

have a sitting of the House today to introduce some proposed amendments which were initially promulgated by Mr Brown who unfortunately is not with us today due to his absence from the Island and I understand that he has asked members of the Legislative Assembly to give consideration to those proposed amendments to the legislation to bring them to the House today with a general feeling that the issue needs to be resolved at the March sitting and couldn't continue past the March 19th sitting. Hence the requirement to come to the sitting today with that. With that I would withdraw from debate for the moment and allow other members to comment. I understand that the process of from here on in is that the Bill would need to be agreed to in principal before the introduction of those amendments. There may well be some further debate before that question is put and before we can consider the amendments and I do understand that I don't mean to pre-empt debate on those amendments but I do understand that the proposal is to allow those amendments to sit on the table for the next two weeks so that they can be discussed more widely in the community before the matter is proposed to be finalised at the March 19th sitting

SPEAKER Thank you Chief Minister. Is there any further debate? If there is no further debate at this time the question is that the Bill be agreed to in principle

QUESTION PUT

Would the Clerk please call the House

MR BUFFETT	AYE
MR GARDNER	AYE
MR DONALDSON	AYE
MRS JACK	AYE
MR IVENS BUFFETT	AYE
MR NOBBS	NO
MS NICHOLAS	AYE
MR SMITH	NO

The result of voting Honourable Members the ayes six the noes two, the Bill is agreed to in principal. We progress to the detail stage Honourable Members

MR I BUFFETT Thank you Mr Speaker I now read the detail stage amendments that I propose to make to this Bill. I move that proposed paragraph 6(1)(a) be deleted and secondly an amendment to paragraph 6(1)(c) by deleting 18 and substituting 12. As the Chief Minister has already mentioned this special Sitting of the House today is to consider those amendments to the Legislative Assembly Bill 2003. It has been discussed among members over the last two weeks. The Bill was presented by the Chief Minister at the February sittings of this House and was to sit on this table until the 19th March sitting. This amendment reflects matters that were discussed at a meeting held between the Minister for Territories the Hon. Wilson Tuckey and members of this Legislative Assembly on or about the 26th November and furthermore it honours undertakings given by the Chief Minister at that time. The sittings today have arisen as a direct result of a number of informal meetings amongst the membership of this house and with the real view that it is a better arrangement for any amendments that are done to electoral laws affecting this island to be done by this house rather than within the parameters of the Commonwealth Parliament. The principal moves to make amendments to this bill has been motivated as explained by the Chief Minister by Mr Brown. Members would be aware that Mr Brown is currently in London on Commonwealth Parliamentary Association matters and therefore is not able to be present today. On that basis and with a view to putting the matters on the table for consideration, and importantly to let the community know what is proposed, I undertook

to move the amendments. Mr Speaker Mr Brown has forwarded me a letter setting out his views on these issues and in short, supports the removal of the reference to the Australian citizenship requirements and also supports that the appropriate period of enrolment be reduced to six months. I have moved that they be amended to twelve months. As I anticipate that this bill will be adjourned until the sitting on the 19th I will not debate the view of Mr Brown at these sittings as it is anticipated that he will be in a position to do that at the sittings on the 19th. As outlined above, I move the amendments as I have done and I must say that my personal view is I do not support the requirement of the deletion of Australian citizenship. That is all I intend to say at this time on introduction of those amendments to allow other members the opportunity to have their say

MRS JACK Mr Speaker like Mr Ivens Buffett here I also do not support the deletion of the Australian citizenship. This comes about from a series of talking with various people and my own personal view and it also comes about because if we keep citizenship out of our voting system to me it brings us more in line with the local council election and I do not see this House being in line with local council elections considering our views or the concerns that we have with departments such as social service and our own rules that we can have on Immigration so from that point I would like to see citizenship brought into the electoral process and would like to see Australian citizenship be part of the requirements. As Mr Buffett also said, these amendments are not final, they are put on the table to give other possibilities, to enable further discussion between ourselves, the community and the Commonwealth and I think that a very valuable asset at this stage in time, thank you

MR GARDNER Thank you Mr Speaker Mr Brown has undertaken and circulated to all members a very detailed paper on some of the justification for his proposed amendment to six months. As said, it's a very detailed paper and six months appears in Norfolk Island's electoral and Government arrangements since 1957 and comes to the fore on many occasions over the last couple of centuries. The significant departure from the paper that has been circulated and included in Mr Brown's amendments is that in all of those references in the past, from 1857, although there has been a reference to six months and periods of a similar time, they have always been connected to some form of permanent commitment to the Island. That is where the significant departure is in Mr Brown's proposed amendment, that it does not link itself to any permanent requirement to reside on Norfolk Island and commitment to the community but just for the benefit of members of the listening public I would proposed Mr Speaker if it is appropriate to table that paper so that members of the community if they are interested in the justification for it may make themselves aware of the references in the past to six months, the justification of those past references and I think they will see for themselves that there has been a significant departure from the intent of that six month period that was in existence over many years on Norfolk Island so I therefore table that paper

MS NICHOLAS Thank you Mr Speaker. Back in October last year the Chief Minister sought Member's views on the recommendations of the JSC Report in respect of electoral issues. This is how I responded to his request at that time. I have no difficulty with the recommendation that Australian citizenship be a requirement for election to the Norfolk Island Legislative Assembly. I am informed that the current Electoral Officer operates as a polling official exercising powers and functions on behalf of the Australian Electoral Commission in respect of Federal elections and referenda. I see no threat, implied or otherwise, in their involvement in the Norfolk Island electoral process. Indeed, it is possible that long spoken of reforms to our procedures may be more readily implemented with their assistance. It is also likely that the credibility and acceptance of locally conducted referenda would be lifted by their involvement. I emphasise this was a response I made in October last year.

Councils and the early Assemblies were elected by persons who were enfranchised after only six months of living on Norfolk Island and, the Chief Minister has tabled the paper which details a lot of that and again, I see no great threat in the implementation of this recommendation. However, I recognise that this view is not widely held in the community and seek a compromise period to satisfy those who feel strongly about the issue. I have heard twelve to eighteen months as being acceptable periods. Now when the Federal Minister, the Honourable Wilson Tuckey was here in November I made my views clear to him then I think in a general meeting of Assembly members with the Minister. Since then I've not been persuaded to change my opinion, in fact, in the months since then, in conversations I've had, with rare exception, my position has been clarified, supported and confirmed. The Legislative Assembly Amendment Bill presently before us ignores the issue of Australian Electoral Commission involvement. I was prepared to accept their involvement because, among other things, I've been concerned by the increasing "failure to vote" numbers at elections. There are probably machinery reasons for that escalation for, despite the increase in speed of communication in some areas, it's not without reason that ordinary postal services are now referred to as snail mail. It simply takes too long for ballot papers to reach absentee voters between the time of announcement of the list of candidates and polling day. However, the matter of Electoral Commission involvement appears to be no longer an issue. Eighteen to twelve months is a generally acceptable period of residency on Norfolk Island prior to participating in a referendum or election. If accepting twelve months qualification rather than eighteen months, the present Bill states eighteen months, Mr Ivens Buffett has suggested an amendment bringing that down to twelve months and if that means the difference between this Bill being accepted by Commonwealth and not, then I support that amendment. In respect of the Australian citizenship requirement. Despite arguments put by those who hold dual citizenship, in respect of the possibility of their allegiances being divided, I hold to that requirement, as do those I've had conversation with and listened to. In this time of uncertainty both on Norfolk Island and in the world scene, I ask that Members think carefully and that members of the community think carefully about the ramifications of eliminating that provision from our legislation. Thank you Mr Speaker. I support one portion of Mr Ivens Buffett amendment in respect of the amendment to twelve months, but I do not support the deletion to Australian citizenship, thank you

MR SMITH

Thank you Mr Speaker. Many could be forgiven in thinking that the debate on this issue is the debate on whether Norfolk Island is having to make a decision on becoming integrated into the Australian system or not. It's not. This issue relates directly to who can enrol on our electoral roll and who cannot. Right now the only person who can be enrolled in less than two years and five months is a person who has been on the Island before and on the roll who's name has been removed. Everyone else needs to be on the Island for 900 days out of a four-year period. It makes no difference where you come from. Everyone is the same. There have been times in the past when it was different as the Chief Minister has pointed out from Mr Brown's paper prior to 1979 when it was a different system. When the elections were for the Advisory Council, when the Administrator ruled and took the advise of the Council – if he wanted to. With the powers that were invested in the Legislative Assembly it would have become more critical to have those who voted to have more understanding of what life on this pacific island is about. They would need to recognise how critical it is to ensure that those who are elected have a good knowledge about Norfolk Island. They would have to have a good knowledge about the culture and the traditions as spelt out basically in the Norfolk Island Act and how Norfolk has a distinctly different background to the countries that surround us. Many are missing that point. Those last few words have been used so often that they may have grown to sound just like words without much meaning, but meaning they do have. More than what is recognised on a day to day basis these days. They go back to the combining of two very different cultures on Tahiti and then on Pitcairn Island over two

hundred years ago. Two cultures, British and Polynesian that eventually became one culture. A mix of cultures that must have been fraught with many problems, not the least which was being on an Island way out in the Pacific where even had they wanted it, help was not at hand. A people who obviously had to work out how to get on simply to survive. Out of that the traditions and culture would have emerged and so they did, and on moving to Norfolk Island they carried that on, doing things the way they had developed over sixty years before their move here. But of course, eventually Norfolk Island became effected by the neighbouring countries in many ways but still Norfolk Islanders carried forward their way of doing things as the people who knew best how to deal with the difficulties of being on a remote pacific island. I guess it's in human nature that we tend to try to make everyone think the same as ourselves and we are doing that around the table here too I guess, that's the democrat role we play. Even right now we have big or strong countries that are saying to little countries, that they must conform and do as they are told or they'll be blown to bits. We might even see a nasty, savage, possibly a world war with the thinking of those big countries and here we are, we're being told to conform to become tame animals, little animals on a pacific island to do as we are told. And so to Norfolk Island. We are a young governing power, a mere twenty four years down the track as a Legislative Assembly developing our own systems that are considered to be in the best interests of this Island. Not always do we want the best ways. Naturally. Once again the democratic process. Norfolk Island has been on a learning curve that has been steep at times. To replace the regime of the Administrator and the council in 1979 - the Council advised him - to having legislative powers to make laws, and how to fund and make the final decisions here have not been easy over those twenty four years and those who have been around a long time will know what I'm talking about at that, but it has been done. Where in those days the Administrator had the whole regime of Canberra to call on, to advise, to assist with problem solving and the funds when needed to make the Island function. There are some who would prefer that still to be the case where one person administers the Island as was the way then but the revenue was still raised within the Island. There was an annual grant given to assist the Administrator back in those days. It was not a major grant. Most of the revenue was raised on the Island. I mention that Mr Speaker because a lot of criticism that the Legislative Assembly attracts these days is said to be the lack of funding that we can provide. Longer term people will remember even the public works call that was finally done away with in 1990 as a revenue raising thing. Records show that stamps at one point produced over half the island's revenue but rarely did the Island owe any money. There have been borrowings and payback. We still borrow and we still pay back. We do have money in the bank. Not much, but we have money in the bank. Now there are not many pacific islands that can say that with confidence these days. Now our governments have made mistakes over time, but that has been improved on, the next time around generally but we still have a democracy that is alive and well. More so then in most countries these days. Of course we do have Australia who we can ask for assistance from time to time when it's needed and we do because we actually have a good relationship with Canberra generally. We have disagreements as we rightly should. That's what democracy is all about. We're having one right now. A difference in opinion over whom should make the rules about our electoral system. That's what this debate is all about. We believe it's the right of the Norfolk Island people. We are the community that will be affected by any change and so any proposal should be made here with the advise of the community. That is democracy. We are going through that process right now, through a Select Committee which has been approved by this forum a mere few months ago, approved by the Legislative Assembly and that process should continue. But then I'm at a loss as to why the Commonwealth is making such a fuss about a small community of say 2000 who live in the Pacific Ocean and how we vote. In the end it will make little difference to them. If they do bulldoze this issue and force it on us and without us getting a clear view from the people who live here that they want change and maybe they do. Maybe the community does. that's already been said around here this morning. We get varying views but we

don't know the whole community's view and that's what we are supposed to do with an issue that is as major as how you vote. You are supposed to ascertain it from your community. We are bypassing that Mr Speaker but why the fuss. It is a major change to Norfolk Island to make Australian citizenship mandatory. It is historic as that has never before in Norfolk Island's history as far as I know ever been the sole criteria to be on an electoral roll here, that is as far as citizenship is concerned. But why the big deal about it. The qualifying period is as mysterious as much of our population changes constantly. I believe it was when Adrian Cook AC was the minister for Immigration he discovered that many people who had been under Immigration control by the General Entry Permit or temporary entry permits either left the island shortly after obtaining residency or left even before they reached that point and we've recognised that. If that's the case how many people will be voting in our elections, but more importantly, in our referenda where often an issue can be changed by a referendum, who are people who don't intend or may not continue to live on Norfolk Island but sadly, I think there are those on the Island who are using this issue to promote their own desire to ignore the strong history and culture of Norfolk Island and join forever, forever, the integral integration, similar to the states and internal territories of Australia. In other words. They want their cake and to eat it too. To live on this Island and make it like where they come from. Now although I can see the Chief Minister's reasoning for bringing this legislation forward in the first place I would feel that we are being disloyal to the electorate. If we make any decision before the Select Committee completes its inquiry into this matter, we are not carrying out the democratic process that we are supposed to be doing. Neither is the Commonwealth and I can say that with confidence because it is exactly why the bill was rejected in the Senate because they didn't consult with Norfolk Island Norfolk Island when they tried to make this change before. Now maybe the Commonwealth is right. Maybe Norfolk Island is at that point where a change should be made. Maybe it doesn't make any difference whether to vote you have to be an Australian citizen or to be a member of the Legislative Assembly you have to be an Australian citizen. I think all of us around the table here are Australian citizenship holders except for I think one, there is one who isn't, so in reality it doesn't affect us whatever happens, because we already have citizenship. We've already been elected. God knows we might not ever get elected again. We've all been here more than twelve months or eighteen months, in fact more than two and a half years. Maybe there is some sense in being elected to the Legislative Assembly; we need to hold Australian citizenship. Maybe that is an argument. But to vote. As I understand Mr Speaker in the Federal elections, you don't have to be an Australian citizen to vote. As far as I know. I couldn't actually find the information this morning but I was looking for it, where those who lived in Australia prior to I think 1984 or 1985, who were then British subjects, were still able to vote in elections in Australia. I'm going to find out before the next sitting because I understand that to be the case. If that is the case why is the Commonwealth wanting us to do it. Now I can stand corrected at that time if I find out that I am wrong I shall certainly say that I was wrong. But if that is the case how can they say it to Norfolk Island. But I don't have any argument with that in this case at this moment because my thing is about democracy which is the basis of our whole being as a Legislative Assembly or a Government. We are supposed to be working on the basis of democracy and democracy really is about asking the people. Now we can go ahead and do anything we like as proposed, and if the community doesn't like well they'll certainly tell us but it is making major change. I don't believe it is our right to simply change the rules without consultation, with out the community's input. Not our just talking to our friends and finding out views that way, but as a community. If thought thorough assessment the community states that it wants the change, then so be it. That's when they do it. And people might be surprised. There mightn't be quite as many who want the change as is being said. So my points Mr Speaker, one is the democratic process and the other one is we really have to find out what the community thinks about this. I support one part of the amendments and that is to delete the Australian citizenship. If we have to go to this point today or at the next sitting, the

qualifying period the Chief Minister has it at 18 months at this time. I think that's low enough. It's a compromise on our stand on two and a half years but I think the community would possibly accept that a reduction of twelve months maybe acceptable but I would still like to know, thank you

MR DONALDSON Thank you Mr Speaker. The way I see this issue is that there are two elements to it. One is the length of residency and the other is whether or not you need to be an Australian citizen to be on the electoral roll of Norfolk Island. The current situation as to length of residency is set out in the Legislative Assembly Act and it requires a person to live on the Island for 900 days in the four years immediately prior to the application to go on the electoral roll. That to my way of thinking is a little bit burdensome. That's two and a half years in round figures you have to be here before you can vote. For that reason I support the amendment to the Act that will reduce that to the current amended period of time of twelve months. I would probably even come down to six months if that was the case but it's twelve months and I've thrown my weight behind that and I'm quite happy about that. The second issue of Australian citizenship. The current situation is that it is not mentioned in the Act. You don't have to be an Australian citizen to be on the Norfolk Island electoral roll at the moment. This amendment actually originally changed that so that you did need to be an Australian citizen and subsequently it has been amended so that you don't need to be an Australian citizen and that's what we are talking to at the moment. In talking to that one I've had reference to what I consider to be a pretty important document, and that's the Norfolk Island Act and the Preamble to that Act and I'll just take the liberty of reading out one of the sections of the Preamble to the Norfolk Island Act which I think throws a little light on this particular subject and it says that whereas the Parliament, that is the Commonwealth Parliament considers it to be desirable and the wish of the people of Norfolk Island that Norfolk Island achieve over a period of time internal self-Government as a territory under the authority of the Commonwealth and to that end to provide among other things for the establishment of a representative Legislative Assembly and other separate political and administrative institutions on Norfolk Island. Now the important words in there are the people of Norfolk Island and establishment of a representative Legislative Assembly. There is no reference in there to the people of Norfolk Island being the Australian citizens of Norfolk Island and for that reason and for the reasons of my practical observations of Norfolk Island on a population, is that there are people on Norfolk Island who aren't Australian citizens who are on the electoral roll and probably are deserving to be on the electoral roll. There will be people in the future who come to Norfolk Island, take up residency here or who stay here for twelve or eighteen months or whatever the term is and not wish to take up Australian citizenship and they should not be left out of the people of Norfolk Island who form the basis of the representatives who elect the Legislative Assembly. I think that really concludes my statement. To sum it up, I agree with the twelve months residency before you can vote or go on the electoral roll but I don't agree with the need for Australian citizenship and would like to retain the status quo on that one, thank you

MR NOBBS Thank you Mr Speaker I find this whole issue quite abhorrent actually. If we look back a little bit in history over the time that I've been on the Legislative Assembly the issue of the residential arrangements came up within the last six years. They've been really pushed in the last six years. We saw a bill being put into the Senate. It was defeated and there was some considerable work done by the community and community representatives and also the Legislative Assembly at the time to have this issue put away, put to sleep as we thought on the basis that there would be consultation with the community. The Joint Standing Committee came over here and they also sat in Canberra. They appeared to understand what the situation was on Norfolk Island although there was still an ongoing pressure by persons unknown at that stage to have the issue changed. The situation then came along that the Joint Standing Committee suggested that they wouldn't proceed with these before

the election, the last Federal election in Australia. This happened and the issue we thought, when we went to the election here, that the issue would be dead. But unfortunately nobody really followed up on it after that time. It was regurgitated with the result that we have a report delivered which provided for bringing in of the three issues that we are talking about, that is the three months, the Australian residency and also the use of the Electoral Commission. It is unfortunate that in the report of the Joint Standing Committee they refer continuously to people or actually the Department of Territories and other people, they pay little heed to the Norfolk Island community's view which has been expressed in two referenda and also in other areas as far as other reports and submissions to that group. I believe that under the self-Government arrangements, we have control of electoral matters. It is Norfolk Island's position to change the requirements for voting and also residential status on the Island. It is difficult to understand why we are here today actually. To give a bit of background, and I think the community needs to know this. This hasn't been going on for several weeks. This was brought up last week and I'm particularly disgusted with the way it was done. We met early last week on the basis that there was going to be a deal done between the Commonwealth and the Norfolk Island Government. I had grave doubts about this considering that when the Minister for Territories came over here in November and bearing in mind that there had been little done in relation to the report up to that time, when the minister came over here in November he suggested that he may be able to get through the system, twelve months and drop the requirements for supervision by the Electoral Commission. This was his position at that time. That's as far as he could go because unfortunately this issue had been brought up about four or five years ago as far as we understand, as part of a Cabinet submission dealing with the Cascade Cliff proposal. And I will say it again, the Cascade Cliff proposal was to loan money to Norfolk Island to fix up a problem which had been identified for hundreds of years on land which the Commonwealth actually owned, and still owns. Now we were told that this was the best way of doing it. That there would be a loan provided, that we would be able to run it and on it would go. I understand that in that Cabinet Submission which was not made available to the Norfolk Island Government was this electoral issue. It then became part of a decision made in relation to that loan. So now we've got a situation where there's been a Cabinet decision in relation to the electoral issue which Norfolk Island knew nothing about at the time and which was tied into a loan to do a job on Commonwealth land. Now what's happened now, is that it's progressed on to this current situation. Minister Tuckey says that he will see whether he can do a deal to get us down to twelve months instead of six months and the others as I said. Last week we had this view that it was to be a mandatory six months, there was no don't worry about the Australian citizenship business and the electoral office supervising us, don't worry about those, they'll be right. Okay. At that time it was said that the twelve months was fine but we would still be required to have Australian citizenship. The Electoral Commission issue which everybody believed was a furphy in the first place would not be in there. Now that's fine. So we changed. But now we come to this forum and with the twelve months, we are not having the citizenship business. Why, Why, Why, Why? Why are we here? It's confusing but it's not. It's pretty smart. If you look at it this way. On the Island here, the Australian citizenship requirement there are groups who accept it, groups who don't. there's a split in the community. On the other side of it, for the six months or to reduce the number of the time that you have to be on the Island before you enrol, there's significant opposition to that. A huge opposition. So what would you do. You don't worry about the one you can get through later one. You hammer in on the other one. It's pretty smart thinking I believe from those who wish it to be brought in. Now, in two and a half days or whatever it was there was a Petition that went around and it got a certain amount of people putting their name on it. I forget what the exact number was but it was considerable and that's been tabled in the Assembly here, but I think what it did, was it reinforced the view of the two previous referenda that 70-80% of the community were of this view and I believe that the basic view is that we should do it ourselves. What we've got here now is the situation where the Australian

Government or their representatives are saying to us – I'll take you back abit. My Dad, we had a farm out where Jap lives. Just down the road from Jap's house there's a really good spot there were we used to dispose of our animals, off the cliff because there was no tip at that stage and all that sort of business and we would take the animals out there and straight into the water and away they would go. What the Australian Government is saying to us now, we are being taken to that same spot. You jump or we'll bail you away and push you over. That's what this is all about. Now we are talking to representatives of a group who are now saying that they are quite prepared to commit our troupes to go into an area and fight, the community has got some doubts about it but we are still prepared to push on with this sort of thing and I believe their judgement in this case is atrocious. I believe that the messages we are getting is quite incredible considering that they are coming from the representatives of the Australian Government here on the Island and I think those messages are quite disgusting and there are some things that we should really look at and bring into question the actual role here of certain representatives of the Australian Government and I don't say that lightly because we don't want these things. They cost the Island. Here we are sitting around this morning, we've already been here nearly an hour. I didn't think it would go that long. This has been going on for five and six years. The cost to the Island on this particular issue, five or six years full on. There's been reports done on it and there's been payments made to consultants. It's into hundred and hundreds of thousands of dollars plus the fact that the time that has been expended on this particular issue is quite incredible. The time by the staff members in the public service and the like. No wonder they're not getting anything done and I question what is really going on because we had the Joint Standing Committee over here. There were two members who were previously involved in this issue. One of them made a fairly outstanding statement. What he should have done was put in a dissenting report. There's no good talking about it now. He should have done it at the time, but if he's of that mind now, will he support a move in the Parliament to change the Norfolk Island Act. The other members of the Joint Standing Committee that came over here, the newer members are really interested in Norfolk Island 's way of life. I believe that they will support us if, and only if, we follow it up because having been to out of the way places as far as work is concerned and having lived in them and seen people come in here, it's fine when they're on the ground and they're here and everything is lovely and isn't it a wonderful day and we'll do this for you and that for you, the main part of that is the follow up afterwards. The continual hammering and the badgering, the keeping at them to say are you still in there because in jobs such as the members of Parliament has, they have a variety of different roles in life. Their own electorate is the prime one and then these sort of committees where they commit themselves are further down but we have to be in there consistently. There was some reasonable publicity generated from nothing really, just put into the local paper from the system and there was reasonable publicity generated for it. I mean this is a serious issue. What it is, is that the Australian Government and I'm not anti Australian, as I've said before and I'll say it again, I would have loved to have played for Australia in any sport that they liked. There's no problem about that. Particularly the cricket team at the present time, but the go is, with this sort of situation we have Norfolk Island being lectured to, berated, pushed, shoved, whatever you'd like to call it, coming into line with something which I don't believe is in Australia's interest anyhow. What's the value of it. Nothing whatsoever. There is nothing really from the Australian perspective to say why this should happen. We all have to be equal is the Prime Minister's view when I put it to him a few years ago. I said to him at the time, you've got a plane Prime Minister. I will take you to places where Australians are not, not, not equal. If he needs to go by plane. He probably doesn't have to. He can probably walk down the street of Kirribilli and find the same thing or across the harbour anyhow. But the situation really is that we've been pushed into this and I don't believe that we should put up with it and I think that the Government has to do more in a proactive way instead of as they say, acquiescing to the views of particular people that wish to come along and tell us what to do. I find this

extremely difficult, this whole issue, because as I say, this will be the first time where we've seen this sort of thing go on where people say we just roll over otherwise they are going to do it to us. I would rather myself go down fighting than I would putting my hands up and saying I'll jump, because that's what this is all about and there's no way in the world that I would ever consider that. This Island will survive. There's no worries about that and it is quite interesting to hear people say it's uncertain times, but if you look back at a lot of the debates and papers and what have you going back for a hundred years you'll find that uncertain times is a big deal. Progress in these progressive times and all that. It changes. The only certainty really for us is that we have a community which has said that they believe that the electoral issues are for a decision by Norfolk Island not by the Australian Commonwealth or the States or anybody, because that's what the Senate really is, the State representatives, it's not a decision of theirs, it's a decision of ours and it should be allowed to go on. George mentioned that we put in a motion for a Select Committee in December. This was after Tuckey's view. Some people said that it was a stalling tactic. Yeah. That's fine. How can you get through that number of issues, in any shorter time than by October this year. The Select Committee can get through them but it would be like the Senate Committee's. They say, they'll discuss it with Norfolk Island and all that sort of thing, but we won't get the community's views in under that time. It's not a stalling tactic, it's something that needs to happen. Just on the Norfolk Island Act, the Preamble says, and just before I understand what Graeme had to say in relation to that, but I'll just read out the four point from the Preamble if I may. The Preamble recognises that the residents of Norfolk Island includes the descendants of the settlers from Pitcairn Island. The Parliament (that is the Australian Parliament) recognises the special relationship of the said descendants with Norfolk Island and their desire to preserve their traditions and culture. The Parliament, that's the Australian Parliament, considered it to be desirable as Graeme said and to be the wish of the people of Norfolk Island that Norfolk Island achieve over a period of time internal self-Government as a Territory under the authority of the Commonwealth and to that end to provide amongst other things for the establishment of a representative Legislative Assembly and other separate political and administrative institutions on Norfolk Island. As Graeme read out. Then it goes on, the Parliament, Australian, intends within a period of five years after coming into operation of this Act, consideration will be given to extending the powers conferred by or under this Act on the Legislative Assembly and the other political and administrative institutions of Norfolk Island and that provision be made in this Act to enable the results of such consideration to be implemented. That's never been done. The Preamble to the Norfolk Island Act is really interesting. The Northern Territory Act doesn't refer to the native people there, or the descendants of the original settlers in the Territory. We are different and that's what the difference is. Mrs Jack spoke about local council elections. The only interesting part about it really is that no other parliament of this nature covers those issues, council issues. Therefore it's important for Norfolk Island that we maintain this difference. We are different. And that's all about it. I won't go on about this because as I say I oppose any changes and therefore I guess I should support one part of this Bill but I think that we are actually wasting our time. I believe that we are letting the community down because I think the community has spoken and until they tell me different I won't be doing anything. People might have got voted in on what they believed was a close relationship with Australia. That was only one of the components in the whole deal and probably a very small one. This issue will show you why you have to be consistently on your guard and why previous Assembly's have done precisely that and that they have fought to try and maintain our own way of doing things. And that to me is the most important thing. We have self-government to a degree. Some people say that we've got self-Government now. We have self-Government to a degree. The Preamble to the Norfolk Island Act which is an Australian Act provided by the Australian Parliament, provides that that review should occur. One again the Select Committee is looking at those issues which we need to progress self-

Government. We are doing a lot of them now but anyhow I won't get onto that. Thank you very much Madam Deputy Speaker

MRS JACK Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker I must take issue with one facet of Mr Nobbs'. I've taken issue with him in private MLA's meetings and it concerns the petition that he spoke about. I refuse to acknowledge that Petition and as a matter of fact, out the other evening when somebody else raised that petition in front of me they were another person who organised it and I refused to acknowledge that I and told them the reasons why and that is, that people were harassed, or those where the words that people in the electorate spoke to me about. They did not appreciate their names being read out of an electoral roll and being contacted by phone while at work or at home, wanting to know why they hadn't signed it. I disregard that petition and it would be remiss of me if I didn't raise it in this House, thank you

MR NOBBS I know Mrs Jack has spoken on this before but really you insult the community Mrs Jack unfortunately

MRS JACK Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker I had no intention of insulting the community for I greatly believe in petitions. I disagree with the way that that petition was carried out. A petition to me means that the people come along, they feel free to sign their name. They do not get followed, thank you

MR D BUFFETT Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker. This is about Norfolk Island's electoral requirements and I would like a moment or so to try and provide a synopsis. I'll try not to be repetitive of a number of the other members but that may be inevitable in a couple of instances. This whole matter was really initiated in the Australian sphere whether it be in a Cabinet arrangement or whether it has come from Joint Standing Committee Reports to the Australian Parliament and the three issues that have been identified from the Australian arena have been the matters of Australian citizenship, the time required for enrolment on the Norfolk Island electoral roll and the proposed provision of oversight by the Australian Electoral Commission. These matters really raise two major concerns. The first is the matter of powers from afar trying to dictate to Norfolk Island as to what it's localised domestic arrangements should be and secondly the major concern relates to the detail of the proposal itself and I'll come to that in a moment. In recent times, not on this particular occasion that is raised now because this matter is not new, it has been raised on previous occasions, there were at least two referenda that were put to the people on this matter, and the community by something like 78% and 79% a) indicated that they would not want to be dictated to from afar and in the second when the detail was put at a referendum, they declined the detail in terms of that being imposed upon the Norfolk Island community in terms of the electoral matters. Could I now just try and elaborate on those two major concerns. That is, the powers from afar dictating to us and the details of the proposals. It is really an unsatisfactory arrangement for the Commonwealth of Australia or indeed any other area to try and dictate to Norfolk Island on its domestic arrangements. That has been done from time to time and I don't want to elaborate except to say that it is a totally unsatisfactory situation. It's a cost for us, it means resources need to be unnecessarily be put to task to combat some of the difficulties, much of it being an educational process to ask people to understand about this place which has its differences and indeed on many occasions, once this is understood some of the difficulties that have been pressed upon us have gone away, but I've got to say that, that only completion of our self-Government arrangement will provide a major remedy or a major deterrent from this sort of difficulty being visited upon us with now alarming regularity. Completion of self-government is long overdue. Don't confuse constitutional reform with completion of self-Government. We can conclude self-Government with the constituent arrangements that are in place now. I'm not trying to say that they are all perfect but it doesn't prevent us from concluding the self-Governmental arrangements

and once they are properly in place then there should be provisions that would prevent us being revisited from time and time and time again on matters such as these. Any more I would say would be somewhat repetitive of things that have been earlier said and I don't necessarily want to do that except identify that issue. It is unsatisfactory that our domestic affairs should be dictated from afar. The second matter relates to details of the proposal. The ones that are in front of us at present are citizenship and the period of time for enrolment. The matter of the Australian Electoral Commission's participation has really not reached a level of major participation in the processes so I just identify that at the moment. First of all the details of the proposal relating to citizenship. Australian citizenship is a very desirable citizenship to possess and those who possess it can be proud possessors. People travel in leaky ships for thousands of miles to try and acquire it. It is something of significance and value, but I've got to say that at present in Norfolk Island Australian citizenship is not a requirement to be enrolled. It is not a requirement at present. There may be proposals that it be done but it is not a requirement as I understand at this moment. The test here is as to whether here, as to whether Norfolk Island's citizenship, residency, community acceptance, call it what you like, the test here is to whether people pass that test to be acclimatised in Norfolk Island and to participate in Norfolk Island. It need not be a test applied by authorities from afar. We should determine the criteria. Not an authority from afar. Can I move on to the period of time for enrolment. At present it is 900 days out of a four yearly period. There is a proposal. The Commonwealth wishes to reduce it and the norm within Australia is something like six months but I must say that their criteria for people who come into their community is much longer than that. The six months is only from one electoral roll to another electoral roll in the Australian sphere. If you are coming to join the community such as people come to join the Norfolk Island community the period is much longer. A period whatever the period is designed to allow people to become accustomed to their new place then to have the opportunity to have a meaningful say. As I've said, we have this time said 900 days out of the past four years. There are proposals to reduce that and those proposals have varied from six months to twelve months to eighteen months. A paper has been circulated and that's been referred to a couple of times in this debate here this morning and it must be acknowledged that that paper shows that for some considerable periods of time there was a period of six months and that is quite clear, but it must be seen that that was in a quite different environment. In the earlier times people needed to achieve a certain acceptance by immigration status within the community and we did not have the significant numbers within the floating population that we do now experience so we are talking about different times and different times need to have different tailors to accommodate the components that lie within them so the period of time is the second arrangement. Can I now turn to this legislation. Firstly the Chief Minister introduced a piece of legislation at our last sitting entitled the Legislative Assembly Amendment Bill 2003 and in brief terms it addressed two of those issues that I mentioned earlier. It addressed Australian citizenship and it addressed time before enrolment that needed to be spent. I compliment the Chief Minister on introducing this legislation. I did so at the time that he did it. I didn't necessarily say that I supported it but I did say that I complimented him because he did give an undertaking to the Commonwealth Minister that he would address the issue and he would bring it forward to the Parliament and he did that at the first available Parliament after that undertaking and the proposal said it was an introduction of Australian citizenship because I made the point earlier that under the present law there isn't such a requirement but there was a proposal that it be introduced and that was the Chief Minister's proposal and a period of eighteen months was to be the time that people needed to spend in the Island before they would be eligible to enrol. Now that eighteen months was a reduction in terms of the present proposal which is the 900 days arrangement. The bill did not address the Australian Electoral Commission and as I have said, I don't believe that that is an issue that we need to pursue at this moment. I've got to say frankly that I think that there was coercion in the introduction of that legislation. I think the Minister made it very clear

when he came here that if you don't do something I will come with a big stick and the Commonwealth Parliament and do it and so there was that background to the matter being introduced here in this Parliament. Now that was done a number of weeks ago. Today, and the design of today is to exhibit an alternate proposal to put it very simply and the alternative proposal is that we need not change the Australian citizenship arrangement that is we leave it as it is which doesn't require an Australian citizenship arrangement and that we adjust the electoral period to twelve months and the design is that that be exhibited to the Norfolk Island community so that it might make its view known to us. Much has been made of the point about consulting with the community and I agree with that and this is part of the process to do that. The community's views are essential. Yes we do have views of the earlier times that I referred to in terms of the referendum. A couple of them. But here are arrangements that we need to consider further given the pressings on this matter from the Commonwealth and I'm not trying to say one way or another at this moment as to whether we should bow to those pressures or not. In fact I've given some clear indicators that in some areas we need to be allowed to pursue our own proper courses. So the community's views are important to be had in terms of the original proposal put on the table by the Chief Minister in February, the particular piece of legislation that is foreshadowed in terms of the amendments put today and we need to ask the community to let us know what their views are on this matter and my ears are open to hear those views. They are very important. Madam Deputy Speaker thanks you. Oh, I should say this that there is a view that we should try and decide this matter at our next ordinary sitting. I think there is some wisdom in that. We should not give the Commonwealth opportunity to just run off and do its own thing and thrust things upon us. That will create further difficulties within this Norfolk Island community, which I think is unnecessary for them and unnecessary for us

MR GARDNER

Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker. My remarks if I can start by quoting from the transcript of a news article on ABC The World Today and also I think repeated on Pacific Beat and I quote a section of that news article that deals with this matter, an interview with Minister Tuckey and these are Minister Tuckey's words. "I went out. I talked to them (referring obviously to Norfolk Island) I promised to try and do something of a moderate nature to extend the period of qualifications and they came up with an entirely different proposal than what I hinted might be possible and it's just one of these things where you don't go on for ever and as I have warned them, they are presently fully fledged members of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. If they continue to confront international conventions I would suggest that people such as the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association would be inclined to revisit their membership". Now Madam Deputy Speaker most people around this table and I'm sure most people listening would certainly be aware of the precarious state that Australia itself finds itself in as far as breaches of international covenants and conventions are. They are well documented over many many years but Mr Tuckey in that interview was referring to the requirements for Australian citizenship and the period of time to be eligible to vote. He says that obviously my proposal was entirely different. Well that's not quite correct. The only difference between what Minister Tuckey discussed with all members of this Assembly and groups within this community was simply the difference between eighteen months and twelve months. It is not an entirely different proposal. It's a minor change to a proposal. But that's how negotiations begin. You've got to have a start and then you go through a negotiation period. Well that was actually thrown back in our face significantly firstly by a letter that was sent to me. I'm just looking for the date. A letter dated the 6th February and a content of a press release of similar content that was in the Norfolk Islander and sent to them on the 7th February for publication on the 8th. I'll quote from a couple of passages of my response to Minister Tuckey's letter and they are relevant because they deal with why we need to consider citizenship as being a prerequisite to enrolment and also to be elected to the Legislative Assembly. My understanding of the international covenant of

Civil and Political rights is that an estate, a signatory state, Australia is a signatory state, so is New Zealand and so are most other independent nations a member of the United Nations, that the requirement to let somebody vote for their Federal representation is something that is dealt with by that international covenant. It is something that allows a citizen of a state a say in their Federal arrangements and I have absolutely no difficulty with that. As an Australian if I want to vote for the Federal Government I believe it's my right to do that. If I lived in New Zealand or the United States or anywhere else who is a signatory state to those international covenants and a member of the United Nations I would uphold the right of anybody, any individual who is a national of those to cast their vote along the lines for representation in the Federal body. Now I'll just digress a little bit and quote from my response to Minister Tuckey's letter and the press release. "Your comments that based on well established precedent that Norfolk Island's electoral system is not democratic is simply a view and it should be recognised that where a view is held there is very likely to be a contrary view. It is important to point out that every person enrolled has had to pass identical qualifying periods and requirements for enrolment. There is no discrimination. But I continue. I would also add that because of the Norfolk Island community's unique traditions of culture, history and language that sets it apart from Australian mainland community's coupled with the maintenance of our own immigration regime and this is particularly important, which is distinct and separate from that of Australia that our current electoral regime expresses the principal that the right to vote should be preceded by demonstrable commitment to the polity in which one votes and in the Norfolk Island context the nearest equivalent to citizenship is resident status under the Immigration Act 1980, a piece of Norfolk Island legislation and our current requirements reflect that commitment. Now our current arrangements are no different if you were to compare it to a state signatory, to the ICCPR, to what is required in the Federal arrangements in Australia. You have to demonstrate a commitment to Australia before you can cast a vote in an Australian Federal election and what controls the Australian citizenship is their immigration regime and as I've said in my letter to Minister Tuckey, in the Norfolk Island context the closest that we have to citizenship is our immigration regime which establishes your commitment to a place. Now in the Australian situation before you can ask a vote in the Federal election you've got to be an Australian citizen and there is a period of time that you have to walk through just like our immigration arrangements on Norfolk Island, before you actually receive that citizenship and then you are allowed to vote. It's important that there is a recognition that Norfolk Island is different. There is an assumption that Norfolk Island is part and parcel of Australia. These arguments could go on until the cows come in and they certainly will. They will probably go on for a lot more years yet until some definite answer is found but it's got to be recognised and is recognised as I said to Minister Tuckey in my letter, it is recognised very clearly that Norfolk Island is different. In the Preamble to the Norfolk Island Act. There is no requirement for us to have to be the same. In fact we are different in a whole host of areas. We have our own immigration regime which brings me back to the citizenship point. Our Immigration regime establishes citizenship on Norfolk Island though you are a national of another body which in a lot of cases is the Commonwealth of Australia because people have an Australian passport or a New Zealand passport but to be here and to demonstrate your commitment to the community you go through an immigration regime no different to any other signatory state to the international covenants except we aren't a signatory state to the international covenants but we don't need to be either. Because we are recognised as being different it is important that Australia fight the cause for us. In other words as I've said to Minister Tuckey and I've been reported on the radio, he shouldn't be turning his venom and vitriol on Norfolk Island and saying you people haven't done as I've asked of you. What he should be turning around and saying is look, we recognise the difference and all those people who are trying to knock us, right up to the Office of the Prime Minister who's driving this, and I'll touch on that shortly, Minister Tuckey if he is worth his salt is going to stand there and say we recognise that these people are different. We recognise them in so many different areas that they are different,

because we're not the same as the Northern Territory, we are not the same as the Australian Capital Territory, we are not the same as the state of Australia. We are different. Very clear. There is no argument about that and that should be upheld. Wilson Tuckey should be fighting for our rights. He's not doing that. Of course he's a party man. He's got to do as he's told otherwise he doesn't remain a Minister for Territories long but it doesn't help our cause. Mr Smith in his earlier contribution made a reference to persons who are elected to this body having a knowledge of Norfolk Island. I think there is some confusion that exists that these proposals may in fact have people who have been on Norfolk Island for six or twelve months or whatever the case may be to be elected to this body and therefore not have the necessary knowledge and background to be represented in this forum. I need to make it quite clear that in the proposed legislation there is no move to change the eligibility to be a candidate for election to the Legislative Assembly. That is dealt with under the Norfolk Island Act and there is no proposal to change that and those requirements are that you must have resided on Norfolk Island for a minimum of five and a half years. I think it is in line with the residency requirements under the Immigration Act 1980 which was subsequent obviously to the Norfolk Island Act so that's not proposed to change. In other words, people who are resident still would have to be – I'm sorry, eligibility for election is still tied to the requirement to have to be a resident of Norfolk Island. Mr Nobbs referred to and I think Mr Smith also referred to the reason as to why the Senate rejected the Commonwealth Government's prior legislation and that was to do with the lack of consultation. We know the history since then. The Joint Standing Committee was asked to look at Norfolk Island's electoral issues and go out there as Minister Tuckey came out here in November, well they came out here before that. They produced a report I think dated June or July of last year that we were in receipt of about August which basically reflected exactly what the Federal Government were trying to impose in the first place. Now I don't have a conspiratorial mind if there is such a word, but it just seems from the content of that Joint Standing Committee report which was delivered on electoral matters that the views of the people of Norfolk Island were not taken into account in the preparation of that. It appears as though that was simply a vehicle to achieve victory following the defeat that had been encountered in the Senate and that's further backed up by the recent visit of the same Joint Standing Committee albeit with a few new faces in it and one old face that as Mr Nobbs said, should have prepared a dissenting report but didn't. It still doesn't mean that he can't represent that dissent in whatever forum he is a member of. I understand it's Paul Neville who is a member of the House of Representatives. It doesn't prevent him from talking to his view and dissent to that report however I again quote from my letter to Minister Tuckey in relation to the recent visit of the Joint Standing Committee "the Norfolk Island Government has been encouraged in recent days by opinions expressed by some members of the current Joint Standing Committee in both formal and informal discussions that clearly establishes that members of that committee harbour significant reservations in relation to the recommendations of the Joint Standing Committee Report into Electoral Matters. This in itself is a strong argument to defer action on this matter and in view of your widely expressed desire to be the Minister FOR Territories I appeal to you to reconsider your actions thereby respecting and acknowledging the expressed desire of the people of Norfolk Island to continue to legislate for and administer electoral processes in Norfolk Island. There is a major hiccup in communication and in the dissemination of factual evidence within the Commonwealth. That was evidenced clearly in discussions that both myself and other members of the Legislative Assembly had with members of the Joint Standing Committee. One member of that committee in particular said that they had been told a number of things about Norfolk Island prior to their visit here and they had no reason to doubt it and found in fact there was absolutely no substance to the information they had been provided with, once they had visited Norfolk Island and seen for themselves the facts as presented. There are real concerns raised by that committee's actions, by the people who have dictated that committee's actions and a willingness as I think was reported to me yesterday by an officer of Wilson Tuckey's

office that those people were in unanimous agreement on that document. Yes they may well have all signed off on it but it has been amply demonstrated to us that those people obviously never read the material that was put in front of them, never considered the views of the people of Norfolk Island in those documents that were placed in front of them and actually have a very different opinion of things following their visit to Norfolk Island and that is a major cause of concern because if the Commonwealth are pinning their justification for wanting to impose changes on our electoral system. They are very wayward in their justification for doing so based on that. To the amendments I don't have to remind you and other members around this table that as far as the proposal to delete citizenship is concerned it has been indicated to us very clearly that is not acceptable by the Commonwealth. It may not be acceptable by the Commonwealth but it is not the Commonwealth's legislation we are dealing with, it is Norfolk Island's legislation's. As I said in my introductory remarks to my bill at the last sitting, I had every intention following the receipt of Minister Tuckey's letter and publication of his press release in the paper only a day or so after receipt of that letter to consider withdrawing the bill. We had been significantly let down. We had heard a number of claims that Minister Tuckey was going to be for territories and my letter is too long. I'm not going to read it into Hansard but I'm happy to table that document. One of my major concerns is that we work around this table. We work with each other and we have a great deal of respect for each other I believe. We also have a deal of respect for representatives of other governments including the federal Government and as has been demonstrated to me in recent days the handshake is a great thing. But we can't rely on the handshake any more. We can't even rely on people's word any more because that changes and that is particularly disturbing to me and it is particularly disturbing to a number of members of this Legislative Assembly. I've tried to demonstrate why we are different and why we don't have to be the same because we are not the same. That is clear. There is no argument about that. There is some reasonableness in my mind in revisiting the qualifying period but in light of events particularly those masterminded by the Commonwealth it is important that we hear what the community has to say through our Select Committee. I'm a member of that Select Committee and I'm confident that the way the matters have been approached in the workings of this Select Committee that we are going to have a just hearing from the community and a just input from members of the community in relation to these matters and it is important now as I say in light of events that we continue that to finality. Mr Nobbs I think was one member who mentioned the activities of last week. As members were aware I was absent for the first couple of days last week whilst some of these workings were going on but I must admit that in the middle of last week I was completely at sea over this issue because there were what I believed to be solid positions taken by members of the Legislative Assembly and for one reason or another there seemed to be discussion about deals being struck and I think that was reported in the paper on the weekend. I wasn't aware of deals being struck but I was aware of Mr Brown's proposal to do away with citizenship and reduce the period to six months and that's interesting when I look back on Hansard on the 12th February when Mr Brown said I'll happily complain till the day I die about the thuggery that is proposed but I will not bow to it. It is interesting that I guess my interpretation of bowing to things may be different to another's interpretation of bowing to things but certainly our current arrangement of 900 days in the last four years and a reduction to six months is not in some way bowing to the wants or desires of the Commonwealth. I don't think I have too much more to add at this stage. I'll certainly chew through my notes and construct some further debate for the sitting on the 19th but I am also mindful of the fact that from what I've been able to glean from around this table and Mr Brown's more recent response that he would not be supporting these amendments have led me to believe that the legislation will fail but obviously it is appropriate that we allow time for the community to make comment and I support David Buffett's words that we need to hear from the community, more than we have to date

MR SMITH Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker. I know that time is running. We didn't expect to speak to this at great length this morning but there's a couple of points that have been raised in debate this morning that made me think. One was, and I refer back to when Minister Alex Somleyay had proposed this change to Norfolk Island citizenship at whatever date it was and at a conversation I had with him at his home he stated that he must have been badly advised because as he understood it, this initiative came from Norfolk Island and I said I don't believe that to be the case. I can't think of anybody who would want to propose it. I now see that I could have been wrong. Secondly if this legislation passes as it is we would need to have an election. One thing that both Somleyay and Macdonald realised once we got along the track with what they were talking about, was they maybe allowing other people to vote but they would automatically disenfranchise people who already have the right to vote and they talked about a grandfather clause for people who are already on the roll, that they can stay on the roll forever as long as they are on Norfolk Island but we haven't got that. But as I understand it, in 1982-83 when the electoral system was changed, the Legislative Assembly went to the community and said well we've changed the system so we'd better give you the opportunity to try it out and we would need to do the same today because if we change the voting system or the electoral system we would need to have an election and I'm disappointed in that. Whether we do it or whether the Commonwealth does it that would be the case. Once you've changed the law you can't really carry on under a different regime. You would have to give the community the opportunity to see how it works and the results it would produce. I'll say no more thank you Madam Deputy Speaker

MR I BUFFETT Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker it seems that the general debate on this issue is almost completed. There will be further debate at the substantial sitting of this parliament on the 19th March. There have been a number of issues raised here this morning. Some of them are innovative I believe. One of them for example is to use the fact that we have our own immigration regime and in some defacto sense we are granting citizenship under that regime. That's an innovative concept by the Chief Minister and probably needs to be further looked at and hopefully not jeopardise the immigration distinctness that we have at the moment. There is that issue and we have a number of other ones that have been raised. Shortly before moving the adjournment could I ask, I think we all need a Hansard fairly quickly of the debate this morning so that some of these issues can be addressed at the formal sitting and having said that, I move that the debate be adjourned and resumption of debate made an order of the day for a subsequent day of sitting

DEPUTY SPEAKER Any further debate Honourable Members. There being no further debate I put the question is that this matter be adjourned and made an Order of the Day for a subsequent day of sitting

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

That matter is so adjourned

FIXING OF THE NEXT SITTING DATE

MRS JACK Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker I move that the House at its rising adjourn until Wednesday, 19th march 2003 at 10.00 am

DEPUTY SPEAKER Thank you. Is there any debate Honourable Members. The question that the House at its rising adjourn until Wednesday, 19th march 2003 at 10.00 am

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

ADJOURNMENT

MR NOBBS
that the House do now adjourn

Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker, I move

DEPUTY SPEAKER
There being no further debate I put the question that the House do now adjourn

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

Therefore Honourable Members this House stands adjourned until Wednesday, 19th
March 2003 at 10.00 in the morning.

