

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

CONDOLENCES

SPEAKER Honourable Members we commence this morning with condolences, and we move to Mr Nobbs

MR NOBBS Mr Speaker it is with regret that this House records the passing of Michael Reford Hickey after a long illness in hospital at Canberra, on Monday 20th April last. Michael was born on Norfolk Island on the 6th June 1938, the oldest son, second child of five to Don and Elsie Hickey. The Hickey's had come to Norfolk Island some years before and they resided as far as I can remember, in Burglars Lane. Don was the Baker for the whole of my younger years. Michael was educated initially on Norfolk Island then he went to the mainland where he excelled as a student and also as a sportsman. He matriculated and undertook a surveying course and during this period he really began to excel in the sport which he came to be fairly famous in actually, Rugby Union. He played first grade for the Randwick Club, which is a famous Rugby Club in Sydney. After Mick completed his course in surveying he spent some time on Norfolk Island working here with John Sleep, the Surveyor at the time, then he went back to Australia and operated out of Canberra working for the then Department of Interior. Michael spent some time travelling around Australia, including some period in the Northern Territory and it's a fact that there is a mountain actually named after him on the Western Australia Northern Territory border. Michael left the Department of Interior and took up his own Surveying Business in Canberra and he worked there until he came back to Norfolk, about four or five years ago. During his period in Canberra, Michael again excelled in sport and he was selected to play for New South Wales, and it is a measure of the man's character - and I've always admired him - was that at the time he had arranged to marry his wife and he had to withdraw from the game, and obviously he was never selected again because that was the story of Rugby Union at that time, that if you didn't give up everything for the game, well you're history. Anyhow, Michael went on to play and coach the ACT, he was up for selection as the Australian Coach and missed out in a pretty close ballot so overall, he had an excellent sporting career. His contribution to the community in Canberra was immense. At his funeral which I attended, there were over 600 people and it was a very sad day for quite a deal of the Canberra community. Michael returned to Norfolk in about 1995 but he was already suffering from illness which had struck him about ten years ago. Whilst he did work on the Island here, and he contributed greatly to the land package which we are still awaiting transfer, he then became gradually more and more sick and eventually was required to go back to Canberra where he spent the remainder of his days. He is buried in Canberra. He was obviously a great friend to me and I felt his passing very dearly. To his wife Myrene and family, the four children, Karen, Greta who predeceased him, Peter and James, to his brothers and sisters and their families, this House extends its deepest sympathy.

DEPUTY SPEAKER Thank you Mr Nobbs. Honourable Members as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased I do ask that Members stand for a period in silence. Thank you Honourable Members.

NOTICES

Are there any Notices this morning? No. We move on

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

MR BATES Thank you Mr Speaker. I have a follow up to some questions asked of Mr Ion-Robinson Minister for Community Services, Mr Ion-Robinson regarding the planning questions following on from the 11th February 1998. How much money will be set aside for the management of the Reserves.

MR ION-ROBINSON Excuse me. There's been \$45,000 that has been bid for in next years budget to, for the Reserves. As yet we haven't, or the Minister for Finance has not finished his slash and burn exercise so I'm not sure how much will be in actual fact dedicated to the Reserves.

MR BATES There are about 4 more questions in that same series thank you Mr Speaker. The next one is what was the process for public comment prior to recent works at Bumboras.

MR ION-ROBINSON As far as I'm aware there is very little, as it was done more for public safety which is becoming as Members of our Parks and Wildlife will be aware a greater potential hazard to the finances of the various organisations. So as I say there was not a lot but it was done more for public safety with the erosion problem being solved as well with the amount of traffic over those areas.

MR BATES Thank you Mr Speaker. In relation to, further question for Mr Ion-Robinson. In relation to planning applications and further tourist development, does the Minister realise that the planning objectives and conservation values referred to in the Norfolk Island Plan can be loosely interpreted and implied unless adequate codes and strategic policies are developed.

MR ION-ROBINSON Yes, Minimum standard regulations are under way and in fact are in draft form at the moment. We discussed this, the minimum regulations just last Monday so hopefully we will have something in concrete very shortly.

MR BATES Thank you Mr Speaker. A further question in this series. Who is drafting the codes for the Building Act etc and would it not be appropriate for the National Capital Authority to be involved with their level of expertise and passed involvement with the Norfolk Island Plan.

MR ION-ROBINSON Yes. Codes and regulations are being done basically by our Public Servants. They are consulting all sorts of bodies, including the Australian codes and regulations and being used here where appropriate. They are being done at the moment and as I say and hopefully all members of the community will be invited to have a look at them before they are set in concrete.

MR BATES Final question in this series Mr Speaker. There has been mention in a question by Mr Nobbs to you on the 18th of March that land administration has cost the Island a large sum of money and that problems of land management were created by the Commonwealth. A) How much money has the Commonwealth contributed so far to the land review and administration and B) Do you agree that problems of land management were created by the Commonwealth and if so can you elaborate.

MR ION-ROBINSON Thank you. At short notice of course I don't have these figures at the top of my head. I agree that the problems of land management were created by the Commonwealth but there's not much we can do about that. However as I said the various bits and pieces of that land management are slowly coming together, slower than I would wish but that's the way it works and as soon as I can get those figures on how much the Commonwealth have contributed I'll get back to you.

MR SPEAKER Thank you Mr Ion-Robinson. Further questions.

MR BUFFETT Mr Speaker a question to Mr Robertson who has responsibility for the Burnt Pine Upgrade. Earlier proposals were in place for a roundabout at the T intersection of New Cascade Road and Taylors Road. Can the Minister tell us if this roundabout is to proceed and if so when it might be done, and also let us know whether he considers that this is a practical method of traffic control at that particular sight.

MR ROBERTSON Thank you Mr Speaker. The roundabout has been a contentious little issue for quite some time. When we had the public consultations and the plans were put on display at both the Foodland Mall and the Post Office there were some people that wrote and indicated that they were not very pleased with this particular idea. Now each and every one of those people have been consulted with and have actually been, most of them of course were those which were in the proximity of the area itself. We've had discussions with all, we've looked at a number of other issues that came up and you may

recall that at one stage there was a painting on the road of three different colours, white and there was purple and there was green indicating different sizes that had been advocated as being the specified sizes. These were done, we've had trucks going around in circles, we've had buses going around in circles and we've had trucks and trailers going around in circles. There are, the traffic controlling part of it is that it works very well on the mainland, it works very well in many other places and some people have indicated to us that we don't need it on Norfolk Island, it's not necessary and I guess a lot of people are not really subject to, or not very interested in some of the changes that take place. To try and help alleviate that the guttering and kerbing that is into the section in New Cascade Road has been completed and they intend to fill in the gap between the dug up piece of road and the gutter and that there will be a dummy roundabout made of actual wood will go down within the next week or two, so that those people that are having difficulty understanding how it would work, there's also drawings and sketches going into the newspaper letting people see just how the whole thing and system works. In actual fact you will probably find that within a very short time it will be like the rest of Burnt Pine. People are already beginning to ask me, I can't remember what that old section was that we've done up now between the Bond and Foodlands and there finding it difficult to remember what the old one was like and the new one seems to be absolutely great. So yes there will be a trial done with it. It won't necessarily be scrapped and no there will not be a statue in the middle of it. Thank you.

MR SPEAKER Thank you Mr Robertson. Further questions

MR BUFFETT Just a supplementary Mr Speaker. Are there plans for installation of roundabouts at other sites.

MR ROBERTSON We had initially looked at down at the hospital corner and at the School was another one but those sort of are in the back until this main one is actually up and running and we see exactly how it works but yes they were in the initial plan that was done a couple of years ago.

MR SPEAKER Thank you Mr Robertson. Further questions.

MR BUFFETT Just a final supplementary on the Burnt Pine Upgrade Mr Speaker. We all see where the present upgrading is going which is basically from the T intersection that I've just mentioned to Max's vicinity. Can the Minister just let us know or more the community in the sense the next portion that is proposed after the completion of what is underway at present.

MR ROBERTSON Depending on finances, on completion of, at the moment we're doing the one side and then they will look at doing the other side of the road with the paving and footpathing before the actual road itself is dug up and completed. Completion of that we're looking now at moving from Max's through that corner and up to the RSL so that would virtually complete the town section before going back or depending on costs whether we finish at Max's at this point and then go back and start back toward the airport to maybe coincide with the opening of the new airport. The Steering Committee is yet to make decisions on those.

MR NOBBS Thank you Mr Speaker. Just one for Gary first. Gary is this memory problem is that an upsurge in Alzheimers or what do you think is the problem with the people that can't remember what it was like in Burnt Pine.

MR ROBERTSON I take that as rather a facetious sort of a statement. The, in fact I guess those people are indicating to us that they are very pleased with the way things have progressed and they are more happy to see what's going forward and not too willing to think of what it was like before that. Perhaps you should ask them. They may remember and tell you.

MR SPEAKER Thank you Mr Robertson. Further Questions Without Notice.

MR NOBBS One for Mr Brown. Mr Brown a concerned parent has advised me that there is no requirements for a test prior to a 15 year old being issued with a motor bike licence. Is this so and if so I ask why, and does the Minister agree with this state of affairs.

MR BROWN Mr Speaker the document which is issued to a young person on retaining the age of 15 years is a learners permit rather than a licence and the normal thing for a learners permit is to an eyesight test and I don't think that there is much else. It is at the time of undertaking the test for the motor vehicle drivers licence normally not before the age of 16 years and 3 months that the test occurs.

MR SPEAKER Thank you Mr Brown.

MR NOBBS Another one for Mr Brown relating to immigration. In December I asked the following question. The Immigration Act provides a list of those holding residential status maybe published by the Minister in the Gazette. This would appear a worthwhile exercise. Will the Minister have this list published. Minister, your response was that you were proposing to do so anyway. Why hasn't it been done.

MR BROWN Mr Speaker there has been discussion over the years about the fact that there is an extremely large number of people, or there are an extremely large number of people who hold residency but who live away from Norfolk Island. There are various types of residency. There are many who would have residency from earlier times, whose names we might not even know. There are many others who are probably never going to return to Norfolk Island and who some feel should be chopped off the list. There are others who certainly have an intention to return to Norfolk Island for their retirement years or upon completion of their education and early years of work. There are others who are simply away for short periods for whatever reason. The whole of the question of whether or not we should be taking action to terminate residency where people appear to not intend to return to Norfolk Island has been examined along with many other issues as part of the current review of our immigration policies and legislation. No decision has yet been made as to just what action we should be taking in that regard. Some would feel that it would be a terrible thing to be contemplating taking someone's residency away from them, not withstanding that they might not have been here for 20 or 30 years. Others would feel that it is important that we keep our list tidy and that we know exactly how many people are able to return to the Island at will at any time. At this stage I would say to Mr Nobbs that it is not possible to compile a complete list of persons holding residency but that question and the question of any list will certainly be addressed prior to the completion of the present review.

MR NOBBS Can I just have a supplementary to that. John is it possible to provide a list that you have of people and then if there are others that feel as though they are hard done by they can then apply and you can complete the list and get it out of the way.

MR BROWN Mr Speaker it's certainly possible to ask the Immigration computer to print for us a list of all of the people which it recognises as residents. As Ron has quite rightly suggested that list might not turn out to be a complete list but I have no difficulty in asking for that list to be prepared subject only to the writer that I won't be in a position to warrant that it is an accurate list.

MR GARDNER Thank you Mr Speaker. First question this morning, there's a couple of them to Mr Robinson. Is the Minister able to update the House on the progress of the establishment of a hemp seed industry for Norfolk Island.

MR ION-ROBINSON Thank you Mr Speaker. The Dangerous Drugs Regulations 1998 were made by the Executive Council on the 21st April 1998 thereby removing the legal restriction on growing certain types of hemp. I understand at the moment that there are several applications for permits to grow hemp being processed so it looks a goer.

MR SPEAKER Thank you Mr Robinson. Further questions.

MR GARDNER Next question is also to Mr Robinson. Minister is it correct that the rat control program run in the National Park is now ceased.

- MR ION-ROBINSON Not as far as I am aware, however I'll check it out for you.
- MR SPEAKER Further Questions Without Notice.
- MR BATES Thank you Mr Speaker. I have a question for Mr Brown Minister for Health. In October you undertook to produce Healthcare Policy Guidelines and copy them to Members. Has this been done.
- MR BROWN Mr Speaker I think Brian's talking of the proposed revision of the Healthcare Referral Guidelines and that hasn't been completed yet.
- MR SPEAKER Mr Buffett do you have any more questions or can we swap places for a while so Members can ask me any questions.
- DEPUTY SPEAKER Further Questions Without Notice Honourable Members.
- MR NOBBS Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker. Just a couple for Mr Robertson. First one, not facetious Gary. When will the revised budget for the Burnt Pine Upgrade for the year 1997/98 be made available to the public.
- MR ROBERTSON I take it your referring to the final stage that we are doing at the present time.
- MR NOBBS With all due respect I thought that there was a budget for Stage 1A was revised and that also 1B is being revised. Is that
- MR ROBERTSON Well at the moment there is a bid in the budget which has not yet been finalised but we are hopping that the monies that we're bidding for in this 1998/99 budget will complete Stage 1B. 1A, we're still in that first process and we have enough money to complete what we intend to do up to Max's.
- MR NOBBS Just a supplementary. Has there been an inquiry into the perceived overrun in the parts completed to date and if so when will the findings of the inquiry be available and if no enquiries have been undertaken why not.
- MR ROBERTSON Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker. We did have a review of the amount of expenditure that had taken place on the first section going up to the Foodlands which had been a overrun, and some of the reasons for that were put in that budget paper which was given to all Members and some of the reasons as to why that took place. It was also indicated at that time that there was a learning curve which had come in and that in the next piece which we are currently doing that would be taken into consideration and has been so that the methods being used and the way it's been done and the way that the teams are working better has improved considerably the first stage of this project. So once this is complete then yes the Steering Committee is sitting down looking at a total input as to exactly where, when and what and which that will be applied into the next section.
- MR NOBBS I think this is in your area Gary I'm not too sure but recently the Admin purchased vehicles to the tune of \$55,000 was approved by the Tender Board. Were there tenders called for the purchase of these vehicles.
- MR ROBERTSON Yes I'm one of the members of the
- MR NOBBS It's your area though isn't it
- MR ROBERTSON Beg your pardon
- MR NOBBS I thought... Is Works not your area

- MR ROBERTSON Works is my area
- MR NOBBS Well purchase for Works
- MR ROBERTSON There was a vehicle but most of it
- MR ION-ROBINSON Most of that was for the Forestry are Mr Speaker. Yes tenders were called as they usually are but what we did last year with purchasing of vehicles, we put a lump sum in and left it up to the Public Servants to prioritise what they required and then after they priorities their list of requirements they were then put out for tender and the Tenders Committee only looked at the tenders submitted. We don't prioritise the list.
- MR NOBBS Just a supplementary. I can't recall the tenders appearing in the Gazette, the results of it. I thought there was an agreement that we had that all tender outcomes would appear in the Gazette. Is there a reason for that.
- MR ION-ROBINSON I cannot tell you why it hasn't been but I will enquires into it for you.
- DEPUTY SPEAKER Further Questions Without Notice.
- MR GARDNER Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker. Question is for the Minister for Finance. Considering the marked level of inactivity from the current committee looking at the introduction of GST over the last 12 months, what steps does the Minister intend to take to progress the matter.
- MR SMITH Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker. While I'm looking forward to the committee talking to me about it I haven't made any moves to progress it at this point in time. We're currently doing the budget, in fact that's almost finished, the second draft of the finalised budget. If we do the budget right we should not need any extra revenue this current financial year, that's at this point in time, but that depends on what the Members of the House or Members of the Assembly do with the budget when I give them the signed copy in the next couple of days but certainly GST has been talked about for quite some time and I'd certainly be interested in talking, I think Brian is on the committee. I'm quite happy to talk to Brian about that in the near future
- MR GARDNER Just a supplementary to that Mr Deputy Speaker. Chief Minister it's just been referred to looking at extra sources of revenue. My understanding is that the GST wasn't to provide extra sources of revenue but to act as a replacement to some of the tax regime we have in place at the moment. Is that correct George.
- MR SMITH I'm not too sure what the committee's final recommendations would be whether it would be to raise extra revenue or as a replacement tax I'm not really too sure.
- MR GARDNER Supplementary Mr Deputy Speaker. Has the Minister in his position the recommendations from that committee.
- MR SMITH I don't think so. Did you say have I had recommendations.
- DEPUTY SPEAKER Further Questions Without Notice.
- MR BATES Yes thank you Mr Deputy Speaker. Question for Mr Gary Robertson following on the Burnt Pine Upgrade. The Minister is aware that driveways footpaths and work on some banks has all been done as part of the development. What is the policy for future development when people wish to put in new driveways or replace existing ones and perhaps have to tear up the kerbing and things to do that. Do we have a policy for that or are we going to fund those driveways as well.

MR ROBERTSON Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker. Are you referring to in the Burnt Pine area or are you just totally.

MR BATES Yes

MR ROBERTSON Where possible we're going through, we've taken into consideration any of those that may or may not require that method of putting in a driveway as per now. Whilst this is all been done, the oneness has been taken on the Steering Committee have taken on that we will continue to lay that down as we move. People coming in on a later basis may have to finance some of their own but there is not hard and firm policy been decided on that at this stage. Where possible we're trying to link in as we're moving through town.

MR BATES Question for the Chief Minister. Does the Minister intend to table a balanced budget at the special meeting in June and how much the additional expenses associated with the strategic plan of strategy will reflect in that budget.

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker. Whether it is going to be a balanced budget or a budget that runs with a deficit will of course depend on the Members of the House when we present the budget and what your views are about it. There's always two views about the Appropriation Bill. One is that if you run a balanced budget that means at the end of the year your guaranteeing a surplus or almost guaranteeing a surplus depending on the spending in the year or whether you go for a budget that spends in excess of what your expected revenue is to be. Last year I ran with the option of running a balanced budget for the obvious reasons that if we did end up with a surplus which is happened in the previous years, that is money that is a saving really, but it really depends on what Members want to do, but we've got it down to almost a balanced situation although it still has a deficit that I've got to talk to one or two of the Minister about at this point in time. If Members want to run it with a deficit that will be your decision. My preference is for almost balanced budget with a slight deficit.

MR BATES Further question for the Chief Minister. Will the budget reflect any new or increased fees and/or taxes.

MR SMITH At this point in time Mr Deputy Speaker it doesn't although there may be one or two areas that we may need to look at, fees for things that are costing us an extra large amount of money in this particular financial year. It's my preference that we don't at this point in time until we get the strategic plan and the strategic review working which is going to take some time anyway, I would prefer not to make the adjustment although Mr Bates might be pleased to know that he did ask me in recent times, or maybe it wasn't so recent either whether I would review the taxes and charges I have received quite some time ago from the Accounts Department a selection of the fees and charges that we may be able to adjust with some recommendations on that, and once we've done this budget I'm going to be going through those with the Members to see what, where some of these fees and charges should fairly be increased.

MR BATES Further question for the Chief Minister. Why does the Minister propose 2 meetings in June to table and pass the budget when unlike an election year there has been ample time to prepare the budget for this sitting.

MR SMITH Mr Deputy Speaker I really never thought much more about it until some of the Members raised it the other day. We could have actually run the budget in today's meeting probably but traditionally it's been done 2 meetings in June. It's a little bit late now but it's probably a good idea if we treated the budget the way it needs to be treated before May. It certainly could be introduced in that way.

MR BATES Further question for the Chief Minister. For some time now vacant positions in the Public Service have been manned by persons acting in the position. Since the recent review only adverse senior management positions, how long will it be before the positions can be filled permanently.

MR NOBBS For Mr Brown. Collection of Court fines. What progress is been made in the collection of outstanding Court fines John.

MR BROWN Mr Deputy Speaker some time ago we issued drafting instructions if my recollection is correct in order to make 2 changes to the mechanism for collection of Court fines. The first proposed change was to enable such fines to be collected in the same way as civil debts, and the second proposed change was to introduce a system which has been introduced in a number of the mainland states whereby if a fine is not paid within the necessary period the particular person's drivers licence and/or motor vehicle registration is cancelled or suspended until the fine is paid. As at the present time I understand that the necessary amending legislation is waiting to be drafted but I have followed that up with a note this morning and I'll be happy to let Mr Nobbs know of the progress once I get a response.

MR NOBBS Thank you Mr Brown. Just one for Mr Robinson. Ric on May 1 regulations were made for the importation and use of pistols on Norfolk Island. There seems to be no publicity to notify the community of this fact. I ask what is the proposed usage of the pistols and are there conditions attached to their use.

MR ION-ROBINSON Yes there are conditions attached to the importation of pistols and one of the primary and usual ones is that it can only be used on land under the control of the Norfolk Island Pistol Club. So yes there are.

MR NOBBS Just a couple for Mr Smith. George there is a tender let for the removal of the old airport terminal obviously. What were the details of this tender please.

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker. The tender for the demolition or removal or whatever needed to be done to take away the old airport terminal building was let quite some time ago. The tender was, we had various tenders. We took the tender that would cost us the least amount of money which is the standard, almost procedure for tenders. That amount was \$3,000 that was tendered by Mr Lyle Tavener who has progressively over the last 2 or 3 weeks been removing the, most of the old building. There is one section that is not been included in the tender that's the old flight service area. It's the little piece on the end that is being saved for the emergency management centre. That's still sitting on the site but that's going to be removed somehow over the next 2 or 3 days and that will be resited on the airport building or the fire service basically.

MR NOBBS Supplementary Mr Deputy Speaker. I don't think that appeared in the Gazette. Is there a reason for this not appearing in the Gazette.

MR SMITH I really don't know Mr Nobbs. I don't know whether it appeared or not and if it didn't I don't know why.

MR NOBBS Could you chase it up. I think it's becoming a habit.

MR NOBBS Mr Deputy Speaker could I ask another one for the Chief Minister. George this, the sea around Norfolk Island. There was a unanimous decision passed 2 months ago related to the sea around Norfolk Island. As the responsible Minister what has been done to progress the matter.

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker. That I intend to be one of the matters that we will be discussing at the Intergovernmental meeting with other related issues to offshore matters. That will be included on the agenda for the Intergovernmental meeting which is intended to be held at this point in time in July, 1 July.

MR NOBBS I've just got one for Mr Robertson. It's a lengthy one Gary. At our last meeting in response to a question the Chief Minister provided information including names on landing fees etc wavered. The total figures amounted to some \$20,000. Mr Smith provided names etc for only some \$5,000 worth. It appears you agreed to the waiver of fifteen grands worth but as you were away

no further information was available. May I ask how were you in a position to make such a decision and on what grounds did you come to the decision you took.

MR ROBERTSON Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker. I'll take that question on notice and I'll furnish a paper on it next month thank you.

MR NOBBS Could I ask him the next one to add to that Mr Deputy Speaker. Why are the relevant details such as names, dates reasons etc for travel not available and what airlines were involved please.

MR ROBERTSON I'll take the whole thing on notice certainly.

DEPUTY SPEAKER Thank you Mr Robertson.

MR GARDNER Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker. My question is for the Minister for Health Mr John Brown. Minister following presentation of draft budget papers and an understanding of the difficulties associated with the recruitment of Doctors to the Norfolk Island Hospital, can the Minister provide some background to the increased bid for recruitment of those Doctors.

MR BROWN Mr Deputy Speaker the budget proposals for the Hospital for the coming year include a quite significant increase in Doctors remuneration. The recruitment of Doctors for Norfolk Island is not an easy task because it's necessary to find a General Practitioner who has a number of specialist type skills. It's essential for example that we have one of our Doctors able to handle anaesthetics, that one of our Doctors be able to handle surgery, that one of our Doctors be competent in obstetrics area, and all round Doctors are getting to be a rare breed. Country centres throughout Australia are having difficulty in recruiting General Practitioners with the range of abilities which are needed in a remote place and no doubt that is part of the reason for country hospitals throughout Australia closing and medical services being concentrated in the larger regional towns and cities. We don't have the ability in Norfolk Island to simply have a couple of Nurses at the Hospital and transfer everybody to Sydney, Brisbane or Auckland when medical attention is needed. Some work is being done in Australia to try to overcome this problem. There are rural Doctors training colleges in NSW, South Australia and Queensland now and they are colleges to which General Practitioners go normally after a number of years of practice and at those colleges they obtain specialist type skills and in fact a Doctor from one of those colleges will be spending 6 months with us later this year. Members will recall that I've been expressing concern for some time at the fact that School Teachers salaries in Norfolk Island have not been localised and we have a situation where, no doubt to a significant degree as a result of the exceptional lobbying skills in the NSW Teachers Federation, Teachers are a very well paid profession. They're not a profession that is on 24 hour call 7 days a week. They're not a profession that is required to work public holidays. They do have lengthy school vacations. They do have far more reasonable working hours than many others within the community and I've been saying for some time that unless we are prepared to address the question of localising Teachers salaries we're going to find that other professions within our community are going to say well look, we think that we're just as highly trained as a School Teacher and we think that it is inappropriate that we be not judged in remuneration terms accordingly. So we've had the difficulty of some School Teachers in fact being paid more than the Doctors. We've had the difficulty of it being very difficult to recruit suitable Doctors for country areas in Australia and we have had extreme difficulty in ensuring that we can guarantee into the future that we will have the ability to attract Doctors with the range of skills which are possessed by our present Doctors and I should in saying that pay tribute to the present Doctors that we do have because they have been doing and continue to do an absolutely marvellous job in somewhat difficult circumstances. In recent times the Administrator has assisted me by obtaining for me details of the pay rates which apply to Doctors in Cocos and Christmas Islands and account has been taken of that. Discussions have been held with a number of medical recruitment agencies and account has been taken of their suggestions as to the appropriate level of remuneration for Doctors in Norfolk Island, taking account of the fact that earnings in Norfolk Island are exempt of income tax. If we do not have a range of Doctors with adequate skills we are going to have to fund more and more medical evacuations, and the cost of that both in terms of the Healthcare Fund, HMA, and the community generally would be cost that simply could not be born. The Hospital Board has recommended that there be a reasonably significant improvement in the remuneration

and conditions of our Doctors. That change does take account of the professional training and responsibilities of our Doctors and of the high quality that is required in order to provide the necessary services here. I will be happy to provide to Members details of the proposed new contracts. I propose to do that on a private and confidential basis however because it's a personal matter for the Doctors which is not appropriately dealt with publicly, and I don't think I can add much more to that at this stage.

- DEPUTY SPEAKER Thank you. Honourable Members time for Questions has expired.
- MR NOBBS Can we extend it for 5 minutes.
- MR BATES I have 2 further questions Mr Deputy Speaker.
- DEPUTY SPEAKER Yes I can see 3 people who are seeking the call Mr Nobbs. I'm not too sure that 5 minutes is going to cover those if that is the intention of an extension. What is the proposal.
- MR BATES Well I'd like to propose that question time be extended for a further 15 minutes.
- DEPUTY SPEAKER Proposal is 15 minutes extension Honourable Members. Is that agreed by Members.
- AYE
- DEPUTY SPEAKER That is agreed thank you. Mr Gardner you presently have the call. You have concluded?
- MR NOBBS My question is to Mr Brown. In the Gazette we were advised that registration of Companies were cancelled. Some were Norfolk Island Airlines, Maries Tours, Hillcrest Hotels. I think you will agree they are fairly well known Companies. As Minister what was your role in this.
- MR BROWN Absolutely nothing Mr Deputy Speaker.
- DEPUTY SPEAKER Further questions.
- MR BATES Yes thank you Mr Deputy Speaker. Question for the Chief Minister. Back in September 1997 you promised to provide a discussion paper for the progressive upgrading of Rawson Hall. Why hasn't the paper been produced and are you authorising expenditure on the Hall without consulting your colleagues, and does Rawson Hall sit comfortably under your portfolio.
- MR SMITH Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker and thank you Mr Bates for that question and there's a series of questions within that question. The first one I suppose, the last question I'll try and answer first. I'm not really sure that it does, but then who does it really fit under anyway. However because I've had an interest in the Hall, and I've discussed that on many occasions around the table here particularly when it started in the budget time last year that I would like to see money put towards refurbishing the Rawson Hall. The Rawson Hall is a valuable asset to the Island and it always has been, it's the only community Hall that is big enough to take most of the major functions. I've felt for many years that we, although money has been spent on it over the years, that I've felt that it needed more to be spent on it. If it doesn't fall into my area nobody else certainly picked it up. Over the last 12 months I've been working with various people including one of the members sitting around the table here. We've discussed it, we've had builders looking at it, we have had the Works people having a look at it. We've got various suggestions, we're developing something now that will be, that I can bring back to the Members and say this is what we want to do. We've got a user group that is being formed. We'll be meeting I think it is for this week. If it's not this week, it's early next week to discuss what we're proposing to do with the Hall and I think it's something that all Members should get behind. We're asking other people in the community to get behind to develop the Hall into something that is useable. Rawson Hall has not changed much since it

if I so wish to change all 5. Prior to the actual names going into the Board the names will be put into this forum and any new member or any change of the Board will be put into this forum before that's actually done.

MR NOBBS Just one for George. George what procedures are available for holding of enquiries into the management of Norfolk Island affairs such as landing fees or Burnt Pine or any others that you want to bring up.

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker. I can't think of any just off hand but maybe I should take that on notice for Mr Nobbs and give an accurate answer at the next Sitting.

MR NOBBS One for Mr Robinson. There is a regulation made on 1 of May stating that the Masked Lapwing is now an unprotected bird. Why is this so. What publicity is been given to such a momentous decision.

MR ION-ROBINSON Thank you Mr Speaker. One of the papers that I have to table at Presentation of Papers in fact is Masked Lapwing or Spurwinged Ploa. It's not a native of Norfolk and it's a sort of a drift in and it's becoming a problem up at the airport so it will be added to Schedule 2 of the Birds Protection Amendment Regulations 1998 which means it is not protected.

DEPUTY SPEAKER Further Questions Without Notice. We have concluded Questions Without Notice then Honourable Members. Answers to questions that are on notice. Question No. 24 is on the Paper for the Minister for Finance. Did you want to respond this morning Minister.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

MR SMITH Yes I will thank you Mr Deputy Speaker. Yes Mr Deputy Speaker I refer to the Question On Notice from the last Sitting of the House. The question was would the Minister please table details of travel funded by the Norfolk Island Government, that is travel by the members of the Assembly, Administration employees, Norfolk Island Government contractors and employees of statutory authorities for the period 1 November 1997 to 30 April 1998 and include for each person actual details of travel, including means, destinations, reasons and costs. Also if a report on each trip is available. Mr Deputy Speaker I subsequently instructed the Public Service to present travel details of the Assembly and other revenue funded entities to Government Business Enterprise, statutory bodies, example Hospital and Tourist Bureau and other agencies. That information has now been provided and I advise as follows the summary of all travel expenditure for that period 1 November to 30 April and they are a total of \$57,695-00. The Community Services \$750-00, Immigration \$797-00, Legislative Assembly \$15,692-00, the Hospital \$4,200-00, the Philatelic \$8,900-00, Policy and Projects \$6,500-00, Telecom \$9,555-00, Tourist Bureau \$11,175-00 with a total of \$57,695-52. Mr Deputy Speaker those figures, I just rounded up there but there is the actual full amounts there listed. Mr Deputy Speaker in accordance with Mr Nobbs' wishes I table a copy of the details that make up the travel showing details of who travelled, where they went and for what purposes.

MR NOBBS Supplementary to that. George I don't know whether you know but does this include FOC's that were provided to people travelling on Government business obviously.

MR SMITH Mr Deputy Speaker I'm not sure that they would show up if there is such a thing as anybody that travels FOC on official business. I don't think so.

DEPUTY SPEAKER Thank you Chief Minister.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

DEPUTY SPEAKER Are there any Papers to present this morning.

MR ION-ROBINSON Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker. In accordance with Section 41 of the Interpretation Act 1979 I table the Bird Protection Amendment Regulations 1998.

DEPUTY SPEAKER Thank you. Further Papers.

MR ROBERTSON Mr Deputy Speaker I table the Inbound Passenger Statistics for April 1998.

DEPUTY SPEAKER Thank you. Further Papers.

MR SMITH Mr Deputy Speaker I'd like to table the Financial Indicators. I'd also like to table the Norfolk Island Annual Report 96/97 and recommend that people read it. I'd also like to table and move that it's noted a letter from the Federal Minister for Regional Development, Territories and Local Government which I just received this morning. Mr Deputy Speaker the letter reads, to the Honourable George Smith MLA Chief Minister, Norfolk Island Government, Norfolk Island. My Dear Chief Minister I am writing to let you know first hand of the funding measures included in the Federal Governments 98/99 budget. The full budget kit is enclosed for your information. In relation to Norfolk Island the Government will continue to maintain funding for the Office of the Administrator as well as contribute some \$400,000 for the conservation of the Kingston and Arthurs Vale Historic Area, yours sincerely Alex Somlyay and I'll table that letter.

DEPUTY SPEAKER Thank you and did I interpret correctly that you propose that that Paper be noted.

MR SMITH Yes

DEPUTY SPEAKER The question before us Honourable Members is that the Paper be noted. Any debate.

MR NOBBS Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker. Is there a cost of the Administrators Office given.

MR SMITH Well we pay for it and then as I understand it's repaid by the Commonwealth so that funding is continuing.

MR NOBBS No I mean they said \$400,00 for KAVHA but how much for the Administrators Office.

MR SMITH I couldn't say just off the top of my head.

DEPUTY SPEAKER Further debate. No debate. Honourable Members I put the question. The question that that Paper be noted.

AYE

DEPUTY SPEAKER Further Papers to present. We have concluded Papers Honourable Members. Are there any Statements for this morning.

STATEMENTS

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker. I'd like to make a Statement on the Referendum on World Heritage listing of KAVHA. This legislature on the 18th March 1998 commissioned a Referendum to find out the opinion of the Norfolk Island electors on whether the Kingston ArthursVale Historic Area, which is KAVHA should be nominated for World Heritage listing. Yes and no statements were invited, a public consultation process undertaken and a poll taken last Wednesday 13 May 1998. Result of the Referendum was 276 said yes in favour of the question, 626 said no. There was 72 informal

votes and this was a decisive no vote. This result has been formally declared and published by the Returning Officer and consequence of this and after consultation with the membership of this Assembly I have written to Senator Robert Hill, the Minister for the Environment who had earlier corresponded with me on this issue to advise him that the Norfolk Island Government does not endorse the nomination of KAVHA for World Heritage listing and I will read the letter we sent to Senator Hill. Senator Robert Hill, Minister for Environment, Parliament House Canberra. Dear Minister, we earlier corresponded on the prospect on the KAVHA in Norfolk Island being nominated for the World Heritage listing as one of the number of convict sites and over recent months our officers have joined in a working group to assess heritage values of various sites. In the addition to the above you kindly provided the assistance of Dr Warren Nicholls and others to participate in a program of public consultation here on the Island and I am grateful for his presence and presentations. To find out the community's conclusive view on this prospect a Referendum was conducted on the 13th of May. The result was a definite rejection of such a proposal. In light of this Referendum result I now formally convey to you the Norfolk Island's Government decision not to endorse nomination of KAVHA for World Heritage listing. Yours sincerely, George Smith, Chief Minister.

DEPUTY SPEAKER

Thank you. Further Statements.

MR ROBERTSON

Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker. On the

On the 16th and 17th of April I attended the 41st meeting of the Tourism Ministers Council which was held in Melbourne. This meeting is convened on a yearly basis at different locations selected in advance. You may recall that Norfolk Islands previous Minister for Tourism - Mike King, had successfully lobbied that the previous years meeting, scheduled for February 96, be held here at Norfolk. Unfortunately this was relocated to Canberra at short notice due mainly to the airline schedules that were operating at that time. Tourism Victoria were the hosts for this year and the Victorian Minister for Small Business and Tourism, the Hon. Louise Asher MP was in the chair. All the tourism ministers and their executives or advisers from all states and territories were in attendance also in attendance from New Zealand was the Hon Murray McCullay MP, Minister for Tourism, Sport, Fitness and Leisure and Housing. The Federal Tourism Minister the Hon Andrew Thomson MP also attended. There was an extensive agenda before us with reports being verbally given by Ascot - (Australian standing committee on tourism) and ATC (the Australian Tourism Commission). The main recommendations put to the ministers by Ascot was the development of a domestic marketing campaign. The recent collapse in the economies of Asian countries has meant a drastic downturn in inbound tourism to Australia, the worst being a 70% reduction in the Korean visitors, 50% reduction from Indonesia, and 25% reductions from honking, Malaysia, Taiwan and Thailand. Whilst these are short term figures and the long term projections show a small overall increase there is a significant downturn in the revenues from tourism being felt in each state. The obvious immediate push is for domestic travel, interstate or territory. The result of this strategy will mean that Norfolk will have to fight harder to compete in its traditional markets. It was raised at the meeting that the domestic push had already started with the major airlines offering extremely attractive airfares for interstate travel. Another recommendation adopted by the conference was that all states and territories should look into the licensing of inbound tour operators. Queensland in particular was having difficulty with some inbound operators cheating their customers with dubious trading techniques eg. Overcharging, excessive commissions and exclusive dealings. Further discussion on a number of other marketing initiatives took place and one area which Norfolk Island may be able to get involved in is the torch relay for the 2000 Olympics. The Australian Tourism Commissions General Manager, John Morse spoke on the possibilities of the olympic torch, on its way to Sydney, passing through some pacific islands, NZ and then Australia. Why not New Zealand - Norfolk Island - Australia. The conference was very informative and in the pecking order for future venues Norfolk has raised its hand for march 2003. I have a second Statement. Mr Deputy Speaker the second Statement I have is on the Schedule changes that is currently in the wind and pipeline for Norfolk Jet Express. Norfolk Jet Express commenced its services to Norfolk Island in May of 1997. Since October the 26th '97 Norfolk Jet has offered 7 weekly services from Sydney and 3 weekly services from Brisbane utilising the BAE 146/100 aircraft with a passenger capacity of 64. There have been some minor changes to this Schedule in terms of arrival and departure times but it essentially has remained the same from the 26th of October 1997 to the 31st of May 1998. The Schedule has proved very popular and convenient for visitors to Norfolk Island and I have attachments to this and has been one of the key reasons why Norfolk Island has experienced an increase in visitations in 97/98. During this period the earliest and the latest times Norfolk Jet aircraft has been scheduled to arrive/depart Norfolk Island has been

7.10am Friday, Saturday, Sunday and 9.45pm Saturday respectively. As the aircraft has been based on Norfolk Island over this period, Norfolk Jet has been able to provide a far more flexible schedule than would have otherwise been possible had the aircraft been based in Australia. No flights were offered on Tuesdays due to the aircraft being required for maintenance in Brisbane. Norfolk Jet Express in late April '98 circulated a draft document titled "Schedule of Service from 31 May '98" which I have as an attachment too. The draft Schedule was to be effective from 31 May '98 to the 24th of October '98. Norfolk Jet were intending to operate this Schedule using a BA146 aircraft similar to the one that has been servicing the Island during the past 7 weeks. In issuing the draft Schedule Norfolk Jet made known its plans to sub-lease its aircraft to Airlink a subsidiary of QANTAS Airlines to enable Airlink to operate an early morning Brisbane, Canberra, Brisbane service Monday to Friday. It is understood that Norfolk Jet is contractually obliged to make its aircraft available to Airlink up to the 26th of October '98. The main changes proposed in the draft Schedule could be summarised as follows. Aircraft to be based in Brisbane. Brisbane Norfolk flights depart 1.55am Tuesday to Friday. A number of late arrivals/departures introduced, this is Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Saturday, Sunday. Seven weekly services Sydney/Norfolk/Sydney, three weekly services Brisbane/Norfolk/Brisbane and one weekly service Brisbane/Norfolk/Brisbane via Sydney, that is an extra weekly service provided. Aircraft to be serviced on Monday's rather than Tuesday's, that is Monday's services cancelled and Tuesday's services added. Now the reaction to the draft Schedule from local operators was not good. The main concerns from our local operators can be summarised as follows. Inconvenience for travellers, question if potential visitors would be willing to travel on late night services particularly those over the age of 55 and that's 56% of our Norfolk Island visitors. Incoming visitors on late night flights may disturb those sleeping in their accommodation. Outgoing visitors on late night flights will be required to be out of their accommodation by 10.00am and will have to keep themselves occupied without a place to store luggage, rest or freshen during their late departure, or prior to their late departure. Outgoing visitors travelling to Brisbane may be required to purchase overnight accommodation on their return to Brisbane due to the lack of connecting flights. The peace and tranquillity of Norfolk Island may be disturbed by late night flights. If some services are late, local accommodation operators are concerned that visitors will complain that they should not be required to pay for the first night's accommodation. Inconvenient and increased costs for local tourism operators in meeting/greeting late night flights, also concerned about the general tiredness of staff given that they will be required to be at work the following day, having serviced late night flights the evening before. Possible lengthy delays due to problems with fog and frost at the Canberra airport. I as Minister for Tourism and along with Tourism Norfolk Island expresses our concerns about the draft Schedule and those of local operators to senior Norfolk Jet's representatives. Following these discussions Norfolk Jet held further negotiations with National Jet Systems, that is the Company from which Norfolk Jet releases its aircraft. The outcome of these negotiations resulted in further changes being made and another Schedule being issued. Prior to announcing their final Schedule Norfolk Jet representatives again met with myself and Tourism Norfolk Island to detail the changes they intended to make to the draft Schedule. It was at this time that Norfolk Jet announced that it had negotiated a lease of the British Aerospace RJ70 aircraft from National Jet Systems. The aircraft is configured for 66 economy seats and 10 business class seats but due to current CASA flight attendant limitations will fly to Norfolk Island with a maximum of 72 passengers. The RJ70 will come into operation by early June 1998, however Norfolk Jet will be operating on a timetable outlined in the Draft Schedule from 31 May to the 30th June '98 and I have an attachment No. 4. On the 6th of May '98 Norfolk Jet provided a final Schedule of services from May '98 to the 24th of October '98 to myself. This Schedule allowed for 6 weekly services Sydney/Norfolk/Sydney and 4 weekly services Brisbane/Norfolk/Brisbane. Under the final Schedule Norfolk Jet is still bound to sub lease its aircraft to Airlink for an early morning Brisbane/Canberra/Brisbane service Monday to Friday. The other key changes between the draft Schedule and the final Schedule can be summarised as follows; No services will be offered on Mondays, it's the aircraft's maintenance day, or Thursdays. Late Norfolk Island arrivals and departures will be Tuesday, Wednesday, Friday, Saturday and Sunday. Norfolk Jet has indicated that the performance capabilities of the RJ70, it fly's higher and faster, may enable it to bring forward the last of its schedule services each day by approximately 1 hour. Should this prove to be the case Norfolk Jet Express has given a commitment to make alterations to its schedule so as to improve the acceptability of the schedule to potential visitors and minimise inconvenience to local operators. However local operators still believe that the final schedule in the form it currently stands will result in the same problems as the initial draft Schedule. Norfolk Jet has signalled possible improvements in the schedule following the 26 October 1998, and are currently negotiating with Airlink regarding this matter. It is understood that Norfolk Jet Express plans to provide

mid-morning services from Canberra/Sydney/Norfolk and an evening service Norfolk/Sydney/Canberra three times a week, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday. The proposed Schedule outline by Norfolk Jet in discussions would result in only one late night arrival on Friday and one late night departure on Sunday night. Should this proposed Schedule eventuate following the 26 October 1998, Norfolk Island will be in a strong competitive position. Not only will the Schedule be more attractive to potential visitors, but it also provides Norfolk with the added bonus of direct services from Canberra. This will open up significant marketing opportunities in this densely populated area of regional NSW. This outcome is highly desirable. At the present time the operating airlines are critical to the success of Norfolk Island as a tourism destination. The Schedule set in place by Norfolk Jet up to the 26th of October presents a significant marketing challenge for the Island, particularly if visitation is to remain at 1997/98 levels. Norfolk Jet claims that the Schedule offers good Sydney connections with QANTAS domestic flights for its SYD/NLK/SYD services. The benefits of these connections will need to be considerable to overcome the impediment of the late night arrivals on the SYD/NLK/ services on Tuesday, Wednesday, Friday and Saturday nights. By offering an additional Brisbane/Norfolk/Brisbane service with a larger aircraft, NJE has significantly increased capacity on this route - a route that was already significantly oversupplied. Norfolk Jet Express has already taken action to overcome some of the problems resulting from the Schedule change. For example, the airline has introduced a \$99 day trip ex Brisbane in co-operation with Pacific Unlimited Holiday (see attachment 5). The airline has also indicated that it will continue to heavily promote the short-break concept to maximise the number of passengers on its Brisbane/Norfolk services. Norfolk Jet is an integral component of Norfolk Island's tourism industry, and the long term viability of the airline is of paramount importance. The final Schedule introduced by Norfolk Jet does not have many positives from a marketing or product delivery perspective, but the airline has given a commitment to improve the situation as soon as possible ie from the 26th October 1998. It is Norfolk Island tourism industry's next interests to support Norfolk Jet in this difficult interim period 31 May to 26 October and lobby the airline to make the proposed Schedule improvements from the 26 October 1998. Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER

Thank you. Mr Robinson

MR ION ROBINSON

Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker. I would like to make a Statement just to update you on the Army Worm Biological Control Programme. The initial brief given to Ag Research was broken down into three milestones. (a) confirm pest species and presence of possible secondary hosts in Norfolk Island and identify ten possible release sites (b) assess the vulnerability of primary and secondary hosts to the parasitic wasp *A ruficrus* in laboratory trials under quarantine at Ruakura and (c) prepare a report and further project outline discussing the feasibility of proceeding with the release of the parasitoid and detailing the host, specifically testing required to meet AQIS and Norfolk Island requirements. The scientist from Ag Research, Mr Bruce Willoughby visited the Island in March to collect army worm larvae for testing against the proposed biological control agents milestone (b). He is now in the process of compiling his report which will complete milestone (c). This report will also include cost estimates for the introduction of the proposed parasite. At this stage funding has only been approved for milestones (a) and (b). Funds have been sought in the 1998/99 budget for milestone (c). It was the intention to seek funds for the introduction phase when the decision on the introduction has been made and an estimate of actual costs are known. Additional army worm larvae was sent to Mr Willoughby at Ag Research on last Wednesday week ago, on the Air New Zealand flight to perform additional testing. Specimens were collected from various sites around the Island and this will ensure that a good cross section of the army worms are available. If the testing all goes to plan and funds are available, we should be in a position to introduce the control agents, early in 1999. As many of you know the army worm has had a devastating effect on our pasturage over the last month and one of the ways to combat the problem is early in April, is to lime or top dress your paddocks. there are not many people who are willing to do that, however. That's it

MR NOBBS

I move that the Statement be noted

DEPUTY SPEAKER

Thank you. The question is that that Statement be noted

MR NOBBS Well it's a milestone Ric, that something's being done at long last. I mean, there's some pretty angry people around in relation to this. Information was given to the Assembly and also to the Admin over three years ago. Three and a half years ago and nothing really has happened until your term actually so at least something is happening. I hope it's not held up for too long because, what will happen is this. People will start spraying and I think you'll find that the greenies should realise that there'll be a helluva lot more damage done by spraying than there will by any possibility from this particular parasite. As to the liming effect. That's wonderful, but the only trouble is, I think you'll find that you have to use quite a number of bags to the acre and the cost is quite prohibitive on the Island situation where you are paying huge costs of freight and the like. It's fine in other areas but I think it's pretty well out of the question here, although it would be handy if something like that was done, regardless of the army worm, thank you

DEPUTY SPEAKER Further contributions? the question is that that Statement be noted
QUESTION PUT
AGREED

Further Statements this morning. Then we have concluded Statements Honourable Members

MESSAGE NO 126 FROM THE OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

The Speaker has received the following messages from the Office of the Administrator. Message No 126. On the 21st April 1998 pursuant to Section 21 of the Norfolk Island Act 1979 I declared my assent to the Gaming Supervision Act which is Act No 4 of 1998, and the Gaming Act 1998 which is Act No 5 of 1998. Dated the 21st April 1998, signed A J Messner, Administrator

Any Reports of Standing or Select Committees? No. We move on to commence Notices

NOTICES

NORFOLK ISLAND STRATEGIC PLAN AND STRATEGIC REVIEW REPORT

Notice No 1 is the Norfolk Island Strategic Plan and Strategic Review Report. Chief Minister

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker. The final draft of the Norfolk Island Strategic Plan (April 1998 issue) to cover the period 1998-2003 which has been released for public comment and endorsement; and secondly, the final Strategic Review Report commissioned by the Legislative Assembly and presented to the Assembly by John Howard & Associates in April 1998. The Report deals with a Strategic Management Review of the Administration of Norfolk Island. The Executive summary and recommendations contained in that Report has been made publicly available. Mr Deputy Speaker I now move - (1) The final draft of the Norfolk Island Strategic Plan (April 1998 issue) - tabled in the House today, be noted and that consideration of this Strategic Plan be made an Order of the Day for the next day of Sitting to allow for public comment to be received and (2) the final Strategic Review Report tabled today, be noted and made an Order of the Day for the next day of Sitting to allow for public comment to be received at which time the recommendations contained therein be considered and dealt with individually and either agreed to; amended and agreed to as amended; rejected or adjourned to allow for further consideration, as the case may be. Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker

MR ION ROBINSON Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker. We politicians and public servants are here to carry out the wishes of the people of Norfolk Island. I think that the majority of the people of Norfolk Island want to see this plan and review actually take place. It has to happen if Norfolk is to survive. Make no mistake, the implementation of the review is going to cost alot more then the \$30,000 that at this stage, is in next years budget. Too many times in the past, there have been reports and reviews done and not carried out. If it means that we will have to increase some charges to get the revenue to implement the review, then I think it would be irresponsible of us not to do so. This review is important, thank you

MR NOBBS

Mr Deputy Speaker. Thank you. This Strategic Review I'm talking about, includes nothing new really, nothing that hasn't already been bandied around, be it in this place, through the local paper or around the pubs. I'm speaking now as an ex public servant who is now a politician, so I've got a double dose. I find the report extremely interesting. As I said, I've been a public servant for quite a number of years and I've operated in field operations, the clerical side and also in management. The report could be said to have identified all the problems, but not given all the solutions. It could be said that the Report is well padded. It could be said that it cost heaps. All these are fair criticisms, but I believe in the old saying, 'what you win you wear' and in that context I say that it should not be buried although I'm sure there are those of a mind to do just that and it has obviously happened in the past. If we do that, we will let the Island down, but, and I repeat, but, we will let down a large number in the Service who see the problems and are looking for a change. Who are they looking to, Gentlemen? Not the senior public servants, not the Public Service Board. They have been there, done that. The result of going down that road I think is fairly evident by the size of this report. They will be looking to this Assembly to stand up and be counted. Mr Deputy Speaker, the report basically says the following, there's no plan for the future, there is no real link between the Assembly and Admin. There's no leadership by the Assembly; the Assembly has no responsibility for the public service; the structure of Admin is crook; it's sectionalised and is not operating as a co-ordinated unit and finally, some practices, and I say some practices, within Admin, require attention. These to me are roughly the main points. Seven of them. Four rest squarely with this and previous Legislative Assemblies. Turning to each one. Sure we have a plan attached to the report. Fine. It waffles on a bit, but we as the elected Members need to fill in the guts of it. Not sit on the fence as we waffle on. There is no real link between the Assembly and Admin and I say from personal experience, that it is my belief that some are very cleverly working to ensure this. It's a plank in the platform of divide and rule. And I've said it before and I'll say that again. Some have used it very effectively for their own good of course, or so they believe. To be quite honest, being an ex public servant, I put these actions in the same level as treason. Talk about the Berlin Wall. We do better. Both the Assembly and Admin have their own walls. The next point, is no leadership by the Assembly. It goes hand in hand with the previous points. It is alot easier to lead if you have a plan to follow. Crisis management is fine now and again. Not consistently. It also helps if you have something to lead, which is the link to Admin. It should also be accepted that leadership is by the Assembly. Not just the Minister. It involves all Members. The Report says the Assembly has no responsibility for Admin. Admin is the responsibility of the Public Service Board. This is another of those planks which promotes further the 'divide and rule' platform. The report says that the structure of the Admin is not right. The report is big on criticism of sectionalisation. The writer recommends introducing Programme Management. Programme Management pushes decision making and responsibilities down the line. This can also tend towards sectionalism. What stops sectionalism is leadership. The report makes a big deal of thirteen senior Managers. It makes a big deal of cutting this number to seven. Here we differ. My belief is there should be only four. The CAO and three others. Each with a link to a Minister, the remainder of the structure would then flow down from these positions. Mr Deputy Speaker, we do not need a high priced Secretary to Government. The position is yet another plank in the divide and rule platform. Each Minister however, does require help. My suggestion would be to utilise the current cost of the Secretary to Government to fund these helpers. The Assembly does not require a Research Officer. Advice should come from the Service or Consultants. I put it to you gentlemen, that with an effective administrative structure and secretarial support, ministerial positions would in fact be only part time. The Report identifies a need for training. A lack of action in this area is criminal but it is all part of the divide and rule conspiracy. Keep them in the dark and feed them on - I'd better not say. The Report identifies some practices that need attention. I would not deal with these except to say that the remedies won't hurt. Mr Speaker, much has been made of the statement "the way ahead". Unfortunately, the way ahead has been typical of those lost. They tend to go around in circles. My hope is that the way ahead, for a change can be straight up the middle. We must progress those issues I've spoken of. We need now, not next year, two things. A new structure for Admin and a new Public Service Act. The report says the new structure should be developed by the CAO and approved by the Assembly. The Act should be provided priority by the drafting staff. I believe the changes can be made smoothly and without any fear on the part of existing employees. The only ones who will suffer are those who wish for things to remain as they are and I fear that this is for their own personal glorification. Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker

MR BATES

Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker. I think that both Mr Robinson and Ron have touched on the issues that are of concern. Ron says there is nothing new and I tend to agree with

that. Ric alluded to the cost. The motion before us is that at the next meeting we are going to agree to a whole heap of things, or amend them, or reject them. Ron has already alluded to some amendments to some of the things like the senior structure of the public service and the role of the STG and the Research Officer. Another Member, Mr Brown, has mentioned that he is not in favour of bringing the Statutory Bodies in under the umbrella of the Administration, so no doubt there will be some interesting developments come out of this report and in the end I guess any resemblance to what we have before us now and what actually happens may be only co-incidental. The one thing I would like to see when we do come to the next meeting, where we are going to agree to, amend or reject, at least we know for each of the questions before us, what the cost of implementation will be for that particular question; what the ongoing cost will be and also which of those recommendations require quite a large amount of amendments to legislation because I believe that there are some recommendations here that can be agreed to easily, quickly, get on the road with them, put them in. There are others I believe that will take a long time and some of them won't be able to proceed because of cost and others will take alot of time to introduce legislative changes and unless we understand when we look at one of these, just where they fit in those categories, I think we are stumbling around a little bit in the dark. Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker

MR SMITH

Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker. I didn't intend to speak to the Report at all after tabling it, but I would just like to make a few points. From the comments that have been made around the table. One of the interesting things about the Strategic Plan and the Strategic Review document is they are linked. I don't know whether some people have missed part of the point. With this Strategic Plan, whatever you want to do with the Report, you do it, the way the Strategic Plan says you do it. You identify what it is, you identify the issues, you look at the costing of it, you put it into specific projects, the key initiatives, you cost it, and then you implement it, if you want to implement it. That is the key. The small document is the key to the big one. If we think that we are going to sit around the table, and maybe we will, at the next meeting we will try and plough our way through this document and say, "Oh I don't like that" or "I think you're mad if you don't do this and do that", the whole idea is linked to the Strategic Plan. If you pick something out of the Report and you want to do it, you use the process of the Strategic Plan. Alot of it is interlinked, right through all the recommendations and the recommendations amount to 118. Now there's bits of each recommendation in other recommendations, so we need to treat it very carefully and agree to one, but we might not agree with one of the other ones that you might not like, so you have to treat that very carefully, and as we go through it, whatever the recommendations are that we like or don't like, we use the Strategic Planning process to put it in place, or to throw it out. I would like to say that Mr Deputy Speaker because there is some talk I gather from some Members that it is going to be put on a shelf. It's not my intention for the thing to be put on a shelf. For my part I intend to be going through the recommendations that I agree with and at the next meeting I will be moving particular motions on the ones that I like or agree to or think that is going to be great for the future of Norfolk Island. And I'm going to apply the process of Strategic Planning which is what this whole thing was about and I hope other Members see it in the same way. There are things that I think each one of us here around the table could say, individually, "Oh I don't like that recommendation", and I'm sure each Member is going to have one of those that they are not going to like. That's what this is all about so we work on the majority and that's why I've put it into the House as a recommendation. It is either agreed to or it's not, by the majority or the minority and I won't say any more at this point Mr Deputy Speaker. I would prefer to leave it until the next meeting when we discuss the adoption of the Strategic Plan if that is the intention of the Members. It's certainly my intention and following the adoption of the Strategic Plan and as John Howard and Associate said, you have to adopt the Strategic Plan before you do anything with the Strategic Review and that is my intention. to follow that particular course.

MR BROWN

Mr Deputy Speaker thank you. The tabling of this Strategic Plan and of the Strategic Review report are highlights of George's time as Chief Minister. The question of Strategic Planning has been talked about for years and we've not managed to do much about it, but on this occasion we have retained Consultants, worked with those Consultants who have now provided us with their final product. It is our job now to give the community value for the money that they have spent. Whilst I can understand George's thinking that he would like to sit down and deal with each part of the Strategic Review Report, individually and using the mechanism prescribed by the Strategic Plan I think we are going to be very old men by the time we get through that exercise. There are bits of the Strategic Review Report that we all like. There are bits that individually we think could do with a bit of change. If we are

report, no progress report or even advice as to what the lady is up to. I actually spoke to the lady whilst she was here and found her very informative, very interesting and I've been desperately looking forward to getting some feedback. I just bring you back to one point. I believe that we've degenerated possibly to our lowest level in the immigration stakes. The deportation of a person some couple of months ago and the need to pay his freight, that's the cost of the air travel back to Australia. It seems that the requirement to hold a return ticket was not necessary. I'm bitterly disappointed that there's no real progress with the review on immigration, and I understand the need for review is supported by the Immigration Committee as well. Consequently, I will not be supporting the motion

MR BATES

Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker. I think it's a shame that Mr Nobbs comes forward with such things that he has just come forward with. As somebody who is always very wary of consultants, he has decided that when he comes back to this life he is going to be a consultant because it seems to be pretty easy money. You talk to people and then you write what they tell you. Unlike most Consultants, this lady that the Minister has engaged in whatever, I don't know how he's done it, she's been to the Island at least twice to my knowledge and she has spoken with the Immigration Committee and I don't know where Mr Brown got her from but he is to be congratulated in really come to grips with somebody who quickly grasps the problem and quickly offers a solution and understands the ins and outs of immigration. She is an excellent choice and I must say so in this forum. The Committee itself and the couple of talks that I have had with her, I'm delighted with what is happening and I think it is up to the Minister to possibly tell you what progress the lady has made, but I can assure you that she is making progress. I can assure you that she is heading in a direction and its a pity that remarks like those just made, had to be made in this instance

MR BROWN

Mr Deputy Speaker if I can just assist Ron by giving a little bit of information. Bronwyn Paddick indeed visited Norfolk Island again late last week and the Immigration Committee made themselves available on Saturday afternoon, well and truly in their private time, in order to meet with her. Certainly I would like to thank the Committee for the time that they did make available and for the work that was done on that occasion. There is in fact a draft report which unfortunately had not reached me before Mrs Paddick's visit, but it is at the post office now awaiting my collection and I'll certainly be happy if Ron would look at that. We are probably a month away from having the final version of that report and I will then look forward to discussion that with Members and to receiving such suggestions as Members can make in addition to the additional suggestions from the Immigration Committee but we certainly are making progress. It's been slow but it is a very difficulty area and we do want to get it right

MR NOBBS

Mr Deputy Speaker I'll just clarify something that was said by Brian. I wasn't being critical of the lady concerned, although I might have appeared to be critical of Mr Brown for not letting us know what the story was. That's all

DEPUTY SPEAKER

Further debate? No. Then if we have no further debate Honourable Members then I will put the question that the motion be agreed to

QUESTION PUT

AGREED

MR NOBBS

NO

Did you want the House called Mr Nobbs. No. We will record your opposition to that. That motion is agreed to Honourable Members

REFERENDUM ACT 1964 - REFERENDUM ON THE COMMONWEALTH'S PROPOSAL TO INTRODUCE LEGISLATION IN RELATION TO VOTING AND ELECTION RIGHTS OF AUSTRALIAN CITIZENS FOR THE NORFOLK ISLAND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

MR SMITH

Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker. I move that the motion passed by this House on 15 April 1998 directing the Speaker to conduct a referendum on the Australian Government's intentions to change Norfolk Island's electoral process be rescinded pending the outcome of discussions

taking place between the Norfolk Island and Commonwealth Governments and that the Chief Minister report back to this House at its next sitting of progress with those discussions. Mr Deputy Speaker this is in relation to the proposal put to the Norfolk Island Government by the Federal Minister, Mr Alex Somlyay, that it was the Commonwealth's intention to propose changes to the Norfolk Island Act and the Norfolk Island Electoral Act to change the system that we have for voting and for participation as Members of the Norfolk Island Legislative Assembly. There has been fair process since that was announced some time in March, the last discussion that we had was with the Members of the Assembly meeting with the Administrator to discuss the issue on the Minister's behalf. This motion reads that the referendum be rescinded pending outcome of the discussions taking place and the result of what those discussions might be. Thank you Mr Acting Deputy Speaker

MR BUFFETT

Thank you Mr Acting Deputy Speaker. The principle substance of the motion that has been proposed by the Chief Minister is that we rescind the earlier motion that relates to the conduct of a referendum. It does additionally say in that motion, pending some further discussions and reporting back but it does quite clearly use the word, rescission. Our there in the community it is quite clear to me that the community do not want to have a rescission of that motion and so I have a proposal to put to amend that. And I will make the proposal and read it to you and then address it. I propose that all of the words after "that" that is first occurring, be deleted and the following substituted ". ." That's the amending proposal that I put to the House Mr Acting Deputy Speaker. And if I could just explain what this really is. It is not saying rescind the motion. It is saying pause on that motion, which is different from rescission, for a specific period of time, and during that period of time there is the expectation that there will be discussions which have already been foreshadowed between the two governments with a view to satisfactorily (that is, satisfactorily from the Legislative Assembly's and the Norfolk Island community's point of view), arrangements negotiated. Mr Acting Deputy Speaker, I've mentioned earlier that out in the community there, it is my perception certainly that people continue to be concerned and indeed, distressed at the proposals that have been put forward and initiated by the Commonwealth Government, and we as the elected representatives of the community need to do something about that. Referendum has been proposed and in the discussions that have been had about that situation there has been a willingness on the part of the Commonwealth to come forward and speak and discuss this matter and there have been some preliminary time frames suggested. I think the latest time frame that has been suggested is the 1st July. That being the case, I think it is wise, there is opportunity for the matter to be settled to our satisfaction, that opportunity be given for those discussions to take place, with a view to a satisfactory resolution and I think we should give both that opportunity I've just mentioned and encouragement for it to happen, but I think we clearly need to be continually concerned about what the community is saying and so there must be a time frame attached to this and the time frame is in this motion, that by the time we come together as an Assembly in the July sitting that it needs to be satisfactorily resolved, otherwise we will have to heed what the community is saying and get on and have a referendum about the matter. That is the nuts and bolts of the amendment that is before you and I encourage Members towards that view

MR NOBBS

Mr Acting Deputy Speaker thank you. This issue continues to be a bit pathetic I think. I would not support the motion as notified in the paper to rescind the motion. If Canberra was to withdraw it's proposal then and only then could we support a motion to rescind. I read that letter a couple of days ago from Minister Somlyay responding to Chief Minister George Smith dated the 14th May. Mr Somlyay's letter said, amongst other things, and I quote "following our discussions in Canberra on 12 March 1998 I had been under the impression [this is Minister Somlyay] that your response would include some alternative options on how the changes to the electoral arrangements might best be implemented." The key words are "how the changes to the electoral arrangements might best be implemented." In the next paragraph Minister Somlyay goes on to say that we should discuss the issue at the Intergovernmental Meeting and finishes the paragraph by saying that he proposes "our Officers develop a paper on such options for our considerations, the options being the ones that he talked of earlier, however the changes to the electoral arrangements might best be implemented. It appears that the only options according to Mr Somlyay's letter, relate to possibly the time of day and the date his proposals will be brought in. My impression of this matter is pretty simple. The community will accept no change to the proposals put by Canberra. There will be no back flips, no compromise, no you scratch my back and I'll scratch yours. I warn Members that if anybody thinks that this issue will somehow bring the Offshore Finance Centre to fruition, they must be joking. The Offshore Finance Centre will eventuate if it suits the

powers that be in Australia. Who votes or does not vote on Norfolk Island is irrelevant to such people. Such social issues just don't rate. These people couldn't care less about such things as human rights unless it affects the markets and you can look at Indonesia as a prime example. I supported a proposal to hold off on this referendum for as I said at the time, we should not confuse the World Heritage and the voting issue. There is also a belief from the Canberra representatives at our meeting that there was some chance of negotiating a return to the status quo based on the fact that the issue had been addressed several times in the past. However, Mr Somlyay continues to take a non conciliatory stance. Canberra has shown no real inclination to back off. Given the World Heritage issue is now out of the way and there is a need for a definitive backing or otherwise from the community, my view personally is that we need a direction from the community and we should proceed with the referendum as soon as possible. Now that Mr Buffett has put his motion forward, I may be swayed to consider holding off but I would hope that Members would take consideration of what was said in the last letter from Minister Somlyay and hopefully this matter will be resolved in the not too distant future. But I've got my doubts.

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Thank you Mr Nobbs. Is there any debate? Is anybody familiar with the amended motion. I will just read it out and then take a vote. The amendment put up by Mr Buffett reads THAT no formal action be taken between the 15th April 1998 and the July 1998 Sitting of the Legislative Assembly to implement the resolution passed by this House on the 15th April 1998 which directed the Speaker to conduct a referendum on the Australian Government's intention to change Norfolk Island's electoral processes. This pause upon the April 1998 motion is provide opportunity and encouragement for the difference of views on such voting and electoral processes to be settled within this time frame to the satisfaction of the Legislative Assembly by discussion already foreshadowed between the Norfolk Island and Commonwealth Governments. If there is no further debate then I'll put the question that the amendment be agreed to

**QUESTION PUT
AGREED**

That amendment is agreed to. Honourable Members, the amendment becomes the motion and I put the question that the motion be agreed to

**QUESTION PUT
AGREED**

The ayes have it

Honourable Members I believe we have a motion by leave from Mr Brown

IMMIGRATION ACT 1980 - RE-APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE

MR BROWN Mr Acting Deputy Speaker I seek leave of the House to move a motion foreshadowed in respect of re-appointment of members of the Immigration Committee.

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Is leave granted? Leave is granted Mr Brown

MR BROWN Mr Acting Deputy Speaker I move for the purposes of subsection 6(4) of the Immigration Act 1980, this House recommends to the executive member that Joan Marie Kenny; Zilpha Dianne Menghetti and William John Menzies be re-appointed as members of the Immigration Committee until 18 May 2000. Mr Acting Deputy Speaker the term of Mrs Kenny, Mrs Menghetti and Mr Menzies expires this week and it is necessary to either re-appoint them or to appoint new members to the Committee. Because of the Review which is going on at present and because of the importance of the participation of the present Immigration Committee members I would like to reappoint each of those Members and I seek your support for that motion

MR BUFFETT Thank you Mr Acting Deputy Speaker. Members of the Immigration Committee, like members of a number of other community committees have a very thankless task. The three members that are being proposed to us by Mr Brown have served before. They are continuing Members and to my observation they have done a very good job. As I say, rather a thankless one at times and they've had to tackle some quite difficult issues and difficulty is multiplied of course because

you are dealing with people's lives and so I compliment those people who have served this time and endorse their re-engagement as Members of this committee

MR NOBBS Mr Acting Deputy Speaker I agree with what David has said. I think they've done a great job. It is a very difficult task immigration, and I endorse their re-appointment

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Thank you Mr Nobbs. Further debate. Then I put the question that the motion be agreed

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

The ayes have it

Mr Brown did you wish to seek leave to move appointment of members to the Hospital Board

MR BROWN No thank you Mr Acting Deputy Speaker, I propose to do that at our next meeting

We move to another motion by leave. Mr Nobbs seeks leave to move a motion of progression of processes of self government. Is leave granted? Leave is granted Mr Nobbs

PROGRESSION OF PROCESSES OF SELF-GOVERNMENT

MR NOBBS Thank you Mr Acting Deputy Speaker. I seek leave to introduce the following motion related to amendments to the Norfolk Island Act. It is the intention to introduce the motion and then adjourn the matter until the next meeting. I move that this Assembly request the Minister for Territories to progress the processes of self government by introducing amendments to the Norfolk Island Act which will allow -

1. The Norfolk Island Government the opportunity to participate in the selection and other similar issues related to appointment of the Administrator and Deputy/Acting Administrator.
2. The Act to specify only those powers which are reserved to the Commonwealth Government namely foreign affairs and defence.
3. Acceptance by the Norfolk Island Government is mandatory to provisions of any Commonwealth Act extending to Norfolk Island.
4. The Governor-General be denied the ability to either disallow an Act to which the Administrator has given his assent or introduce a proposed law into the Legislative Assembly.
5. Qualification for election to the Legislative Assembly are confined solely as provisions of the Norfolk Island Electoral Act.
6. The Administrator on advice of the Legislative Assembly appoint Judges of the Supreme Court.
7. The responsibility to make grants or other dispositions of Crown land be a function of the Norfolk Island Government. Mr Acting Deputy Speaker the motion does not specify what precise amendments are required as the motion would be too cumbersome. What it does establish is the parameters within which amendments are required. If we are to progress self government, and I believe all Members have indicated this is so, then we must amend the Norfolk Island Act to reflect precisely this. The thrust of amendments proposed are pretty basic. They are not radical, they do progress self government, they do retain Norfolk Island as part of Australia, they do not promote independence. There are some seven points in the motion. Point 1 relates to the selection of the Administrator. Since self government nearly 25 years ago now, Canberra has selected the Administrator as supposed head of the Norfolk Island Government. Similar Territories such as the Northern Territory which have Administrators, have a role in selecting their Head of Government so this is not a big ask. Point 2 revamps the Act to provide that only those responsibilities which are retained by Canberra are specified in the Act. The current rhetoric and schedules etc within the Act which are confusing to all but the legal profession are to be deleted. This amendment was in fact recommended by the Grants Commission. Point 3. Acceptance by the Norfolk Island Government is mandatory to the provision of the Commonwealth Acts. There is an understanding in the past I believe, but unfortunately things have changed over the years. There is a need to specify what should be a foregone conclusion. Point 4. Is the Governor General being denied the ability to either disallow an Act to which the Administrator has given his assent or introduce a proposed law into the Legislative Assembly. It is fairly straight forward to me. The elected representatives should be allowed to run this show without pressure

from outside sources. Point 5. Qualifications for election to the Legislative Assembly are confined solely to the provisions of the Norfolk Island Electoral Act. Another straight forward point. Point 6. The Administrator on the advise of the Legislative Assembly appoint judges of the Supreme Court. The Governor General currently appoints judges and there is no good reason why. Point 7 and the last one. The responsibility to make grants or other dispositions of crown land be a function of the Norfolk Island Act. This is specified within the Act as a function of Canberra and as I have said before, unless we administer the land, we really administer nothing, and unfortunately at present, it's all a bit of a sham. Thank you Mr Acting Deputy Speaker

MR BUFFETT Thank you Mr Acting Deputy Speaker. Members will already know that I applaud all efforts in motions and other actions that might progress and bring self government to a satisfactory conclusion for the community of Norfolk Island and this motion is promoting self government and I do support its thrust. I note that it will come forward again at the next Sitting and during that time there will be room for Members of the community to make their comments about the various points and I would like to absorb those. When it does come forward I want to make some substantive comments then and I will probably make some amendments maybe, to this motion. Not that I oppose what is proposed. Those seven points I think are proper points for us to be raising in concluding the matter of self government for Norfolk Island. Indeed, some of the points are ones that I have been saying to Members and to others for probably a long period of time, but there may be some additional points that Members would like to consider that may be able to be added to this motion to get along the track with self government and as its general thrust at this moment, I applaud the motion.

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Thank you Mr Nobbs. Further contributions? No further contributions

MR NOBBS I move that debate be adjourned and resumption of debate be made an Order of the day for a subsequent day of Sitting

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Thank you Mr Nobbs and I put that question to Members that debate be adjourned and resumption of debate be made an Order of the day for a subsequent day of Sitting

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

The ayes have it. That matter is so adjourned

TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMENDMENT BILL 1998

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Acting Deputy Speaker. I present the Telecommunications Amendment Bill 1998 and move that the Bill be agreed to in principle. This Bill amends the Telecommunications Act 1992 for the following reasons. It's to provide for fines of up to \$10,000 to be applied to persons who provide services reserved for the Administration under Section 6 to 10 of the Act; to provide that injunctions, damages and account of profits can be obtained against such persons despite the imposition of a penalty against them under Sections 6 to 10 and to provide that the offences created in respect of Sections 6 to 10 are continuing offences, is that a further penalty of one fifth of the original penalty can be imposed for each further day on which an infringement occurs. And to provide that equipment or lines used in the commission of an offence under the Act may be forfeited to the Administration. Under Section 6 of the Act only the Administration is allowed to provide reserved line links and ancillary facilities, payphones, mobile telecommunications services and PABX's. Currently if a person infringes these prohibitions the Administration is only entitled to apply for an injunction restraining the infringement to seek damages or on account of profits against the person. The Bill penalises such infringements with a maximum fine of \$10,000 and provides that the imposition of the fine will not prevent the Administration still seeking the existing injunctive and other remedies. The Bill provides that continuing breeches of these prohibitions will result in an increased penalty of a further one fifth of the original penalty for each day of which the breach continues. This provision will deter commercial operators who might otherwise flout the law on the basis that the profit arising out of continuing breach outweighs the possible maximum penalty. Mr Acting Deputy Speaker, this is really just adding to the Telecommunications

Act 1992 with the penalties that it should have had in the first place. It is my intention to adjourn this Bill until the next Sitting at the appropriate time

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Thank you Mr Smith. Further contributions? No further contributions. Perhaps you would like to so move Mr Smith

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker, I so move

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Thank you Mr Smith and I put the question that debate be adjourned and resumption of debate be made an Order of the day for a subsequent day of Sitting
QUESTION PUT
AGREED

The ayes have it

ROADS AMENDMENT BILL 1998

MR ION ROBINSON Thank you Mr Acting Deputy Speaker. I present the Roads Amendment Bill 1998 and move that the Bill be agreed to in principle. This Bill amends the Roads Act 1996 to firstly provide that the owner of land adjoining a public road is responsible for preventing vegetation on the land from encroaching on the road; give the Administration power to enter the land, clear the vegetation and recover the cost incurred from the landowner if the landowner fails to comply with those obligations and amend an incorrect reference to the Official Surveys Act 1979. The Administration currently incurs significant expense in keeping road verges clear of vegetation encroaching from private land. It's right to recover the costs incurred is not clear at common law. Furthermore, when Section 5 of the Roads Act 1996 comes into operation the Administration will have a statutory responsibility to maintain public roads. This amendment will make it clear that an adjoining landowner and not the Administration, is responsible for controlling the encroachment of vegetation from the land onto a public road and will give the Administration powers in respect of encroaching vegetation similar to its powers under the Noxious Weeds Act 1916 to enter and clear land and to recover the costs incurred from the landowner. There are several cases that have arisen as a result of my intention to put this amendment in. There are particular place around, one belongs to a Member of this House, where the vegetation is in fact encroaching from the reserve onto his land. Obviously this Bill and amendment do not affect a landowner in this respect, thank you

MR GARDNER Thank you Mr Acting Deputy Speaker. I have just a couple of questions on this if I can at this time. With reference to a problem that occurred in Mill Road some time ago, where the power lines that were actually on the road itself, were damaged by material falling from a private property, and the fact that the Electricity Undertaking has a programme of actually clearing that sort of debris away before it does cause any damage, is the intention of this Bill to recover those costs associated with the clearing of electrical lines?

MR ION ROBINSON Thank you Mr Acting Deputy Speaker, I'm not precisely sure on that one. I don't think so. I will endeavour to find out for you before we continue debate on this matter next week

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Is there any further debate on the Roads Amendment Bill 1998. Mr Robinson, do you wish to adjourn

MR ION ROBINSON Thank you. I move that debate be adjourned and resumption of debate be made an Order of the day for a subsequent day of Sitting

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Thank you. The question is that debate be adjourned and resumption of debate be made an Order of the day for a subsequent day of Sitting and I put that question to Members

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

That matter is so adjourned

BOOKMAKERS BILL 1998

MR BROWN Mr Acting Deputy Speaker I seek leave of the House to withdraw the Bookmakers Bill 1997 which sits as Order of the Day No 8 on the Notice Paper and in its place to introduce the Bookmakers Bill 1998

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Is leave granted? Leave is granted. The Bookmakers Bill 1997 stands discharged from the Notice Paper

MR BROWN Mr Acting Deputy Speaker thank you. I present the Bookmakers Bill 1998 and I move that the Bill be agreed to in principle. Mr Acting Deputy Speaker, this is a revised version of the Bill which had previously been tabled. This Bill provides for the issue of Bookmakers licences. It controls certain key aspects of licensed operations. It provides for the ongoing regulation of licensed bookmakers. It provides specific powers for the Gaming Supervisory Authority, the Director of Gaming and Authorised Officers in respect of Bookmaking. It replaces the Bookmakers Bill 1997 which has until now been before the Assembly. The new Bill is consistent with the approach taken in the Gaming Act 1998 and the Gaming Supervision Act 1998 both of which were recently passed in the Assembly. The Bill will enable Bookmakers to provide racing and sports betting facilities. Such facilities may include provision of services by Telecommunications devices, complementing interactive home gaming operations under the Gaming Act 1998. Bookmakers will be regulated under the conditions of individual licences issued by the Gaming Authority. In issuing such licences, that authority will have to comply with the general directions of the executive member. Such directions are subject to review by the Legislative Assembly as a disallowable institute. Furthermore, the terms of each licence must be tabled in the Assembly. Mr Acting Deputy Speaker, the new Bill is quite extensive. It is some twentythree pages in length. An explanatory memorandum has been prepared which describes the structure of the Bill and what is intended to be achieved by it. That explanatory memorandum is attached to the copies of the Bill which have been provided to Members this morning. The Bill and the explanatory memorandum are certainly too complex to ask Members to deal with them today and I don't propose to do that. I propose at an appropriate time to move an adjournments so that Members can consider them and the public can consider it, during the time from now til our next meeting, with a view to possibly finalising it at our next meeting. to such extent as I might not already have done so, I table the explanatory memorandum

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Thank you Mr Brown. Further debate? There being no further debate you may wish to move the adjournment

MR BROWN Mr Acting Deputy Speaker thank you. I move that debate be adjourned and resumption of debate be made an Order of the day for a subsequent day of Sitting

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER The question is that debate be adjourned and resumption of debate be made an Order of the day for a subsequent day of Sitting

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

That matter is so adjourned

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Honourable Members, we move to Orders of the Day

LIQUOR AMENDMENT BILL 1998

We resume on the question that the Bill be agreed to in principle and Mr Brown you have the call to resume

MR BROWN Mr Acting Deputy Speaker thank you. Members will recall that this is a Bill aimed at clarifying one aspect of the Liquor Act in relation to prohibition orders and it is aimed

to make it clear that if a prohibition order has been issued against a person then not only can that person not go and purchase liquor himself, but liquor can't be purchased by some other person on his behalf or given to him by some other person. In effect, the purpose of the amending Bill is to clarify that the definition of supply is to include the provision by any means rather than just provision by sale. Thank you

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Thank you Mr Brown. Is there any further debate? No. I put the question that the bill be agreed to in principle

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

I think the ayes have it.

We now move to the detail stage? Is it the wish of the House to dispense with the detail stage.

MR BROWN Mr Acting Deputy Speaker I move that the Bill be agreed to

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER The question is that the Bill be agreed to

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

The ayes have it

AIRPORT AMENDMENT BILL 1998

We resume on the question that the Bill be agreed to in principle and Mr Smith you have the call to resume

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Acting Deputy Speaker. Members will remember at the last Sitting, I introduced the Airport Amendment Bill 1998 to amend the Airport Act 1991 to allow Regulations to be made under paragraph 3g(2)(d), providing for the waiver of charges rather than only for the waiver of landing fees. That still sits as it is, but I foreshadow that there are some detail stage amendments

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Is there any further debate? There being no further debate I put the question that the Bill be agreed to in principle

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

We now move to the detail stage Mr Smith

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker. I move that the amendment be taken as read and agreed to

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Thank you Mr Smith. Is there any further debate? No. The motion is that the amendment be taken as read and agreed to.

MR NOBBS Which one are we talking about

MR SMITH That is the detail stage amendments to the Airport Amendment Bill 1998. All Members have been circulated with a copy of it

MR ION ROBINSON Could you explain exactly what this amendment does please Mr Smith

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Acting Deputy Speaker. That motion that the amendment be taken as read won't apply. Obviously we need to discuss it in the detail stage and I will. Clause 3 page 2 lines 2 and 3, omit clause 3 and substitute the following clause: "3. Subsection 3g(2) of the Airport Act 1991 is amended by omitting paragraph (d) and substituting the following paragraphs - '(d) waiver of charges; and (da) steps that will be taken to be reasonable for the purposes of giving notice under subsection 3c(2); and'". That is the detail stage amendment

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Thank you Mr Smith. Is there any further debate on that proposed amendment?

MR ION ROBINSON That clarifies it just nicely thank you

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER The question is that the amendment be agreed to and I put the question

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

The ayes have it.

We now move to the amended Bill and I seek a motion that the Bill as amended be agreed to

MR SMITH Mr Acting Deputy Speaker I move that the Bill be agreed to

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER The question is that the Bill as amended be agreed to

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

The ayes have it

DANGEROUS DRUGS AMENDMENT BILL 1998

We resume on the question that the Bill be agreed to in principle and Mr Brown you have the call to resume

MR BROWN Mr Acting Deputy Speaker thank you. The purpose of this Bill is to amend the Dangerous Drugs Act 1927 to allow information contained in a certificate signed by an analyst to be admitted as evidence in proceedings for offences under that Act. There are no facilities on Norfolk Island for analysing samples to determine whether they are substances prohibited under the Dangerous Drugs Act. Samples are sent to the ACT for analysis and it is then necessary for the analyst to give evidence in court of the result of each analysis. Bringing analysts to Norfolk Island to give evidence in each proceeding under the Act is costly for the Administration and time consuming for analysts. The fact that similar evidentiary provisions exist in the drug legislation of most Australian jurisdictions where it is much easier for analysts to attend court proceedings, underlines the particular difficulty faced by Norfolk Island Police in enforcing the Dangerous Drugs Act in its current form. The amendment allows the admission in court of written evidence of the identity and qualification of the analyst, evidence of the matter in which the sample was received to enable the court to establish that the sample analysed was the sample despatched by police in Norfolk Island, and the results of the analysis. Certificate evidence will be given weight according to its terms on the same basis as if the analyst had personally given evidence in court. It will be open to a defendant to challenge certificate evidence by calling contrary evidence or by calling the analyst as a witness. Analysts must be appointed as such for the purposes of the Commonwealth Customs Act 1901, the ACT Drugs of Dependence Act 1989 or another person prescribed for the purposes of this section. Mr Acting Deputy Speaker, at the appropriate time, I propose to move a short amendment to that and I will describe that amendment at the time that I move it thank you

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Thank you Mr Brown. We are debating that the Bill be agreed to in principle. Is there any further debate? There being no further debate I put the question that the Bill be agreed to in principle

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

The ayes have it.

We move now to the detail stage. Mr Brown

MR BROWN Mr Acting Deputy Speaker I move the amendment which I have circulated. It is an amendment to page 2 after line 24 where I move that the following clause be inserted.

Regulations 4. Section 15 of the Dangerous Drugs Act 1927 is amended by omitting “the Minister: and substituting “The Administrator”. Mr Acting Deputy Speaker this amendment provides for the amendment of section 15 of the Dangerous Drugs Act 1927 such that the Administrator, rather than the Federal Minister responsible for the administration of the Norfolk Island Act 1979, is empowered to make regulations under the Dangerous Drugs Act 1927

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Thank you Mr Brown. Is there any debate on the amendment?

MR NOBBS Mr Acting Deputy Speaker I just wonder how many more of these Acts have got these same sort of provision in them. Should there be a search done so we can do the lot in one hit?

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Is anybody in a position to answer that

MR BROWN Mr Acting Deputy Speaker I’m not in a position to answer whether there are any other Acts in which the Minister has a power which it appropriately be transferred to the Administrator but certainly I can ask whether it would be a difficult task to review that question

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Thank you Mr Brown. Is there any further debate on the amendment. Then I put the question that the clause as amended be agreed to

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

The ayes have it.

Is the remainder of the Bill agreed

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

We now move to the amended Bill and I seek a motion that the Bill as amended be agreed to

MR BROWN Mr Acting Deputy Speaker I so move and could I just add for the benefit of Members that the Official Secretary has advised that the Dangerous Drugs Amendment Bill 1998 and the detail stage amendments with which we have just dealt, are acceptable to the Commonwealth and I apologise for not making clear to Members that that consultation has taken place and that what we are proposing to do today is indeed acceptable to the Commonwealth

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Is there any further debate? Then I put the question is that the Bill as amended be agreed to

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

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

CUSTOMS AMENDMENT BILL 1998

We resume on the question that the Bill be agreed to in principle and Mr Smith you have the call to resume

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Acting Deputy Speaker. This was introduced a couple of meetings ago. I might just go through the details of what the Bill was about. It is in relation to Firearms. The purpose of the Bill was to amend the Customs Act 1913 to correct a drafting anomaly made to the Act as a result of amendments made by the Customs Amendment No 2 Act, 1996 and to amend the terminology used in the Customs Act in respect of firearms so that it is consistent with the Firearms Act 1996. Customs Amendment No 2 Act, 1996 removed semi automatic firearms or things capable of being made into semi automatic firearms from Schedule 2 as a prohibited import. It inserted semi automatic firearms or pump action shot guns with a magazine capacity of greater than five rounds as item 4 in schedule 3, items that can be imported only with the permission of the Administrator, provided that the Administrator can only permit the importation of schedule 3 item 4 firearms for the purpose of an approved shooting competition. This left the import of pump action shotguns and arguably, semi automatic firearms,

with a magazine capacity of greater than five rounds unregulated. It also restricted the Administrator from authorising the import of semi automatic rifles for bona fide purposes other than shooting competitions and it should be noted again that while the importation of pump action shotguns with a magazine capacity of greater than five rounds is not currently controlled, their possession and use is strictly controlled under the Firearms Act 1996. Mr Acting Deputy Speaker, there is a detailed stage amendment to this particular Bill as well but I will leave that to the appropriate time

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Thank you Mr Smith. Is there any further debate on the question that the Bill be agreed to in principle. there being no further debate then I put the question that the Bill be agreed to in principle

QUESTION PUT

AGREED

The ayes have it. We now move to the detail stage. Mr Smith

MR SMITH Mr Acting Deputy Speaker. I don't need to seek leave for these amendments do I. No. I would like to move that the amendments be taken as read and agreed to as a whole, but it depends on whether Members have copies of their detail stage amendments. Perhaps Mr Acting Deputy Speaker I will read them anyway and move that they be agreed. Detail stage amendments of the Customs Amendment Bill 1998 clause 3 page 2, seeks to omit inserting the following item after 5. No 6 will read "self loading or repeating action shotguns with a magazine capacity of greater than five rounds" and insert "omitting item 5 and substituting 5. The following firearms - (a) firearms of machine gun construction (b) self loading or repeating action shotguns with a magazine capacity of greater than five rounds other than firearms that have been proved to the satisfaction of the executive member to being rendered permanently inoperable. No 2 clause 4 page 2, omit the clause and insert the following clause "(4) the Customs Act 1913 is amended by omitting the third schedule and substituting the following schedule. The goods the importation of which is prohibited unless permission in writing of the Administrator to import the goods has been granted. Item No 1, description, pistols and revolvers of all kinds and other firearms capable of being concealed about the person. (2) Ammunition for use in a firearms referred to in item 1. (3) the firearms or other guns intended for the discharge of drugs, gas or noxious or irritant liquids or objects containing such substances (4) self loading or repeating action shotguns with a magazine capacity of no greater than five rounds. semi automatic firearms not otherwise specified in the second or third schedule. Firearms or other guns referred to in 1, 3, 4 or 5 will be taken not to include firearms or other guns referred to in the second schedule or that have been proved to the satisfaction of the executive member to have been rendered permanently inoperable", and I table those amendments and move that the amendment be agreed to Mr Acting Deputy Speaker

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Thank you Mr Smith. Any further debate on the amendments? there being no further debate I put the question that the amendments be agreed to

QUESTION PUT

AGREED

The ayes have it. Is the remainder of the Bill agreed to?

AGREED

The ayes have it. We now move the question that the Bill as amended be agreed to. Is there any further debate? Mr Smith, do you wish to move?

MR SMITH I move that the Bill will be agreed to

DEPUTY SPEAKER The question is that the Bill as amended be agreed. Is there any further debate? Then I put the question

QUESTION PUT

AGREED

The ayes have it. That Bill is agreed to.

ROAD TRAFFIC AMENDMENT BILL 1998

We move to Order of the Day No 5, the Road Traffic Amendment Bill 1998. We resume on the question that the Bill be agreed to in principle and Mr Brown you have the call to resume

MR BROWN

Mr Deputy Speaker thank you. There were two elements to this Bill. The first dealt with pedestrian crossing and school crossing issues and I think in that regard the Members were almost unanimously supportive. The second element to it, which is the element of the laser speed gun, and in that regard we were certainly not of unanimity on the last occasion. Since then we have had the opportunity to look at the laser speed gun, to have its workings explained to us and to discuss with the police the way in which, in a community policing environment, such an implement would be used and certainly it has been explained to Members that in a community policing environment it is a question for the Legislative Assembly to be providing guidance to the police as to whether the Legislative Assembly wants policemen to be hidden behind trees at the bottom of long hills to catch speeding motorists, or whether it wishes a far less aggressive role to be pursued including on appropriate occasions, the cautioning of motorists if difficulties are encountered rather than necessarily issuing a summons or a traffic infringement notice upon every opportunity. I urge Members to support the Bill in its entirety. We are wanting to introduce compulsory third part motor vehicle accident insurance at an early date. We have already seen the huge cost in both emotional terms, personal financial terms and community financial terms which can arise from motor vehicle accidents. We have I think all experienced the sadness of friends being injured or killed in motor vehicle accidents and frankly, speeding is one of the things that contributes to that. We don't like the thought of a laser gun being in Norfolk Island. We all think that that's getting a bit too mainlandised but none of us can escape our responsibilities to do our very best to provide a safe environment for all of the people who use our roads. If someone gets hit by a speeding motorist because we have made it plain that we are not going to support the police in enforcing our laws, then we should stand condemned. If we are going to take a less than serious approach to road safety, then we will be letting down the community which has elected us, and I put the laser speed gun to you, along with the pedestrian crossing and the school crossing issues, as issues of road safety which we need to address, thank you

MR GARDNER

Thank you Mr Acting Deputy Speaker. I support this Bill in its entirety. Firstly, a vehicle of any kind is a potentially hazardous thing. We have speed limits which have been put in place and the reasons for putting those in place are to provide a safe means of transportation for people, knowing full well that our roads may not be up to mainland standards and that's why our speed limits are somewhat less than you would find on the mainland. Speed judgement is important for everyone's safety too, if you are able to sit there and watch vehicles going backwards and forwards it is ingrained into you the ability to be able to judge a vehicles speed. The problems arise, when you do have people who are travelling at excess speed and you attempt to then make a judgement, pull out onto a road to overtake, whether they are going too slow or too fast, and exactly what happens if you misjudge it. As far as I'm concerned, if this action will avoid even one accident, at a future time, being avoided, then it is more than enough reason to support this Bill and I so do, Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker
Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker

MR NOBBS

Mr Acting Deputy Speaker it would be a great world if we didn't have any laws at all. I suppose we wouldn't have any lawyers then John, anyhow it would be a wonderful world if we could do that but unfortunately we don't live in that sort of environment. I support both of these provisions. Obviously the road crossing one is fairly critical and I also believe that the laser gun situation is as well, because it should act as a deterrent. I would hope that it never gets used, and I would hope that nobody including myself gets pulled up by it, but that's the way, and as I said at the last meeting, well if you speed and you get caught, well you cop it and that's it, so the idea is, don't speed

MR SMITH

Thank you Mr Acting Deputy Speaker. I said at the last meeting and I said in the previous Assembly, of which I was a Member, that I didn't support the introduction of such things as the laser speed guns, and two or three other things that were suggested at that time that should be enforced on Norfolk Island. I held the view at that time that we are forever trying to keep ourselves apart from mainland ways, and for every little bit that we chip away with introducing whatever it may be, we are chipping away at what Norfolk Island is all about and having the freedom to do things its own way. But referring to the speed gun and the pedestrian crossing moves that Mr Brown is proposing, I certainly don't have any problem with the pedestrian crossing moves that Mr Brown is making. I still hold the same view

about speed guns. I've been caught twice by those laser guns offshore from Norfolk Island. I know what it's like, I know what happens when you go past a speed gun. If you don't get caught, or whether you get caught anyway, once you've passed it, it doesn't matter what you do, because you know you've passed it. And that's exactly the problem I have with the speed gun here. I certainly would not criticise the Police in looking to introduce such a weapon or machine, because I realise after speaking to the two police officers who came down and addressed the Members, that they are looking for the aid of such a machine, but I still think that the same thing still applies. If Mr Brown drove past the Police with a laser gun and he was in a hurry, once he was past the police wagon and the gun it doesn't really matter what speed he does, and that's the way it has always worked on Norfolk Island. I think a further deterrent to speeding would be to provide the Police with another vehicle. I think there should be an education process which is where I think the speed gun is a very good tool. That has been used recently. I know that the school used it outside one of the school entrances and clocked the vehicles that were speeding past the school. I know that the Police themselves have done trial programmes with it but I think if any of us around here were pulled up with the laser gun and told that we were exceeding the speed limit by twenty or thirty kilometres an hour, it would be a good lesson to us, because I don't doubt that there's not many people who do actually stick to the very limit that we are supposed to stick to around here. Those are the ways that I would see the speed gun could be used. I don't like the idea of it being introduced on a legislative basis. What's next. Is it seat belts and drink driving laws. There's a lot of things that we could put fear into people about with such things, and that's my personal view. But I think Mr Brown you've got the support around the table, obviously from other Members so it doesn't really make much difference, but I need to have my say. I need to say to the Sergeant and his good officers, that it is not a criticism of the police. I understand what they are trying to do. Please don't pull me up on the way home

MR ION ROBINSON Does it need to be registered? Thank you I support the motion, although I'm setting myself up to get caught obviously. It would be irresponsible of us not to support this

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Is there any further debate on the question that the Bill be agreed to in principle. there being no further debate can I put the question that the Bill be agreed to in principle

QUESTION PUT

MR SMITH NO

Do you wish the House to be called Mr Smith

MR SMITH I don't think that's necessary. I'm the only one
AGREED

The ayes have it. Is it the wish of the House to dispense with the detail stage.

MR BUFFETT Will there be an opportunity for these two matters to be separated at the detail stage? The school crossing situation and the speed gun?

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER I asked the question if the House wished to dispense with the detail stage and that's not so, so we will move to the detail stage.. Clause 1, is that agreed. Aye. Clause 2. Aye. Clause 3. Aye. Clause 4. Aye.

MR SMITH Could we just hold on Mr Acting Deputy Speaker and give us time to actually see what they are?

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Mr Buffett. Do you wish to move an amendment to Clause 4

MR BUFFETT Clause 4 has a definition which talks about an approved speed measuring device. For my purposes I don't see any difficulty if it remains in there. Clause 6 is the matter that really determines the difference between the pedestrian arrangement and the speed measuring device. It would mean that the definition remained in there and if clause 6 was defeated for example, it would have no bearing on the matter, but that's not a great difficulty

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Is Clause 4 agreed. Aye. Clause 4 deals with interpretation. The copy that I have moves then to Clause 6 on evidence. Clause 5. Dealing with action to be taken at pedestrian crossings. Is it agreed. Aye. Clause 6. Aye. Mr Buffett

MR BUFFETT I said No

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Do you wish to do...

MR BUFFETT I wish to do what I've done

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER You don't wish to propose any amendments to it

MR SMITH There's two of us there

MR ION ROBINSON Would you ask the Clerk to call the House please

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Clerk, would you please call the House on Clause 6

CLERK	MR SMITH	NO
	MR BUFFETT	NO
	MR BATES	AYE
	MR ROBERTSON	AYE
	MR GARDNER	AYE
	MR ION ROBINSON	AYE
	MR NOBBS	AYE
	MR BROWN	AYE

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER The ayes six, the Noes two, Clause 6 is agreed. I put the question that the Bill be agreed to

MR BROWN I so move

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Acting Deputy Speaker. I think it is fair that I point out, that although I agree with the pedestrian crossing part of the Bill and I don't agree with the laser speed gun part of the Bill, it is unfortunate that they are tied together in this Bill. If I opposed what I do oppose in the Bill, I would have to oppose the pedestrian crossing side of it, which leaves me with a dilemma as I do support that part of it. It's unfortunate that it is done in this way, but I needed to say that, so that when I do come to vote I'll have to vote in favour of the principle motion because of the component that I do agree with

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER The question is that the Bill be agreed to. Mr Nobbs

MR NOBBS I really think that some people are overlooking the very good point put by Mr Brown in relation to the role of the police on Norfolk Island. I think that's what some people don't realise, that the Police actually operate within the law of course, but as a community policing operation and they are very much seeking advice and direction from the Legislative Assembly, and I think in the past what we have had is a situation where you've had Rambo's parading around the flat and nobody wants to take hold of them and I firmly believe that it's up to the Assembly to establish how the community wants policing on Norfolk Island to operate and I think with that sort of backing that the Minister should then be able to show guidance to the police on how these things should operate

MR SMITH I think I had better comment there in case there is a little bit of criticism of what I've talked about regarding this motion. I said before that I am not criticising the police. The Police have one of the hardest jobs. In a community like ours, they do a tremendous job. They have had a lot of criticism in the past and probably always will because of the type of work they do. My opposing what I have in this Bill has nothing to do with the ability of the Police Force and if there was a suggestion in

any form in what Ron was just saying, I don't agree with that because I commend the Police on the job that they do. It's not easy

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Further debate on the question that the Bill be agreed to. there being no further debate then I put the question

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

That Bill is agreed to. We move on

FIXING OF THE NEXT SITTING DAY.

MR NOBBS Thank you Mr Acting Deputy Speaker. I move that the House at it's rising adjourn until Wednesday 10th June 1998 at 10am.

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Thank you Mr Nobbs. Is there any debate Honourable Members? No. Then I put that question to you Honourable Members that the House at it's rising adjourn until Wednesday 10th June 1998 at 10am.

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

The ayes have it

ADJOURNMENT

MR GARDNER Thank you Mr Acting Deputy Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Thank you Mr Gardner. Is there any adjournment debate? There being no debate I put the question that the House do now adjourn

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

Therefore this House stands adjourned until Wednesday 10th June 1998 10am.

