

17.4.1996

MADAM DEPUTY SPEAKER: We are today resuming the session of 18th December and we will commence today with condolences.

MR BUFFETT: Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker. Madam Deputy Speaker Con Holloway passed away last Monday aged 99 years and on 12th February next year she would have become Norfolk Island's fourth centenarian. Con Holloway was born Ellen Constance Quintal in Norfolk Island on 12th February 1897. She was the eldest and only daughter of Henry Cornelius Quintal, known as Harry, and Frances Quintal. Con's childhood home was with her parents on Cornish Quintal's original grant of land in Norfolk Island adjacent to the present Rawson Hall site. She was educated at the Norfolk Island school at its present Middlegate location and she walked there and back as did most students in her time and after her formal education Con wanted to be a nurse, but that wasn't quite possible in the times that Norfolk Island was experiencing in those days. Towards the end of World War I she went to New Zealand on the cable ship the "Iris" but after a short period of time there she returned to the island and then she made a visit to Australia and after some twelve months there she again returned to the island on the "McCambo" which was one of the Burns Philp ships. Con Quintal met John Holloway during that return journey to Norfolk Island on the ship. A courtship followed and when they both returned to Australia after that Norfolk Island visit they were subsequently married in the new year of 1926 at Chatswood in Sydney. They remained in Australia for some years then in 1946 they returned to live permanently here in Norfolk Island. Their first home together was in Mission Road and then they built their present home on the family land behind her childhood home in Taylors Road. Con and her husband bought a business called The Sample Rooms and this business generally became known as "Holloways" in Norfolk Island and we're probably reaching an era now when most of us would recognise the sort of things that are being described. Holloways was located firstly on the site now occupied by Prentices in Burnt Pine and then on the present site of the electrical business known as Norfolk Electrical and all of this of course was when the Burnt Pine area was in its commercial infancy. In addition to Holloways they had a taxi service and Con's husband was a councillor of the Norfolk Island Council, a predecessor of this Assembly, Madam Deputy President, and he represented the Norfolk Island community for some thirteen years and he was President of that Council in the years 1950 and 1951. Con did have a great love of sport. She also loved horses and animals but particularly in sport she saw the commencement of her first love for lawn bowls through her grandfather, Cornish Quintal, who was one of the founders of bowls in the island. They started bowls in an area at One Hundred Acres, an area we probably recognise as Aunt Liz's at this moment. Then at Dewey's which is on the present airport site now gone and then at the present location which is in Burnt Pine, in the centre of Burnt Pine. She was an avid bowler and she was good at it and I mentioned yesterday and when speaking at her funeral that she liked to listen to the broadcast, she liked to watch the broadcast and she particularly chucked to occasionally see some of those real champions sometimes they made mistakes too and she thought that was interesting to see when all of that happened.

In her later years really it was bowls that she continued and her former associates from the bowling club were again present yesterday at her funeral. Con Holloway always had a sparkling disposition and throughout her years, which went to 99 years, Madam Deputy Speaker, that sparkle did not diminish. She continued to be alert and wise to the ways of this changing world throughout her 99 years. She did have a great interest in the affairs of younger people, notwithstanding the great age gap which would have been present given the time frame which I have just mentioned, but she was interested in how they were coming on in the community and how they were making their way and she made her encouragement to them in her particular way. We, I think, members around this table who have lived here for a long time, would be honoured to have shared our lives with a part of her 99 years, and on behalf of us all, Madam Deputy Speaker, I say to Ralph who was Con's much loved son and members of Con's family, we do send our sincere condolences.

MADAM DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you Mr Buffett. Honourable Members, as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased I would ask that all Members stand in silence. Thank you Honourable Members.

Notices

APPOINTMENT OF GOVERNMENT AUDITOR

MADAM DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr King it is my understanding that you seek leave of the House to move a motion regarding the appointment of the Government Auditor.

MR KING: Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker. I do indeed, thank you.

MADAM DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is leave granted, Honourable Members.

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED

MR KING: Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker. I move that this House advises the Administrator: (a) to appoint the firm Curran Sole & Tuck, a firm in which at least one of its members is a registered auditor within the meaning of section 51A of the Norfolk Island Act 1979, to be the Norfolk Island Government Auditor under section 51 of the Act for two years commencing 1 January 1997; and (b) for the purposes of section 51 of the Norfolk Island Act 1979, to determine that the terms and conditions of appointment of the Norfolk Island Government Auditor be - (i) an annual base fee of \$26,800 per annum; and (ii) the reimbursement, at their actual cost, of out-of-pocket expenses incurred by the Auditor in relation to the employment, up to a maximum of \$8,000 in any one year. Madam Deputy Speaker, a routine matter which has been brought to a head by a limited public tender process where tenders were sought from two well-known and experienced firms of auditors. I need say no more.

MR BATES: Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker. The reasons that the fact that I have worked with both the present or the retiring external auditors and also with Mr Emerson who is the main player in the Curran Sole & Tuck firm, for reasons of that I am going to abstain from voting on this particular motion but I have no difficulty with either of the two contenders.

MADAM DEPUTY SPEAKER: Further participation Honourable Members. There being no further debate I put the question that that upon be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. Mr Bates I note that you have abstained, thank you.

AIRPORT TERMINAL PROJECT

MADAM DEPUTY SPEAKER: The airport terminal project. We resume debate on the question that the amendment proposed by Mrs Lozzi-Cuthbertson to the motion proposed by Mr King be agreed to. However I understand that Mr King and Mrs Lozzi-Cuthbertson intend to withdraw those motions that are on the Notice Paper to allow Mr Buffett to seek leave to move a further motion.

MRS LOZZI-CUTHBERTSON: That is correct Madam Deputy Speaker. I withdraw my motion.

MR KING: Likewise Madam Deputy Speaker.

MADAM DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. Honourable Members those two motions are withdrawn. I seek therefore leave of the House for these two motions to be withdrawn. Do I have that leave Honourable Members.

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED

Thank you. Leave is granted for those motions to be withdrawn.

MR BUFFETT: Madam Deputy Speaker I seek leave to move a motion that I have informally circulated amongst Members but I will read and formally put on the table once I know your wishes in respect of the leave I now seek.

MADAM DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. Is leave granted Honourable Members.

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED

Leave is granted Mr Buffett.

MADAM DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker. I move that Members of this Legislative Assembly acknowledge the results of the Referendum of 4th December 1996, and the surrounding public debate on the Airport Terminal Project; and resolve to carry out the following processes to respond to a range of community wishes, so that the project may be given renewed direction: (a) Prepare and develop in company with the Architect and Project Management Team, the following two options for community consultation: (i) An amendment of the present plan, by deletion of the georgian style on the Departure Wing, and replacement by an exterior more compatible in design to the remainder of the building; (ii) A single storey plan and design, on

17.4.1996

the existing footprint, acknowledging this may mean a loss or reduction of some of the facilities presently located on the upper floor; (b) Display and consult with the community on these two options; (c) Conduct a poll on the two options; (d) Gain a result from the poll, which will place the Legislative Assembly Members in a better position to know the community's wishes; and (e) Build the airport terminal in accordance with the community's wishes.

MADAM DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. Mr Buffett.

MR BUFFETT: Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker. If I could speak to the motion that I have proposed to the House Honourable Members I won't do at great length because I don't want to be repetitive with background detail on this airport terminal project but it is sufficient to say that we have had a referendum on 4th December and notwithstanding some ambiguity in the interpretation of the referendum results it is clear that some further community consultation needs to be sought and a clearer way ahead needs to be identified - a way ahead that has community support.

Since the referendum we as members have gone through a number of processes to move it forward and these haven't been easy. They've caused unease amongst ourselves and of course there was continued concern within the Norfolk Island community. We've had discussion and communication with our Architect Management Team. We do all remain committed to providing a terminal for Norfolk Island. We equally recognise it must be a building that brings satisfaction in a variety of ways to the Norfolk Island community. This motion sets out options, two options, which have incorporated expressed views that we have observed in the Norfolk Island community.

It does set out a choice for the Norfolk Island community and it does maintain essential facilities to the best extent we are able to balance with what the community is saying to us in the perceptions we interpret within the community. I have got to say that that has not been easy because there are competing interests so to speak. We have the competition for example to reduce costs but we also have the competitive requirement to provide facilities and those need to be balanced and we've endeavoured to provide some balance within the two options that we hope to be able to present to the Norfolk Island community. This motion that I have just proposed to the Members, if passed, commits us to consultation and that is vital in the processes that we are to go through. We have acknowledged that that has been a difficulty. I don't want to prolong that but we're trying to remedy that. Upon the consultation process being presented we want to ask the community for its views, in other words we want to poll the community and that's in this motion, and then when we have a clear indicator from the community as best as we are able in all of the circumstances that are upon us when that is clear to us, and this is important to be said, we want to build it. We want to build it and get on with it and this motion provides a commitment to build a completed terminal but in consultation with the Norfolk Island community. I encourage Members to share a commitment to this move ahead in a manner that does reflect what the community I think will say to us in respect of the building plan. Can I also say at risk of being repetitive again we're all moving through a difficult patch. Don't think this project should be dropped because of that. Don't let it falter any further than it has already. We have an opportunity to give renewed direction to this project and let's do that. Let me elaborate a little on the two options. They're a broad brush at this moment but nevertheless it might be helpful to just give this broader brush. One option is to delete the georgian style of the wing - we know that has caused some significant community comment but, apart from adjusting the style, the balance of the building may retain in a similar format. That's one option. There is also an option we are endeavouring to prepare which will give a single storey plan or design. It really means deletion of the top storey but not necessarily wholesale change of the bit that remains although there may be some small adjustment or some adjustment that might be as a result of taking off that top storey. In the first option there are some costings that are yet to be brought forward and it is thought there may be some small savings but further detail has to be gained to quantify that properly at this moment. The single storey option is seen to be a less costly option and we're asking that firm details be brought forward upon that but that might be just an indicator for us to look at and for the community to know at this moment. These two options do address, not necessarily an exhaustive list I'm going to read out to you, but a couple of things we have perceived to be of concern in the project - the design for example, the cost that I have already mentioned, the matter of public consultation, the siting arrangements and a number of other things are all endeavoured to be encompassed in the two options that we are putting forward and further researching. In assessing those in a time line sense again it is very early days but an indicative timetable might be this, especially in terms of public consultation. In other words how quickly can we put this together so that we can go out and share it with the Norfolk Island community. We have had word today that the architect and the project team may be able to make some responses and make a site visit in the middle of January and there will be some preliminary work that could be undertaken prior to then. It is felt then that by the commencement of February 1997

17.4.1996

we should be able to be in a position to make a public consultative process in this arrangement so that we will have all of the information and all of the detail to be able to share it with the community. It should be at a stage to do that. So we are really talking about being able to present to the public from the beginning of February for a period of time which we would have yet to determine but a period of time that would give good opportunity for people to absorb and make their views known and we would have a poll at the end of that time. I suppose if we are able to achieve that and then move on to revision of drawings and the plans that are finally determined then we would have to go through the tendering process again and then commence the construction process and the estimate at this time is that it may be mid-November to mid-December for completion of the project. They, can I stress Madam Deputy Speaker, are indicative timetable arrangements but it is best to share some of the indicators at this moment when we are putting out what we are putting out than to be silent on the matter. I do encourage Members to participate in the debate and to give support to this way ahead Madam Deputy Speaker.

MADAM DEPUTY SPEAKER Thank you Mr Buffett. Participation Honourable Members.

MR CHRISTIAN Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker. I certainly support the motion that Mr Buffett has before the House today. It fairly well mirrors comments that I had at the earlier part of this meeting on Wednesday. I think it is a sensible way to go forward and I think Mr Buffett has quite adequately covered all of the areas of community concern. He's identified them and indicated how we intend to respond to them and I wholeheartedly support that approach.

MADAM DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you Mr Christian. Further participation?

MRS LOZZI-CUTHBERTSON: Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker. I also support Mr Buffett's motion. It has taken many hours of discussion on the part of all Members and the project team to come to that and I compliment Mr Buffett on putting together a motion that really truly reflects what we all want, or what most of us want and which capsulates in a constructive way to move ahead that will give everyone an opportunity to contribute.

MR BUFFETT: Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker. What more do you want me for Madam Deputy Speaker.

MADAM DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am hoping you might elicit some comments from some of our other Members.

MR BUFFETT: I do encourage Members to let the community know the thinking on this way ahead. I do commend it to you of course and I would hope that we are able to demonstrate to the community that: (a) we want to consult with them, and (b) we want to bring it to finality and if Members feel that that is a way ahead please join me in telling the community so.

MR SMITH: Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker. Thank you for encouraging us, Mr Buffett, into this. I think we've come to the stage where we've run out of things to say which can be quite a blessing to the community I think. I certainly support this motion. This hasn't been an easy process since the referendum. We're now taking control of this in the way that we think is the best way to go. We'll get the project back on the rails. Not everyone is going to like the way we're doing this but I think this is the only way we can do it and lead the way to getting a new air terminal built before the end of 1997.

MR KING: Thank you Mr Speaker. I don't want to prolong this debate unnecessarily and I'll only be saying a few words and I acknowledge that the motion is represented to us as a means of progressing the matter and I have an earnest and sincere hope that that is the desired result. The difficulty of course as I see it is that we've been here before. We've been right at this very situation, position before. This won't be the first decision we've made to move ahead with the terminal project. There have been many other decisions which we've made which have sought that same result, that same end outcome which have been overturned, substituted, varied, etcetera. I understand fully and I accept that there is a majority of Members who wish to proceed on this basis and that they will vote accordingly and it is on that basis that I will be not supporting this motion and that is as a matter of principle, or as a matter of my not compromising my principles. What we will be effectively asking the community is to design an airport terminal. I don't believe we can responsibly do that. Consult, consult by all means. I have absolutely no difficulty with that but don't abrogate your duties and your responsibilities. It is not the duty nor the responsibility of the community at large to gather all the information and properly inform themselves. That is our duty and that is our responsibility. You cannot pass that onus on to the community through any process of consultation. Furthermore, Mr Speaker, I don't

believe that the motion is an appropriate response to the referendum given the extreme difficulty in the interpretation of the referendum result. The only clear message coming from the referendum came from those 340 odd who voted "Yes" and this motion ignores those people. I hope Mr Speaker that my concerns are misplaced. I will not be supporting the motion.

MRS ANDERSON: Thank you Mr Speaker. I supported the original design of the airport and I was in favour of its construction. I found the design exciting and innovative. However those are my views and not those of the majority. It doesn't matter now how we felt in the past or what we might have stated in this House. The community has spoken. The electorate did not approve of the decisions we had taken earlier. We must heed the will of the people. We must revisit those decisions and together with our project managers we've been doing just this over the past days. In the motion before us today we have outlined a plan of action that takes on board the concerns expressed in the community. We've heard that the majority do not like the mix of the designs in the one building, more particularly the georgian portion. Our architect has already been asked to put forward an alternative design for that portion in light of the result of the referendum. We've heard expressed concerns about the cost of the project and objections to the second storey. The motion proposes that the architect be requested to put forward an alternative single storey design and to identify cost savings. The question of locating the building further away from the powerhouse is also to be addressed. "Oh no", I hear the cry, "you're going back over old ground. We've got to go forward. Just get on with it." Yes, we are going back over old ground. We've got to go back to where we started going wrong. This is going to cost time and money. It has to be done. We must review the design of the airport terminal and we must recanvass the views of the people. Mr Speaker, members of the public and even some Members of this House have admonished the Assembly for not debating this matter sufficiently in open session. They want to hear our arguments, to find out who is on whose side. Mr Speaker, although it is important for us to make our views known, heated arguments and remonstrances are best kept to the Committee Room. We've certainly had our moments and words have been uttered and later regretted. The public do not want to be treated to a bun fight. They want to see that we are serious about building an airport terminal and they want to be reassured that their views will be taken into consideration. It is important that we find a solution that, although it will not surely please everybody, will please or at least not antagonise the majority. We are united in this goal and this is reflected in the motion before us today. Mr Speaker I support the motion and I look forward to the successful completion of the airport project. Thank you.

MR BATES: Thank you Mr Speaker. I intend to support this motion as I think it is a way ahead. I think I'll still believe it when I see it. However one thing I do really charge Members with that they stick to these options of this motion that if carried gives us today and if they begin to get weak round the knees, or something like that, that by the time we get to (c) or (d) and especially when some of them get to (e) I will be driving them as hard as I possibly can because I think that is what has happened in many cases. There is one thing that I am prepared to debate at length and that is my firm opinion that, regardless of what option the public eventually decides on, it must have a facility which will allow the tourists, it is the travelling public that is stranded, for want of a better word, for several hours at the terminal building due to a late plane or whatever, must have the ability to at least have a cup of tea or a cup of coffee or a plate of sandwiches and if that facility is not in either of the two options, or the second option that is coming forward, well then I will be saying more about that when the time comes. I have some questions about the motion. We say we will conduct a poll, but we don't say how, or what, or who. Is it going to be the people in the electorate, is it going to be everybody that is living here, and how are we going to do it. When we come to (e) we say we are going to build an airport terminal in accordance with the community's wishes. I would feel more comfortable if that was extended to read "build the airport terminal in accordance with the community's wishes as expressed at the poll" because I'm sure that the community's wishes may not be exactly, or we may start to interpret the community's wishes as something a little different to what the poll is. That's about all I want to say at this stage Mr Speaker but I see this as a way ahead.

MR SPEAKER: Further participation?

MRS LOZZI CUTHBERTSON: Thank you Mr Speaker. I just wish to clarify a comment, or comment on a comment that has been made by Mr Bates and has been made in the Committee Room extensively. The changing of the direction that this motion represents, in my opinion does not in any way display the fact that some Members have gone weak in the knees as we have been accused. In fact I think it displays that the majority of Members here are willing to listen to a democratic direction that our constituency has given us. Not something that we can dismiss, ignore or

17.4.1996

override. We have been given a direction. In this House we often as executive members give directions under the various Acts that we manage and administer. The community has given us a direction. For us to ignore it would have been to shirk our duty. Really I find it insulting to suggest that because we are listening to that direction, we have gone weak in the knees. Thank you Mr Speaker

MR SPEAKER: Further debate. If there isn't any further debate I am at the stage of putting the question Honourable Members.

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

MR KING NO

Do you wish the House called Mr King. No. Your No vote will be recorded. The ayes have it Honourable Members, the motion is agreed thank you

Leave

MR EVANS Thank you Mr Speaker. I seek leave of the House to move a motion seeking to transfer the responsibility for the management of the building of the new airport terminal from the portfolio of the Minister for Tourism and Finance to that of the Minister for the Environment

MR SPEAKER Leave is not granted. The will of the House is not expressed unanimously Mr Evans

MR KING Mr Speaker. I move that so much of Standing Orders as would prevent that question be suspended

MR SPEAKER Thank you. The question is Honourable Members is that so much of Standing Orders be put aside as would prevent that question being heard. Could the Clerk please call the House

MR BUFFETT AYE
MRS ANDERSONAYE
MR BATES AYE
MRS LOZZI CUTHBERTSONAYE
MR SMITH AYE
MR EVANS AYE
MR ADAMS AYE
MR KING NO
MR CHRISTIANAYE

The result of the voting Honourable Members. The ayes eight the noes one, the ayes have it. Mr Evans, would you proceed with your motion please

MR EVANS Thank you Mr Speaker. I move that this House transfers the responsibility for the management of the building of the new airport terminal from the portfolio of the Minister for Tourism and Finance to that of the Minister for the Environment. Mr Speaker thank you. I'd like to speak to my motion. The main reason for bringing this motion forward is that there is a perception that Mr King is the wrong man for the job. This is an opinion that I hold. I think some other members hold and I'm sure some members of our community hold this same opinion. The airport project really did run off the rails. I don't think I can blame any one person for this. I honestly believe that it has happened because of a number of things and I say a combination of these same things but I firmly believe that it can be brought back on track and I believe that what Mr Buffett's proposed here today is a positive step in the right direction. There will in time be two proposed options. When we, and I mean all ucklun on Norfolk, will make a choice one way or the other the public consultation process must take place. We the Assembly ...

MR KING Matter of relevance and digression Mr Speaker.

MR SPEAKER I wouldn't accept a point of order at this stage Mr King.

MR EVANS We the Assembly would then take the public's views into account and select one of the two options and go forward and I believe then and only then can the project really progress. We have one set of plans for the terminal that will forever sit on the bookshelves as a monument to a previous Minister's

17.4.1996

vision and now we have another that the people have put to bed forever. This island cannot afford to do this a third time and not get it right. This next attempt must take into consideration the consensus expressed by the people. Mr Christian has a good track record with regard to major projects he has undertaken whilst in the Assembly over the years. Mr Christian must take the community's views into consideration and he is prepared to do this. There is a need for the public to be kept informed with progress and I believe Mr Christian will do this also. He is the right man for the job and with this motion I am hoping for a more positive response from the public bearing in mind that not everyone will be pleased but Mr Speaker I bring this motion to the House today in the hope that it will get support and it will be the next step forward. Thank you.

MR KING Thank you Mr Speaker. I raise that point of order of relevance and digression because the only reason put forward there in that jumble of words in respect of my dismissal from this project was that there was a perception that I was the wrong man for the job. I invite other members around this table to add to that list please.

MR SPEAKER Mr King if you want to have the floor I will give you an opportunity to speak. I don't accept that there is a point of order as you have raised at this stage. Do you wish to have the call?

MR KING No not at this point thank you.

MR SPEAKER: Further participation?

MRS LOZZI CUTHBERTSON: Thank you Mr Speaker. I support the motion but not the spirit in which Mr Evans has expressed it. In my motion on Wednesday I went to some lengths to mention that many of the decisions that had been made until very recently in fact had been made by the majority of the Assembly together. I think it would be wrong to scapegoat Mr King for the way the project has gone off the rails. The major mistake made, and I don't want to belabour it, was failing - all of us - failing to hold a public consultation process and for that certainly Mr King alone should not be blamed. We all carry that responsibility. The reason I moved my motion last Wednesday was that in putting forward for everybody's consideration my strongly felt opinion that we should go to the community with more than one option, more than one new option, I certainly meet with continual and strong resistance from Mr King and it certainly took me some time to convince other members of the Assembly. I was in the minority on the 9th of December when we discussed this and I am glad to see that other people have come to see some of my concerns that were expressed then and Mr King has every right to say that on the 9th of December only one option was asked for except with some costing. Now what concerned me and why I moved my motion is the reason I think this project should be removed from Mr King and this is that he refused to consider that we need a second option. We had major differences about this and since he completely would not consider it until Monday 16th it seemed to me to be impossible to expect he would be prepared to change and to consider alternatives that we are putting forward today. And that is why I put my name forward at that stage - not because I particularly wanted to take over the project, in fact I was dreading it, but at that stage nobody else wanted to take over that project and unless there was an alternative there really was nowhere else to go except Mr King's way. I'm glad that today and as a result of their discussions that have taken place over the last two days. Mr Christian has found a way of reorganizing his commitments so that he's willing to take it over because by far Mr Christian is much more suitable and equipped to handle this project than I am. I have absolutely no problem with that but I really emphasise that Mr King should not be scapegoated but at the same time he was not willing to be flexible enough to consider all other alternatives that had to be submitted to the community and I think we are going to have to be very flexible in listening to the community and we're going to have to do it with an open mind and be prepared to respond and that is why I am supporting this motion. Thank you Mr Speaker.

MR SPEAKER. Mr Bates.

MR BATES Thank you Mr Speaker. I find some of those remarks a little unfair. I think those remarks are assuming that if Mr King goes on with the project he will not honour the motion of the House today and I think it's unfair to say that an attitude of his some little time ago will be overridden by the motion of the House today and therefore we have to get rid of him. We must ask ourselves why are we considering this motion. Mrs Cuthbertson said to me some of the things I am

going to say now. Are we trying to cover up our own mistakes and say it's all Mr King's fault. I find this is just further proof of the mess we are in and certainly no way to reinstate any confidence in our project managers or those local contractors who, in good faith, wish to make a contribution. To change horses now will not change anything if the jockey uses the whip now and again but pulls back on the reins as soon as the horse responds. I think we have pulled out the whip and jumped forward, but once the public have made a decision on the concept soon to be presented to them we must let the horse run and not continue to pull on the reins. In other words let our project managers get on with it and that's not Mr King nor Mr Christian with virtually no interference from members. I am not sure that Mr Christian will not interfere with the work of the project managers. Only on Thursday he was telling them how to suck eggs. There may be a perception that Mr King has contributed to the mess we're in but if members of this House are trying to shift the burden of their own mistakes on to Mr King then that's different. He may not always have been right and I've taken my criticisms direct to him. The public will judge him next April as they will all of us who offer ourselves for re-election, but to try to shift the burden of our own inadequacies will fool no-one. I urge members to make a stand after the public have studied the next conceptual drawings. Stand up and be counted and face the electorate but don't keep blaming someone else. If I thought the project would move smoother with Mr Christian holding the reins I would support this motion but I remain concerned that he might try to tell Arrow Construction how to manage the project and that would be a further disaster. Frankly I don't care whether it is Mr King or Mr Christian who handles the Assembly's role in the project from here on in but I do want to see that we do what our project managers ask - that is give them a clear direction and a set of objectives etcetera and let them go. If members want to shift the blame by supporting the motion I hope it doesn't backfire further down the line when our role diminishes and the real managers take over. Thank you Mr Speaker.

MR SPEAKER

Further debate. Mr Adams.

MR ADAMS

Thank you Mr Speaker. Mr Speaker I think it is fair to say that we live in interesting times and I think this is also an issue that if I'm frank with we've just about spoken to the nth degree about him. I shall be brief and to the point. I think what we're looking at here now from today forward is a package and I think there is two parts to the package as proposed. One is the motion put forward by Mr Buffett and the one, the second part of the package is a motion put forward by Mr Evans and a few brief words on both of those to give my position and the reasons why Mr Speaker. I think the motion is presented, the progressive motion as presented by Mr Buffett gives a good consolidation of progressive factors and gives a commitment to a team effort and includes stake holders, the architects, the project management and also the members of this House.

It also includes such progressive factors as the achieving and dissemination of options, the consultation on those options and the holding of a poll to put together some conclusions arising from such a poll. And most importantly Mr Speaker is the commitment, the cast iron commitment to get on with the thing and build it. Part 2 the appointment of Mr Christian I see as the executive member with responsibility for the project I believe is an appropriate move. I believe Mr Speaker it gives further clarity of the House's intention as expressed publicly through the comments on Mr Buffett's motion to identify a successful process and to go forward not withstanding it may not be an easy process and it may not at the end of the day satisfy everybody. Nevertheless it must go forward and on that basis. Mr Speaker it gives further indication that this Assembly desires to revitalize this project and progress in a definitive manner. Now I emphasise definitive. I support Minister Christian's appointment. He is the Works Minister, he has the Building Board in his portfolio and his experience will be a positive contribution to the successful completion of this project. He has my support in his endeavours to successfully commence and complete this project. Thank you.

MR SPEAKER:

Further participation? Mr Smith.

MR SMITH:

Thank you Mr Speaker. Dare I say anything at all about Mike, Mr Speaker. I had to dodge his car this morning but I think Mike and I have had enough shots at each other this year. I would just like to say that I do support this motion purely in this instance on the basis that Michael doesn't support the motion of Mr Buffett's which is supposedly to take us on the road to getting a new terminal built and if Michael doesn't agree with that I would find it very hard not to support this motion.

MR SPEAKER:

Further debate. Mr King.

17.9.1996

MR KING

Thank you Mr Speaker. I think George's comment is the only one made with any sense and clarity. I was wondering who was going to seize on that. Good on you George because that is quite right. It is probably appropriate that I do stand by because I don't support that substantive motion. I oppose it on a matter of principle of course. As to the other speakers, forgive me but I glean very little from your comments, a perception that I'm the wrong man for the job. Whose perception? Some people out in the community, a large number of people out in the community. I know about five hundred of them out in the community that'd have my guts for garters. I know about 460 odd or something voted for me as well and until the perception out in the community manifests itself in a substantial loss of support the other perceptions can be bundled up and put on the shelf. I suppose Mr Speaker history is full of instances where a person is given a job to do, a job of leadership or pushed out the front and when the going gets tough you get a harder push from behind. This is probably not any different than that. I am just a little bit surprised where the push is coming from. Forgive me, Mrs Cuthbertson, but you charge me with being inflexible and I was not prepared to consider any other options until very recently, that you couldn't convince Mr King of your way of thinking and for that, not being able to convince Mr King, Mrs Cuthbertson moves to strip me of my portfolio responsibility. I remind members that the motion I put on the books is a reflection in true form of the decision that all you lot made, the whole eight of you made, in my absence on the 9th December. Yes, Mr Evans wasn't here either. I don't know. Sacking Mike King I'm sure is not going to solve the problem. It may assist it in some quarters, may assist a number of my antagonists out in the community to get off our backs. It may well. It may well invite other commentators out there who are antagonistic towards Mr Christian because he only spends one day a fortnight on the job to say a few things as well. So you see the patterns shift and change, the winds change. I think it's extraordinary that some think that to take Mike King out of the equation will make a difference. I mean the decision making process won't change unless Mr Christian wants to exercise his executive authority in its pure form which he is entitled to do of course but which I'm sure he won't. Not one crucial decision has been taken unilaterally by me along the course of this debacle and I recall the major decision taken on that fateful day in September, Friday 13th Mr Speaker, when the project team and myself made a presentation to all members, with the exception of Mr Bates, and during that presentation, the red book as we all have come to know it, was put before all members. The project team made their presentation, I made a presentation along with members of the Administration on the funds aspect. I said to members, "Go away and read the book. Let's not make a decision today. Go away and read the book." No. What did members want to do? Take the decision immediately, immediately. And I remind members once again that at that meeting I not only urged counsel and caution and pause in respect of making that decision and asked yourselves to go away and properly inform yourselves by reading the book, I invited you all back to a meeting the following day - 12.30 - to speak with the project team, the professional team and myself after you had taken the time to read the booklet on the Friday night. Two or three turned up. One member, and I don't want to go picking, apparently some person, one member rang up and said, "Listen, I've got to go and have a game of golf. I won't be coming." Mrs Anderson was there. I think Mr Evans came along as well. It was an interesting meeting - interesting in so far as those who are now making a lot of noise about the way this project is being conducted were absent after I had urged them, urged them, urged them, urged pause and urged them to read the book and come to that meeting the following day, and I table for public record, Mr Speaker, the minutes of that meeting on September 13th which record that at a formal vote of members it was agreed unanimously that the project go ahead as per the consultants' report and recommendations at \$2.66 million. It records also on Saturday 14th at 12.30 the Minister for Tourism and Finance and the project team will be available at the Assembly Building to discuss any further issues of detail that MLAs may have after further considering the consultants' report. I table that. I even suggested at that meeting if members may recall correctly that the cost could be cut down, that we could do things like the landscaping etcetera at a later time. It was yourself, Mr Speaker, who said, "We'll do it all now. We'll never do it again at a later time. It'll never get done." Mr Speaker's just nodded his head. I offered that caution. I agreed with Mr Speaker. I agreed. It's been suggested Mr Speaker that right throughout this debate I have unduly influenced this matter. Well look I'll remind members again that at that meeting on 9th December I wasn't even present and in any event it was a suggestion, anything in the suggestion you can't think for yourselves you ought to go home and have a think. I know I'm forceful, I know I speak out of turn a little bit, but I regret the inference or reject the inference that I unduly influenced people. The manner in which I thought this project might go ahead was as per the decision taken by seven members, I'm sorry Mr Evans, seven members on that day. Members coming to, and I quote Mr Speaker, "members coming to agreement as follows: DFA to be asked to develop the redesign of the building to a stage where plans can be put on display. A two-week time frame has been indicated." I'll leave out the proliferate. "2. Arrows, that's the consultancy, in consultation with the architects, be asked to provide

members broad brush costings and ramifications for each of the following propositions: construction of single storey with footprint adjusted to accommodate the same functionality as the Georgian, will be the construction of a single storey" and this is important, Mr Speaker - "this information is required by members to allow them to respond to questions from members of the public and is not intended to form part of the package to be presented to the public for comment." I wasn't at the meeting. Your minutes - I table those.

I table also, Mr Speaker, the minutes of 5th December, which was the day after they conducted the referendum. Importantly, and I quote, "the consensus view was that Desmond Freeman Associates be asked to redesign the departure wing to a stage that would be more acceptable to the community with a reduction in cost where possible and with present functionality being retained, be that in a single or two-storey building. The changed design is to be displayed to the public before acceptance by the Assembly." Those are not my decisions and they are not decisions which were forced out of you by my putting you in a half hammer lock. My desire, Mr Speaker, has only been to move ahead and narrow down the issues as we move ahead. It's not been easy for me to find that point, but nowhere, nowhere in the debate today nor can I find or identify any point in which I have deviated from the decisions or the directions which reflected the decisions made by all members around this table. I will not be made a scapegoat. I will not be seen as a scapegoat. Mr Speaker, Mr Speaker, I hear the dogs of political opportunism barking. Let's feed them Mr Speaker. I move that the question be put.

MR SPEAKER The question before us is that the question be put. Really do I need to put that? I will put the question forthwith I think Honourable Members. The question is that that is moved by Mr Evans and I will put that question to you now. The question is that this motion be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT

MR SPEAKER Would the Clerk please call the House.

MR BUFFETT	AYE
MRS ANDERSON	AYE
MR BATES	NO
MRS CUTHBERTSON	AYE
MR SMITH	AYE
MR EVANS	AYE
MR ADAMS	AYE
MR KING	NO
MR CHRISTIAN	AYE

MR SPEAKER The result of voting Honourable Members. The Ayes - 7, the No's 2. The ayes have it. The motion is agreed.

Notice No 2 - Entry Criteria under the Immigration Act

MR KING Mr Speaker I simply moved adjournment of that because I had detected, thought I had detected an error in the information the Minister was putting before the House. The redoubtable Mr Brown has brought that error to the Ministers' attention. I have nothing further to say in relation to the matter.

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Further debate? The question is that the motion be agreed to and the House take note of the statement.

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED.

The ayes have it. It is so noted.

Notice No. 3 - Customs Amendment No. 3 Bill 1996

MR ADAMS Thank you Mr Speaker. I seek leave of the House to withdraw detail stage of Amendment No. 3 from this package of amendments.

MR SPEAKER Is leave granted?

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED

Leave is granted. Thank you Mr Adams.

MR ADAMS I withdraw detail stage of Amendment No. 3.

MR SPEAKER Thank you. That stage is so withdrawn. Honourable Members, that particular detail stage Amendment having been withdrawn I put to you that the Amendments that remain be agreed to. Is that agreed to?

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED

Can I now ask you that all of the clauses including the amendments be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED

That is so agreed thank you. Is the remainder of the Bill agreed.

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED

The remainder of the Bill is so agreed. Thank you. Mr Adams I now seek a motion obviously from you that the Bill as amended be agreed to.

MR ADAMS I so move Mr Speaker.

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Any final debate? If there isn't any final debate I put the question that the Bill as amended be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED

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

FIXING OF THE NEXT SITTING DAY

MR BATES Thank you Mr Speaker. I move that the House at its rising adjourn until Wednesday 12th February 1997 at 10 a.m.

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Any debate upon this. It obviously takes into account a projected recess period Honourable Members until we come back on 12th February.

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED

The ayes have it. That is so agreed. Thank you.

ADJOURNMENT

MRS ANDERSON Mr Speaker I move that the House do now adjourn.

MR SPEAKER Thank you. The question is that the House do now adjourn.

MRS ANDERSON Thank you Mr Speaker. We have had some heated words here today. I hope that Members will take due reflection upon what has been said and that we can find a way forward for the problems that have beset us over this past year. I would like to wish fellow Members and members of the community a peaceful and reflective Christmas and I hope that 1997 will give prosperity and health to all. Thank you.

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Participation.

MR BATES Thank you Mr Speaker. I would like to share with Mrs Anderson those sentiments to the community. I would also like to thank those who have worked with us in the various boards and committees and bodies over the past twelve months for their work and to wish the whole community and all members of this House and their families all the best for the festive season and a prosperous New Year.

MR SPEAKER Thank you Mr Bates. Mr Evans?

MR EVANS Thank you Mr Speaker. Could I put other issues aside

17.421996

for a moment because I'd like to wish everyone on Norfolk Island a Merry Christmas.

To our children I hope Santa do goode fer yorlye. To the students and friends who will be reuniting with their families I hope you have a good time. To other Members and their families best wishes. The staff of the Assembly thanks for me and that applies to the Public Service staff who help implement decisions and discussions from around the table. Thanks. The general public - God bless you all and I hope 1997 brings happiness, good health and prosperity to everyone. Thank you.

MR SPEAKER Thank you Mr Evans. Further debate. Mr King.

MR KING Thank you Mr Speaker. A few words of best wishes as well from myself recognising that despite the events of the past few days it is yuletide and I want to say, especially at this stage, to Mr Christian, good luck with the project and to those around this table my best wishes for Christmas and the New Year. To those in the community who regard me in a poor light, who have a poor perception of me I wish them good cheer. My antagonists and protagonists I wish them peace and tranquillity. I say good luck to my colleagues, those of you who will be standing for election again next year. I ask members and maybe the community to reflect on some of the achievements of the Parliament these past twelve months and not just the bitterness and vitriol that has emerged over the terminal in recent times. That's most unfortunate. It has been a good year for the Parliament of Norfolk Island and there have been some very worthwhile achievements. There is a sun shining on the horizon. There is absolutely no doubt about that. I fall short of talking about the five minutes of economic sunshine etcetera but I will say once again good times are ahead for Norfolk Island. I remain very confident that the next five or ten years for Norfolk Island are going to be very good indeed and all the signs are there. I hope that everyone is able to enjoy the benefits of that revitalization of the economy. Best wishes to everyone, thank you.

MR SPEAKER Thank you Mr King. Further? Mr Smith.

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Speaker. I reiterate most of the things that Mike has said and I too wish all my colleagues round this table all the best for this time of the year and all those in the community that like us or even don't like us I wish you all a very merry Christmas and a prosperous next year.

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Further debate?

MRS LOZZI CUTHBERTSON Thank you Mr Speaker. I think I will mention, I will give the wishes in my own language: buona talie en buon capida non tuti. Grazie.

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Further contributions Honourable Members. No further contributions. We are about to adjourn. If I may then join with you all members in saying to members of the Norfolk Island community warm wishes for Christmas, happy and prosperous times for 1997. Could I equally with you extend good wishes to officers of the Service, Clerk and Deputy Clerk of this Parliament and especially to those who have offered their services to the Norfolk Island community and to us here in this Assembly in voluntary capacities and there are many people who have undertaken such tasks as well as those who have performed in statutory functions for the Norfolk Island community. Warm wishes to them for Christmas and a good new year in 1997. To each of you Honourable Members my eight colleagues in this nine member Assembly could I wish you warmly to you and your respective families very best wishes, good Christmas cheer and blessings for a Christmastide. Thank you for your contributions in this Legislative Assembly during 1996 and hope that we will all continue to make a contribution for the balance of this term which will obviously take us through into the early part of 1997. Thank you warmly, merry Christmas and a happy New Year to everyone.

I put the question that this House do now adjourn.

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED

The ayes have it. This House stands adjourned Honourable Members until Wednesday 12th February 1997 at 10.00 a.m.

--ooOoo--

