

Good morning Honourable Members. We commence with the Prayer of the Legislative Assembly

**Prayer**

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

**Leave of absence for Hon M W King, Hon R E Adams and Hon N C Christian**

Honourable Members, Leave from todays sitting is sought for Mr King, Mr Adams and Mr Christian. Is Leave granted? Yes, thank you

**Statement by the Speaker**

Honourable Members we assemble this morning for what is our February Sitting after our recess since 20 December 1996.

For reasons I will explain in a moment, I intend, with your agreement, to only call on Condolences, Messages from the Office of the Administrator, Notices of Motion being the Immigration Quota and an amendment to the Road Traffic Act then to suspend this Sitting until next Wednesday the 19th February. The Island is facing a major difficulty in the announced withdrawal of Ansett Airlines, from the Norfolk Island service by 1st July 1997, and the three Ministers with relevant and associated responsibilities are presently in Melbourne pressing the Island's interest. Your having just granted them leave. Over the past week a community consultative group has been established. The Minister with responsibility for Air Transport, Robert Adams, has located in the Burnt Pine areas, (in the former Valley View Restaurant) to give impetus and community focus to efforts. Two main areas of difficulty are being worked upon -

- a) the loss of bookings present and prospective associated with the advertised withdrawal of Ansett on 1 July 1997, and
- b) the getting of a suitable replacement carrier.

Ministers Adams, King and Christian are in Melbourne today with an appointment for discussion with Chief Executives of Ansett about the loss of bookings caused by the 1 July deadline to withdraw. They will return on Thursday. Positive interest in being an airline carrier to the Island has commenced to be expressed by both Norfolk Island interests and established Australian and overseas Airlines. Upon the return of the Ministers some detail may be available and if this turns out to be so, this will be distributed in the weekend press. In their absence Members have seen merit to handle only urgent business today and defer the balance until next Wednesday.

**Condolences**

MR SPEAKER

Honourable Members I ask if there are Condolences

MRS ANDERSON

Mr Speaker, it is with regret that this House records the death of Gordon Maskill-Smith on 23 December 1996. Gordon was born in New Zealand, then in early childhood moved to England with his parents; where they remained until Gordon was in Secondary school. When they returned to Auckland, New Zealand Gordon enrolled at Auckland University. After graduating he joined the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research in the discipline of chemical engineering. Gordon married Beverley in May 1940 and they were together a total of 56 years. They have one daughter (Bronwyn) two grandchildren and one great-grandson. In 1946 Gordon was sent by the

DSIR to the USA as a scientific liaison officer to the government, where he served with distinction. Upon his return to New Zealand he joined the Winstone Company in a scientific development capacity where he remained for 14 years. In 1975 Gordon and Beverley came to Norfolk Island ostensibly to retire, but they purchased the ABC Hobby Centre which he ran and developed for 11 years. Gordon carried on running the business even after he sold it. Gordon had a distinguished association with Rotary. He was a Past President of the Rotary Club of Mt Roskill in Auckland. He became a very important member of the Norfolk Island Club especially with his detailed knowledge of other Rotary clubs and activities. He served on most committees and as Secretary, Vice President and President. He was a man of integrity, one of the most reliable members. Because of his selflessness he was honoured with the award of a Paul Harris Fellowship in August 1983, a well deserved honour which he accepted with dignity and humility. Gordon had a fine organising ability and it was he who organised the Rotary District Conference here in Norfolk Island in 1983. The job was carried out with total success. Gordon served in Rotary for 36 years and had a 100% attendance record. Amongst other organisations he was also a member of the Probus Club and of Red Cross. To Beverley, Bronwyn and her family, to Gordon's many friends, this House extends its deepest sympathy.

#### **Message from the Office of the Administrator**

Honourable Members I have received the following message from the Office of the Administrator, Message No 96. On 18th June 1996, pursuant to section 21 of the Norfolk Island Act 1979 I declared my Assent to the Tourist Accommodation (Amendment) Act 1996, which is Act No 7 of 1996 and the Employment (Amendment) Act 1996, which is Act No 8 of 1996. The Message is dated the 19th June 1996, Alan Kerr, Administrator

#### **NOTICES**

#### **NO 2 - IMMIGRATION ACT 1980 - DETERMINATION OF GENERAL ENTRY PERMIT QUOTA FOR PERIOD 14 FEBRUARY 1997 TO 13 FEBRUARY 1998**

MRS CUTHBERTSON Thank you Mr Speaker. I move that for the purposes of Section 21 (1) of the Immigration Act 1980 this House resolves that it be declared by instrument in writing that 85 General Entry Permits be granted during the period of 14/2/1997 to 13/2/1998. Mr Speaker, I'm certain that many people listening to this meeting will want a detailed explanation of how the quota figure I have just recommended that this House adopt was reached and I will try to be as clear as possible in this statement. At the end of 1992 and early in 1993 the 6th Assembly debated at some length the problems that were even then affecting Norfolk's economy because of a steady decline in population. To counter that decline and address those problems it was decided to include in the calculations for the quota of GEP's made available every year in allowance for a growth in population. The percentage figure for that targeted increase was set at 2% as it was felt that such a figure would allow a manageable level of growth which could easily be monitored and which would produce the desired increase in population numbers over a few years. At that time and since then every time immigration has been discussed in this House there has been general recognition that Norfolk Island needs a certain level of population to make essential services, businesses and trades viable. Unfortunately at the same time we have witnessed a steady outflow of residents and GEP holders and our permanent population is made up of residents and GEP holders has continued to decline. Mr Speaker this is happened in spite of a quota intended to produce a steady growth. Simple mathematics will demonstrate to anyone interested to check the figures that if the figure upon which the 2% increase is calculated decreases the allowance for growth is mostly swallowed

12.2.97

up in keeping numbers at a steady level at best. Last April this Assembly agreed to tackle the problem of a population policy which was not working by reviewing the manner in which the immigration quota was calculated. Mr Speaker, as you and Members will recall the quota used to be set by calculating 2% of the average of the total number of residents plus GEP holders present on the Island at the end of each month of the previous year I move that for the purposes of Section 21 (1) of the Immigration Act 1980 this House resolves that it be declared by instrument in writing that 85 General Entry Permits be granted during the period of 14/2/1997 to 13/2/1998. Mr Speaker, I'm certain that many people listening to this meeting will want a detailed explanation of how the quota figure I have just recommended that this House adopt was reached and I will try to be as clear as possible in this statement. At the end of 1992 and early in 1993 the 6th Assembly debated at some length the problems that were even then affecting Norfolk's economy because of a steady decline in population. To counter that decline and address those problems it was decided to include in the calculations for the quota of GEP's made available every year in allowance for a growth in population. The percentage figure for that targeted increase was set at 2% as it was felt that such a figure would allow a manageable level of growth which could easily be monitored and which would produce the desired increase in population numbers over a few years. At that time and since then every time immigration has been discussed in this House there has been general recognition that Norfolk Island needs a certain level of population to make essential services, businesses and trades viable. Unfortunately at the same time we have witnessed a steady outflow of residents and GEP holders and our permanent population is made up of residents and GEP holders has continued to decline. Mr Speaker this is happened in spite of a quota intended to produce a steady growth. Simple mathematics will demonstrate to anyone interested to check the figures that if the figure upon which the 2% increase is calculated decreases the allowance for growth is mostly swallowed up in keeping numbers at a steady level at best. Last April this Assembly agreed to tackle the problem of a population policy which was not working by reviewing the manner in which the immigration quota was calculated. Mr Speaker, as you and Members will recall the quota used to be set by calculating 2% of the average of the total number of residents plus GEP holders present on the Island at the end of each month of the previous year. That 2% will then declare to be the quota for the following year. In April 1996 this Assembly decided that in future the quota would be calculated by taking the average population figure used in February 1996 to set the quota as the base figure and adding to that figure the quota for 1996 as the base figure for 1997. That would form a targeted population for 1997 and then calculating at 2% growth we want to achieve on that population figure by 1998. I know that sounds a little complicated but we decided to make sure that we would not go on calculating the figure on a decreasing base but we would try a base that was 1996 February figure and move up from there. Let me explain that with real figures. In February 1996 when the last annual quota was set, our average population for the previous year was 1521. Add to that figure the 34 quota places which in fact have been filled and our target for the Norfolk Island population for this February should be 1555. Adding 2% to that figure gives us a target population figure for February 1998 of 1586. Unfortunately however our current average real permanent population is 1502. The gap between that real figure for the average population and our target population for February 1998 is therefore 84. Hence the recommended figure for the coming years quota works out at 84. I have been asked, what happens if there is a sudden migration back to Norfolk Island of residents who moved away over the past few years. Again simple mathematics should assure anyone concerned about letting in too many people at the same time as the residents begin to return. If our average permanent population increases, the gap between that figure and our targeted population figure will get smaller and our quota will get smaller. For example if our average permanent population

12.2.97

at the moment was 1570 the quota would be only 14. So you see if people start coming back to Norfolk Island we're not going to have a huge quota, we are going to have a smaller quota. So that is the safety valve in the method that the quota is going to be calculated. It is a flexible quota which will respond to the reality of the situation and I think we need to ensure that whatever we do our population doesn't increase out of proportion and it doesn't fall out of all feasible economic situations. In recommending a quota of 84 for the coming year I am mindful that it is an exceptionally large figure but I put it to this House and to everyone listening that for the economic viability of this community we need a certain number of people. This method of calculating the quota as I said responds to the real situation as it fluctuates. Furthermore we will be reviewing as we have decided on a six monthly basis what is happening to immigration. Therefore that will happen in May this year. That is the next six monthly period for reviewing what is happening to immigration. Anyway of this 84 places only 42 will become available for the first six months of this year and again in August 1997, this year whoever is Minister for Immigration will come back to this House to request declaration of the 2nd half of the quota and again the situation can be reviewed. So I ask people not to be concerned about this unexpectedly large number of the quota because there are mechanisms in place to ensure that it's reviewed regularly by this House and the formula itself will respond to the reality of the situation. I commend the Motion to this House.

MR SPEAKER

Thank you. Debate Honourable Members?

MR EVANS

Thank you Mr Speaker. Mr Speaker I have some real concern with that large number of 84 people. I do realise that we need a certain number of people within this Island to support the Norfolk's infrastructure but I also have reservations about the retirees policy under the Immigration Act and I also have concerns of the Social Services Act which would then apply to those retirees, in other words the pension. So even though I can see where Mrs Cuthbertson is coming from I also have concerns with that large number being 84. I'll just leave it at that for now thank you.

MR SPEAKER

Thank you.

MR BATES

Thank you Mr Speaker. Yes I think Mr Evans has hit the nail on the head there. Some of the concerns he's raised are exactly the concerns which I have on the issue and I just jotted down a few things. We had a formula for calculating the quota which I think was put out by Mr King some time ago and part B of that was to disregard the 31st December figures as it is inflated extraordinarily due to the large number of residents that have returned for Christmas. Now that is one point because although that may be a true statement the December figure is also year by year a real figure of the population at the time and to disregard it I think waters down the formula and you know it disregards the fact that although a population figure at 96 was 1502 it was an extraordinarily large number of students off shore which are not included in that figure and it's reasonable to assume that a number of those will come back but I also share the concerns of the imbalance that this formula may bring in the policy of this House to allow 25% of the quota to go to retirees. On the basis of this we could get 21 retiree applications in the next 12 months and this business I think the whole formula needs to be rethought because 84 GEP positions is actually a 5 or 6% growth in the next 12 months on the figure of 1502 and I think that is just too high. That's going to mean if we could fill those we're going to have a real 5% growth in 12 months is too quick. It doesn't achieve and we could be making mistakes and it doesn't achieve what we are trying to do. I would like to move at the appropriate time that the figure be reduced to what it has been for the recent times and that is 34 with the same view that it can be reviewed in August and

12.2.97

if some of these other issues are again re-looked at the retiree situation, which I don't think is really working but 21 of them in the next 12 months I think would be a disaster because it's all very well to say that these particular people will not be a burden on the community for health or education or social services but in 5 years time they will become residents and once they become residents those checks and balances are gone. You can't say to a resident you must maintain your health cover, you must maintain your independent income and we see that our social services system and our health system can be abused. People can offload assets and various things and get themselves into the system. We've got the aging population thing which is also a great concern and if you just look at the statistics that recently came out, in 5 years the average age of our 50 to 54 group has gone up by 32. The 55 to 59 group has gone up by 22. Small drops in the 60, 64, 65, 69. The 70 and over group has gone up by 35. No they're large figures, so we have an aging population. We have a problem. I think the whole system needs to be relook at and I would like to move at the appropriate time that that figure be changed to 34 which is the figure we've had for the last couple of years.

MR SPEAKER

Thank you Mr Bates. Further debate?

MRS ANDERSON

Thank you Mr Speaker. Mr Speaker I support Mrs Lozzi-Cuthbertson's Motion. I agree with what she said about the requirements of a minimum population for the Island to support our infrastructure. I don't agree with the scare tactics that Mr Evans and Mr Bates have alluded to. I believe that the necessary checks and balances are in place. If residents, people of Pitcairn decent can be persuaded to return to the Island that would be an ideal situation and this quota calculation takes that into concern. If they do come back then the quota will be reduced. In the meantime if we cannot provide an environment to which people want to return then I think that we have to open up the Island to other people to be able to support our essential services and maintain our trades and businesses as they need to be retained. I fully support the Motion. Thank you.

MR SPEAKER

Thank you. Further debate?

MR SMITH

Thank you Mr Speaker. I think the figure of 84 is a large amount of people and rather than having an amount of people of this number coming into the Island I would rather see some of the 900 people that have left here in the last 10 years come back here to live, but then we've got to be realistic. We've got to look at this in a common sense way. We've got to worry about Norfolk Island, we can't be worried about the people that choose to leave unless they have to for schooling or something like that, but if people are moving away we do have to keep our population at a certain level. We can see what has happened to Pitcairn Island whose very much tried to protect the Island as it has been but over the years the population keeps decreasing. Norfolk Island is falling into that same category. It's doing the same thing. The population did peak some years ago but that population as we hear every year is shrinking. Some of it is due to our policies as Mrs Cuthbertson explained the way the quota used to work it could continually reduce the size of the population. Last year we sat around the table here, we agreed to do something about it by having a real 2% increase in the population based on a certain calculation. That calculation has proved and as Mrs Cuthbertson has pointed out that the population even since then has dropped and if we don't really come to grips with it and look at it in a realistic way we'll find there is the real problems that there's less people to pay for the health care scheme, there's less people to pay for the electricity, there's less people using telephones etc, so I think we've really got to be realistic in the figure, looking at the figures for the immigration quota, the figure of 84 is divided into 2 over the 12 months. In six months time the next

12.2.97

assembly can look at the remaining 42 places in the quota and they can say then if they think it's too high. They can change it. They can do away with it all together if they like and I think we've really got to look at this in a common sense way and come to grips with what is happening in the population. It is dropping, we do need a certain amount of people here to keep the local industries going. I don't think I would be supporting Brian and reducing the number, particularly down as low as what he's suggesting. I would be quite prepared to go along with the 84 people in the quota but I would ask that Mrs Cuthbertson do look seriously at the retired portion of the quota which I understand runs at about 25% of what the quota is last year, I understand it would have been about 7 people or 7 places that were allowed under the 25% policy. I think as the quota gets higher that does increase the ability of more and more retired people to be able to come here and whether that's good or not, that's for people in the community to decide but I would really like that to be taken into account and maybe by next month we may be able to hear something from Mrs Cuthbertson along those lines but at this stage I support the quota as it stands.

MADAM DEPUTY SPEAKER Thank you Mr Smith.

MR BUFFETT Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker. There is obviously some difference of view about this matter and some expressions of concern in specific areas. One of the areas that I perceive to be areas of concern and which I share is the component within the quota that might relate to retirees and Mr Bates has quoted some figures that have increased dramatically in that particular area and there now lies a question mark as to whether we should continue to increase at that rate in that particular area. I share that concern and I think it should be examined. The Motion itself at this moment endeavours to set out a figure of 84 for the totality of the year. Mrs Cuthbertson has very correctly explained that at the half year mark that that can be looked at, but in reality what we are doing if we look at the 84 figure is we are setting it for the year and we are setting it knowing that there are these areas of concern. My suggestion would be not to necessarily destroy the quota formula at this moment but quite clearly only set it for half the year. That is, reduce the figure by half but knowing that it is for half the year and during that time re-evaluate as to whether the percentages of various components remain those that we would want to continue. That's not destroying their formula at this moment but it is giving breathing space for it to be examined and it obviously cuts the figure in half at this moment. Now theoretically as I understand it that should cut the particular retiree group in half for the period of 6 months and during that time it can be evaluated. If after evaluation it is thought to continue, fine you can then set the balance for the balance of the year. If you want to adjust it you have provided the breathing space for an adjustment to be made and although Mr Bates has foreshadowed that he would want to present a figure I think he mentioned at 38 I would also ask Members to consider if there is this area of concern to put it at 42 for a half yearly period and assess it then. I don't think there's a great deal of difference between the 38 and the 42 although Mr Bates may have a view upon that but it gives some ordered arrangement in which it can be evaluated and doesn't necessarily enter into an adhoc arrangement at this very moment but I just put it down on the table for consideration.

MRS CUTHBERTSON Thank you. If I could deal with Mr Buffett's suggestion first. Does Mr Buffett propose then that we change the Motion to name 42 for a period of say February 14th to August 13th?

MR BUFFETT Yes, half a year.

MRS CUTHBERTSON I have no objection at all to changing that Motion and

12.2.97

I certainly would be quite happy to do so but may I deal with some of the concerns very properly expressed by other Members as I certainly have looked at them myself when I looked at this figure and I thought of the consequences. First and foremost the kind of people that are being coming forward with "retirees" proposal are certainly of varying ages. From people in their 50's and to people slightly older but certainly nobody of a large age has come forward, only 1 person but he was a member of another group and he got in on an appeal but the other people have all been 50's and early 60's and that age group with substantial funds, keen to look at what was viable once they got here and making up their mind on a slower basis, so that if they for example decided that they want to enter business once they arrived here they would apply back to the Immigration Committee and the Immigration Minister for a change in their proponents. So we're not getting a lot of very elderly people. We're getting people who have substantial funds, who are prepared to look at passive investments, that is in property and so on and businesses which they don't have to run and look at other opportunities and become more viable and more involved in the economic life of the Island as time goes on. We require of these people to bring their health insurance at a very high level with them and all the evidence so far, this goes back to way before we started to set the quota is that most people that come in with high insurance, health insurance retain it for their own peace of mind they retain their insurance and this certainly relieve some of the pressure on the health care system of the Island. I certainly can give no undertakings that the new people coming in will do the same but the past is always an indication of what we can expect for the future. As far as people becoming dependent on social services we do have a 10 year waiting period before you become eligible for social security payments on the Island. The other movement that we have observed and this is somewhat anecdotal but I certainly know of a number of people and this I'm talking about long term residents of the Island who seem to have gone back to Australia where they had qualified because of their periods of work there to qualify for the required period to be legible for a pension in Australia which they then have brought back to the Island. So some of these people that may be coming in now have already qualified for a pension somewhere else, a pension which is higher than the one set in Australia and very reasonably if they do find that their means have changed over the years. They can go back to where they come from by putting in their qualifying period over there and come back if they then so desire to Norfolk Island with a pension for which they have worked in other places and they have every right to bring to Norfolk Island. This is happening at a reasonably significant level and we should not ignore it. I again cannot be certain that this will go on happening over the years but if you consider it from a personal point of view and it would apply to me for example. I have worked for many many years in Australia I have earnt the right to a pension over there. Should my financial situation on Norfolk Island change it certainly one of the options that I would consider and I would consider it strange for other people not to do the same. So I don't think we need to panic quite as much about this term retirees as it might be implying, but I said to Mr Buffett a little while ago I certainly am prepared to consider changing and setting the quota for only 6 months. May I also mention that if we only set it for 6 months the number of retirees of course would be reduced by half. Even if we set it at 84 for the whole year in the first 6 months of the year the number of places for retirees would only be a half of that but again the suggestion has been that we can keep an eye on the kind of people that are applying, the means and condition and I certainly could get out some statistics for Members in a little while and we can all then have a look at just what the statistics indicate. So if the House is so minded I will be quite prepared to consider changing this Motion and reducing it to half a year quota and changing the figure to 42.

MADAM DEPUTY SPEAKER Further participation.



12.2.97

balancing acts to be run in this situation, in this context that working out a point system that advantages all aspects of our situation is going to be difficult. I certainly would be prepared to work on it and I would be delighted if Mr Bates would like to work on it with me. It's not going to be easy though and I don't wish to promise something that I may not be able to deliver with any great certitude. Thank you.

MADAM DEPUTY SPEAKERMr Buffett

MR BUFFETT I'm just going to say Madam Deputy Speaker that if Mrs Cuthbertson wishes to adjust the figure from 84 to 42 and adjust one of the dates to the August date to give it a 6 month period of currency and I would be happy to support the Motion in that context.

MRS CUTHBERTSON Madam Deputy Speaker I will so move that amended Motion will now read that for purposes of Section 2 (1) of the Immigration Act 1980 this House resolves that it be declared by instrument in writing that 42 General Entry Permits be granted during the period 14th February 1997 to 13th August 1997.

MADAM DEPUTY SPEAKERThank you Mrs Lozzi-Cuthbertson. The question before is that the amendment be agreed to.

MR EVANS Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker. Well I'm very pleased to hear Mrs Cuthbertson come through with that amendment. That makes me much happier. You really implied Madam Deputy Speaker that I was trying to introduce some scare tactics and in fact I wasn't. I really was trying to point out that I did have some reservations and some real concerns about policies with relation to the Immigration Act and things that could well come before us with relation to the Social Services Act as well and those are two points that I clearly wanted to make clear. In fact I was actually going to support the Motion as it stood because I am well aware of the fact that here on Norfolk Island we do need a certain number of people to support our infrastructure. We have become accustomed to a fairly high standard of living and I don't think the majority of our population would like to go backwards there. Hopefully we don't have to but I do feel much happier now that this Motion has been changed to a number of 42 for the 6 months so that if in 6 months time it will be addressed and reviewed. Thank you.

MADAM DEPUTY SPEAKERThank you Mr Evans.

MR BATES Madam Acting Deputy Speaker I will support the amended Motion but there is one further concern which I do have and I think it's best described as sometimes you can't see the wood for the trees and I get a little bit concerned when we say 2%, 2% populate or perish. We really getting a 5 to 6% increase in here and it's more or less saying well we'll take anybody that comes and I mean that's not good enough for Norfolk Island. We have to be very careful what we do and we do let the people in that we do get the right people here that we just don't go ahead with a 6% increase for the sake of a 6% increase. That is the concern which I just threw into the ring but I will support the amended version of the Motion.

MR SMITH Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker. I think it's a good idea what Mr Buffett has suggested. I certainly support moves along that line because it also doesn't tie the next Assembly in to the total years quota and they can adjust it if they want to at that particular time. They may well add the other 42 people on anyway but this way it's taking a proper course I think and I support the Motion.

12.2.97

MRS CUTHBERTSON I don't want to speak at length but I just wanted to reassure people listening that people are not just accepted willy nilly. There are selection criteria to be met. There is a Immigration Committee that examines every application and finally I hope that I have proved myself a responsible Immigration Minister. No if people come forward who do not meet the criteria I certainly would not support for one moment that they should be accepted just to fill the quota. Thank you Mr Speaker.

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Further debate?

MRS ANDERSON Thank you Mr Speaker. I'm pleased that Mrs Lozzi-Cuthbertson made those comments. I believe that as a member of the Immigration Committee Mr Bates should know that we don't just take people because we have empty slots and we have people who make applications. All the applications are vetted very thoroughly. Thank you.

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Further debate? If there is no further debate I'll put the question that the amendment be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. I will put the question now that the question be agreed as amended.

QUESTION PUT  
AGREED

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

**NO 4 - ROAD TRAFFIC AMENDMENT BILL 1997**

MRS CUTHBERTSON Thank you Mr Speaker. I present the Road Traffic Amendment Bill 1997 and move that the Bill be agreed to in principle.

MR SPEAKER The question is that that Bill be agreed to in principle.

MRS CUTHBERTSON Thank you Mr Speaker. At a later stage if I may foreshadow I will seek the leave of the House to move this Bill through all its stages as an urgent Bill and if I may explain why I'm doing so. First and foremost this is a very minor Bill that seeks to amend the Road Traffic Act 1992 by changing the speed limit as it is now provided in front of the School and in the vicinity of the School from 20km per hour to 30km per hour. We have received many comments from the community that 20km an hour is a speed which causes quite a number of cars some difficulties. I sought the advice of the police who also recommended that it would be more appropriate and more likely that people would honour that speed limit if it was increased at a speed which was reasonable and they recommended a 30km an hour speed. I have consulted on this matter with various people that may be interested and certainly 30km an hour seems to be an acceptable speed to everyone concerned. The other thing that will go hand in hand with this change is the improvement and changes to the signage around the School. Unfortunately at present there has also been many comments about how confusing some of the signs are and the fact that the speed limit applies on weekends and school holidays when really it is not necessary for it to apply. So the Legislative Counsel has had this minor amendment for some time but of course he's work requirements have been quite heavy and we've only been able to get to it now. I do not envisage there will be any controversy about this change and I hope that the Members will support

12.2.97

its being dealt with through all stages as quickly as is possible. Thank you Mr Speaker.

MR SPEAKER Thank you.

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Speaker. This is a simple piece of legislation change. I think it's going to be welcomed by a lot of people. If the Police are happy with and the School is happy with it I'm sure that we will have whole hearted support for you.

MRS ANDERSON Thank you Mr Speaker. Mr Speaker this appears to be another piece of common sense legislation which Mrs Lozzi-Cuthbertson has the habit of introducing to the House and I fully support it. Thank you.

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Further debate?

MR EVANS All I gwen tull is nor before time.

MR SPEAKER Thank you. Further debate? No further debate. I think debate is concluded Mrs Cuthbertson you mentioned earlier that we might hold this matter over until later in this particular sitting which we will adjourn shortly and then you would seek that it be concluded when we come together again. Your Motion please.

MRS CUTHBERTSON Thank you Mr Speaker. I move that debate be adjourned and made an Order of the Day for a later hour in this sitting.

MR SPEAKER Thank you Mrs Cuthbertson. I put that question.

QUESTION PUT

AGREED

The ayes have it thank you. Debate is so adjourned and we'll have that as an Order of the Day at a later hour in this sitting.

### **Suspension of Sitting**

MR SPEAKER Honourable Members we have concluded those items that earlier was said that we would cover for today and so I will now suspend this sitting Honourable Members formally at a time that the Speaker will determine but I will give you an informal indication that that will be next Wednesday the 19th at the normal hour of 10.00 in the morning. I'm really saying it in those terms so that if things come up during the time that the 3 people are away and that is extended for any reason we will have some flexibility on how we handle the matters. So Honourable Members we suspend on that basis this morning. Thank you.