

Good morning Honourable Members. 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, Amen

**Condolences**

MR SPEAKER Honourable Members I firstly ask if there are Condolences

**Petitions**

Honourable Members are there any Petitions this morning?

**Notices**

Notices. Are there any Notices?

**Questions without Notice**

Questions without notice. Are there any Questions without notice

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Speaker. A question to Mr Adams. A question that was asked of me during the week. Now that Mrs Sampson has left the Island and is no longer part of the Assembly I was asked whether the Waste Management Committee will still operate now that she has departed and if so, when will they meet again

MR ADAMS Thank you Mr Speaker. Thank you George for the question. Mr Speaker I am at this stage considering my options in regard to the Waste Management Committee. I haven't reached any definite decision at this stage, but when I do I will keep Mr Smith informed thank you

MR BATES Thank you Mr Speaker, my first question is to Mrs Lozzi Cuthbertson, responsible for legal matters. Could the Minister inform the House if she is still pursuing the matter of bankruptcy legislation and if so, what is the present status

MRS LOZZI CUTHBERTSON Thank you Mr Speaker. As Mr Bates knows, I have brought this matter before the MLA's on a number of occasions, and generally the impression I had was that there were not sufficient numbers to pursue the matter. The drafting of legislation will in fact be lengthy and demanding and in fact we have a very long list of legislation already to be prepared in the remaining period of this Assembly. However, recently I have received communication from the Commonwealth asking us to relook at this issue and I intend to bring all my papers together and consult MLA's again at the next meeting about this very issue

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Further questions

MR BATES Thank you Mr Speaker, a further question for Mrs Lozzi Cuthbertson, responsible for Healthcare. On several occasions (**microphone went off**) ...Members, when travelling overseas. Has the Minister been able to follow this up

MRS LOZZI CUTHBERTSON Thank you Mr Speaker. My memory failed me. It's just a blank hole there. I can only say no, I haven't looked at this recently. I will



control of the army worm. Have you had any further information on them

MR CHRISTIAN                    Thank you Mr Speaker. In recent days in fact, yes, some correspondence has arrived from one of the research facilities in New Zealand. There is a biological control that is available that is in the form of all things, a wasp which eats the grubs in its very early stages before they inflict too much damage. I've had a draft programme outlined in that letter which would include a number of site visits to the Island and the eradication programme or control programme would probably stretch over something like three or four years from start to finish. At this stage I don't have any costings for the exercise and officers of the Administration have gone back to the research facilities in New Zealand seeking that advise and when it's forthcoming I will circulate it to Members

MR BATES                        Thank you Mr Speaker. One final question for Mr Christian. Does the Minister have any accurate estimates of the cost implications both long and short term for the land package legislation to be considered later this morning

MR CHRISTIAN                    Thank you Mr Speaker. Up to date once all the legislation that is before the House today and a couple of other smaller pieces that will be dealt with at the next meeting, the legislative package I suppose for the land package has cost, or will cost, somewhere in the vicinity of \$466,000 and of that, approximately \$330,000 has come from the Commonwealth and \$136,000 has come from the public purse here in Norfolk Island. I expect to complete the legislative package, that is, in regards to the protected lands in Norfolk Island, will cost an additional \$30,000 and that will be funded at this time in any event, purely from within the Norfolk Island area as the Commonwealth has indicated that they would most likely be unable to contribute. As far as the long term impact goes, I think I said at the last meeting, there will be some short term hire costs until the new register is up and running, but after that is established, I think it will be pretty much back to business as usual as we know it now

MR SPEAKER                      Are there any further Questions without Notice this morning Honourable Members?    No

**Questions on Notice**

MR SPEAKER                      We will move to then Questions that are on Notice. There is one to the Minister for Tourism and Finance. Did you want to respond to that Mr King

MR KING                         Yes thank you Mr Speaker I'm happy to. The question placed on Notice Mr Speaker relates to my recent travel to Bangkok and an effort to extract from me how much I have spent in public moneys on that travel. Mr Speaker I will be as frank as possible in dealing with this question and I'm happy to provide the information in as much as an exercise in keeping the community informed but I suspect that in reality this is a political point scoring attempt by Mr Smith. In fact, it's one of the oldest political tricks in the books to poke at ministerial travel costs and the usual rub off in the community of course is resentment and political backlash. I suggest Mr Speaker that that's the basis of this attempt, a point scoring exercise. I mentioned in this House that the reasons for the absence or trip referred to in the question was not only to attend the PATA conference in Bangkok but to undertake some staff recruitment interviews in Sydney on my return from Bangkok. An exercise which otherwise Mr Speaker would have resulted in the travel costs of five short listed job applicants coming to Norfolk Island for an interview. The cost of the trip as far as I was concerned was in the order of \$6,400 of which \$5,932.99 cents was paid for from the public purse. The remaining \$400-500 Mr Speaker came from my pocket because of the lousy allowances paid to Ministers. The expenses of the Marketing Consultant Mr Doyle amounted to

some \$3,800 and were charged to the Tourist Bureau. Mr Speaker I happily acknowledge these costs as legitimate and necessary expenses of Government. At the risk of repeating myself I re-emphasise that Government's owe it to their communities to remain abreast of current activities in all areas. Particularly areas of course which affect our own communities and to make and maintain Government and industry contacts which will enable us to provide positive influences and outcomes. For example, at the relevant PATA conference discussions in relation to the Ansett and Air New Zealand merger. Discussions in relation to Crisis Management in Tourism. Particular interest I would have thought to Norfolk Island given that we are a single industry economy. If I'm to be criticised at all Mr Speaker, I should be criticised for not travelling enough. Mr Smith had it right when as Tourism Minister he travelled some 70% more than me. He in fact jumped on a plane every other month. I travel about once every four months or four times a year to be more precise. Perhaps the Fifth Assembly of which Mr Smith was a Minister, got it right by immediately doubling the amount of public monies spent on travel then what was spent by the prior Assembly, the Fourth Assembly. Maybe the Sixth and Seventh Assembly of which I've been a Minister have got it wrong by reducing expenditure from that spent by the Fifth Assembly by some 40%. However, Mr Speaker I maintain that my record in relation to frequency of travel and expenses of travel compares more than favourably against any of my ministerial predecessors who have held similar responsibilities and further Mr Speaker, I would close by challenging any current or former Minister or Member to match my record for the number of times I have returned unspent moneys to the public purse, thank you

#### **Presentation of Papers**

MRS LOZZI CUTHBERTSON Thank you Mr Speaker. In accordance with paragraph 41(2)(a) of the Interpretation Ordinance 1979 I table the Census and Statistics Regulations 1996 and the Road Traffic General Amendment No 2 Regulations 1996

MR SPEAKER Thank you Mrs Cuthbertson. Any further Presentation of papers this morning

MR KING Mr Speaker, I table the inbound passenger statistics for May 1996 and move that they be noted

MR SPEAKER The question is that they be noted

MR KING Mr Speaker, thank you very much. The figures for May 1996 compared to May 1995 show an improvement of 8.9% overall, which places us at this time of the year compared to the same time last year, as a 4.4%+ situation. Compared to 1994, two years ago, we are 10.2%. I mention those figures just to demonstrate that there is sustained growth in that particular area. For the month, an improved contribution from the Queensland market to 22%. A reduced contribution from the New South Wales market down to 29% and I suspect, I think quite rightly, that that has a lot to do with the marketing efforts of the Country Music Festival to which I offer some commendation for their efforts during May and the success of their Festival, thank you

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Any debate on the question that these papers be noted

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Speaker. I reiterate what Mr King says about the increase in numbers during the month of May this year and last year and possibly also the year before through the efforts of the people who are involved in the Country Music Festival, and I think there's other things that need mentioning too, and that is the fact that the RSL had a special week in May this year which

also contributed to an increase in our tourist numbers. I take that back, that was April was it. There was also the Bowling Club. Another organisation that puts a lot of effort into attracting people here for specific events like the Bounty Bowls tournament and I appreciate the Minister making mention of those organisations that do contribute to increasing our tourist numbers

MR SPEAKER Thank you Mr Smith. Further contributions? The question that the inbound tourist figures be noted

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

The ayes have it that Paper is noted thank you. Are there any further Papers to present this morning

MR KING Thank you Mr Speaker. I table at this stage the proposed budgets for the Government Business Enterprises and move that the document be noted

MR SPEAKER The question is that those Papers be noted

MR KING Thank you Mr Speaker. This is an attempt to get into this public arena the proposed budgets for the Government Business Enterprises. There is an arguable question as to whether the provisions of the Public Moneys Ordinance relating to Appropriation Bills applies to the Government Business Enterprises. That question remains unresolved in my mind. I simply continue with the practices of former Finance Ministers in tabling these for discussion in the House, after which it would be my intention, come the 1st July, to give authority to these budgets by signing this proposed document. I make just a couple of brief words Mr Speaker. I mentioned in my presentation on the revenue fund budget that the Business Enterprises make a contribution of some 35% towards general revenues. That has risen consistently and regularly over the years and I think 35% contribution to this year's general revenue is probably the highest contribution for some time, if not all time. That contribution to general revenue is largely from three areas. Two areas in fact this year and that is from the Liquor Bond which regularly makes a contribution between \$720,000-750,000 to general revenue and the Telecommunications Business Undertaking which makes a healthy contribution every year. Mr Speaker these budget proposals reflect simply a level of commercial activity to be undertaken by these businesses during the year. Nothing more. There has been a realistic and earnest attempt to instil a degree of additional responsibility and accountability with the Business Managers and there has been a positive response by those Business Managers and by the Public Service generally. They will be given more authority to deal with a range of miscellaneous expenditures in each of their areas, but they will have less money to do so, and they will have the authority to shuffle things around within those miscellaneous expenditure areas to achieve certain targets and certain expenditure totals. I think at this point in time I will listen to other Members Mr Speaker. I have nothing more to say at this point

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Are there any participants in this debate which is on the budgetary papers relating to GBE's, be noted

MRS LOZZI CUTHBERTSON Thank you Mr Speaker. I support these budgets for the GBE's and I particularly support the added flexibility that has been given to the Managers in the sundry expenditures area. I like the Minister's approach of cutting the requests for the sundry expenses by 5% and generally allowing the Managers to re-order their priorities as put forward in the first place to operate within a 5% lesser amount. That kind of flexibility should be encouraged in more areas and not just the sundry expenditure area perhaps in the future, but let us







We are at Notices Honourable Members

**NO 1 - PUBLIC SERVICE ACT 1979 - APPOINTMENT OF A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD**

MRS LOZZI CUTHBERTSON Thank you Mr Speaker. I move that this House under Sub-Section 13(B)(A)(i) of the Public Service Act 1979 resolves to appoint John Thornton Pearson, being a person referred to in paragraph 13(B)(A)(3)(a) of that Act, to be a Member of the Public Service Board for the period 26 June 1996 to 15 March 1998. Mr Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to also thank Mr Bob Elvey who has been a member of the public Service Board until today, for his sterling contribution to the work of the Public Service Board, which is certainly not an easy job for anyone in the community to undertake and in this respect I am very grateful that Mr John Pearson has agreed, with some hesitation I may mention to become a Member of the Public Service board. I also must indicate, that in Mr Pearson agreeing to take on this responsibility he has wrung from me a promise that I will see that a Revision of the public Service Act takes place in the remainder of this Assembly's life and as I have done so before, I reiterate that this certainly will happen. I commend Mr Pearson's nomination to the House

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Any further debate? No. Then I put the question that that motion be agreed to

QUESTION PUT

QUESTION AGREED

The ayes have it thank you, that motion is agreed

**NO 2 - TOURIST ACCOMMODATION (OWNERSHIP) ACT 1989 - MAKING OF REGULATIONS IN RELATION TO TRIGGER MARKET SHARE**

MR KING Thank you Mr Speaker. I move that in terms of paragraph 6(2)(b) of the tourist Accommodation (Ownership) Act 1989 this House resolves to approve the making of regulations prescribing a trigger market share of 10% in relation to the ownership of accommodation units. Mr Speaker, this motion and the one following are among the final steps in what we have termed the deregulation of the tourist accommodation industry. I foreshadowed on a number of occasions the need to objectively determine what we believe to be a fair chunk of the market to own or control. In previous years the trigger market shares set in relation to tourist accommodation have been 30%, in relation to units 20% in more recent years, in relation to self contained units alone. Both of those - well they were both set objectively - but their objectives were to ensure that certain individuals or organisations in the Island didn't get any bigger than they were at that present time. The objective on this occasion in terms of the wider question of deregulation is for us to address the question of how many players or how wide do we want to spread the benefits of tourism. After some discussion among members I bring forward a proposal that we establish by regulation that no one person should hold any more than 10% of the total tourism accommodation in the Island. Now Mr Speaker, the fact of the matter is that there are three or four individuals or organisations who already exceed 10%. Not by much, but they already exceed 10%. I will not be making any proposals that those persons divest themselves and they will be protected from the requirement to divest themselves by the operation of the law.

They will however, be prevented from getting any bigger if that is the wish of the House. That's the basis of the motion Mr Speaker. It is not my intention to move it to finality today. I'm happy to leave it sit on the table for the next meeting

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Debate Honourable Members. No Debate

MR KING Thank you Mr Speaker. I would so move the adjournment to

the next meeting Mr Speaker

MR SPEAKER Thank you. The question is that the debate be adjourned and the resumption of debate be made an order of the day for a subsequent day of sitting

QUESTION PUT

QUESTION AGREED

The ayes have it thank you, that matter is so adjourned

NO 3 - TOURIST ACCOMMODATION ACT 1984 - MAXIMUM NUMBER OF ACCOMMODATION HOUSES IN THE CATEGORY OF HOTELS

MR KING Thank you Mr Speaker I move that this House resolves (1) to repeal all previous quotas fixed in accordance with subsection 8(1) of the Tourist Accommodation Act 1984; and (2) for the purposes of subsection 8(1) of the Tourist Accommodation 1984, to fix five as the maximum number of accommodation houses in the category of hotels. Thank you Mr Speaker, this motion is probably the most important part of the package of tourist accommodation matters to be addressed by the Assembly. The motion will effectively lift the long standing moratorium on new accommodation development and I am sure it will be welcomed by those in the community who for many years have waited patiently, not always quietly, in the wings to join the industry. The motion is necessary Mr Speaker if the community is to enjoy steady growth towards the year 2005 target of 340,000 bed nights which has already been agreed by this House after close and extensive consultation with the community. On the face of it Mr Speaker the words of this motion might suggest that it is going to be an unmanaged free for all. That is certainly not the case.

This motion and the law itself will be supported by a strong policy which will guide the issue of new accommodation licenses. It is the clear intention of this House that new accommodation be approved in an orderly and sustainable manner, consistent with the desire for balanced, orderly growth in the tourism industry itself. Those in this House or in the community who are concerned that the matter might get out of hand or out of control can perhaps draw some comfort from the fact that the statutory mechanism to impose quotas will remain in place and will be a tool which is readily accessible and available to the Assembly to use. This motion also specifically addresses the category of hotels and seeks to give effect to Members wishes that for the foreseeable future there should be a maximum number of 5 Hotels within the Tourist accommodation industry. That is one over the existing number. Again Mr Speaker I intend to leave this motion sitting on the Table until the next meeting.

MR SPEAKER Thank you Mr King. Debate Honourable Members?

MR BATES Thank you Mr Speaker. The Motion itself leaves a few questions as to what is meant by an additional hotel. I think past debate in this House has been in favour of an up-market hotel, not necessarily competing with the present hotels for the same type of clientele and that certainly where my support lies and I'm not sure how the Minister intends to allocate this additional hotel. I hope it's not first in best dressed because I think when this hotel goes ahead it needs to be something that is up-market that's the sentiments behind a lot of things that have been said around this House. It needs to be up-market to cater for the different type of clientele. So I just make those comments at this stage.

MR SPEAKER Further debate.

MRS CUTHBERTSON Thank you Mr Speaker. This two motions. The one that went through before have been looked at from various directions in various other forms. I'm reassured by some of the provisions of the Bills that already have passed

through this House or the other one that is still waiting for finalisation with regard to Tourist Accommodation. They set a structure for allowing people who want to develop a hotel or any further accommodation to gain provisional approval which gives them a certain amount of time to submit full plans, costings etc. The other guidelines with regard to the disposal of waste and the utilisation of power and so on which will ensure that when the final guidelines or the proposed final guidelines are submitted to the relevant Executive Member a very fair decision can be made as to the quality of what is to be built and I think we need to look to a very strong policy to go hand in hand with these proposals to ensure that we can all be happy that whichever Executive Member at any future time has to deal with these kind of proposals will have a very carefully thought out framework against which to make decisions as to what will be built on Norfolk Island in the future. In this respect I certainly support the procedures that are in motion to deregulate the industry but look forward to the content of the policy that will go hand in hand with the procedures before this House today. Thank you Mr Speaker.

MR SPEAKER

Further debate Honourable Members. Mr Adams.

MR ADAMS

Thank you Mr Speaker. Mr Speaker I'm my position on this is that I favour deregulation of the Accommodation Industry in a structured manner. There's two parts to it. One is the deregulation of Hotels from the present position that they occupy now and also deregulation of other non-hotel establishments. Mr Speaker, while supporting deregulation of the Tourist Accommodation in the area of units and self contained establishments, my feet get very heavy concerning hotels. Mr speaker, however from my feelings from my colleagues around the table I think my concerns about the hotel are rather academic I've got the feeling it's going to go through whatever my concerns are, but I think Members need to reflect on the prime question concerning a hotel. I don't necessarily think that the prime question is whether where all the funds or resources are available onshore or whether the funds and resources are available off-shore to put together such an establishment. The prime question I believe for Norfolk Island is can our environment afford it? Mr Speaker, it seems to me that the environmental impact of a hotel has not been properly canvassed and has not been properly thought through and at the time Members see fit to agree to the extra hotel being part of the quota then when the applications, such as they are come through, Members will need to be able to answer very firmly that yes, the environment can afford the impost of such an establishment. Thank you Mr Speaker.

MR SMITH

Thank you Mr Speaker. Just a few words. The less I say the sooner we'll get this thing built I think. I think Members should remember that we've already passed a motion about the hotel a couple of months ago and asked the Minister to bring forward the legislation to allow that to happen and that's what this is all about. I take into consideration Mr Adams' concerns too about the environment and things. It's really important with what we're doing. We've got to be really careful with that. As for the type of hotel that we're going to get. I think Brian mentioned we don't want something that's no different to what we already have, not that there's anything wrong with the ones we've got but also in that motion we talked about a first-class hotel already the expression of interest we've received, the Minister has received them and I have received some also. They're already talking about a first-class hotel and I'm sure the one that gets chosen will be of a very high standard and it won't be competing with the hotels. That's all I have to say at this stage. Thank you Mr Speaker.

MRS ANDERSON

Thank you Mr Speaker. Mr Speaker I'm in support of Mr Kings' motion. I believe that a deregulation of the Tourist Industry can only be of benefit to Norfolk Island. As regard to the hotel, I believe that we do need a new hotel and as we have discussed in the House the need on Norfolk Island is for a better hotel, a first-class hotel and I agree with Mr Bates comments in this regard. Like Mr Adams I'm very concerned about the environmental impact of the hotel, but I believe that we have the mechanism to ensure that any future





support it. I believe that we have to look very carefully at our water resources on Norfolk Island. We can't keep sticking holes in the ground and thinking that the water will always be there. It's been in the past the easy way out, rather than go to the trouble and expense of catching the water from roof areas in Norfolk Island, people have preferred to sink a bore when it wasn't necessary. I think that until we have a clear picture of what our water situation is as suggested by Mr King, we will have to continue to have a moratorium on the sinking of bores and wells and I commend the motion. Thank you Mr Speaker.

MR SPEAKER

Thank you Mrs Anderson. Further debate?

MR SMITH

Thank you Mr Speaker. I don't know why I should support this Bill. I've got no facts in front of me. I've got plenty of analytical evidence about it. I remember a discussion 4 or 5 years ago that was very similar to this about the Islands' ground supply of water running out. A few of us took a visit to an expert, or Norfolks' best expert in drilling, and underground things, I think it's a Geologist or something, who said there is plenty of water. There's a mass of water table underneath the Island and it stretches some 50 miles south of the Island, but we don't know that as Mr King said, maybe it's time for us to take a look at and find out just how much water is down there. Maybe we do have to spend that money. But there is some questions in my mind. If somebody has a well or a bore that is their main supply of water, they may have had it for 20 or 30 years and it's needs to be expanded or deepened, do we say to them, no you can't have it, you just have to buy a tank and hope it rains. I just wonder if we're taking those people into account, if there is anybody in that situation, I'm not saying there is, but Mr Adams has already convinced me that this should be supported and I therefore will support it. Thank you Mr speaker.

MR ADAMS

Thank you Mr Speaker. Just to pick up a few points that Mr Smith has raised. Firstly it is quite true there are lot of facts unknown to us. There's a whole range of things that are unknown to us. What I'm saying with this motion Mr Speaker is for us to have pause, while we put in place a policy direction, and in that policy direction we'll be requiring some a great deal of movement as to a strategy regarding proper conservation of water Mr Speaker. What this motion does is effectively prevent any movement on the impost front if you like regarding artesian water until such time as an overall policy is in place under which we can make realistic and proper decisions, rather than the adhoc while the manner in which this thing has been done in the past and Mr Speaker I continually run into the point that the water situation regarding the marginality if you like of the situation is only anecdotal, you put it this way, if I've got a tank, a pump and a tap and the tap stops running Mr speaker and I look in the tank and there's no water, and I tell somebody else that that's the situation, that's anecdotal but it doesn't put any more water in the tank, so Mr Speaker what I'm attempting to do with this motion is to give us pause, until we have a proper summing up of the fact as we are able to find them and put in place a reasonable management strategy under which we make decisions. Mr Speaker, the intent is not to have a moratorium on bores and wells for ever and a day. It's simply to be put in place to give us pause until such time as we have a dedicated and properly structured policy under which we make decisions. Thank you.

MR CHRISTIAN

Thank you Mr Speaker. I intend supporting Mr Adams' motion today. There is a lot that we don't know about our ground water reserves and in fact, a recent study undertaken in the KAVHA area would indicate that ground water coming to the surface in some of our creeks is in fact 25 years old. How they determine the age of that water I'm not sure but that's the advice that's been given to me and it will probably be borne out by further studies so I think it would be irresponsible not to support this motion that's before us today.

MR SPEAKER

Any final debate Honourable Members before I put the



Firstly we usually end up with a better result than we've budgeted for. Balanced budgets almost without exception end up as a surplus, deficit budgets almost always end up with a smaller deficit or even a surplus, and the surplus budget usually produces a larger surplus than was thought and this seems that the 1995/96 year about to end fits nicely into this category and I believe we should be telling the community what we intend to do with the surplus when we have one. We could reduce taxes because morally I don't believe we have the right to tax the community just to create a surplus for which we have no plans. We could put some away for that rainy day and we could put some of it in the bank or some of it back into the community for some worthwhile or needed project. In putting some of it back it's just possible that we might end up with that bogey of Norfolk Island politics, a deficit. I've repeatedly said that as far as practical we should be surplus budgeting in good times, creating a reserve and deficit budgeting in bad times thereby propping up the overall economy. Too often I've seen Ministers of Government drastically reduce Government spending in bad times thereby worsening the effect on the Island economy as a whole. Let me give you a simple example \$50,000 would adequately employ 2 people for 12 months, full time or 4 people half time. In bad times just \$50,000 spent in such a manner would be a direct injection into the economy, because the bulk of that would be spent by those people in the private sector economy. Conversely when times are bad the retrenchment of 2 staff would save the Government \$50,000 allowing to perhaps balances the budget, pat itself on the back but in reality there's \$50,000 less to go around in the wider community, less duty for the Government, less petrol levy, less turnover in the business sector, a direct deterioration in the economy. In follow to the planned deficit budget can benefit the community, it can inject back into the economy surpluses of previous years, but we must know what is causing the deficit. It is only when our day to day operating commitments cause a deficit that we're in trouble. If that deficit is planned to help the economy or to create a community asset or benefit then it could be good government and not a political disaster. During the recent downturn in the economy we did severely deplete our reserves, but we did also create a bit of casual employment and some part-time work. Our reserves served us well but they did go close to depletion. I have no difficulty with Mr Kings' budgeting for a surplus however if 1995/96 ends up as a substantial surplus as he forecasts then we should be saying out loud what we're going to do with it and I eluded earlier to some of our options. Mr Speaker I've tried to get Members and the community focusing a little more on that pool of money out there in the community which makes up the Island economy. I've tried to say that when the pool is healthy the Government has the means to milk it a little and when it's beginning to show signs of diminishing it can replenish it just a little. In effect it can budget to stabilise the economy a bit. Deficit and surplus budgeting is a tool it can use to that end. It is foolish just to say that we have balanced our budget, we are clever, we have met community expectations, thank goodness that is over for another 12 months, now what's next on our agenda. Of course there will be many who say the Government wastes its money etc and during the life of this assembly both Mr King and his predecessor have endeavoured to reduce spending, and to their credit have had quite a degree of success and I congratulate them. When I talk about the importance of Government spending in the wider community I'm not talking about waste. I don't like waste of any type, whether it's natural resources, public funds, private funds or misuse of assets. No Mr Speaker, but proper Government spending is and will always remain a major factor in the Island economy and its relation to an influence on the economy must be considered more closely than has been done in the past. I'm still of the opinion that relying solely on tourism is risky and have I hope convinced the Minister that we need to spend limited funds in following through any proposal which in our opinion has the potential to attract offshore funds and to boost our economy. Of course many of these will not be productive and we should not throw money at any and every proposal but nor should we neglect to spend on the investigation of potential if long term benefits for the economy and the community are there. We still have in the pipeline at present the offshore finance centre, goods and services tax and the possibility of establishing

an authority to licence and control offshore gambling organisations. None of these are a threat to the tourist industry which on a limited budget is itself striving for some reform within the Island with new marketing strategies, policies and plans. Acknowledgement should be made on the work of the Bureau with special mention to the Chairman Mr Walker and also the local Manager Mr Gallaway who has spent long hours in all aspects of improving tourism and working towards unity within the tourist industry. Although Mr King is not entirely satisfied with this budget and I agree that areas are being neglected through the lack of funds, I believe that within the limited resources available to them the Ministers of the Government are to be congratulated. I have been up front and encouraged Mr Christian to provide a sealed road past the public entrance to all residents properties and he assures me that this is high in priorities over the next few years. I've still to get more support in doing the same with electricity, but I will continue to push. Mr Adams has shown his genuine desire to improve care of Public Reserves and to encourage more productive use of the rural properties and also encourage sporting bodies, especially those that have put on things that have been of real benefit to the community. Although I have not always agreed with Mrs Lozzi-Cuthbertsons methods, she has argued strongly with much success for necessary funding in the areas within her portfolio. Although it is an area in which I hesitate to comment on for obvious reasons, I think generally reforms within the management areas of the Administration are progressing rapidly. However there is no doubt that the more responsibilities we take on in the progression of internal self government the more support structure we require in administering these newly acquired responsibilities. Later today we will be considering a whole package of land reform legislation designed to allow us to take on more local control. Despite my regular call for assessments of the implementation and ongoing costs of administering new or proposed legislative changes, the end result is usually a criticism of the growth in the Public Service, its spending, even though it is caused directly by the legislation we pass with expectations of the Government within the community. Mr King has said that if revenue flows better than forecast he's not opposed to additional supply Bills for other projects during the year but in the bounds I earlier eluded to of stabilising the economy I agree with this concept. However any additional spending must be properly considered by all members and approved on its merits and benefits to the community as a whole. Mr Speaker I think I've said enough even if our traditional revenue sources are showing signs of recovery I think we should not become complacent. I'm still firmly of the opinion that internal self government will ultimately fail through its inability to fund its responsibilities unless we look at some reform in our revenue sources. Our business enterprise as I said earlier contributes substantially to our revenue by way of dividends. They with few exceptions don't receive subsidies and their dividends provide fundings, that otherwise we would have to raise through taxes. The taskforce looking at GST is at present seeking advice from both local banks and the New Zealand Government and when that advice is finalised we'll be in a position to consult more with the local community and to make its final report to the Assembly. I hope all members of the community will consider its report with an open mind and make known their views before the Assembly Members are asked to more formally consider the issues. Thank you Mr Speaker.

MR SPEAKER

Thank you Mr Bates. Further debate. Mr Smith.

MR SMITH:

I've got to agree with the comments that you made and agree with comments made by a couple of members when the Bill was introduced that this is basically a good budget. For two reasons. One that it is balanced the other that there is to be no increases in taxes and charges and that is good for the community. But it is deficient in other ways and in what Brian, what Mr Bates was talking about there is a perfect example of what happens with the budget. We get it at the end of the financial year and we, if there is enough money, we will allow some new projects to be done, or if

there is no extra money, they just don't get done. But it comes down to planning and what I intend to do is over the next couple of months is to introduce some initiatives to take account of things like what Brian is talking about, for example, with the legislative process that we have, we are talking about the path to self government. It is no good us just accepting control or powers from the Commonwealth without assessing the costs of them first. I think it is a very important point that if we are going to follow this path onto self government that anything we intend to take over as a function or power we should assess the cost of it before we do it, there is no problem in doing that, it doesn't mean we won't get it or we shouldn't take it, at least we know the actual cost, the resources cost, before we move into those areas and I will be making some moves in those areas as I said over the next month or so. Some other things. I think the Assembly itself, there needs to be some changes in the way the Assembly works, the time has passed when it is a part-time parliament which it really what it has been and I am going to make moves that all the Members by the budget at the end of this year that all Members will be paid an equal amount of pay so that we can all put in a lot more time than we can now and it will make the wheels of Government turn faster I hope. It is a planning exercise.

There is so many other things when you look all through the community. Whatever we do. I mean the Minister was talking earlier about a new electricity generator. Those things should have already been planned before this budget. They probably have been in the area of electricity, I don't know, and if it has been planned, put it in the budget and work out we can fund it at the end of that, not knock it out because there might not be enough money there in the first place which is the way our budgets tend to work. I think things like. One of the things I should say, I think there is kind of a belief that the budget for the revenue fund is just for the public service, but it is a fund for all of the Island really, just the public service is the major part of it and I think that we should look at little further afield when we are talking about the budget, for example, what Mr Adams was saying about water things, we passed a moratorium on new bores on wells but if we, unless that is going, that could stay the same for years and years and years unless we plan and allow some funds to be dedicated towards doing that, those sort of projects is what I am talking about, and it is all about planning.

The airport is a good example of planning and budgeting. If you take the runway which has to be upgraded some time, I don't know when it is, I assume it is still ontrack for the year 2004 I think it was, but is there any plan drawn up to accommodate that, will we have the funds by the time that time comes around, is that time going to come sooner because we have more aeroplanes using the runway, the airport terminal is another example of planning, this thing has been on the books for some three years now, I don't think the planning of that has been really very good. We are going to build a terminal this year that satisfies the current trends in passenger movements but I don't think it takes into account any future requirements that we may have, or the airlines may have, what I am talking about there is that in 1993 the airport terminal was upgraded for F27s and F28s which are small aircraft. The following year we had Boeing 737s flying here. Already the terminal was made to be too small. I want us to be a little careful when we are doing our planning that we plan far enough ahead like with the new Terminal that we are going to build, I hope that it is going to satisfy our requirements for at least 10 years as long as the aircraft type doesn't change it probably will but it hasn't been planned that way, we need a new terminal, lets build it

and hope for the best. In the area of primary production, it is a most important industry and it gets little attention at budget time, I'm pleased to see there is a little money approved this time, at least it is a start, it is becoming more and more urgent to plan for fruit production as well as other areas, like vegetable production, milk and I think that whatever we can do to assist we should plan to do those things and budget for them as well. In the commercial sector there is ways to improve services to the commercial sector, particularly in the technology area such as computer services, the world wide Internet and similar systems are becoming more and more important in buying and selling and now are widely used for business purposes. Now Internet would be or could be a valuable advertising medium for the tourist industry as well as for the business sector. If we can connect to this facility it is well worth planning for. Have we done that? And if we want to do it, have we costed it? Probably not. There's things in the community like services areas where we've seen an increase in events that are specific like the Doctors conference, the RSL special, the Country Music Festival in the last twelve months, but we don't have a good facility for these events. A good public facility. And I will be proposing that we refurbish the Rawson Hall to a standard appropriate to a community centre. It will cost us, but if we are serious about our tourism and improving the plant, we have to plan for it and plan for it now. I could go on and on about the importance of planning and budgeting. I know it's pretty boring stuff to a lot of people, but it is really important and I would like to list some of the important areas that get talked about but don't get included in the budget. Brian talked about some of them too. Like, some people don't have access to electricity as yet. There are still dirt roads. A new generator. There's talk of a new kiosk and safety unit at Emily Bay. The Offshore Finance Centre. An appropriate incinerator at Headstone. Those sort of things that we just talk about and talk about but we don't actually seem to be able to do anything about it so I'm intending to bring forward some initiatives in these areas for Members to discuss and if we agree with them, plan them out properly and start budgeting as soon as the new financial year starts so within twelve months we will know how much money will actually be needed out of the revenue fund. If there's not going to be enough money the way we've budgeted, then we look at the way we earned the money. If you look at the Business Enterprises, I mean we are already looking at the Government Business Enterprises to see if we can raise extra funds out of there. We've already made the moves in accommodation, that's going to certainly increase the amount of revenue coming into the Island. Finally I would just like to touch on the revenue side of the budget. Over the last few months Mike and I have probably fallen out a little about the state of the economy is or isn't. We've disagreed a little on that. I still don't think it has changed very much and in the budget here, in our revenue from taxes there's an increase of \$42,000 over the revised budget of the last twelve months. If you look at our revenue from charges, there is actually a decrease budgeted for \$22,000. The revenue from earnings has a decrease of \$22,000 and I know that these are budget figures and I know that they'll bring in an awful lot more than what's written here on the paper but it is exactly the point that I've been trying to make over the last few months. It is okay to sit down here as we do and feel safe and secure and say, things are on the improve. And certainly, in some areas they certainly might be. But you get out in the community and you find that it is not quite the same out there. I know that, and I hope all the other Members

realise that as well. But I don't like bringing things into the House and saying, "Look things aren't that good. What can we do about it?" and being told "You're wrong. Everything is alright" I just want to make that point because with the revenue expected this year it is very little different from last year and it proves the point that things haven't improved all that much. It is not a doom and gloom statement that I'm making there either. It is just a fact.

I think I'de better leave it at that Mr Speaker

MRS LOZZI CUTHBERTSON Thank you Mr Speaker. Listening to Mr Smith really causes me enormous confusion. I wonder whether we attend the same meetings at times. He makes us sound as though we are a bunch of fools that haven't looked at such obvious things as planning an airport, and consulting the airlines. I know it doesn't come within my area of responsibility but everyone of us around this table have had briefings about the progress being made in planning the airport. Everyone of us have had opportunity to ask questions, and I know for example that at various times we have been assured and we have been advised that the airlines have been consulted in the planning of the airport, that their projections for future tourism being brought to Norfolk Island is being taken into consideration and they found no fault, or they had minor suggestions with regard to the plans that we were considering. So in planning the airport what has held it up is that the original design which was chosen by the previous Assembly when examined by this Assembly was found to be excessively expensive and not utilising enough local material. Now that is why the change has been made and we are moving to a new design. Alright. It has cost time and it's cost some money, but eventually the new design will incorporate features that will be seen by every tourist as representing Norfolk Island. There will be materials from here on Norfolk Island rather than having to be brought from overseas. We have evidence from all the plans and all the consultations that we've conducted that the airport will be operational and should meet the needs for the next ten years. The plans are not being developed in vacuum without any consultation from people who understand and I'm really surprised that Mr Smith does not know that. With regard to the Internet, it is really not a complex matter for Norfolk Island to be connected. In fact some people already are utilising the Internet. The cost involved there is a cost of telephone calls. At the moment Telecom is one of our greatest source of income. To reduce the cost of telephone calls has consequences on our income. The income this Island receives and distributes in other expenditure. In subsidising things like the hospital, the school, the welfare services and all sorts of things like that. Now if we make the Internet accessible at a cheaper rate we have to be able to negotiate a cheaper rate from Telstra whose lines we use at the moment, and that kind of negotiation is underway. We've been told about that in meetings a number of times. Getting a cheaper rate out of Telstra is not going to be an overnight effort but the process is underway. Once we can afford to offer telephone calls more cheaply to the public, Internet access will be that much cheaper as well and more people will utilise it, but if you are willing to pay for the present telephone costs, you can use Internet now. There is no problem about that so we certainly are not ignoring the issue of the Internet. With regard to the incinerator I also wonder whether you attended the same meeting. An incinerator of the quality that is required costs a half a million dollars. What do we do? Find half a million dollars for an incinerator out of the blue. I think we need to look at alternatives and something else that might be cheaper. The Committee that was set up to look at waste management was looking at that. I hope that Mr Adams will continue in that direction. I could go on but I certainly will try not to. I agree with you in the promise you have made that although the figures indicate that there has been a 3-5% improvement in our tourism figures, that the recovery out there in the economy in the private sector has not been nearly as swift and as easily perceived as we would like it to be. I'm also aware of the fact that the market place out there has changed, that the tourists that are coming here have different needs and buy different things from what tourists ten years ago used to buy and those shops and

businesses which offer the same kind of services and goods that they offered ten years ago, are finding it a little harder than they found it ten years ago. I know that from personal experience. I've had to have a relook at the market that I'm servicing through the shop that I own and that the kind of tourist who come here are now doing much more by way of activities rather than actually shopping. This reduces the amount of time they spend in the shop and therefore the amount of money that they will spend in that direction, but this means that all the other merchants will have to reconsider what they offer to those tourists and do some more market research in the direction of what will attract the attention of the tourists who have less time left to shopping. It is difficult out there in the community. I'm well aware of it. I'm not in favour of painting a good picture for the sake of painting a good picture, but the reality is that the tourism figures have improved and seem to be continuing to improve. What tourists do out there has changed. That is the main thing. That has affected a great many people but to assume that very little planning or really thinking is going on, is unfair and incorrect. Certainly I'm aware that my colleagues on the executive are trying to find answers and planning answers in their various areas and in the areas that are my responsibility, planning is one of the most important aspects of the things that I spend my time on. What Mr Smith probably is asking for and certainly in my conversations with him I get that impression, is that he would like to see a combined plan which is accessible to everyone. I think that would be valuable and hopefully the remaining time with this Assembly will certainly turn our attention to that. To assume that no planning at all is going on I think is incorrect and unfair to everyone concerned. Going back to the budget, and that's what this discussion is all about, I don't want to add a great deal more to what I said last time about it. I think it is essential that we do not allow surpluses to build up and to sit unused as I said last time, and I really am encouraged by Mr King's very clear undertaking that he is not adverse to bringing in Supply Bills not just at budget review times, but earlier times if necessary during the year and that revenue will be kept under close scrutiny and if surpluses do build up, I like Mr Bates, think that that certainly would be valuable for the money to be ploughed back into the economy and this I think qualifies as a time in which the Assembly should be taking a very positive view to stimulating the economy and utilising whatever resources it has to contributing to improvement in conditions for everyone. Thank you

MRS ANDERSON                      Thank you Mr Speaker. I shall try to keep my comments brief because I believe my colleagues have covered most of the points that I would have liked to raise. Firstly, I commend Mr King for bringing down a balanced budget. I'm in favour of balanced budgets. I'm a rather conservative person by nature, however, I wouldn't like Mr King to become complacent in his approach to budgeting. I would like to see this Assembly as a far more aggressive Assembly in looking towards the future. Maybe the economy has improved, tourism has improved by 5% or such, certainly this year has been a lot better than 1993, but I don't think it's good enough. I would like to see this Assembly prepared to spend resources and money on looking at future projects. We have in recent times investigated telephone betting, we investigated a quarantine station, which cost us time and money, but they were all projects which could have been of benefit to Norfolk Island and had to be investigated, and I would like to see us investigate more projects of that ilk in the future to look at diversifying our source of revenue for Norfolk and not relying uniquely on the tourist industry which we do at the present time. Mr Bates alluded to the Offshore Finance Centre. I think this is a project which should be aggressively followed and brought to conclusion. I think it is something that if we could get it off the ground would be of immense benefit to Norfolk Island and it should be pursued actively. I agree with Mr King's approach to the GBE's budgeting and making the managers of the various sections more accountable and more responsible. I think that only in this way, by making people responsible for their own areas and having a finger on the pulse of what their particular branches are doing, can we get a more efficient working in



to my understanding, little idea of what sort of impact the hotel pushed fervently by Mr Smith, would have on, for arguments sake, the Electricity Undertaking. Has he ever bothered to ask. Isn't that a tremendous example of how we are going to conduct our future planning regimes. Also I'm a bit surprised given Mr Smith's disquiet about my motion that I moved today Mr Speaker from the floor of the House regarding the water situation which effectively says, lets pause until we put in place better planning regimes. I'm somewhat at a loss Mr Speaker. I do agree very strongly with Mr Smith concerning the area of remuneration for MLA's. I believe for a non executive Member of this Assembly to be paid a remuneration of \$160 per week approximately is an absolute joke. I really think its a disgrace that we expect non executive members to take on the role of a politician, notwithstanding the fact that its on a part time basis, I think \$160 a week is a joke for their responsibilities and what they have to do in that job. Mr Speaker, just a few words in closing to commend Mr King in his approach to the budget. I believe it's a good way to go. The overall thrust has been to introduce a higher level of flexibility in putting together the budget, not only in putting it together but the implementation, the actual working of the budget. I think the approach is a refreshing one and it certainly assisted me to get on with the job

MR KING

Thank you Mr Speaker. I think clearly part of the role of the backbencher is to criticise constructively their executive members and try to influence them and to persuade them to their way of thinking, and I have absolutely no objection to that. But what I do object to is coming into the House ill prepared and making ill considered remarks. I take serious exception to that. Particularly when, as Mrs Cuthbertson said, we all attend the same meetings. It is clear to me from some of the remarks that are made from time to time, and here today by Mr Smith, that some of the things that are said and that we talk about, are simply not heard. Now I don't know whether they are hearing problems or whether we ought to be making some sort of subsidy on hearing aids or something but there is a serious difficulty when people are prepared as an elected representative to come into this House and not properly equip themselves or even read the Hansards of the previous debates so that they can make factual presentations and argue for their constituents reasonably and strongly. I just cannot in my heart find any excuse for that. There was a criticism about the overall lack of planning and performance by the Ministers. Now if the words that Mr Smith uses are ill chosen, they nevertheless remain his words. He said "There's nothing done on certain things, that it's only alot of talk, that it is just talk". You used those words George, I didn't use them and no-one here did, so it's no use coming back to say well I didn't mean that. What I really meant was, let's have an overall plan. I agree with that. But to suggest that we sit down here picking nits out of our hair, day after day or week after week when many things of a planning nature are discussed in our informal meetings, in these meetings month after month. We just got through finalising today, one of the biggest and most significant plans for economic development in the history of the Assembly. A plan which has spanned the endeavours of this House and executive government over a period of about six months. People can have appreciations about the state of the economy. I don't want to get in on any arguments about that but again, when you base those appreciations about the economy on a poor analysis of figures that are put in front of you, you've got to be brought to account as well. It is not sufficient to say, the taxes have simply increased by 42% and therefore that reflects poor economic improvement through tax gathering. I mean if you read the Hansards, if you listen to what I say, time and time and time again, you take out the extraordinary items that are reflected in the pages, you come up with the fact that the taxes forecast to be collected this coming year are 3.3% greater than the taxes for this year. Directly proportionate to the expected increase in tourism and again, I make the point that the increase in taxes for this current year almost ended. The increases are directly relative to improved tourism activity. You can't get away from those things. Nor can you get away from the fact that there are very few empty shops up in town. That alot of the wage earners or the lower income earners in the Island

are starting to get more and more benefit from the trickle down effect of an improved economy. Indisputable. All the indicators that are available to us suggest improved economic activity. But no-one has to take my word for those, because the facts are there for you to analyse them yourselves. As I have mentioned in the past, I hope that on future occasions, in the not too distant future, we can put all the information in the hands of an independent economic analyst and he can say to us where we are at so that we can avoid, maybe if you are prepared to accept the views of a professional economic analyst independently appointed, that we obviate necessity for the doom and gloom messages that we are sending out to the community from this forum. Mr Bates, is the wise sage of this House. And I mean that with a great deal of respect because I am completely in harmony with his view towards budgeting. Deficit budgeting in bad times. Absolutely. I admire him for the stance that he has taken consistently over the years on that. He hasn't had a great deal of support, but he has been consistent in his approach to that, and I couldn't agree more. As to the question of a safe level of reserves. Well I don't know. Who knows. I defy anyone around this table to safely say what level of reserves is sufficient. Come the end of this financial year, we would probably have something like 18% of total recurrent costs of providing public services on the Island. That would be the envy of most countries around the world to have 18% in reserves, but what does 18% represent. 1.6, 1.7, 1.8 million dollars. We, like many other small Island communities subject to diseconomies of scale. We can blow the reserves in one project. Half a project. Hospitals, cliff face exercises, just to give you examples of two. Diseconomies of scale and because of that we could chew up our reserves. We could chew up \$10,000,000 in one project. The rebuilding of the hospital for example. So whilst it is a good exercise to turn our minds to what level of reserves we want, I don't know whether we are going to find any consensus on the answer. I also agree with Brian that we cannot tax and simply salt that money away. That is a slap in the face of the good taxpayers of Norfolk Island and we need to review what we plan to do with the taxes we gather from the community. Some members may have heard me say, that there is a greater call being placed on the public service to put before us properly costed out capital projects. It is not for us as basically lay politicians to say, we'll throw a lump of the taxpayers money at an unplanned project, but we need to have more input from the Public Service Managers about capital projects in their areas and I hope that during the course of this year, unlike Mr Smith, not wait until the end of the year, but during the year, to bring those costings forward. I guess it is only on that basis that I say to Mr Bates that I wasn't satisfied with the budget. That there wasn't sufficient properly costed out capital projects come forward this year. There's been a reluctance in recent years, driven by what the Public Service saw as a prohibitive shortage of money so that absolved them in simply not bringing projects forward. We have to change that thinking a little bit and have them bring the projects forward and leave it to the politicians or the elected representatives to rearrange priorities or arrange the funding. Mr Speaker, just one final word on the beautification of Burnt Pine allocation. Mr Christian, although he can answer for himself, he has answered questions in recent times about what he proposes there in terms of planning. George may not have heard that but Neville is moving ahead with developing some plans based on professional help for Burnt Pine and I can only assure Mrs Anderson that there is a generous allocation of moneys included in the one bucket for Burnt Pine allocation. I think the capital works road programme, is itself, about \$77,000 greater than last year. Given that it is proposed that the same works team will be doing the Burnt Pine roadworks and the curbs and gutterings or whatever it is that might be proposed, there is ample funds there to maintain solid roads programmes and apply some good funding towards Burnt Pine. Thank you Mr Speaker, that's all I have to say at this time

MR SMITH

Thank you Mr Speaker. I feel I need to defend myself a little bit here with some of the comments Mr King has made. He can say I've come down here ill prepared, don't read the hansard and going deaf. That's his view. I



MR SPEAKER                   The question before us Honourable Members is that this Bill be agreed to in principle

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

The ayes have it, the Bill is agreed to in principle thank you. Do you want to dispense with the Detail Stage? Yes, we so dispense with the Detail Stage and we look to the final motion Mr King

MR KING                       Mr Speaker, I move that the Bill be agreed to

MR SPEAKER:                 Thank you is there any concluding debate.

MR SMITH                     Thank you Mr Speaker. Can I ask Mr King if he is going to table the papers? Can he table them, or do you want me to

MR KING                     I so table. They are not in finalised form. What I will do is finalise them by putting the scheduled amounts out to the right hand side. Let me happily say that I will make it available to anyone in the community who wishes it and on the next occasion I will table it in its completed form

MR SPEAKER                 You just might identify more clearly the document that you are talking about

MR KING                     The document is the final draft containing revenue and expenditure estimates for the year in respect of the revenue fund

MR SPEAKER                 Any further contributions in the final stages of this debate? Then I put the question that the Bill be agreed to. Is there any participation in final debate? Then I put that question

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. That Bill in its final form is agreed

**NO 4 - TOURIST ACCOMMODATION OWNERSHIP (AMENDMENT) BILL 1996**

We are resuming debate on the question that the Bill be agreed to in principle and Mr King you have the call to resume

MR KING                     Thank you Mr Speaker. I have nothing further to add at this stage although I foreshadow detail stage amendments

MR SPEAKER                 Any further debate on the question that the Bill be agreed to in principle. I put that question

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. We move to the Detail Stage and Mr King you have foreshadowed that you would want to propose amendments and maybe if Members are agreeable we might look at that package together. That is, the amending package

MR KING                     Thank you I will take guidance from you Mr Speaker. You are looking for a motion from me Mr Speaker at this stage?

MR SPEAKER Yes, I'm looking for a motion which will address the amendments that you would like to propose Mr King

MR KING Thank you Mr Speaker. I move that the detail stage amendments as circulated and as a whole be agreed to. These are amendments which I foreshadowed at the last reading of this Bill where I expressed a desire to include a provision to ensure that those who might find themselves already above the trigger market share are not required to divest themselves of that excess and as I understand it, that was the wish of Members and I've brought forward this amendment to deal with that

MR SPEAKER Are there any other contributions from Members in respect of the proposed amendments

MRS LOZZI CUTHBERTSON I think its an important amendment Mr Speaker, and it should reassure people whose proportion of the market is already above the trigger level of 10% which has been laid before this House today and it should allay fears that anyone in this House is trying to make them divest themselves of any property that they have rightfully accumulated over the years. I hope that it will make all the players in the accommodation business feel better about the regulation measures that have been introduced today as well. Thank you Mr Speaker

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Further debate? No further debate. What I will do Honourable Members is I will ask you whether you want to agree those amendments, and then I will go through asking whether you wish the clauses that they amend in their final form be agreed and then ask you whether you agree the remainder of the Bill and then we will be at the final stage of looking at that bill as amended. So the first part of that is to ask you whether the amendments that you have just talked about now be agreed to

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you, those amendments are agreed

I now ask whether the clauses as amended be agreed to

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

The ayes have it, those clauses as amended have been agreed to

I will now ask you whether the remainder of the Bill is agreed to

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

The remainder of the Bill is agreed to

The final stage Honourable Members is to ask that the Bill as amended be agreed to. Mr King. Did you want to propose that and speak in its final form?

MR KING Thank you Mr Speaker. I would so move. No further contribution

MR SPEAKER: Thank you. Any final contributions from Members. I put the final motion that the Bill as amended be agreed to

QUESTION PUT

AGREED

The ayes have it thank you, the Bill as amended is agreed to

**NO 3 - INTERPRETATION (AMENDMENT) BILL 1996**

We are resuming debate on the question that the Bill be agreed to in principle and Mrs Cuthbertson you have the call to resume debate on this matter

MRS LOZZI CUTHBERTSON Thank you Mr Speaker. As I mentioned the previous occasion when I tabled this Bill, this Bill amends the Interpretation Act 1979 which is a technical piece of legislation which aids in the interpretation of all other legislation by providing a uniform approach to such matters as references, definitions, and such to reduce ambiguities. The amendment contained in this Bill clarifies the law in respect of delegations and acting appointments, it allows Bills about jurisdiction of courts and services and documents to be simpler and more uniform and it allows the purposes and objects of any piece of legislation to be taken into account in interpreting the Act. It is a very technical piece of legislation and I commend it to the House

MR SPEAKER: Is there any further debate on the question that the Bill be agreed to in principle? No further debate, I put that question Honourable Members

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

The ayes have it. The Bill is agreed to in principle. Do you want to go through the Detail Stage or do you want to dispense with the Detail Stage Honourable Members? Is it agreed that we dispense with the Detail Stage? It is agreed thank you. I then seek a final motion which is that the Bill be agreed to

MRS LOZZI CUTHBERTSON Thank you Mr Speaker. I so move that the Bill be agreed to

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Is there final debate in respect of this Bill? I put the final question which is that this Bill be agreed to

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. The Bill in its final form is agreed

**NO 2 - BILLBOARDS BILL 1996**

We are again resuming on the question that this Bill be agreed to in principle and in this instance Mr Christian you have the call to resume

MR CHRISTIAN Thank you Mr Speaker. I won't say too much as we have a long way to go. The Billboard Bill basically provides for the regulation and licensing of billboards and hoardings around the Island

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Speaker. I don't really agree with this Bill as it stands. I don't think you should have to license a sign and I certainly don't think there should be a license fee attached to it. I don't believe that the Building Board has actually seen this Bill yet. They are wishing to comment on it. The way that signs are handled at the moment is that if anybody wants to have a billboard or a sign, they apply to the Building Board and if it is not suitable or if the Minister is not happy with it he rejects it as it is. I don't really see the point in having to go and have legislation to control signs. I don't think

I'll support that

MRS LOZZI CUTHBERTSON Thank you Mr Speaker. I actually had the advantage of discussing billboards and signs that protrude onto the roadway or on the footpath with one of the magistrates a little while back, and she expressed serious concern because if somebody in some way is injured by striking inadvertently or running into a sign on the roadway or on the footpath, the way the laws are being interpreted in most places these days, it does place the Administration at risk. I was not terribly happy with that concept at that time. At risk of being sued. That was the implication. She had just recently at that time returned from a seminar that looked at such matters and the need for Governments and corporate bodies to take a more proactive attitude to ensuring the safety of the public had been widely canvassed at that time and of placing greater responsibilities on Government and corporate bodies in making sure they remove potential hazards in the way of the public. I don't particularly like this bill myself but I do see the need for bodies such as Governments to protect themselves and to have some rules about such things as billboards and signs that are placed in public places. I hope that this Bill will be managed in a very constructive and liberal way, but at the same time, I think we need to be aware that as part of self government, we have duties and responsibilities, and I would hate to see the Administration saddled with any large claim for damages because we haven't followed the path that is being laid out by the law in respect to such things as billboards and signs. I really am not happy that we need to have so many restrictions but at the same time we don't have any choices. Our responsibilities and duties, hand in hand with self government, is unfortunately one aspect

MR CHRISTIAN Thank you Mr Speaker. The intent of this Bill is not to restrict signage. It is to regulate and control it. I certainly don't intend to sit down here and tell a person what they can and can't have on their signs. What it does is provide guidelines for signage, exactly as it happens now. Mr Smith is quite right. Signage at the moment is dealt with through the Building Board, so to a degree it is already regulated. This formalises the process. The only difference I suppose in a real sense between what happens now and what will happen after this Bill is introduced is that the licence number will appear on the sign. For years and years and years, I can remember signage has always been a contentious issue in Norfolk with not illegal, but uncontrolled signs popping up everywhere. It is an environmental issue in some areas, and as I said before, this Bill needs to be read in conjunction with the Planning and Public Health Acts which are also part of the land package. I personally don't have any difficulty with it and I certainly support it. I really can't understand where Mr Smith's concerns are coming from

MR ADAMS Thank you Mr Speaker. It is obvious that Mr Christian has done his homework on this issue. I think it's along the lines of a better planned and managed situation in the billboard area. I certainly support the motion

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Speaker. Look I don't have any great problem with the what's behind this but how much legislation do we have to pass for every thing that comes along, I mean what effect will this have really. I see in clause 3 that the sign even has to be licensed if it's attached if it's attached to a vehicle does that mean that if you write Lopy's Trucks on the side of your vehicle do you have to have a licence for that as well. Does that include that sort of thing. My objection is Mr Speaker that it's another piece of legislation that I don't know may be read in conjunction with the rest of the Bills that we're going to be looking at today. It makes some sense but I don't believe in just passing Bills for little reason . Thank you.

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Mr Christian

MR CHRISTIAN Thank you Mr Speaker. The example that George has just





AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. Those amendments are agreed. I will go through the three remaining stages as I did with the other Bill, in other words those clauses as amended, the remainder of the Bill, and that the Bill as amended be agreed to in those particular stages. The next stage is the clauses as amended be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT

AGREED

The ayes have it thank you.

That the remainder of the Bill be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT

AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. The remainder of the Bill is agreed.  
The final motion then please Mrs Cuthbertson.

MRS CUTHBERTSON                      Thank you Mr Speaker. I move that the Bill as amended be agreed to.

MR SPEAKER                              The question is that the Bill as amended be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT

AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. That Bill as amended is agreed. Thank you.

**No. 6 Land Titles Bill 1996**

MR SPEAKER                              We are resuming debate Honourable Members on the question that this Bill be agreed to in principle. Mr Christian you have the call in respect of this matter.

MR CHRISTIAN                            Thank you Mr Speaker. This is probably the most significant part of the package that we're dealing with today. The Bill itself covers 54 pages. It allows for the comprehensive reform if you like of titles or holding of titles in land as we know it in Norfolk Island today. It sets up a system of guarantee for both freehold and crown leasehold land within the Island and I think that's probably long overdue as well Mr Speaker and I will foreshadow at this stage that there is a slight amendment that I wish to deal with at the appropriate time. I did go through the general outline in detail when this Bill was introduced into the House Mr Speaker so I won't repeat all of that at this time. Thank you.

MR SPEAKER                              Thank you. Debate on this matter Honourable Members, which is the question that this Bill be agreed to in principle. Debate? No further debate. I will put that question. The question is that the Bill be agreed to in principle.

QUESTION PUT

AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. The Bill is agreed to in principle.

Mr Christian you foreshadowed just now detail stage amendments. Is it the wish of the House to deal with those as a package as a whole. You comfortable with that approach. Yes I'm interpreting that you are and we'll proceed accordingly. Mr Christian.

MR CHRISTIAN                            Mr Speaker. I move that the detail stage amendments as a

whole be agreed to. Mr Speaker this amendment came about as a result of some recent land dealings in Norfolk Island. The original Bill didn't adequately cover the area where a Company was the actual owner of the parcel of land and therefore a Company could change its shareholders and therefore its ultimate beneficial owners if you like without having to actually to pay any conveyancing fee. This small amendment takes care of that unintended anomaly and in fact make the changing of shareholders in the Company are dealing in the land itself and I support that amendment.

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Is there any debate in respect of this amendment. No debate, then I will put the question that the amendment in the package form be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. The amendments are agreed. I know come to the next question that the clauses as amended be agreed to. Those of that opinion say aye.

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. Those clauses as amended are agreed to. I will now put the question that the remainder of the Bill be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. The remainder of the Bill is agreed to.  
Could I now look for a final motion Mr Christian.

MR CHRISTIAN Mr Speaker, I move that the Bill as amended be agreed to.  
QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. The Bill as amended is agreed to.

#### **No. 7 The Land Planning Bill 1996**

MR SPEAKER Honourable Members we're resuming on the question that this Bill be agreed to in principle and again Mr Christian you have the call.

MR CHRISTIAN Thank you Mr Speaker. Members will recall the purpose of this Bill is to provide for a Norfolk Island plan and in the context of that plan the aim is to provide a mechanism for the approval and planning of all activities within Norfolk Island. The intent of the Bill is to promote the conservation, natural environment, landscape beauty of Norfolk, to promote conservation of heritage of Norfolk Island, to preserve the way of life and the quality of life of the people of Norfolk Island and to ensure that human health, safety and things like that are taken care of. Mr Speaker there is also a small amendment that I foreshadowed to this Bill as well and I will deal with that at the appropriate time.

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Any further debate that the Bill be agreed to in principle. Then I'll put that question. The question is that the Bill be agreed to in principle.

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. The Bill is agreed to in principle.  
The detail stage. Are we agreed to handle the amendments as a package.

Aye

We are agreed. Thank you and Mr Christian you might proceed on that basis please.

MR CHRISTIAN                    Mr Speaker, I move that the detail stage amendments as a whole be agreed to. Mr Speaker there are 5 amendments foreshadowed here and I'll go through each of them. They are a result of consultation on the Bill with the planners doing the draft Norfolk plan. Most of them are of a technical nature and it just ensures consistency between terminology in the plan that will come forward and the Bill itself. The first amendment clarifies that an object of the plan is conservation of all environment. Second amendment is just a technical one to fix up some wording. Amendment No 3 , this provides that sewerage, drainage and water activity under the Public Health Act 1996 is an activity requiring planning approval, it just puts that beyond doubt. No 4 is also a technical amendment in regards to wording and amendment No 5 clarifies what kind of application will be a category 2 application under the Bill. That's all I have to say at this stage Mr Speaker.

MR SPEAKER                    Thank you. Any other contributions in respect of this package of amendments. No further contributions. Then I will ask you whether these amendments are agreed.

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. The amendments are agreed. I now come to the next stage which the clauses as amended be agreed to. Those of that opinion say aye

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. The clauses as amended are agreed. Is the remainder of the Bill agreed.

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. The remainder of the Bill is therefore agreed. A final motion please Mr Christian.

MR CHRISTIAN                    Mr Speaker, I move that the Bill as amended be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

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

### **No. 8 Building Bill 1996**

MR SPEAKER                    We're resuming debate on the question that this Bill be agreed to in principle. Mr Christian you have the call to resume in respect of this Bill.

MR CHRISTIAN                    Thank you Mr Speaker. As I've said before the object of this Bill in association with the Planning Act 1996 is to provide for the regulation of all building activity, building use and related purposes within Norfolk Island. The Bill provides than planning approval under the Planning Act 1996 will be required for the construction, alteration ,demolition and the change of use of a structure that is not required for activity set out in the schedule containing the Act. An application may be processed under the Planning Act 1996 only if it complies with the Planning or Building codes. Mr Speaker there are no amendments foreshadowed for this one at this stage and I'd be happy for the Bill to proceed.

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Debate on the question that the Bill be agreed to in principle. Mr Smith.

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Speaker. The question of the Minister as far as the Planning or Building code provisions I see where the Executive Member can adopt all or part of the Building Code of Australia. What about our own Building Codes. Did we ever get those?

MR CHRISTIAN Yes, I was supposed to clarify that. The codes will be the Norfolk Island Building Codes, but the Executive Member may adopt appropriate codes from other areas. This provides the legislative framework for the adoption of the various codes and that can be done by regulation.

MR SPEAKER Further debate? No further debate. I put the question that the Bill be agreed to in principle.

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. The Bill is agreed to in principle.  
Do you wish to dispense with the detail stage?

Aye

Could I seek a final motion please.

MR CHRISTIAN Mr Speaker I move that the that the Bill be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

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

**Day No 9 Roads Bill 1996**

MR SPEAKER We're resuming debate on the question that this Bill be agreed to in principle. Mr Christian you have the call to resume.

MR CHRISTIAN Thank you Mr Speaker. This Bill is another one that is probably long overdue. It's prime objective is to provide for the opening and closing of public roads and related matters involving roads. It will allow us to once and for all put beyond doubt what is a public road and what isn't a public road and to set the standards for roads and to determine at what time a road that has not been a public road becomes a public road by virtue of use and such things like that, and I don't think I need to say anything more on this Bill. It's a pretty straight forward one Mr Speaker and there are no amendments.

MR SPEAKER Thank you. The question is that this Bill be agreed to in principle any further debate. Then I put that question.

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. The Bill is agreed to in principle. Are you happy to dispense with the detail stage.

Aye

We will so dispense with the detail stage, and the final motion please Mr Christian.

MR CHRISTIAN Thank you Mr Speaker. I move that the Bill be agreed to.

MR SPEAKER The question is that the Bill be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

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

**Order of the Day No 10 Subdivision Bill 1996**

MR SPEAKER We're resuming on the question that this Bill be agreed to in principle. Mr Christian you have the call to resume.

MR CHRISTIAN Thank you Mr Speaker. This Bill in association with the Planning Act of 1996 will provide for the planning controls on the subdivision and amalgamation of land within Norfolk Island. The Bill will apply to all individuals as well as to the Administration of Norfolk Island and the Registrar of Tiles will only be able to register a subdivision or amalgamation of land under the Land Titles Act 1996. If the final planning approval has been given to that proposal under this Bill. The Bill also provides for I suppose the formal application or the formal recognition of the subdivision code that will set out standards and procedure requirements of subdivisions and amalgamations in Norfolk Island. Mr Speaker there are no amendments to this Bill so it can proceed as introduced.

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Any debate from other Members. The question is that the Bill be agreed to in principle.

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. The Bill is agreed to in principle. Do wish to dispense with the detail stage.

Aye

The final motion Mr Christian please.

MR CHRISTIAN Thank you Mr Speaker. I move that the Bill be agreed to.

MR SPEAKER The question is that the Bill be agreed to. Any final debate. Then I put that final motion.

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

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

**No 11 The Heritage Bill 1996**

MR SPEAKER We're resuming debate on the question that this Bill be agreed to in principle. Mr Christian you have the call.

MR CHRISTIAN Thank you Mr Speaker. This Bill also needs to be considered in association with the Planning Act of 1996 and it provides for the conservation of things of heritage value within Norfolk Island. The Bill will establish a heritage register which will list items and land of significance to the heritage of Norfolk Island. Before making the register a draft will be prepared and public will be advised by the Gazette notice of where and when the draft register or a draft variation is available for inspection and the effect of the draft register. Mr Speaker this is a fairly straight forward Bill as well. There are no

amendments foreshadowed here and for the first time I think in Norfolk's history it gives a local method for the formal protection of things that are of heritage significance.

MR SPEAKER Thank you Mr Christian. Any further debate from other Members.

MR ADAMS Thank you Mr Speaker. Just a question Minister. I wonder for my benefit would the Minister be able to inform us of the range of people who will be able to contribute towards the listing.

MR CHRISTIAN Thank you Mr Speaker. As far as I am aware Mr Speaker it's available to anyone in the public to nominate something for listing. Whether that nomination does not guarantee listing though.

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Further contributions? Mrs Cuthbertson.

MRS CUTHBERTSON Thank you Mr Speaker. If I may mention I only a couple of weeks ago had some comments from a few people in the community about the importance of preserving certain historical homesteads. I see this Bill as actually ensuring, no matter who owns those homes that certain aspects of those places will be preserved when they change hands and it will ensure that in due course, no matter if an item or a piece of property is in private hands or in the Governments hands that if a proper decision has been made that it should be preserved that it will be preserved as part of the heritage of the Island and this is how in due course the history of a place will be there for a future generations and I consider this a most important Bill and I certainly support it. Thank you.

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Further contributions.

MR KING Thank you Mr Speaker. I have just a question. Did all that mean that the Executive Member of the day can take a decision to list ones property without their approval without the property owners approval. Could that question be answered for me?

MR CHRISTIAN As I understand it Mr Speaker, an application to list something on the Heritage Register must be made to the Planning Board, the Development Board or whatever you want to call it and after a period of public consultation including Gazettal and advice from various offices within the Administration the Executive Member would be required to lay before the Legislative Assembly any recommendations to vary the Register, by vary I would assume that to mean by addition or deletion so the Legislative Assembly would have the final say. In fact Mr Speaker Clause 10 of the Bill says just that. The Legislative Assembly may approve subject to alteration or reject any proposal and that decision then guides the action of the Executive Member.

MR SPEAKER Further debate? No further debate? Then I will put the question that the Bill be agreed to in principle.

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. The Bill is agreed to in principle.  
Do you wish to dispense with the detail stage?

Aye

We will so dispense with the detail stage. A final motion please Mr Christian.

MR CHRISTIAN Mr Speaker I move that the Bill be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT

AGREED

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

**No 12 Crown Lands Bill 1996**

MR SPEAKER We resume on the question that the Bill be agreed to in principle. Mr Christian you have the call to resume.

MR CHRISTIAN Thank you Mr Speaker. This Bill if passed today brings to a close I think work that started back in 1986 or 1987 was the original Crown Lease Review Committee. Mr Speaker this Bill seeks to regulate the granting and administering of leases of Crown land here within Norfolk Island. It also seeks to repeal the Crown Lands Act of 1913. Mr speaker this Bill would also I suppose formalise the arrangements under which people hold Leasehold land I think in recent times renewals have been restricted to somewhere between 5 and 8 years. This now puts people back on a footing similar to the old ones where they can actually say well it is ours, we've got it for I think in private capacity 99 years and in the commercial sense 28 years. So this is long overdue and I', happy to see this one brought to a conclusion today Mr Speaker and there are no amendments foreshadowed.

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Any further debate on the que that the Bill be agreed to in principle. The Crown Lands Bill 1996  
Yes we're looking at the question that the Bill be agreed to in principle. We are not at he detail stage but he may wish to address some components of that at this moment.

MR CHRISTIAN Sorry Mr Speaker the amendments are not of a substantiative nature and I could deal with them at the appropriate time.

MR SPEAKER We're still on the question that the Bill be agreed to in principle. Any further debate. I will put that question then Honourable Members.

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. The Bill is agreed to in principle. Is is the wish of the House to deal with the amendments as a package as has been just mentioned by Mr Christian because we are now at the detail stage. Comfortable with that?

Aye

MR SPEAKER We'll proceed on that basis then Mr Christian you might do so please.

MR CHRISTIAN Thank you Mr Speaker. I move that the detail stage amendments as a whole be agreed to.

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Mr Christian you may speak.

MR CHRISTIAN Thank you Mr Speaker. These amendments are of a technical nature. They correct some cross referencing and Hypergraphical errors in the Bill and will clarify the position of the Administrator under the Bill. It became apparent during consultation regarding the Bill that there was differing legal opinions as the role of the Administrator and this amendment puts his role beyond doubt and that is that he acts as an agent for the relevant Federal Minister. It also makes the Crown Lands Bill consistent with the Planning Act. The other 3 amendments are just to correct hypergraphical errors and there's nothing substantiative in them.

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Any debate in the respect of those amendments.

The question is that those amendments be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. Those amendments are agreed. The next question Honourable Members is that the Clauses as amended be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. Those Clauses as amended are agreed to. The next question is that the remainder of the Bill be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. The remainder of the Bill is agreed to. Now we look at the final question please, Mr Christian.

MR CHRISTIAN                      Mr Speaker I move that the Bill as amended be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. The Bill as amended is agreed to.

**No 13 Public Health Bill 1996**

MR SPEAKER                      We're resuming on the question that the Bill be agreed to in principle and Mr Christian you have the call.

MR CHRISTIAN                      Thank you Mr Speaker. This Bill seeks to regulate all areas of public health within Norfolk Island. The areas that I refer to include environmental health, issues such as sanitation, water supply, garbage disposal, sale of food licences, hairdressing licences and planning approvals for sewerage, drainage and water activities. This Bill needs to be read in context with the Public Health codes and the intent of it is to protect the public health of the residents of Norfolk Island. There is no amendments foreshadowed to the Public Health Bill Mr Speaker.

MR SPEAKER                      Thank you. Any other debate on the question that the Bill be agreed to in principle. I'll put that question.

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. Dispense with the detail stage?  
Aye

MR SPEAKER                      Final motion please.

MR CHRISTIAN                      Mr Speaker I move that the Bill be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

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



amendments. Then I will put to you the question that the amendments be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. Next I put to you the question that the Clauses as amended be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. The next question is that the remainder of the Bill be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. The remainder of the Bill is agreed to. Thank you. The final motion Mr Christian.

MR CHRISTIAN                      Mr Speaker I move that the Bill as amended be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. The Bill as amended is agreed to.

**No 16 Land Administration Fees Bill 1996**

MR SPEAKER                      We resume on the question that the Bill be agreed to in principle. Mr King you have resumption of debate on this matter.

MR KING                              Thank you Mr Speaker. This Bill deals with the establishment of a mechanism for fees which we place as the existing mechanism contained in the Conveyancing Act seems to attract a similar fee based on 2% of the value and consideration for the transfer of land. At the last occasion I spoke about this Members raised a couple of queries which have been attended to in amendments which I will bring forward in a few moments.

MR SPEAKER                      Any further debate on the question that the Bill be agreed to in principle. Then I'll put that question if there is no further debate.

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. We are agreed on the Bill in principle. The detail stage. Are you comfortable about handling this as a package.

Aye

MR KING                              I move Mr Speaker that the detail stage amendments as circulated and as a whole be agreed to. Mr speaker these are amendments that are consequent upon earlier amendments moved by Mr Christian to the Land Tiles Bill relating to share transfers in Norfolk Companies holding property in Norfolk Island. These amendments provide a mechanism to allow the Registrar of Titles to ensure that an amount equal to 2% of the value or 50 fee units which ever is greater be paid to the public coppers in respect of land transfers involving Company shares. It also remedies a matter raised by I think Mr Bates at the last reading where a reference to a monetary amount has been replaced with a reference to fee units to enable more ready adjustment at a future time. I commend those

amendments.

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Any other contributions in respect of those amendments?

MR ADAMS Thank you Mr Speaker. I'd like to pass a few comments on the overall package that we've had before us today. I wonder if you can give an indication when this would be appropriate.

MR SPEAKER This in fact is the final piece of legislation in the package. I think this is the best opportunity that you'll get in respect of the closeness of the matters being handled. Let me also say however, that if you want to take an opportunity in the adjournment debate you would equally have an opportunity there, but maybe this is an opportunity Mr Adams if you'd care to take it.

MR ADAMS Thank you Mr Speaker. Mr Speaker I'd like to pass some comments on the overall package that we've had here before us today and indeed I've had thoughts for the last two months. I've chosen to adopt this broadbrush approach to comments on this rather than go into it Bill by Bill and clause by clause illuminous nature of the beast in front of us. Mr Speaker this package of legislation is in fact the outcome of the machinery part of the report of the Land Review Working Group. Mr Speaker this report in effect forms the policy umbrella under which the legislation before us today seeks to achieve the policy objectives of the recommendation contained in that term working groups report. In the past Mr Speaker lack of proper legislative direction in such areas such as land use in such areas as developmental planning. It's been a major weakness in the administering of land matters on Norfolk Island. Previously Mr Speaker the only substantive legislative tools available to us have been such things as the sub-division ordinances 1967, the Crown Lands Act 1913, the Building Act of 1967 with a Harrison and Grierson report being looked to for some general policy direction. Mr Speaker it was looked to for some policy direction because it was never formally accepted. The package before us today brings our management system forward by I think it's fair to say Mr Speaker a quantum leap. One of the key concerns, if not the key concern of communities, particularly smaller ones like ours Mr Speaker is sustainability.e I believe Mr Speaker that inadequate or obsolete management regimes weaken sustainability or hopes for sustainability. Given Norfolks' increasing population over the years since the inception of the Legislative controls I mentioned earlier and given the Assemblies' policy of a 2% increase of permanent population and further having regard to the movement towards structured deregulation of the tourist accommodation industry and again more people, Norfolk is long since I believe past the stage where obsolescent planning systems can continue to be used. Mr Speaker the Bill that we have had before us today provides us with a planning management system that ensures that we have the ability of the community to cope viably with increasing people pressure. Mr Speaker as I've indicated earlier I totally support the package before us and again commend the land review working group for putting together in such a short period of time such an excellent package of management tools for the Assembly to use into the future. Mr Speaker just in closing I would like to add that though I'm happy with the package that we've processed today in the next phase of movement in the lands area, the one of transfer of power in the protected lands area, is an important area and it's an area where I caution that we need to hasten carefully. Mr Speaker we need to avoid being to hasty in accepting further transferred responsibilities willy nilly without properly having regard to such matters as cost, without having regard to a proper assessment of obligations on both the Norfolk Island Government and the Commonwealth Government both now and into the future. Thank you Mr Speaker that's all I have to add.

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Honourable Members we are at the stage of



MR SPEAKER: Thank you Honourable Members. There being no further debate I put the question that the House do now adjourn

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

Thank you Honourable Members. This House stands adjourned until Wednesday the 17th July 1996 at 10.00 o'clock in the morning.

--oo0oo--