is available to Members and I don't say this with arrogance, I say it earnestly because I sincerely embrace the principle that if Members do not like the way that law and policy is implemented or carried out by the executive member then members must take the decision to remove that executive member. Now again, I don't say that arrogantly I say that with all sincerity that that is a check and balance which is available to Members. Thank you Mr President

MR KING: I'm sorry to bore you all Mr President I have another statement.

Mr President last night I received a telephone call from a very distraught Norfolk Islander who is on the mainland at the moment and who happened to have just watched the nationally televised programme "A Current Affair". This person Mr President was particularly upset that two prominent members of our community, one a former member of this House and a Minister of the Government, had been interviewed on the question of Norfolk Island's relationship with Australia. The message delivered in the programme was that Norfolk Islanders favoured independence and that Australia had done nothing for Norfolk Island and that the case for independence was to be put to the United Nations. The impression given by the programme was that the two persons represented the views of all Norfolk Islanders. Mr President I don't want in any way to take away the rights of an individual to express his or her opinion or views on any matter and in whatever forum, I do however want to use this forum to distance myself and distance the Norfolk Island Government from the views expressed by those individuals. I think it's fair for me to say that this present government and the majority of Members of this House do not share the independence aspirations or the expressed views that Australia has done nothing for Norfolk Island. Mr President my own hopes and aspirations are that Norfolk Island can form a closer relationship with Australia and that at the same time pursue with success our own self government. I hope also that we are able to repair some of the damage done to our relationship with Australia by the minority cries for independence from those who happen to have more ready access to the media. It's important also Mr President for those who might hear those cries to understand or remember that one of those who has cried the loudest recently stood for re-election to this House. If the majority of Norfolk Islanders wished him to represent their views they would have re-elected him. Instead they rejected his representation with a 35% swing against him. He cannot now talk as a representative of the community

MR BATES: Can I move that the Statement be noted Mr President

MR PRESIDENT: The question is that the Statement be noted

MR BATES: Thank you Mr President. I would just like to congratulate Mr King on the Statement he has just made and certainly say that I support the remarks that he has just made and agree entirely with what he has said

MRS LOZZI CUTHBERTSON: Mr President I also received a phone call last night about this very programme. The person who saw the programme had the impression that it had been from some considerable time ago and certainly if that was the case it wasn't made clear in the programme itself. I certainly support Mr King's comments and may suggest that perhaps a press release should be issued by this House as to the feelings expressed by Mr King

MR PRESIDENT: Further participation. The question before us is that the Statement be noted and if there is no further discussion on that particular motion I'll put the question

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. Are there any further Statements this morning. We have concluded statements Honourable Members?

Messages from the Office of the Administrator

MR PRESIDENT: We move to Messages Honourable Members. Message No 72. On the 21st June 1994 pursuant to section 20(1) of the Norfolk Island Act 1979 I declared my assent to the Criminal Law (Amendment) Act 1994 which is Act No 12 of 1994 and the Deserted Wives and Children's Ordinance 1923 Repeal Act of 1994 which is Act No 13 of 1994. The message is dated the 21st day of June 1994, and signed Alan Kerr, Administrator.

Reports of Standing or Select Committees

MR PRESIDENT: Are there Reports of Standing or Select Committees this morning Honourable Members? No Reports thank you

NOTICES

We are at the stage of tackling Notices Honourable Members

NO 1 - REMOVAL OF WATER HYACINTH

MR BATES: Thank you Mr President. I move that this House recommends to the Administration that removal of water hyacinth by mechanical means from the Watermill Creek and Town Creek be suspended immediately and remain stopped until the Minister for the Environment provide a report for consideration by this House justifying the need. Mr President this motion was motivated because it appears that the regular mechanical removal of hyacinth from the creeks in Kingston appear to be rapidly changing the character of the creeks and it is unclear just what the purpose behind it is. Not so long ago I can remember the creek in front of the Administration offices and All Saints Church could almost be jumped across. It is true that it was infested with various water weeds and water plants. Watercress could be gathered and eaten and the creek was reasonably attractive. The creek is now rapidly getting deeper and wider and looks like a dirty drain. In wet times there is nothing to slow down the flow of water or stop erosion of the creek

itself. There are those who even claim that the coral and fish life in the bay has been affected by the creek. Mr President the exercise is also a very costly one. Now I don't know the answers and I don't know all the facts but if there are sound reasons for this activity to continue then those who wish it to continue should have no difficulty in justifying their actions and it will put to rest for all time my concerns. I should point out that as the creek gets wider it provides a larger area for the hyacinth to grow in and it increases the area that has to be cleared.

This again increases the costs. On the other hand there are the positive sides of the plant itself, filtering qualities, erosion reduction, and not to overlook that it can look very attractive, especially when flowering. Hyacinth is also infesting the creek in the cockpit area at Cascade and there is a good chance to compare the two creeks. One is mostly left alone and the other is cleared regularly at a substantial cost. Again, I may be wrong but a casual observer I'm sure would agree that the Cascade creek looks much better and is handling the hyacinth infestation fairly well and fairly naturally. Mr President I think it is time to consider if there are better alternative solutions to the problem and that is the purpose of my motion

MR CHRISTIAN: Thank you Mr President. I cannot support Mr Bates' motion and I will mention a few good reasons for not doing so. Firstly the Watermill and Town Creeks fall into the Kingston and Arthurs Vale Historic Area. This would have to be one of the better managed areas in Norfolk Island. The annual harvesting of the water hyacinth forms part of the works programme for this area which is approved by the KAVHA Board. The Australian Heritage Commission is a KAVHA Board Member. In addition the Board has agreed to a study of the total catchment area which serves the Watermill and Town Creeks with a view to improving the water quality flowing into Emily Bay. This may involve the creation of a wet land adjacent to Government House. Secondly in past times when hyacinth control has been allowed to lapse the lower areas of the Watermill creek has flooded onto the surrounding land. This floodwater eventually becomes stagnant and forms a surface scum which promotes algae outbreaks. Add dung from grazing stock and you have an open festering sewer.

Mr President it was a scenario like this that led to an outbreak of drain fever more correctly referred to as Ross River Virus or maybe even Dengue Fever in the early 1980's. The effect on our tourism industry would be as devastating now as it was then. Thirdly Mr President some may say that the creek may have been excavated below sea level. The KAVHA Project Manager assures me that this is not so and that there is still significant amounts of silt along the creek bottom above convict levels. There is evidence that older Norfolkers used to ride their horses along the creek bed and under both existing bridges. You could not possibly do that today Mr President thank you

MRS SAMPSON: Thank you Mr President. I support Mr Bates motion. I also believe that the mechanical digging out of both Watermill Dam and the Creek is detrimental to the area. I hear what Mr Christian says, the water hyacinth is a pollutant clearant. Yes it does get fertilized by cow manure and it also gets fertilized by run off from other fertilizers that come from higher up but I still feel that the widening of it to.. Now it is only a channel or a drain it is no longer a meandering creek which goes through the Kingston area and therefore I would support the motion

MRS LOZZI CUTHBERTSON: I too support Mr Bates motion but find Mr Christian's comments about the Dengue Fever or whatever kind of fever outbreak was caused by the creek polluting the waters of Emily Bay most worrisome. I would really appreciate further information as to just how that conclusion was reached and whether in fact it was supported by scientific evidence because if that was a reason for the clearing of the creek regularly then it is a pretty important reason

and we should consider it

MR KING: Thank you very much Madam Deputy President. I tend to support Mrs Cuthbertson in that there are two schools of thought and the question has been thrown around for a long while. I'm not sure that it is going to assist the present situation given that the works are currently being carried out and are nearing completion from my observations anyway. The question has been around for a long time. I can see elements of both arguments that I can't accept but I haven't had any documentation put before me, I think I would like to decide the question once and for all and I'm not sure that there is information being put to me in this debate that will allow me to vote on this today. I would really prefer, given that the current works are almost completed, that the matter stay on the table and we be given the pros and cons on a properly documented basis so that we can make our minds up

MR BUFFETT: Thank you Madam Deputy President. I think it is appropriate to bring this matter forward for discussion because the clearing process there in the creek has caused comment almost every time it happens and I think it is appropriate to try and settle the matter so that in the longer term we will know exactly where we stand and it won't be an annual or periodic matter that is raised and raised without all of the information being present. Can I just refer to the motion itself. It really asks for a stay in proceedings so that certain reports can be got and information can be brought forward and in that form I really don't see any difficulty in the motion as it stands for two reasons both of which have been explained to date. The first is of course that the present process is almost complete, probably is complete by now and so it will be a little while before any activity is called upon again, and the second part is that we should look at, or appropriate authorities should look at the various bits of information that relate to the area and what is being done to determine in the long term whether this should be a continuing practice or not. You will know Madam Deputy President of course that the clearing of that creek has been done for generations, I mean, in earlier times obviously it was done manually. In fact, it was done manually last year but my understanding is that it had reached a stage of the water hyacinth, the bulrushes and the salvinia, which are really the main difficulties within the creek, the water hyacinth is not entirely on its own, were at a stage where they could not be adequately removed manually and so reversion to mechanical means were made, but mechanical means have only been used in the last few years but its been done for a long time, its been done for generations the clearing process and of course there have been a number of reasons for that. One is to ensure that there is good water flow so that the water gets away and doesn't cause a swamp or stagnant pools as has been described by Mr Christian. When it does that of course it reduces the grazing area around as well as increasing the swamp land. I am aware of course that some people see the swamp land as an advantage in respect of wetlands for wildlife but there are these other points about the drain swamp that has already been mentioned. Another is that there is a real requirement for a reasonable flow of water to come out to push back the sand that comes into the creek frontage and unless you have a reasonable flow it builds up considerably there. Certainly it doesn't stop all the build up of sand in various areas but in that particular area it has been effective. Another effect of course is that it undermines the foundations of the two bridges that are in that particular area, the convict built bridges I'm talking about. When the water banks up it becomes all sodden and it doesn't do them any good as has been proved over periods of time so there are a number of reasons, that's all I'm saying at this time, that the process of clearing and allowing the one central drainage arrangement to operate in lieu of it being spread out into a swamp situation. Again I've got to acknowledge that there are opponents to that, those who would prefer to see the wetlands preserved,

those who consider that the banks are eroded of the central creek when you use various methods, especially mechanical methods. They see that the stream is deepened and further eroded, maybe unnecessarily. They see that the hyacinth undertakes a water purification process, which it does I must say Madam Deputy President, but it also has the other attributes to it that we've endeavoured to talk about and of course they see that the flowers are pretty and that's true too, but again it must be seen in context. Really, what I'm describing is that there are a whole host of things on both sides of the ledger which would be good to be brought together and evaluated so that a balanced approach, I would think probably at the end of the day probably what we would do is that we would clear the creeks, maybe there would be some element of retention of some of the components but it would ensure that there is a reasonable flow and maybe those elements that are retained provide some element of wetland and some element of purification. There is a KAVHA Board proposal to restore some of the meandering creek line and that has been mentioned by Mr Christian when he earlier spoke on this matter and I think when that project is brought to fruition, because the Board has said that it should do that, it will be a project over a couple of years, it may well address some of the problems that have been talked about here today, and have a pleasing appearance. So overall, my view of this motion is, in the context that I earlier mentioned that is it really is something to allow factors to be brought forward and assessed for a longer time I would see no difficulty in that being done at this time but I don't see that it will allow the creek to be overly clogged in the time frame of all of that to happen so I'm comfortable about supporting the motion in that context

MADAM DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Thank you. Further participation. Mr Buffett you wish to resume the chair

MR BUFFETT: If you would like to talk I would. Then I will in a moment thank you

MR PRESIDENT: Honourable Members if we have concluded debate on that matter and I assume looking around the room that we have I will put the motion to the House. The question is that the motion be agreed to

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

MR CHRISTIAN ABSTAINED

Do you want to call the House Mr Christian or we just record you. Right. The motion is agreed with one abstention from Mr Christian. Thank you for your participation Honourable Members and thank you for your first assistance in the Chair Mrs Anderson

NO 2 - FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS LEVY (AMENDMENT) BILL 1994

MR BENNETT: Mr President I present the Financial Institutions Levy (Amendment) Bill 1994 and table the explanatory memorandum. Mr President the purpose of this Bill is to include certain financial transactions as transactions subject to FIL. This will be achieved by making regulations to prescribe those transactions. The Bill specifically excludes credit card accounts from falling into the category of loan accounts so that some deposits into credit card accounts will be transactions subject to FIL. Members who have some concern about that should read section 2(b) of the Act, there is provision to allow the normal bankcard payment transactions without incurring FIL but there is some activity with

credit cards that is clearly outside of the intent of the Bill when it was first brought in. The Bill will also provide Mr President for the audit of trust accounts by a person who is a registered auditor under the Corporations Law or the Companies Act 1985. A person shall not be eligible to audit a trust account if he or she is related to the person who keeps the trust account, an employee or partner of the person, someone who has a financial interest in a business or undertaking of that person or who has been appointed within the previous two years to audit the trust account kept by that person. The Bill restricts any audit to the sole purpose of determining that a trust account is kept in accordance with the FIL Act and the examining auditor is required under the Bill to give the executive member a certificate of compliance with the FIL Act and particulars of each transaction which does not apply. Mr President the Bill tidies up the principal legislation, and closes some of the unintended loopholes which I've spoken about in past times.

If it passes through the House I foreshadow regulations will be made to ensure for example that money orders purchased at the post office will be subject to FIL. That was an unintended omission as I see it from the outset. I am aware that FIL is a most unpopular tax. I am also acutely aware as Minister for Finance that we rely at this time on the Financial Institutions Levy for a little more than 10% of all our public revenue. Given that reliance I consider it is important to ensure that the FIL is equitably incurred and that the avoidance unintended by the Act is minimised. Mr President I commend the Bill

MRS ANDERSON: Thank you Mr President. I would seek clarification from Mr Bennett on one point please. There has been considerable concern within the community that under this new legislation the government will be double dipping on collecting FIL thereby penalising those fair minded people who make their contribution to the public purse by banking their money. Can the Minister please confirm that when a bankcard account is paid by cheque on a Norfolk Island bank account using money on which FIL has already been assessed, that FIL will not be levied a second time on the same amount

MR BENNETT: Mr President yes if I could draw Mrs Anderson's attention to section 2(b)(3) the last words "but does not include an amount of money received by a financial institution for such a purpose by way of a cheque drawn on, or debit entry to an account kept by the person making the transfer or purchase with the financial institution where the money is received". So if you are paying by cheque its drawn on an account at that bank, there's no double dipping. The purpose of this amendment is not to double dip. We have gone to great lengths to ensure that there is no double dipping but the case you've just outlined is covered

MR KING: I just want to raise another query. I thought that Mr Bennett might address them all at the one time but I'll raise it now. Without reading through the Bill and understanding that there are regulations to be made Mr Bennett may like to advise the House whether the tourist for example who arrives here in the Island and transfers a substantial sum of money to his credit card account for the purposes of (a) avoiding carrying around lumps of cash in his pocket and (b) going about his shopping from one outlet to another, whether that person, a tourist, will be subject to FIL given that the objective of this was to establish a local tax rather than a tax on tourists

MR BENNETT: Mr President the current situation is that a visitor or anyone in fact outside transferring money to a financial institution in Norfolk Island is subject to the Financial Institutions Levy. This amendment Bill doesn't alter that in any way but I'm happy to have debate on that particular point. Obviously, Mr King has raised it and it's been raised with him by people undoubtedly. I'm happy to at least debate it but it is not intended that the status quo be changed. The

principle purpose of the amendment bill is to close those unintended loopholes from the original bill and to also bring into play the trust account audit provisions. There is provision in the Act to exempt certain trust accounts yet not contained in the bill was a process of auditing those trust accounts to ensure that the transactions in the trust account were legitimate and in accordance with the Act so that the two things that form the thrust of the bill are to close those unintended loopholes and to deal with the audit requirement provisions

MR ADAMS: Thank you Mr President. Just a question on that Geoff. Do you think with the loophole being closed whether this will be reflected in any retail pricing on the Island

MR BENNETT: No, I don't for one moment think that closing the loophole will alter in any way the retail pricing of any goods or services

MR ADAMS: Thank you Mr President. Just another question for you Geoff. Obviously these loopholes are of sufficient concern for you to bring forward this motion but I notice that in the revenue estimates for last year and the future financial year your revenue estimates are not increased at all. Why would that be

MR BENNETT; Mr President it is difficult to quantify just how much FIL is avoided by those unintended loopholes. In the case of the decision to bring money orders purchased at the Post Office under the FIL Act will have only a minor amount of increased FIL I think somewhere in the order of \$3,000. We are able to quantify that but to quantify how many transactions occur using bankcard as a means of depositing large sums of funds we are unable to get a handle on it so that as a result of that I wasn't able to add anything to the revenue

MR PRESIDENT: Thank you. Further participation. No further participation

MR BENNETT: Mr President I move that the debate be adjourned and the resumption of debate made an Order of the Day for the next sitting

MR PRESIDENT: Thank you. The question is that the debate be adjourned and the resumption of debate be made an Order of the Day for the next day of sitting

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you

ORDERS OF THE DAY

1 - APPROPRIATION BILL 1994-95

Notices are complete Honourable Members, we are moving to Orders of the Day and we are resuming debate on the question that the Bill be agreed to in principle

MR BENNETT: Thank you Mr President. When the Appropriation Bill 1994-95 was tabled at the last Sitting I made a lengthy statement about observations and some of the highlights of the Bill. I don't intend to repeat all that I said but just to pick out a few of the salient points from that Statement. At that time I said the Bill proposes expenditure totalling \$8.27 million and is expected to be funded by revenue estimated to be \$8.305m and as a consequence of mathematics it shows a modest surplus. I opinionated that it was a strong budget, positive but responsible noting that the revenue forecasts were still considered by many to be

ultra conservative but I also noted that there was optimism for the future and that there was an opportunity to review the budget from time to time throughout the financial year and I also agreed that if circumstances dictate that it will not be necessary to await the six monthly review, but we could review the budget at an earlier time if Members thought that was appropriate. I talked about the previous couple of years and how difficult they were but then went on to say that evidence from the tourist arrival statistics tabled by Mr King over the last four months have been very positive and that there was a great deal of hope that the increase in numbers would continue, that there was you will recall a further aggressive marketing approach or advertising approach to be taken and the Members were at some time soon going to see the marketing plan from the tourist organisation for the next few years, all positive stuff. I understand from Mr King in informal discussions in more recent days that the figures for this month which is the fifth month in a row will see an increase that's very strong as well. I also noted, and I think it came out in the debate that although the tourist arrival numbers are up we haven't seen yet a direct corresponding leap in the key revenue items such as customs duty and FIL for two, although we had seen a substantial increase in the receipts from Departure Fee Levy. I think it's been acknowledged that the impact on Customs Duty and FIL, Customs Duty in particular is not immediate, there is a leadtime for people to stock up after some confidence is there that visitor numbers were going to continue to rise so I'm hopeful that we will see some upturn in that as this year pans out. I spoke about the underpinning objectives of budgeting as I saw them and that was to continue to endeavour to live within the Island's means but a particular objective this time round and for the next year or so ought to be to replenish the Reserve Fund which at this time is at an all time low well not an all time low but an unacceptably low figure. Mr President I explained how the budget process went and also mentioned that not all bids for expenditure were successful that some \$800,000 odd expenditure bids had to be culled out but that we had successfully culled those out whilst still maintaining a balanced programme of works and services to keep both human and other resources fully occupied for the year. I explained that the budget proposed to spend \$8.27m which is about \$1m more than last year and that the ability to do that was as a result of an additional million or so dollars in revenue and I explained where that additional revenue was being derived from or where it was coming from. It included the postal operations and Telecom, both the phonecards and the re-arranged imbalances payments from Australia Post and finally Mr President I went on to highlight some of the key spending items in the budget. Some of the new programmes that were being taken on, the fact that we were able to get on and do some of the things that have had to be put into the second or third or fourth priority baskets over the last couple of years through lack of funds, that we had consciously focused additional funds in the area of tourism to ensure that the marketing plan which Mr King may soon give to this House will have sufficient funding to make it all work and finally Mr President I commanded the Bill to the House and I reiterate that commendation

MR BATES: Thank you Mr President. I support this Bill which I think generally meets the expectations of the community. It meets the cost of essential services of education, welfare and health and provides for the ongoing costs of administration and government. It also allows for some capital improvements and if, as I think, the revenue estimates do prove conservative we have the options of doing more capital improvements or reinstating some of our reserves which have been reduced to an unacceptable level over recent hard times. I am confident that this can be achieved without increases in tax and that in itself is welcome news. The Minister has mentioned that fees and services are now being reviewed and that expenditure cuts for reforms are still under review. It is however, my belief that future governments need to look beyond the simplistic balanced budget concept to the wider matter of the total Island economy which I believe is not well understood

by most. I can't pretend that this budget does much more than meet the generally accepted concept that balancing the budget is all that needs to be done by the Government in its financial management of the Island. However, I do believe we are making progress and beginning to understand that we need to look at the economy as a whole and the important role that both the public and private sectors play in the total picture. As well as the major issues confronting us I believe there are also exciting opportunities ahead for us and I do believe we can look forward with quite a lot of confidence in the future, thank you Mr President

MR ADAMS: Thank you Mr President. I think in itself it's a budget that pays our bills adequately and with a surplus which is good however, I think the Legislative Assembly and the Administration exist for a greater purpose than just paying bills and I believe that this purpose is the development of Norfolk Island's secure financial and cultural future and I also think this purpose is barely given lip service by this budget. We have to take into account that we are no longer the Advisory Council, simply advising the Administrator. We are moving toward a situation where we are grouping federal, state and local council powers and responsibilities in one basket in other words, I think we can be classified as a country in our own right, albeit one that is only five by three. I don't believe that this budget reflects that. This budget is more at home in 1978 not 1994. It does little for Norfolk culturally, it does little to broaden our revenue base, if anything it increases our near total dependency on the tourist dollar, it gives no confidence to the family person struggling to make ends meet, it gives no hope for the year 10 and 12 leavers that they can have some sort of secure career employment on Norfolk Island. Consider that the community pays \$1.3m per year for education on our children but after leaving school we can't even offer these people a typing course. No emphasis is placed on the fact that we are not self sufficient in the manufacture of any foodstuff, we now even import lemon juice into Norfolk Island. I think the Government needs to remember that it is a government of the total Norfolk Island community not just itself and its bills. It needs to actively participate in the development of the private sector, provide research and development guidance to the private sector, at least access to it, marketing assistance and provide upskilling for our community. I think the Government needs to recognise that it's not a them and us situation as in private and public sectors, it is actually a country situation. With a status quo budget like this I believe proper direction and development of our community is avoided. Bills are paid and the head is wedged firmly in the sand for yet another year. Thank you Mr President

MRS SAMPSON: Thank you Mr President. If the people demand additional or more sophisticated government services of course they've got to pay for them therefore this budget must be geared to pay the Administration accounts. Unfortunately there appears to be a cargo cult mentality here where the money and goodies are expected to fall out of the sky with no cost to the recipients. With a stagnant immigration policy which impacts on all aspects of life in the Island I can't see the projected revenue being achieved. The private sector does not appear to share the optimism seen around this table. There may be more tourists on the ground but their money is nearly all taken up with eating, accommodation and tours, the shops are hurting and this is where the customs revenue generates. It was to be hoped that this Assembly could arrest the slide to the welfare state that the majority of Members here now support and the progression is now self determined. Once services are introduced no one ever appears to remove them if they prove unnecessary or unworkable or just plain useless. It was to be hoped that the Members could have had the foresight to see the dangers ahead so although I appear to be out of step I will continue to challenge the socialist ideology that prevails and I will not go along with the unanimous, harmony and unity that it was suggested that this

Assembly portray and will no doubt continue to receive vitriolic attacks under parliamentary privilege because of my opposition

MR CHRISTIAN: Thank you Mr President. I intend to support the Appropriation Bill today but in so doing I must say that I endorse the comments made by Mr Brian Bates and Mr Robert Adams. I too have felt for a long time that not enough consideration is given to the Island as a whole in preparing our budget. I think we as a group are coming to terms with that and hopefully we can see some improvement in the future but I'm not about to withhold supply for the forthcoming financial year so I support Mr Bennett's Appropriation Bill but the support is qualified

MR KING: Thank you Mr President. A number of harsh statements have been made in this debate. I'm sure it's caught Mr Bennett unawares. I certainly didn't anticipate the harshness of the debate. I think it's somewhat cruel some of the things that have been said. Somewhat ill informed, and an expression in some cases of fairly poor judgement of what are the facts. With all due respect to Mr Adams' wider philosophies which I also embrace the budget does reflect new revenue bases, it does reflect new expenditure of \$1m which goes out into the community and it circulates in the community. That \$1m will theoretically turn into probably \$2-2.1/2m impact in the wider economy so I think it's a little harsh to say that the revenue base hasn't been widened. There are opportunities which will arise from that money circulating in the community in terms of jobs and upskilling hopefully, and I think there has been a degree in recent times of a changed attitude on the part of local employers to employ local people and to train them and I would hope that that additional money floating around in the economy will certainly enhance that. On the Public Sector side of things well obviously there are things that we can do which need not be explicitly set out in this budget and I'm hopeful that we can do those things, upskilling for example. In the budget itself we have made a provision of some \$25,000-30,000 for staff training and that's an unprecedented amount that has been allocated for staff training. I think the House is to be commended for taking that step. The benefits of that will flow not only to the work force in the public sector but onto the public service in terms of increased efficiency and therefore the benefits flow out into the wider community. I think it's being a little bit harsh to say that those things haven't been addressed. As far as industry diversification is concerned well of course, simply because there's not a specific provision in the budget for industry diversification doesn't mean that we can't offer the assistance of the kind that Mr Adams calls for. We can give advise, we can use our contacts on a government to government basis in the region to establish commercial contacts and to make commercial appraisals and the like. Those things don't necessarily cost money and they don't necessarily need a specific appropriation in the bill. Certainly I've done those things on a number of occasions without additional cost to the public purse. It's inappropriate to say that there's a stagnant immigration policy. I mean the effect of the immigration system or the immigration population policy may be that levels have stagnated over the years but currently there is a policy in place of a 2% target growth of 2% per annum. Now we can do no more than that. We couldn't expect in times of recessionary economies that people are going to line up to come to Norfolk Island. They are simply not going to do that. We can hope that as the economy improves as I'm in no doubt it will Mr President that there will be an increased number of people who want to come to the Island and perhaps replace those who are either departing or departing this world so those things will happen. It is not appropriate to say that there is a stagnant population policy pursued by this House and it's not appropriate to say that the tourism dollar is simply going in one direction or another. If there are commercial operators out there who have more skills and business acumen who are able to attract more people to their doors then

that's to their advantage and good on them. There are people out there who simply don't present well in business, who don't properly market their goods and services and products. Now they've got to upskill, it's not up to us to upskill or train or educate those people, they've got to lift their act a little bit. I acknowledge Mr Bennett's suggestion that the increased tourist numbers doesn't appear to have manifested itself in increased moneys in the public purse. Well I think we've all got to understand that it takes a little time for that tourist dollar to circulate in the community. There's a considered multiplier effect of 2.5 to 1 but it doesn't multiply overnight. It takes some time for that tourist dollar to spread through the community so whilst the increased tourist numbers may not have manifested themselves in recent times in increased expenditure by local people in the community there is no doubt in my mind that it will as that dollar starts to circulate. I think the bill is good, I think it's solid, I think we're going to address some of the concerns of Mr Adams, I personally won't be attacking Mrs Sampson in a vitriolic manner in the course of this House and I'm sure that no others will but nevertheless we won't impede her in the manner in which she wants to present her case in the House. Thank you. I'll support the Bill

MRS LOZZI-CUTHBERTSON: Mr President, I wish to support the Appropriation Bill and certainly certainly disagree with some of the negative comments that have been made about it. It only seems like yesterday that we were going through a very very severe recession and there was very little light at the end of the tunnel. Things seem to be turning around now and to expect them to turn around any faster would be just a little illusionary. I think the Appropriation Bill reflects some of the positive things that are on the horizon and has made the most of them. I could not expect it to do much more than it has done. Hopefully next year we will be in a different situation. It is a little confusing that certain people call the bill too socialist and certain people would like to see the government become much more socialistically inclined and become more interventionist so obviously there is not going to be a pleasing of everyone at some stage in the future. I support some of Mr Adam's preferences, I would like to see more done to encourage industry but at the moment I think we have to operate within limitations and I think it would be imprudent to spend money we do not have. If in fact the economy does turn around as it is hoped it certainly would be one of the priorities we should pay attention to, to try to stimulate local industry as much as we can but until we have the means safely on hand I would not like to see any extra expenditure on matters which may not bring immediate results. I generally support the bill because it seems to run a fair balance between encouraging and being prudent

MRS ANDERSON: Thank you Mr President. I intend to support the Bill as it stands. I think it's a fair estimate of our forthcoming year. I do support though Mr Adam's suggestions that to the extent possible we should support local industry, offer training, improve our local infrastructure which is of benefit to all the community. I agree also with Mrs Sampson that we do not want to become a socialist state. We do not want to offer handouts to people who are not prepared to help themselves. I think we are becoming very much a user pays environment and I think we should encourage people who want to work for themselves and help themselves rather than give handouts to people who are not prepared to help themselves. I do support the Bill

MR ADAMS: Thank you Mr President. I think the refusal of successive Assembly's to recognise and lessen such problems as our massive trading imbalance with Australia and New Zealand, our dangerous level of dependence on tourism, the amount of outside labour we import while not upskilling our own people, to name but a few, is again continued on by this budget. We need to be going about our business I believe, as does any other developing nation, albeit in our case a small

one. We need to identify our strengths and weaknesses. We need to direct resources to the areas where we are weak, particularly to assist the private sector to develop as this is where Norfolk's economic growth will come from. I think as long as the Island is continually faced with balance sheet budgets, progress in a real and measurable way will be very slow in coming and perhaps in twenty years time the problems I have mentioned will still be around. More residents will have left the Island to live elsewhere because the taxes have been increased to give these famous balanced bill paying budgets - it makes it difficult to make ends meet, it means that our dependence on itinerant labour will increase and as long as our economy remains recessed population figures will remain relatively stagnant and low, thereby the tax burden on the low population is always in danger of being increased to prop up these bill paying budgets. I think we really need to step back and look at the big picture. Get out of bill paying mode only and to provide hope and confidence for the future in our community. I support the Bill in a most qualified manner but I don't believe that this sort of status quo budget is the way to go for Norfolk considering our state of ongoing constitutional maturity and I hope next years budget is more appropriate to Norfolk Island 1995 rather than 1978, thank you

MR BENNETT: Mr President I have listened with great interest to Mr Adams and I think that he makes some very good points. I think one of the points that I respond to is the point that he made about Governments, Legislative Assembly or Administration needing to have a wider brief in terms economic management than simply as he expresses it, the bill paying syndrome. That's clearly a task set before us. We simply have to have a wider brief. I think it is fair to say that in the last couple of years we were scratching to even fund the most basic expenditure and there was absolutely no opportunity to become cute or try to expand the horizons too much. I think that I have expressed in both the times that I spoke on the budget and I don't apologise for it, that the revenue forecasts are conservative but that's the way I think it ought to have been fixed. I've spoken about the opportunities that are out there, we are unable right at this time to put a figure on it but just to give you an example in the budget there are some \$200-300,000 expected from phonecard revenue and in discussions yesterday the industry thinks that there are possibilities for Norfolk Island to exceed \$1m in the first year in phonecards. Now I'm certainly not going to be silly enough to put a million dollars in the revenue forecasts for phonecards because it is still from my part or the Governments part and the Administration's part as well, unknown territory but these additional bonuses that will come to the revenue will allow us to do a number of things. It will allow us to begin looking at a different way of doing budgets. It will allow us to perhaps develop more spending in some areas that have been starved over time but as to the question of funding business opportunities, well Mr Adams, you talk about that alot but I haven't yet seen too much evidence of people who are wanting to create businesses on the Island coming or being denied access to assistance. I know in your own case it is a fair case and I acknowledge that but there aren't alot of people out there who have responded to the opportunities. We called for expressions of interest. They really came to pretty well nought. They were very narrow in their focus so I'm a little bit confused, I'm not sure whether you are wanting to government to assess the market and create the opportunities and say to people these are all the opportunities who would like to come and pitch for us. I mean, I'm just as keen as everybody to see alternative industries or industries that will be able to augment our reliance on tourism but they have to be solidly based and not be flippant in nature or ill thought out. One can expend an awful lot of money chasing pipe dreams, I think people who have got an interest in developing things for Norfolk Island have to do a bit of work, if the proposals have any solid base to them then I'm certain for my part that the government will look at ways that they could make the pathway

smoother. As to the matter of insufficient money for staff training and no career opportunities for the Island, sure, in the last couple of years that too has had to suffer as we have struggled to make ends meet but as Mr King said, staff training at the level of 1% of the salaries that are paid in the public service is an objective and we are meeting it this year with \$25,000. That was not done lightly and we've created the way clear for two apprenticeships. Now I know that's not many but at least it is a start, we simply couldn't make the revenue basket go far enough around to cover every aspiration but I think it is attempting to try, while it is ostensibly there to pay the bills it has already embarked on a wider brief. Members who were part of the last Assembly will be aware that there was a fairly strong push towards having the whole way of budgeting transformed by way of programme budgeting rather than item by item, job by job. Now that project to look at that is not dead, it's with the Public Service and let me say something will come of that, whether it's accepted because it's not that easy, there are some parts of the Administration that adapt themselves well to programme budgeting and there are others that have the wrong way of going about it so we've got to learn how to separate the needs in terms of that kind of budgeting approach to maybe the more traditional approach but I do accept and I accept well the fact that we should all be acknowledging that there is a need for a wider brief in economic management.

Mrs Sampson made reference to one thing about the services we create and no-one does anything to review the services and they just seem to continue, well I took a decision earlier today not to read my statement that I made last time I launched the budget, two weeks ago, but perhaps I should have because I went to great pains to say, and I will repeat it now that very importantly just because of the additional revenue we believe we are going to get has not meant that the government has gone soft of the curbing of unnecessary inappropriate or wasted expenditure. There remains a solid commitment to explore every avenue of expenditure to this end, the Expenditure Review Committee has made a number of recommendations already and has some major rationalisation studies in train which are expected to bring considerable expenditure savings at the same time as increasing programme efficiencies. Mr President that group of people, it's not a short term commitment they will have a evolving and continuing role in examining on an ongoing basis, services, delivery of services, the outputs and the things that we do so I can't accept that that is something that we consciously do, that is, Mrs Sampson assertion that we have a tendency to create services and don't do anything about abolishing them when they become superfluous or whatever. Mr President that's all I have to say at this time

MR CHRISTIAN: Mr President I think we are kind of getting off the track from the matter before us at the moment. What we are talking about now is a Bill that authorises expenditure for next year not the wider philosophical implications so I move that the question be put

MR PRESIDENT: The question is that the question be put

MR BENNETT: Mr President if I may just make a comment about that. As I said

MR PRESIDENT: I am obliged to put that question. I need to gain the approval

MR BENNETT: May I debate that the question be put

MR PRESIDENT: No. Not that the question be put but Mr Christian did you want to allow further comment

MR CHRISTIAN: So long as it doesn't take too long Mr President

MR BENNETT: Mr President also mentioned in the address two weeks ago was a comment and it's important to what Mr Christian has just said that the annual Appropriation Legislation provides a dual opportunity. You deal with the budget on one hand but it is the only other opportunity other than the adjournment debates where a Member may rise and talk about almost anything so Members of this House are able to get off the subject. They can talk about last Saturday's football results for that matter, that's one of the privileges of an Appropriation Bill process but having made that point I'm happy

MR PRESIDENT: It is open to Members to make motions of their choice to the House at any time. The question is that the motion be put

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. The question before the House Honourable Members is that the Bill be agreed to in principal

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

MRS SAMPSON NO

Would I call the House Mrs Sampson? No. Mrs Sampson is against. The motion that the Bill be agreed to in principle is carried. Do you wish to dispense with the detail stage Honourable Members. That is dispensed with therefore I seek a final motion

MR BENNETT: Mr President I move that the Bill be agreed to

MR PRESIDENT: Any final debate? I put the question that the Bill be agreed to

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

MRS SAMPSON NO

The Bill is carried with Mrs Sampson being against thank you

NO 2 POSTAL SERVICES (CHARGES) AMENDMENT BILL 1994

MR PRESIDENT: We are resuming debate on the question that the Postal Services (Charges) Amendment Bill 1994 be agreed to in principle

MR BENNETT: Mr President at the last meeting I presented the Postal Services (Charges) Amendment Bill 1994 and commented that it makes a minor amendment to the Postal Services Act to remove the hitherto free mail privileges from most agencies of the Norfolk Island Administration and Australian Government entities in Norfolk Island. I went on to say that the Bill rose as a result of
I have pleasure the Postal Services (Charges) Amendment Bill 1994. Mr President I move that the Bill be agreed to in principal. This Bill makes a minor amendment to the Postal Services Act 1983 to remove mail privileges from most agencies of the Norfolk Island Administration and Australian Government entities in Norfolk Island.

The Bill is a result of a report by the government's Internal Auditor who in 1993 drew attention to the fact that the Norfolk Island Postal Service subsidises other government agencies to an amount estimated in excess of \$30,000 per annum. The

intention of this Bill was to end the current situation whereby bodies such as the School, the Norfolk Island Hospital and the Administrator's Office receive free mail privileges. The Bill also makes clear that other agencies, whether under the auspices of the Norfolk Island Government or the Commonwealth, should pay for using the Norfolk Island Postal Service. I went on to comment that some had said that the result is just the same. The same amount of money that will need to be dealt with differently. It will create a journal entry but the amount of dollars will be exactly the same however I think the point made is that in modern accounting procedures true costs should be reflected in an organisations ledger and the purpose of making this minor amendment is to allow that to happen. That was the thrust of the Bill Mr President and I continue to commend it

MR PRESIDENT: Any further discussion? No. I put the question that the Bill be agreed to in principle

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. Do you wish to dispense with the detail stage. It's so dispensed with and I seek a final motion that the Bill be agreed to

MR BENNETT: Mr President I move that the Bill be agreed to

MR PRESIDENT: Any final debate? I then will put that final question that the Bill be agreed to

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. That Bill is agreed to

NO 3 HEALTHCARE (REFERRAL) AMENDMENT BILL 1994

MR PRESIDENT: We are resuming debate on the question that the Bill be agreed to in principle

MRS LOZZI-CUTHBERTSON: Mr President, in moving the Healthcare (Referral) Amendment Bill 1994 I might inform the House that there has been some concern expressed that the new section 20(1) might negate the current referral guidelines. I was not certain that these concerns did not have some validity so I sought a legal opinion.

I have received that advise and am satisfied the new section does not affect application of the referral guidelines that exist and that they will continue to stand as a guide to the professional discretion of medical staff. They will not require or of themselves prevent a referral. The Bill will therefore ensure the law reflects the operation of referrals to specialists both on and off the Island which currently exists. I commend the Bill

MR BENNETT: Mr President I hear what Mrs Cuthbertson said about the legal opinion but I wonder at the end of the day whether, if a person who thought they may have seen an opportunity to have medical treatment other than those prescribed in the Act done, by following the Act itself and disregarding the guidelines believing that the Act might surpass the guidelines, we may well have a dispute on our hands that may well be resolved inadvertently or otherwise by an executive member's decision. I mean you can imagine that the pressure of somebody returning after having \$5,000-10,000 worth of medical treatment and saying but here is the Act, the Act says if a service isn't available on the Island then I ought to be

referred and sure the guidelines spell it out, but when push comes to shove there is a fear that unless you can make it very clear in the Act then the possibility is there for a dispute and I think that the people who are phoning in about the concern that they saw in the bill all were of the like mind that there is an opportunity to have a situation arise that may well be resolved favourably to the person having got medical treatment but against the spirit of the Act in causing some financial consequence. My view was that if it was at all possible the Act should make clear what the intention is without directing or curbing the medical superintendent's duty to make referrals when he or she sees them. I'm not sure whether I've made that clear but the Act says words to the effect that there are certain services not available on the Island or in other circumstances there should be a referral and the guideline actually spells them out, but there has to be a life or death situation or there has to be a situation which might cause undue hardship for a person not to be referred and all those sorts of things. Cosmetic surgery sort of doesn't fit into that but it does fit neatly into the Act. You can't have cosmetic surgery on Norfolk Island so a person may justifiably argue that as it is not available on the Island then I ought to be referred

MRS LOZZI CUTHBERTSON: Well thank you Mr President. My advise is that subparagraph 1(b) of the Referral Guideline limits the circumstances where an off Island referral can be given to those where the provision of a service is necessary to prevent loss of life or undue suffering. On the broader matter of tightening up the operation of the Guideline my understanding is that they have been used most prudently by the Medical Officers at the Hospital. Not being legally trained I can only go by the legal advise I receive and I have been assured after particularly raising this doubt that you've mentioned, by the Crown Solicitor that the Act is restrictive rather than permissive. This may not stop people from arguing and going into dispute and I don't see how you can ever stop people going into dispute if they wish to but I can only go by the assurance I've been given that the Act is clear and that it will not allow for the granting of payments of bills which do not fall within the Guidelines

MRS SAMPSON: Mr President could I ask Mrs Cuthbertson, isn't the brake on that the Healthcare Committee that is in operation - on referral. That if a person wishes to have a referral and it's refused by the Doctor they can take their request to the Healthcare Committee

MRS LOZZI CUTHBERTSON: I honestly do not know if that has superior powers, I would have to check on that. In referring it back for legal advise I was wanting to make sure that the Act itself was clear, that nothing could over-ride it because the legislation is the final authority and have indeed been assured that this is the case

MR BENNETT: I hear what Mrs Cuthbertson said and I have no reason to doubt the validity of the advise that she has had, it is simply that I have this underlying concern that Guidelines can be made so easily. For example, Mrs Cuthbertson may make Guidelines tomorrow that are different to the ones we've got now yet the Act takes an action in this place to make a change and whether there was any way of linking the Guidelines to the Act by having it prescribed or something. I don't know, it's just there is that underlying concern. It doesn't come from a wide section but it is enough to be a little bit worrisome

MRS SAMPSON: Another question if I may Mr President. Does Mrs Cuthbertson inherit the Guidelines of the last Minister for Health who inherited it from the Minister for Health before him or can you make your own adjustments

MRS LOZZI CUTHBERTSON: The guidelines issued by the previous Minister for Health are still enforced. At this point I see no good reason why they should be changed and I certainly hasten to reassure Mr Bennett that I have no plans to loosen the Guidelines on a whim without discussing them with my colleagues or for any other reason. If there are good solid reasons put before me why they should be then I would consult with my colleagues as well. The Guidelines that exist at present were issued by the previous Minister for Health as I understand it, they can be altered from time to time if there are good reasons for altering them

MR PRESIDENT: Any further participation? No further participation. The question before us is that the Bill be agreed to in principle

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. Do you wish to dispense with the detail stage of this piece of legislation. It's so dispensed with and therefore I seek a final motion that the Bill be agreed to

MRS LOZZI CUTHBERTSON: Mr President I move that the Bill be agreed to

MR PRESIDENT: Any final words? I then will put that final question that the Bill be agreed to

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. That Bill is agreed to

Honourable Members I have been requested not to call on the next and therefore I will not so we move on

FIXING OF THE NEXT SITTING DAY

MR ADAMS: Thank you Mr President. I move that the House at its rising adjourn until Wednesday 20 July 1994 at 10 am

MR PRESIDENT: Thank you Mr Adams. That is the third Wednesday as is our normal procedure Honourable Members. Any discussion on that? No, I put the question that that motion be agreed

QUESTION PUT
MOTION AGREED

The ayes have it. We agree that we meet next on Wednesday 20th July

ADJOURNMENT

MR CHRISTIAN: Mr President I move that the House do now adjourn

MR PRESIDENT: The question is that the House do now adjourn. Any participation in the adjournment debate?

MR KING: Thank you Mr President. Earlier on in this meeting I was asked a question about topsoil. What might have happened to the

topsoil from an exercise undertaken by Administration people up at the school. Well it's been confirmed to me that the soil that was excavated during the placement of playground equipment at the school was used only for school purposes.

That the majority of the soil was used to fill a hollow and level the ground behind the equipment. A couple of loads were made available for the school groundsman to use on the school grounds and the balance of the soil was used to cover the area where the water and sewerage line was laid in the school grounds. I think it's important to get that information back now to the Meeting and therefore to the community so that it avoids the suspicions that might arise in the community's minds as to what happened to this valuable and somewhat scarce commodity or quantity of topsoil. So that's what's happened to the topsoil and that's for Mrs Anderson's information and for the interest of the House

MR PRESIDENT: Thank you. Any further participation?
No further participation and I therefore put the question that that motion be agreed to that the House does now adjourn

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

Therefore on that basis Honourable Members this House will stand adjourned until Wednesday 20th July 1994 at 10.00 am.

--oo0oo--