

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

Prayer

Almighty God we humbly beseech Thee to vouchsafe Thy blessing 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

Mr Bates, would you be kind enough to take the chair

Condolences

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Honourable Members I call on condolences, Mr Buffett

MR BUFFETT Thank you. It is with regret that this House records the passing of Holder Stanley Christian on Tuesday 23rd July. Holder was born in 1920 in Norfolk Island to Rita and Stephen Christian. His two brothers, who were Nig and Lober predeceased him. Holder married Muriel and they had one son, Denis and later, Holder met and married Agnes and they had three children, Alison, Stephen and Sarah. There are three grandchildren, Dean, Marcia and Daniel. Holder Christian went to school on Norfolk Island, and then went to work after school at Bill Maher's garage. In 1941 he and his brother paid their way to Sydney and on arrival there Holder enlisted in the Army. He was a member of the Light Aid Detachment with the 2.2 Machine Gun Battalion serving with them for two years on active service. Upon discharged in May of 1946 he returned to Norfolk Island to work with the Works Department. In 1956 Holder, with Bev McCoy, Jack Quintal and Charlie Adams, went to Byron Bay to research improving the whaling industry in Norfolk and on their return Holder remained with the Whaling Station until it finally closed down in 1963. Holder worked at the Paradise Hotel, at Burns Philp, then at the Paradise again when it was at Kingston and finally the Customs Department and he worked there until he retired in 1985 and it was fitting that officers of the Customs Service were his pallbearers at his funeral. Holder was President of the Lions Club. He was a Magistrate of the Court of Petty Sessions from 1977 to 1990. Holder joined the Norfolk Island Sub Branch of the Returned Services League in 1948 and he held in that organisation many offices as a Committeeman. He was a dedicated President for over 26 years. For his outstanding service he was awarded Life Membership of the RSL in 1990. Holders dream to leave Norfolk Island's younger generation a reminder of the old days was realised with the making of the Legacy tape. He was instrumental in having the Australian Defence Force Careers Advisers visit the Island annually for career counselling. Holder's courage and pride, his friendship and quiet loyalty will long be remembered here in this Island and to his family, Agnes, Denis, Anna, Dean, Marcia, Daniel, to Alison, Stephen, Jeanine, Sarah and Damian, to his many relatives and many friends, this House extends its deepest sympathy.

Mr Acting Deputy Speaker it is with much regret that this House records the passing of Kathleen Adams at the Norfolk Island Hospital on the 24th July. Kath was born in Dublin, Ireland, to Garrett and Jo-hanna Joyce in 1917. She had two sisters and a brother. Kath grew up and was educated in Dublin, but also spent much of her earlier years in County Kilkenny and Denegal. She lived through the Great Depression and the second World War in Ireland, emigrating to Australia in 1950 to take up residence in Kirribilli, Sydney.

During this time Kath worked as a seamstress for the Singer Company and it was also around this time that Kath met Eric. They were married in 1955 and three years later they moved home to Norfolk Island. Kath worked at various establishments on Norfolk, Prouds for many years and at Prentices for a long period. Kath also worked at one time in Prentice's shop on a cruise ship before retiring in the early 1980's. Kath had a liking for travel and travelled extensively throughout her working life. She was a kind and gentle person, known for her radiant smile and she was blessed with a caring and loving nature, and a bubbling sense of humour. Kath was a devoted Catholic and a regular churchgoer until the later years of her life when ill health made attendance difficult. Kath and Eric had one son, Robert who of course is our colleague in this Assembly, and three grandchildren Boyd, Dayna and Brent. To Eric, to Robert and Joanne, to Boyd, Dayna, Brent and to Kath's other relatives in England and Ireland, this House extends its deepest sympathy.

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Thank you Mr Buffett. Honourable Members as a mark of respect in the memory of the deceased I would ask that all Members stand in silence. Thank you Honourable Members. Mr Buffett do you wish to resume?

Petitions

MR SPEAKER Honourable Members, are there any petitions this morning?

Notices

Are there any notices?

Questions without Notice

Are there any Questions without Notice?

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Speaker. A question to the Minister for Finance. Mr King, can you reassure all Norfolk Island building and plumbing contractors that the building contracts for the airport building have not yet been let and ARROW Construction is only the Project Managing Company please

MR KING I can offer those assurance Mr Speaker, unqualified assurances

MR EVANS Mr Speaker a question for the Minister responsible for Broadcasting and Television, Mr Christian. Due to huge budgetary cuts in ABC TV will the Minister provide formal support to this organisation promoting the excellent product which they produce that we on Norfolk Island are privileged to view

MR CHRISTIAN Thank you Mr Speaker. I wasn't aware that budgetary cuts to the ABC would affect us here in Norfolk to a great degree but I'm happy to talk to Mr Evans and if such a letter of support is warranted I shall certainly arrange for one to be sent out forthwith

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Speaker. The Minister for Finance stated in budget meetings recently that he would be open to requests from other Ministers for additional funds for appropriate projects in this financial year. Emily Bay is lacking in changing sheds since the old ones were removed some years ago without being replaced. I believe to rectify this problem before summer is a relatively simple project for a small amount of funding. Would the Minister for Environment who has responsibility for the area undertake to get the funds and have these done as quickly as possible

MR SPEAKER Who are you addressing that to?

MR CHRISTIAN Thank you Mr Speaker. Whilst I generally support the thrust of what George is requesting I'm not in the position today to give an unequivocal yes that the bathing sheds will be built before the next summer but I'll certainly take it on board and see what can be done but I make no promises

MR BATES Thank you Mr Speaker. My first question is to Mr King, the Minister for Finance. It's sort of a follow up from earlier. Could the Minister explain to those electors who share my concern at the present state of play with the new airport terminal building

MR KING I get the distinct impression Mr Speaker that Mr Bates is going to ask me a similar question each month until the first sod is turned. Again I give an assurance that the airport terminal project is proceeding. I guest I stake my political life on the occurrence of a new airport terminal although I guess if it doesn't occur that matter might be taken out of my hands. It is going to proceed. It is proceeding now. A project manager has been appointed, architects have been appointed and engineers I think by the time the plane comes this evening, all those professionals will be on the ground and of course members are going to be meeting those people during the course of the next two days. So I offer further guarantees to Mr Bates that I'm not playing in fairy land when I talk about an airport terminal. It will proceed. I make one more point Mr Speaker as well, and no doubt I'll have to repeat it again next month, but I can appreciate that when there is talk about a terminal going ahead and no one sees anything being done, but I ask members and the listening community to understand that probably 60-70% of the work involved in an airport terminal project or project of this nature is in the planning stages and that's the stage that we are going through now and once that stage completed I hope the remaining 30-40% will move along fairly quickly and we will achieve a new terminal by perhaps the middle of next year

MR BATES Thank you Mr Speaker, a further question for Mr King, the Minister for Finance. At the last meeting of this House the Minister tabled a paper creating a new head of the trust fund for holding funds granted for monitoring climatic changes and especially the effects of global warming. Are there any guidelines as to how those funds might be used

MR KING Thank you Mr Speaker. I imagine there are. It is probably a more appropriate question for the Minister for the Environment since it is an environmental matter but I'm not sure whether he is able to answer that question but I'm sure there are guidelines. That money has been given to us for a specific purpose and you can rest assured that they are going to make sure that it is spent in accordance with those guidelines but Mr Christian may care to add to that if he is able

MR CHRISTIAN Thank you Mr Speaker. There is nothing that I can add at this stage, the money is in the trust account and it is yet to be determined how it will be spent

MR BATES Thank you Mr Speaker, I had a question for Mr Adams on sport and recreation but I might direct it to Mr King if he can help. Yesterday I received a complaint that nothing was being done about a request made some three months ago by a group of model aeroplane enthusiasts regarding a suitable

place to operate from. Can the Minister advise the House if this request has received appropriate consideration and what is the outcome

MR SPEAKER Mr King, do you want to answer

MR KING Yes, I'm happy to with my airport hat on I guess. I have responsibility in my portfolio for the operation of the airport. I'm aware of that request and I regret it if those individuals haven't an answer. Everyone is entitled to a fairly prompt response to those things although the question itself is a fairly complex one. Where the application or request that Mr Bates refers to was made dated 3rd June, I'm not quite sure but I suspect that it's not three months ago, it has received a great deal of attention and a great deal of correspondence and communication has taken place between our Public Service managers and civil aviation authorities. I would remind members of the arrangements we entered into in Norfolk Island when the grant of land or the instrument the deed of transfer was implemented in 1991 and the condition of transfer of the Norfolk Island Airport was that the Administration enter into an agreement with the Commonwealth of Australia for the operation of the airport and that it be designated as an international airport and operate as directed from time to time by the international body with standards and recommended practises relating to all international airports and government by the ICAO, International Civil Airport Organisation. In short, that meant that any application by any individual group or association who wished to have access to the aerodrome or wished to carry out any activity on, in or over the aerodrome must be considered in accordance with the provision of the aviation regulations and in keeping with the terms and conditions set out in the transfer deed that I referred to earlier on. That brings into account, or brings into play Mr Speaker outside regulatory bodies, that is bodies other than ourselves here within Norfolk Island and therefore any applications relating to airports including over the airport require some consideration by the two government agencies, CASA, Commonwealth Aviation Safety Authority and the Department of Transport and Regional Development. Now some communication has taken place with them, if I can quote from a response from the Civil Aviation Authority in respect to the operation of model aircraft, and I quote Mr Speaker "with reference to the proposal to allow model aircraft activities in the area shown on the map sent with your fax, Civil Aviation Order Part 95 states "except with the written permission of an authorised person, a person must not fly a model aircraft within four kilometres of the boundary of a licensed aerodrome". The letter from the CAA goes on to say that if we wish to allow model aircraft activity on the aerodrome CASA would consider the matter and if permitted impose conditions, however CASA would not comment on the security aspect and they say that they are the responsibility of the Department of Transport and Regional Development which brings into play the other Commonwealth Government Agency so there are a couple of matters there. Now that letter implies fairly clearly that there is room to give permission for those activities. If you look at the regulations and the legislation you will see quite clearly that it was never contemplated that a general permission be granted but there is provision there for perhaps a one off display but not general activity relating to flying aircraft around the airport precincts. The proposal to fly model aircraft is only one of five or six proposals which are lying around in one form or another and I refer to proposals for go-karts, proposals for bicycle riding, model aircraft, running activities and of recent times a very loose proposal for roller bladeing of all things, on the airport. Now I have to make the point Mr Speaker that I would very dearly love to accommodate all those things in the Island and provide some special place for

those activities to take place but I simply can't in any reasonable sort of look at the airport allow those activities to take place on the airport. Now I might be speaking a little bit out of turn because I've not been fully briefed on the matter but I see the airport as being a commercial activity of the Government. It is not a fun park or a recreation centre. There is a tendency and I'm sure all members will agree, that it will be totally unmanageable and get out of control if we start to allow those activities to take place in or around the airport. In addition to the regulatory bodies that have some oversight in the matter, there is also the question of insurance and whether we would be able to maintain satisfactory insurance in respect to airport operations if we allow those types of recreational activities to take place in or around the airport area. So that's all I have to say on that at the moment.

If it's a matter of taking a final decision on this matter, I'm not sure if it's a matter that I need to take a decision, I think it rests at management level in the Public Service and I would expect them at any event to take a decision along the lines that I have just made to the extent that people are still awaiting for a reply to earlier applications, I'll make sure that's done over the next couple of days thank you

MR BATES Thank you Mr Speaker. Another question for Mr King. Sometime ago you made a statement about the possibility of re-arranging the bond trading hours. Have you given further consideration to this issue

MR KING Yes thank you Mr Speaker. Indeed I made some fairly strong statements some months ago that I intend to take a commercial attitude in respect to the operation of the Liquor Bond. I expect it to operate along commercial lines. I'm sure that I have said that I was going to place some particular focus on the retail trading hours of the Bond. That matter has been with the Public Service for examination and I expect decisions to be made on that fairly shortly. In fact I'm quite hopeful that they can summarise those findings and research and place that matter before me over the next few days. I'll certainly encourage that

MR EVANS Mr Speaker. A question for the Minister responsible for law and order, Mrs Lozzi Cuthbertson. Can the Minister provide at the next Sitting of the House in the form of a statement relating to the Road Traffic Act, statistics showing how many people have had on the spot fines, their ages and the penalties if any since the 1st July 1996 and a comparison for the same period last year

MRS LOZZI CUTHBERTSON Thank you Mr Speaker. I'll certainly check this figure out but I believe that no one has actually received an on the spot fine so far but I will check for the next meeting

MR EVANS Mr Speaker another question to the Minister for law and order. Is it a fact that an officer of the Norfolk Island Police has resigned or is this rumour

MRS LOZZI CUTHBERTSON Thank you Mr Speaker. I have received no such resignation but I will check it after this meeting but certainly I have received no resignation

MR EVANS Mr Speaker a question for Mr King, Minister responsible for the Norfolk Island Airport. With the project manager's for the new airport terminal being on the island at present conducting investigations at the

airport can the community be assured that an alternate site out near the Met Station be given the proper consideration it deserves

MR KING Well Mr Speaker the question implies that it hasn't been given any proper consideration and I reject that entirely and very very quickly. I am prepared as indicated the other day, to go through a process of considering it further, but to suggest that it has been improperly considered is quite wrong.

There will be a meeting this afternoon where that matter will be canvassed and I hope, I dearly dearly hope so that we can progress this matter, that the question will be put to rest this afternoon

MR SPEAKER Could I just confirm to you Honourable Members that I have sent a convening notice for a meeting at 4.30 this afternoon on this matter at the airport. Further Questions Without Notice

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Speaker. Would the Minister for Finance update us with the current situation with the electricity building at the airport in relation to the costs so far how long before it will be in use and the expected total cost of the project

MR KING Thank you Mr Speaker. I believe that I have produced some information about the current costs to date. It is in the vicinity of some \$75,000. I am informed just a couple of days ago by Public Service Management that tenders are to be called this week for work relating to the finishing off around there, that is the office space, services etc. I guess that we can safely assume that occupancy will be taken up before Christmas. One of the largest costs yet to be incurred in that project will be in relation to a sealed access road for the building. It is expected that this will be carried out by the General Works Section or the Road Section of the Administration but at proper commercial rates. As I pointed out to the House previously Mr Speaker, I'm led to believe that the cost of providing this access road is much less than the excavation costs that would have been incurred had the building been constructed at the site originally proposed in that area, a little further south. When I'm aware of the final costs, I will let Members know. I simply don't know until we go through that process. I have to say Mr Speaker that this project hasn't been the most satisfying and fulfilling project of my political career, but I'm quick to say that its one that I acquired when I took over the finance portfolio, clearly the project was not properly specified. It was not properly costed at the outset. It was subject to procrastination and argument among the stakeholders and the users of it. It was subjected to, I think fair to say interference from my political colleague. Overall the project certainly has not been satisfactory and it has been very very costly. I've said before Mr Speaker that if nothing else was learnt from the project I hope that there is now an understanding of the "she'll be right attitude" of old, is simply not good enough these days. My immediate objective is to get the building finished and to have it occupied

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Speaker. During World War II a D8 caterpillar bulldozer was brought to the Island for the building of the airstrip. This bulldozer had a shaky start to its career here by ending up in the water before it made it onto the Island but nevertheless it was revived and was in use at the airport for many many years and was looked after by many of the DCA staff until the Norfolk Island Government took over the airport in the early '90's. At the time of the takeover..

MR SPEAKER Is there a question

MR SMITH Yes. .. the D8 was transferred to the Norfolk Island Government, I believe, on the understanding that it would be preserved at the airport. There is some concern being expressed in the community about the future of the D8 bulldozer and I would like to ask a question of the Minister for Works. Has the Minister for Works given any consideration to preserving and displaying this historic machine with all its attachments somewhere, and secondly, where is it

MR CHRISTIAN Thank you Mr Speaker. This question probably should have been more appropriately directed to the Minister for Forests and I shall answer on his behalf. Mr Smith's outline of the past history of the D8 is correct. Members may or may not be aware that prior to the first upgrading of the airport in 1982 or thereabouts, the D8 was almost totally refurbished. Members will also be aware that there are photographs up there on the terminal wall with I think the Federal Minister of the time, Mr Wal Fyfe, turning the first sod for the airport upgrade. However, immediately after that whilst the airport was still under the control of the Department of Transport and Communication the machine was basically put out to pasture. No further funds were to be spent on it, the accessories were basically dumped in an area of the airport which you would probably best describe as a graveyard for surplus machinery. It was allowed to rot away with hakea, lantana and tobacco bush taking over. In 1992 Norfolk Island Administration assumed ownership of the Norfolk Island airport and the D8 along with a significant amount of other equipment was transferred also. Whilst it may have been the intention at that time to preserve the D8, that was never the case. It was still left out to pasture if you like and allowed to deteriorate. Members may also recall that a little bit of restoration work was done on the D8 to get it back to working condition to allow it to be used for the construction of the sports oval constructed at the Norfolk Island Central School. Immediately after that was completed the machine was then returned to the airport. Unfortunately the machine was parked under some gum trees around there, allowed to fill up with gum leaves and water and when combined they produced an acidic solution which was slowly but surely eating the machine away. Therefore, it had not only been totally neglected by the Norfolk Island Administration but by the Department of Transport and Communications before that. Members will also be aware that some months ago the Minister for Forest and Industry put a proposal before MLA's that the best way to preserve this machine was to probably give it limited work with the Forestry Section and there was general agreement at that meeting, certainly I'm not aware of any objections being raised and that is exactly what has happened Mr Speaker. The machine has been resurrected and is now performing useful work for the Forestry and it is hoped that in the long term it will arrest deterioration and its long term prospects I suppose, if Members was to see it preserved for posterity then that would be looked at as well and maybe it could be incorporated as part of the airport terminal but my personal preference would be to see it incorporated somewhere down the line in a museum of sorts, that emphasised the world war II connection because there are significant amounts of other equipment besides the D8 in Norfolk Island which would be worthy of preservation thank you

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Speaker. A question to the Minister for Broadcasting. Radio Station VL2NI runs a sponsorship programme and has for some years. This was devised to give the Radio Station funds above the allocation given it by the Government. These sponsored funds I understand are around \$20,000 per

year. Can the Minister for Broadcasting assure those that contribute to VL2NI by way of sponsoring that those funds in fact, do go to the station on top of the normal budget allocation

MR CHRISTIAN Thank you Mr Speaker. Off the top of my head I can't give that assurance at this stage. I'll have to seek some clarification and give Mr Smith a full response at a subsequent meeting

MR BATES Thank you Mr Speaker. A question for Mr King, the Minister for Finance. Is the Minister prepared to comment on a recent letter by a group of electors to the Human Rights and Equal Opportunities Commission regarding certain matters including constitutional matters of Norfolk Island

MR KING Thank you Mr Speaker. I'm not sure that I can comment in any great detail. That's now in the hands of a statutory body, the Human Rights and Equal Opportunities Commission. I can confirm that some representations have been made to that body as is the right of any individual living in any part of Australia. Those approaches have been met with a response not only from the Norfolk Island Administration or the Norfolk Island Government but also from the Minister for Territories, I think the portfolio Minister, and also from the Commonwealth Department of Territories and the Human Rights and Equal Opportunities Commission will consider those responses in due course

MR BATES Further question to Mr King, responsible for communications or for Telecom. It has been suggested that we are looking at mobile phones to replace the present trunk radio mobile phones. Could the Minister comment if this has progressed any and where does that leave the owner of the trunk radio mobile phone

MR KING Thank you Mr Speaker very much. That matter has received some consideration. There is a proposal that has been made by Telecom people to their management in the Public Service and its receiving some consideration. I remind Members again that the system which is in use now was never designed to be a mobile telephone system, more as an emergency trunk radio system and has been improvised by local users as a mobile system. My own mind on the matter, subject to some recommendations from the Public Service is that the question of a cellular mobile system probably will be put on hold until we decide the broader question of carrier arrangements for Norfolk Island Telecommunications traffic and what equipment they might put into Norfolk Island on the ground and that will to a large extent, bear on what type of mobile system might be suitable for future use in Norfolk Island. As for the outlay of money by those present users of the system who might find their equipment obsolete in due course, there has been as part of the proposal made to the Public Service Management from Telecom a proposal for some compensation for those owners and users. I make no comment on that at this point in time

MR BATES Thank you Mr Speaker. A final question for Mr King. Recently Mr King you undertook to provide a final cost for the airshow to this House for its information. Have you made any progress in that area

MR KING Thank you Mr Speaker. I believe some progress has been made. I haven't received a final costing from the Public Service. I expect that it certainly should be forthcoming in the next few days or next week or so and I'll make that available as soon as I receive it

MR EVANS Another question for Mr King. With representatives from OPTUS recently being on the Island has the government received any proposal from this organisation

MR KING Thank you Mr Speaker. Again, respecting the commercial in confidence nature of those negotiations I'm not prepared to elaborate to any great extent except to confirm that yes, some representatives from OPTUS have visited the Island. I have not yet received a proposal but I understand that there is some further communication between OPTUS and management of the Public Service at this point in time

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Further Questions Without Notice Honourable Members. Then I think we have concluded Questions Without Notice this morning

LEAVE

Honourable Members leave is sought this morning for Mr Robert Adams and Mrs Anderson. Is Leave granted? Leave is granted thank you. There are no Questions On Notice with us at this time

PAPERS

Presentation of Papers. We move to Papers? Are there any Papers for tabling this morning?

MR KING Thank you Mr Speaker. I table the inbound passenger statistics for July 1996 and move that they be noted

MR SPEAKER The question is that that paper be noted

MR KING Thank you Mr Speaker. I'm a little sad and unhappy actually to produce these somewhat dismal figures for the first month of our financial year. It can be said that it reflects a bad start to the financial year. They are in fact the lowest figures of any month for the last three years and its not good.

I mentioned to Members the other day and I confirm now that even though the financial indicators for the month haven't been received, I expect that this drastic fall in tourism for the month of July will reflect most unfavourably in the financial indictors for the months when we receive them. 18% down for the month is a big shortfall to pick up during the year. At this stage I don't say that there is any room for panic. It is impossible to clearly attribute any clear reasons for the downturn but I can be speculative enough to say that there are clear indications that our downfall in visitation is as a direct consequence of Commonwealth fiscal policy. Again I suggest that as many commentators have and as many commentators have observed in the media that there is a very clear level of apprehension and concern among consumers in the Australian community generally about jobs and job security, superannuation issues and about the looming budgetary measures of the Commonwealth, designed to fill their so called \$8 billion black hole. Mr Speaker the commentators have been very clear in their remarks over the past several weeks that domestic tourism in Australia from where we draw, or from which is our major source of visitation has shown very clear signs of flattening out some several weeks ago, and that was confirmed at the recent Tourism Ministers Conference in Adelaide where every state and territory of Australia reported that domestic tourism had flattened out. They went on to say that international tourism is the only spot on the tourism horizon for Australia, one in which we don't do a great deal of

business but again, I guess it maybe points to the tenuous hold that we have on our tourism by putting 99.9% of our money into the domestic markets, but nevertheless the difficulty for Norfolk Island is that because of those economic measures or economic factors in Australia that competition has been very much heightened, that once demand stops you have the situation where the major airlines proceed to dump huge volumes of seats onto the marketplace at prices which we simply cannot compete. The travel pages of the press in recent days all report specials as low as \$350-360 Perth-Sydney return. Prizes which we simply can't - and they are discounted at greater than 50% so that is a direct response by the airlines to fall in demand and something which has a direct bearing on our ability to be able to compete. Those concerns that have been expressed in that way by consumers may be eased a little bit at the end of the month when the Commonwealth delivers its budget. I can't talk for that at all. I'm not prepared to say whether I have any great confidence in whether they are going to be able to ease those concerns at this point in time. I'm not sufficiently learned on that particular point to be able to offer any intelligent comment on it, but I can say that some of the learned commentators have suggested that unless the steps taken in the budget are appropriately framed that Australia is in for its worse economic recession since World War II and that's not good. I don't like to sit in this House and talk about doom and gloom. I still remain confident. I nevertheless acknowledge that those figures represent the worse monthly performance in three years. Our response to that, we will have to consider that over the next few weeks. It may well mean that we might have to throw more money at our promotional campaigns but I'm not sure, and I'm not sure that anyone can tell us how much money is needed to be able to offset the effects of those huge dumping of air seats at greater than 50% discount on the marketplace. It's a big thing to compete against. That's all I have to say at this moment thank you

MR SPEAKER Thank you. The question before us is that that paper be noted. Any further contributions to be made. Mrs Cuthbertson.

MRS LOZZI CUTHBERTSON Thank you Mr Speaker. Considering the economic situation and the economic fears in Australia should we perhaps be considering increasing our promotion activities in New Zealand. That is an economy that doesn't show the same kind of weaknesses and the same kind of fears as the Australian economy at the moment. We do have to fight against enormous odds of the fares that are being offered in New Zealand to Australia which are very very competitive against ours but perhaps we have other things to offer by comparison to Australia and certainly they are very attractive and perhaps we should be emphasising the positives in our destination in New Zealand as against Australia. Would Mr King like to consider that in the context of reorganising our directions in future if necessary.

MR BATES Thank you Mr Speaker. Just a comment on what Mrs Cuthbertson said. It's noted that in the decline or the low figures for this last July the drop from New Zealand is quite significant, it's as much as it is from Queensland or to the second highest, and it's interesting to note that we had a slight increases or quite a marginal increase from South Australia and a small increase from Victoria. I don't know if that tells us anything except that I know that you know there has been a lot of interest in Victoria and South Australia as a source of tourists and those figures have held up okay but it's surprising if it's just the Australian economy that the New Zealand figures are down equally as down as the Brisbane figures. Thank you Mr Speaker.

MR KING Thank you Mr Speaker. I think what Mrs Cuthbertson says certainly has some merit. We need to have contingency plans about these sort of things. We need to know and I emphasised before that we need to put some resources behind I can't quite recall what they are called professionally but they are emergency management plans, plans that we have in place to be able to manage economic crisis like this. We are vulnerable and we are fragile because we are a single industry economy. We don't have those plans and we react spontaneously to things like this because we haven't been able to put the resources behind it to get them properly developed. I note that Mr Smith as Minister for Tourism turned to New Zealand more during the pilots dispute in '89/90 with some success but we have to understand that that is a very very small market place compared to east coast Australia and similarly while South Australia and Western Australia are producing increasing returns, they are in relative small quantities because they are small market places. I think our best bet at the moment is to await the outcome of the Federal Budget and have a look and see whether and keep an eye on the press and the commentators and see what that is going to mean for the consumer or the intending traveller.

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Speaker. I'll just take a couple of points there. I certainly agree with what Mrs Cuthbertson said about the New Zealand figures shouldn't really be affected by the Australian Governments moves and I certainly wouldn't be. It's one of the things I think I was saying in the last meeting when Mr King was debating the tourist numbers that you can have a good year out of one country or the other and certainly in the early 90's when we had 4 flights out of New Zealand per week it really gave a boost to the numbers out of New Zealand but then that dropped away in the period '93/94 and the Australian market has once again picked that up and there's always been that trend that one country booms for a while and then the other one as far as visitors numbers are concerned for us. It's something we have to be really careful about and I think I've been chipping Mike a little bit about talking about record months out of Australia because that can easily drop away. I don't put a lot of concern on the numbers for this last month of July because it happens, it can happen any time. I would only be concerned if the trend continued for two or three more months. There's another part to all this that I've been trying to point with our tourist numbers. The Minister said and rightly so on lots of occasions we're heading towards a record year in the last 12 months. If one does simple calculations in comparison to about 10 years ago if we had 29,000 people staying an average of 7 days in the last 12 months. You compare that to 1986 when people were staying 9 and a half to 10 days that calculates out to about 8,000 people less per year that we're getting on the Island compared to 1986. We just need to be aware of that when we're talking about record numbers and the economy. We've got to accept that in the year '86/87 we had 29,085 visitors, that's 10 years ago and we've got a record number this year of 29,900 Michael, but you compare those two figures and there's a really big difference and I think that shows up, well I believe that shows up in the economy of the Island. On the other hand the Minister is making moves to fix that problem with the tourist accommodation moves that he's making and I certainly commend that. As I said I'm not too worried about the numbers for July at this stage as long as it's not a trend.

MR KING Thank you Mr Speaker. Just one final word and I swore to myself when I walked in the House this morning that I'm going to contain my composure and I'm not going to be rude to anyone or raise my voice, I shan't do that as I don't want to get into any arguments or anything but I do want to make my point that New Zealand as a market place has a distinct and separate set of problems or

features as a market place if you like. Our greatest difficulty in recent times as I've pointed out has been the cost of the or the price of the trans Tasman travel. It's very difficult for us to compete with offerings from Kiwi Air and Air New Zealand itself, with packages of \$200 to \$300 across the Tasman to fun places, Sunshine Coast, Gold Coast is probably our major competitor out of the New Zealand market place but over an above that we mustn't lose sight of the fact the implications of CER, the economies of Australia and New Zealand are closely and inexplicably linked. It will impact on New Zealand and that's just not my laymans view, so there will be a backlash there. I want to make a point also that I'm not blind to the fact of the average stay has reduced and because the average stay has reduced the number of nights or bed nights if you like is not as it was in 1986/87 and I keep getting that a lot from people in the community and in particular and in the tourist paper issued to all members of the community and circulated widely in the community recently in a little attack on me that tourism has tottered around 29,000 for the last 10 years. Sure it has but the responsible way to look at your current performance is to look back on the most recent years and compare your activity now to then, not to some point that you conveniently pick in the dim distant past, '86 or '87. What I've said is that we've maintained sustained increase over the past couple of years which is good and I've gone hip, hip hooray and no one's joined me in saying that, but it wasn't as good as it was in 1986/87, it's 80% better than 1983, it's 30% better than 1980, pick another year, it's 200% better than it was in 1971, what year do you want to pick. So I only make those points that it is more reasonable and responsible to look at your current activity and compare it to your most recent years whether you've had a turnaround in relation to the previous year and it's against that that you forecast what is going to happen in the most immediate future not against what happened 10 years ago but I certainly take the point that we've got to watch this very very closely, we've got to watch it all as a team together. We're fragile, and vulnerable but I don't want to sum up the doom and gloom clouds on the horizon at this point in time.

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Speaker. I think I need to respond to just what Michael's saying there and not a criticism of the Minister either but the reason I always refer back as 1986 is that over that period of 10 years of visitors numbers bubble round that same figure 28,000 29,000 but what creates a lot of discussion in the community is the amount of budget that we put to the Bureau for that amount of people. I don't know what the figure was in 1986 but I know that in 1990/91 it was around 300,000. We're now looking at something around 650,00 I think it is to achieve the same numbers but in reality the numbers are actually less. That is the point where people like me keep comparing back to 1986 or as far back as 1986 and comparing it any further. It's in 1986 that those numbers reached their maximum level and it's never been able to exceed more than 29,000 30,000 visitors per year. It just need to be borne in mind.

MR SPEAKER Anything further to be said? The question is that the paper be noted.

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. That paper is noted. Are there any further papers for presentation this morning? No further papers. Are there any regulations to table. No regulations to table this morning. Are there any statements to make this morning? No statements to be made. Messages Honourable Members. I have

received the following messages from the Office of the Administrator.

Message No 98

On the 9th July 1996 pursuant to Section 21 of the Norfolk Island Act 1979,

A) I declared my ascent to the Billboards Act 1996 Act No 11 of 1996, the Building Act 1996 Act No 12 of 1996. The Public Health Act 1996 Act No 13 of 1996. The Interpretation Amendment Act 1996 Act No 14 of 1996. The Administrative Review Tribunal Act 1996 Act No 15 of 1996 and the Land Administration Fees Act 1996 Act No. 16 of 1996 and

B) I reserve the following proposed laws for the pleasure of the Governor General. The Land Titles Bill 1996, the Planning Bill of 1996, Crown Lands Bill 1996, Subdivision Bill 1996, the Heritage Bill 1996. Planning and Public Health Consequential Provisions Bill 1996, the Official Survey Amendment Bill 1996 and the Roads Bill 1996. And that Message is dated the 9th July 1996, Ralph Condon, Deputy Administrator.

Message No. 99

On the 26th July 1996 pursuant to Section 21 of the Norfolk Island Act 1979 I declared my ascent to the Customs Amendment Act 1996 which is Act No 17 of 1996. Dated the 26th July 1996, Ralph Condon, Deputy Administrator.

Message No. 100

On the 6th August 1996 in accordance with the advice of the Executive Council of Norfolk Island and pursuant to Section 2 of the Administrative Review Tribunal Act 1996 I fixed 8 August 1996 as the date on which the provisions of that Act that have not yet commenced shall come into operation. Dated the 8th August 1996, Ralph Condon, Deputy Administrator.

Message No. 101

On the 13 August 1996 in accordance with the advice of the Executive Council of Norfolk Island and pursuant to Section 2 of the Tourist Accommodation Amendment Act 1996 I fix the 13th of August 1996 as the date on which the provisions of that Act that have not commenced shall come into operation, dated the 13th August 1996, Ralph Condon Deputy Administrator.

MR SPEAKER Are there any reports from Standing or Select Committees. I think not this morning.

Notices

Notice No 1 - House Committee - Appointment of a Member consequent on resignation of Mrs Sampson.

MR BATES Thank you Mr Speaker. On behalf of Mr Adams who is unable to be with us today I move that this House resolves to appoint David Robert Gerard Evans be a Member of the House Committee.

MR BATES Thank you Mr Speaker. Standing Order 19 of this House provides for the appointment of a House Committee comprising of Speaker and two other Members.

The role of this Committee in the main is to advise the Speaker on the facilities to be made available to Members and staff within the areas allocated to the House, consequent on the resignation of Mrs Helen Sampson as a Member of this House a vacancy has occurred on this Committee. Members will I'm sure agree with me that Mr David Evans will gain valuable experience from serving on this Committee with the Speaker and Mr Robert Adams for the remainder of the term of this Assembly and I commend his appointment to the House.

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Speaker. I think Mr Evans will do a fine job on the House Committee.

MR SPEAKER Further debate. I put the question. The question is that the Motion be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you.

Notice No 2 -The Customs Act 1913 Exemption from Duty

MR KING Thank you Mr Speaker. I move that for the purposes of Section 2 (b) of the Customs Act 1913 this House recommends to the Administrator that the following goods imported by the person specified be exempted from duty. The goods are a marquee valued for duty at \$4,011-16, the importer being the Norfolk Island Country Music Association.

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Debate?

MR KING Thank you Mr Speaker. This is a routine matter. A matter that has precedent in exempting from duty for other organisations marquees that have been bought in for on a hire basis and subsequently returned, exported from the Island, so it's a routine matter required in terms of the Customs Act.

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Further debate? No further debate. The question is that the Motion be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you.

Notice No 3 - The Customs Act 1913 exemption from Duty

MR KING Thank you Mr Speaker. I move that for the purposes of Section 2 (b) of the Customs Act 1913 this House recommends to the Administrator that the following goods imported by the persons specified be exempted from duty, the goods being Christmas Cakes valued for Duty at \$5004 the importer being Mr Chris Gatehouse on behalf of the Lions Club of Norfolk Island.

MR KING Thank you Mr Speaker. Again a routine matter with precedence.

MR SPEAKER Any further debate. The question is the Motion be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT

AGREED

The ayes have it thank you.

Notice No. 4 Tourist Accommodation Ownership Amendment Regulations 1996

MR KING Thank you Mr Speaker. I move that for the purposes of paragraph 6 2 (b) of the Tourist Accommodation Ownership Act 1989, this House approves the proposed regulations laid before the Legislative Assembly on the 24th July 1996 by the Minister for Tourism and Finance.

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Debate.

MR KING Thank you Mr Speaker. On the occasion mentioned in this Motion that is the last sitting of this House I tabled the regulations which were proposed to be made in respect of trigger market share, that is regulation specifying that the House regards 10% as being the preferred maximum holding of accommodation units. I thought that was the last step required to be taken in terms of the law I am subsequently informed that that's not the case that I require the House to resolve in the terms of the Motion I just put before it so this is a Motion to finalise the objective of the House to specify 10% as the trigger market share of accommodation units.

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Speaker. Maybe a question to Mr King. To make any changes to trigger market share does that mean it can just be done by regulation.

MR KING Thank you Mr Speaker. No it can't be done. It can only be done in the way that we're doing it now that is why this convoluted process of putting everything before the House and the House agreeing the regulations before they are made.

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Further debate? The question is that this Motion be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. That Motion is agreed.

Notice No. 5 - Immigration Act 1980 - The setting of the General Entry Permit Quota

MRS LOZZI CUTHBERTSON Thank you Mr Speaker. I move that for the purposes of Paragraph 21 3 (a) of the Immigration Act 1980 this House resolves that the Instrument executed on 14 February 1996 by the Minister for Health and Education be varied by increasing the number of General Entry Permits that may be granted in the period between 14 February 1996 to 13 February 1997 from 17 to 34. Thank you Mr Speaker. Since the text of this Motion appeared in the local paper last Saturday I have been asked by a couple of people why I'm asking for an increase in the GEP quota of 17 places so I would assume a few others in the community might appreciate it if I spent a few moments why I'm doing so and how the quota figure is calculated. As Members and others may remember as a result of debate took place in this House during October and December 1993 the Members of the 6th Assembly resolved to adopt a population policy aimed at countering the decrease in the number of permanent living on

the Island that is residents and GEP's which by that time was becoming quite obvious. The Motion that was passed in December 1993 did more than simply try to let sufficient numbers of new settlers in to make up for the people that were leaving. That Motion actually recognised the need for sustained growth in the Island's permanent population and set an objective of achieving a growth rate on average of 2% per annum. The Assembly also agreed to a formula for calculating the number of GEP's which would be made available each year. In order for the Island's population to increase by 2%. This was seen as a moderate inflow which could be absorbed without undue effect from the existing populations lifestyle. The formula calculated in February works this way, the average number of residents plus GEP's who have lived here on Norfolk Island for the previous 12 months is worked out by the Immigration Officer from cards and records that he keeps on the movement of people coming and going from Norfolk Island. He then calculates 2% of that figure and the current Immigration Minister submits it to the Assembly for it to be declared a quota for the ensuing 12 months. It was also decided back in 1993 to make only half of the quota places available in February and the remainder, the second half to be made available in August. As listeners will recall in February this year a quota of 34 places was calculated in this way but only 17 places were made available at that time, that is half of the 34 places. The Motion before this House today seeks approval to make the remaining 17 places available for the remainder of the year, that is until February 1997. Mr Speaker I think it is appropriate to mention at this point that people who can demonstrate a special relationship with Norfolk Island do not I repeat not have to compete for places on the quota. They can simply be granted GEP's under a special category which has no limit. In the past 2 and a half years 110 GEP's have been granted in this special category which almost exclusively consists of staff and the families of the people of Pitcairn background. In that same 2 and a half years 80 GEP's have been granted to people under the quota system. Unfortunately Mr Speaker in the same 2 and a half years our average monthly population, as made up of GEP's and residents has gone from 124 at the end of 1995 to 111 at the end of June 1996, which sadly means that the objectives that this Assembly in December 1993 to bring about a growth in the permanent population of this Island is simply not working. Norfolk Islanders, residents and GEP's are leaving in greater number than we are letting them in, and that has consequences for everyone left on this beautiful Island. It takes a certain number of people working and producing goods and services to make an economy viable. Norfolk does have a regular inflow of tourists who of course are critical to our economy but without a basing number of permanent residents our economy becomes even more dependent on the tourist dollar. In bad months like the July which we've just had the shrinking base of residents is felt even more. Add to that fact that we've had only 269 GEP's contributing to our economy at the end of July 1996 and it is easy to see why we need to declare this extra quota places. Mr Speaker there are however a few bright spots. Because of the changes to immigration policy adopted by this Assembly in April this year we are now able to accept a new kind of applicant for places on the quota, referees of independent means and 6 such applications have been granted so far, although enquiries continue to be received. However we no longer receive a large number of applications from people wanting to buy existing businesses on Norfolk Island and I feel that is a reflection of the extended period of slow business activity which we have experienced as well as the cautious attitude in general in most business people by the last recession and the current talk of budgetary cuts and job redundancies in Australia certainly does not help at the moment. Partly because of this caution of the 17 places which were the first half yearly quota for 1996 that were declared in February

we have only been able to fill 12 places so far, five remain available. Mr Speaker people in the community may ask why bother to release an additional 17 places when we still have 5 places unfilled and my answer is simply that we need to have the places available in case good applicants come forward and from current enquiries we may well still achieve the target of filling our quota for 1996. Anyway I commend this Motion to this House.

MR EVANS Thank you Mr Speaker. This Motion may be seen by some as quite frightening, an increase from 17 to 34 but in fact this quota is the same as last years quota. In essence it is trying to achieve a 2% increase in population. The number 34 being derived by using a formula relating to the resident population including GEP's. Immigration on Norfolk Island is a very sensitive issue. It can also be a very emotional issue. A few facts to be considered are in 1989 28% of residents actually lived off-island. In 1996 we have an alarming 44% of residents living off-island. In the period January to June 1996 20 people left Norfolk Island and took up residence elsewhere so this quota in its first 6 months doesn't cover for the departure of its residents ordinarily residing here. Norfolks' infrastructure will not tolerate too much more decline in its resident population. We need a certain number of people to maintain the services provided to the community. Services that have become a significant part of life for many, for example phone and TV. What the Assembly need to do is have something or somehow attract not only residents, not only residing residents but residents residing elsewhere to Norfolk Island. There is no doubt that Norfolk Island is a beautiful place but it must be buoyant. Each and every person here plays a role in creating and sustaining healthy economic activity. Grouped together we all benefit each other in some way. Using firm criteria I have no problem with the quota. I think its aim may not be achieved but some new residents are injecting much needed cash into the community and this type of activity should be encouraged as long as its done within our terms and guidelines. We've seen many people come here and very quickly they think they need to bring with them all those things they left behind. Norfolk Island is unique, it must always remain that way for our future generations. Having said that I will also say that we all must work toward keeping Norfolk viable. Let's face it you either sink or swim and Norfolk has some good swimmers and there's no reason why we can't become a team. There's only about 1500 of us left and we've got to pull together, have a common goal. Norfolk is our backbone and our home. Thank you.

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Further debate? The question is that this Motion be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. That Motion is agreed thank you.

Orders of the Day

No 1 - Tourist Accommodation Act 1984 - Maximum number of Accommodation Houses in the category of Hotels.

MR SPEAKER We're resuming debate on this question and Mr King you have the call.

MR KING Thank you Mr Speaker. This Motion has sat on the table of this House

for two months. It has a colourful history. It is in fact the trigger mechanism as it were for deregulating or lifting the long-standing moratorium on further tourist accommodation developments in the Island. In strict terms part 1 of the Motion seeks to lift all the quotas in respect of tourist accommodation and part 2 seeks to fix the existing number of hotels in the Island. On the face of it it would appear the second part would appear to be inconsistent with the objective of this House to licence a further Hotel in the Island. I would want to assure Members and the listening community that that is not the case, that it is the intention of this House that we proceed with inviting applications for a new Hotel development in the Island and that should happen over the next few weeks. There will be a lengthy period during which those applications will be able to be put together by proponents and developers or investors. Thereafter a period of consideration by the entire membership of the Assembly after a selection of the appropriate project or development, then this House can move to lift that quota of Hotels by an additional 1 to accommodate the preferred project. That is the process that I envisage. I have nothing further to say on this matter. This completes basically the consideration by this House of all the material which is necessary to meet our objectives in relation to tourist accommodation. I commend this final Motion to the House.

MRS LOZZI CUTHBERTSON Thank you Mr Speaker. I would think that Mr King might like to clarify that in fact 5 represents the number of Hotels that are described in those terms at present operating on the Island. Many people in the community like myself might believe we in fact have 4 at the moment but perhaps Mr King would like to explain which are the 5 Hotels to which he refers in this Motion.

MR EVANS Thank you Mr Speaker. This is the final part of a package which relates to the tourist accommodation on Norfolk Island. The tourism plan adopted in November 1995 has a mission to improve the economic health of Norfolk Island and the quality of life of its residents. The accommodation package itself offers an opportunity for more residents participation in the benefits of accommodation within the tourism industry. This is encouraging and hopefully that will bring tourist accommodation on Norfolk Island up in line with today's competitive standards. It will lift the product that we sell in the marketplace and therefore enhancing Norfolk Island as a tourist destination. It will be good to see the benefits a little bit more widespread within the community. Thank you.

MR KING Thank you Mr Speaker. Just some final words to congratulate Mr Evans on his contribution. He's come in at the late stage of consideration of this whole process and it's encouraging to hear that he also supports the direction which was really decided some months ago. For the purposes of clarifying this Hotel, the number of existing Hotels, there are in fact 5 Hotels, 5 in the category of Hotels in the Island one of which might not appear to the general community to be in that category and that is The Polynesian, Polynesian Motor Hotel is in the category of a Hotel as well. There was some confusion about that in the earlier stages but I hope that removes that confusion.

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Speaker. I think it's appropriate for me to register my opposition to a part of this Motion and that's part 1 which is to repeal all previous quotas fixed in accordance with Subsection 8 1 of the Tourist Accommodation Act which effectively lifts the lid off all accommodation other than Hotels. I'm not going to vote against this Motion because it's important, the whole the package doesn't get delayed any further but I did register some

opposition to the move that is being made here and I'm worried about it, but I believe that the Minister has set things up in such a way that it will be quite safe but I do have a concern with it and I would like that to be registered in the Minutes, in Hansard, that I do have a concern with it, lifting the lid off all accommodation but I won't vote against this Motion, let's get the thing going.

MR KING You never explained what your concern was.

MR SMITH Well I can.

MR KING Well I'm interested.

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Speaker. Perhaps I should clarify that a little bit more. The concern that I have is that we could, we could have a whole lot of people building lots of units all over the place. I don't think it will happen, that's why I'm not voting negatively with this Motion, but it is a real possibility that it could actually happen and that's my objection to it. I would have been happier with a lifting of the lid to a certain point or a certain amount of accommodation. That's been my objection with it as it stands.

MR EVANS Thank you Mr Speaker. I share Mr Smith's concern but I have been assured that if there were an excessive amount of applications and things looked as though they were going to blow its top, so to speak, there is in place the facility to introduce a quota so that it could be controlled at some later stage.

MR KING I just wanted to confirm Mr Speaker that the controlling mechanisms have not been dismantled. They remain in place in the law and we know here in Norfolk Island that we can convene a meeting of this House with rapidity certainly far quicker than a lot of other Parliaments and deal with matters but I've had to deal in the past several weeks with some similar fears and concerns which were put to me before some of the people in the Public Service, I haven't shared those concerns. I don't see that there's going to a great hoard of people lining up to build tourist accommodation. I would like to think that the confidence level is that high in the community but everyone keeps telling me that it's not so I can't see that all those investors lining up to do that. I can see a healthy number of them but certainly all the mechanisms remain in place that are necessary to effect quick controls if we need to. I've always maintained that the approach that we are taking here is one which is going to have the outcomes of which are going to have to be watched very closely. All the mechanisms remain in place.

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Speaker. Part of my concern is not only the building of extra accommodation it's I understand, the way I understand this Motion is that if we wanted to basically anybody could open up there house as tourist accommodation on application. I mean I realistically I don't believe it would happen but we don't know. There is a question I'll need to ask the Minister too. Does this take into account the homestay moves that Mr Adams was making. Was this Motion allowed for that?

MR CHRISTIAN Thank you Mr Speaker. I think there needs to be a clear distinction or an understanding that there is a clear distinction here. The fact that you remove the quota, putting a cap on existing accommodation doesn't open the flood gates for new ones, because you haven't removed the minimum

standards or the licensing requirements. They are all still in place. So Joe Bloggs can't come along and automatically get a licence to put tourists in his house for instance if it doesn't meet the standards. So all of the mechanisms are still in place, the standards are still in place and this is I suppose an easy way forward. I also share some of Mr King's thoughts there that I don't think at the end of the day you are going to be bowled over with a rush of people wanting to invest in the tourism industry in the current economic climate

MR BATES Thank you Mr Speaker. I supported this partial deregulation on the basis that there would be controls for the other mechanisms available to us and I think Mr Christian and others have alluded to those, but we are in the process of developing a plan for the Island, and we have building codes and we have subdivision controls. There is also the water situation and the sewage and that and these things I believe will place the controls that we are looking for and it just won't be over the accommodation places taking place on every second block on the Island or something like that but if these controls don't work to our satisfaction then I think we need to look at a later date at further controls but I see sufficient safeguards in there for the present time anyway

MRS LOZZI CUTHBERTSON Thank you Mr Speaker. Like the other speakers I support this motion. I think it is essential that we move toward some form of controlled regulation. I'm quite satisfied that the other controls will operate to ensure that there is no sudden rush and the most important control as Mr Christian mentioned, will unfortunately be the economic situation. I think this House will have to become much more aware of keeping an eye on the movements in the marketplace when the economy starts to pick up. That's when more people would want to invest in the accommodation industry and that's when it would become important to ensure that whatever development does take place it is staged and guided rather than being allowed to balloon and run out of control. I certainly support the motion as it is

MR KING Thank you Mr Speaker. If there are no further questions arising from the debate let me say that I'm pleased that the debate has recognised that the commercial forces have a lot to do with the rate of development which will take place here. Certainly I say here in this forum what I've said in other forums that if I had some money to invest in the tourist accommodation industry I would be making that investment because this place has a brilliant future as a tourist destination, that is absolutely assured but as far as addressing homestay, this package does not address homestay. I know that that is the desire of this House but that is planned to be addressed by prescribing regulations. I am informed that it doesn't require any changes to the law or any substantive motions to this House other than what we have already mentioned

MR SPEAKER Have we concluded debate Honourable Members? I think we have, then I put the question

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED

The ayes have it thank you

No 2 - Telecommunications Amendment Bill 1996

MR SPEAKER We're resuming debate on this question and Mr King you have the call

MR KING Thank you Mr Speaker. This Bill is one of clarification. As I mentioned at the first reading, it is designed to clarify the powers of the Administration to determine the terms and conditions on which telecommunications are supplied. It sat on the table for a number of weeks. I've received no adverse comment on it but other than that I have nothing further to say. I'll seek to finalise it subject to debate

MR SPEAKER Any participation in debate Honourable Members? I put the question that the Bill be agreed to in principle

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. Is it the wish of the House to dispense with the detail stage. Then we so dispense. I seek a final motion please

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

MR SPEAKER The question is that the Bill be agreed to. Is there any final debate. Then I put that question

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. That Bill is agreed

No 3 - Bores and Wells Bill 1996

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

MR CHRISTIAN Thank you Mr Speaker. This Bill was introduced into the House on my behalf by Mr Adams at the last meeting of this House. The Bill basically seeks to do two things. It seeks to put beyond doubt approvals given for bores subsequent to 1990 and secondly it seeks to put in place a complete prohibition on the construction of any new bores or wells until a future time. I know some members have some concerns that this Bill doesn't address a number of issues such as the use of brown water and things like that but Mr Speaker I take the effort to point out that this Bill is intended to be a short lived one. As such it does have a fixed life and that ultimately, the regulation and controls of bores and wells including uses should adequately be covered under the Public Health Act 1996 and the Planning Act 1996 when they become effective and at this stage Mr Speaker I don't think there's too much more I need to say

MR EVANS Mr Speaker although I will be supporting this Bill because of its significance with relation to our underground water supply, for Norfolk Island it is imperative that our underground source of water be protected by whatever means to preserve its purity. I also believe that both the Planning Act 1996 and the Public Health Act 1996 should be expedited to give flexibility on the matter of bores and wells. In future, every application will be looked at on its own merit, always keeping in mind that the water table under Norfolk's surface is of paramount importance to the health of our community and to the continuance of our main industry, tourism, thank you

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Further debate. No final debate? Then the question Honourable Members is that this Bill be agreed to in principle. Is there any final debate. Then I put that question

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. That Bill is agreed to in principle. Shall we dispense with the detail stage. We shall so dispense with the detail stage and a final motion then please

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

MR SPEAKER The question Honourable Members is that this Bill be agreed to. Is there any final debate. Then I put that question

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED

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

FIXING OF THE NEXT DAY OF SITTING

MR EVANS Mr Speaker, I move that the House at its rising adjourn until Wednesday 11 September 1996 at 10.00 am

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Is there any debate on this matter? Then I put the question that that motion be agreed to

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

Honourable Members

The ayes have it, our next Sitting day is so agreed. Adjournment Mr Smith

ADJOURNMENT

MR SMITH Mr Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

MR SPEAKER The question is that the House do now adjourn. Any adjournment debate? There being no final debate then I put the question that this House do now adjourn Honourable Members

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

The ayes have it Honourable Members, therefore this House stands adjourned until Wednesday the 11th September 1996 at 10 o'clock in the morning.

--ooOoo--