

MR DONALDSON Thank you Mr Speaker, I would like to give Notice that at the October sitting of this House I will be bringing forward a motion to determine which days in the calendar year of 2004 will for the purposes of the Employment Act, 1988 be taken as public holidays. Furthermore, I draw to Members attention that Foundation Day, Christmas Day and Boxing Day will fall on a weekend and a decision will be required if another day will be taken as a public holiday and if so, should it be in addition to or in lieu of those days, thank you

SPEAKER Thank you. Are there any other Notices?

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

We move to questions without notice - Are there any questions without notice

MR NOBBS Thank you Mr Speaker I intended asking this at the last meeting but I ask the Chief Minister would you please advise, following your speech at the opening of the dedication of the road at Mt Pitt, which I commend you on, it was an excellent speech, you made reference to an accident and following this and also the community request both in New Zealand and Norfolk Island for assistance, has there been an inquiry into this accident and if so, what form did the inquiry take and when will the findings be available and if no inquiry was undertaken, the reasons for this, thank you

MR GARDNER Thank you Mr Speaker I'm not aware of an inquiry having been undertaken but I would be surprised that the contractor responsible for the Mt Pitt project had not undertaken its own internal inquiry into the accident and would be surprised too if the Commonwealth as the sponsoring organisation for that project, had not undertaken their own inquiry. I'm unable to provide any insight as to whether an inquiry was undertaken within the confines of the Workers Compensation Regime on Norfolk Island and that is probably a matter that I would prefer to refer to my colleague Mr Donaldson in relation to the Workers Compensation Scheme on Norfolk Island

MR NOBBS As a supplementary, is the Minister prepared to add anything to that at this stage or will he be able to provide some information at a later date

MR DONALDSON Thank you Mr Speaker I did a couple of weeks ago call for a report and the progress on this particular matter from the Administration. I was informed that it is still in progress, the Safety Inspectors reports under the Employment Act have now come in and the matter is still being tied together and it is not ready for any public comment at this moment

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Speaker a question to the Chief Minister in relation to the Joint Standing Committee. Could the Chief Minister for the benefit of the community update us on where the report from the Joint Standing Committee from the Commonwealth is at and when it is expected to be tabled

MR GARDNER Thank you Mr Speaker I've had no formal communication from the secretariat. The only communication I've had with the secretariat of the Joint Standing

Committee was briefly last week and one of the questions that I did ask at that time was when it was expected that the Joint Standing Committee's report would be tabled and it was indicated to me that it was to be towards the end of this month or early October. I'm still awaiting some formal advise on that

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Speaker often with the Commonwealth Parliamentary Reports, there is a draft report that is given to Norfolk Island before the final report. Is there any indication that there might be a draft report before the final one

MR GARDNER I haven't received any indication of that but I'm happy to pursue that

MR BROWN I direct this question to the executive Member with responsibility for road traffic. Can the Executive Member advise whether he has yet completed a study as requested by this House at its August sitting into the safety, danger or otherwise of allowing motor vehicle drivers in Norfolk Island to use hand held mobile trunk radios while driving motor vehicles on public roads in Norfolk Island

SPEAKER I'll respond to that when I come to the floor Mr Brown

MS NICHOLAS Thank you Mr Speaker. A question to the Minister for Land and the Environment. How much crushed rock has been produced during what I believe were trial crushing operations which have been carried out in recent days at the airport site; what scrutiny of the operations is taking place in terms of noise, dust and any other pollution and when will results be known and finally, is the Minister willing to give any information on the future of crushing operations at the airport or elsewhere

MR I BUFFETT Thank you Mr Speaker there are a number of parts to that question that Ms Nicholas has asked of me. I must apologise. I've been out of this system for a few days in the last week or so and I certainly haven't got some of the more specific details but perhaps if I could just make a statement in respect of rock crushing which would cover most of the issues that Ms Nicholas has asked me. Since I last spoke in the house regarding the availability of crushed rock and of crushing operations in general, I am somewhat pleased to advise that we have had five days including today, of crushing on portion 183 at the airport, more commonly known as the Norfolk Island airport. This has enabled the product to be available to the community, the operation of that five day crushing operation has been monitored by an Air and Dust Scientist from an independent firm of scientists who have been employed by the Norfolk Island Administration and that is part and parcel of an order by the Administrative Review Tribunal or suggestion of the Administrative Review Tribunal that we do that. The purpose of employing these consultants was to provide scientific evidence to the Administrative Review Tribunal so that the claims of the applicants in all matters can be properly tested and assessed against factual scientific evidence. To assist in the proper collection of data the scientists have placed on the nearest residences to each of the crushing sites a dust deposition and dust track monitor but it is intended the dust deposition will be moved from the residence after one month and placed at the two separate crusher sites on a permanent basis. Also two independent dust coats have been placed at two separate sites on the island to enable

independent corroboration of results. I am advised that the scientist will report back to the Deputy Crown Counsel as soon as practicable. During the week the scientist has been present he has also been training Administration officers to use the equipment and to effectively read the results of what's been monitored. One of the aspects of the scientist brief is to prepare for the Administration a procedure of what must be followed if a complaint is received and what consequences will then follow, together with assessing what training needs to be undertaken for Administration officers who will be enforcing environmental plan issues. On advise of the other crushing operator it had been envisioned that the site at Ball Bay would also be ready for a period of crushing. However I understand that the shed and site is still not completed and there are still some legal matters which need to be attended to by the intervener, Mr Brown. Therefore with respect to that aspect of the scientists visit it will be uncompleted however it was important to obtain some product for the island and therefore the decision was made to have the scientist attend so that product could be produced at the site that was approved at the airport. These matters are next due to come before the Administrative Review Tribunal on the 22nd September when it is hoped that a firm date of or around the 8th December will be scheduled for the final determination. It is important to note that the applicants or any of the parties even after final determination of the Administrative Review Tribunal can appeal to the Supreme Court against decisions of the Tribunal. I would like to take the opportunity to thank those residences and Administration officers who have made their time available to the scientists to enable some matters in this area to be advanced to the stage it has so at present. It is anticipated that the next lot of crushing to take place on the Island is the stockpile at Aunt Lil's and the Administration is working with those commercial operators in the island to work in a tender process to process that OTR and do other rock products on the reserve. Once again I thank the residents of Young's Road for their patience and input into this matter and that briefly is the situation with rock crushing. With specific reference to the quantity that Ms Nicholas has asked for it was my understanding that the approval carried the approval to crush 1000 tonnes at the temporary airport site. As of right at this moment I personally am not able to say that it has been completed or what quantities of that 1000 has been crushed. I will endeavour to find that out some time today. I understand the crushing operations there today are part and parcel of the approval process and will certainly try and inform Ms Nicholas and anybody else who would wish to know where we stand with that. I'm sorry that's been a little longwinded but it gives some idea of where we are at with crushing operations

MR NOBBS Thank you Mr Speaker I ask also of the Minister for Land and the Environment why a package of material sent to Members of the community affected by the proposed Heritage Register contained a description of the KAVHA area taken from the Norfolk Island Plan which varies from the accepted KAVHA description and why was the Plan not amended when the error was pointed out and I understood accepted prior to the passage of the Plan through this House or is there some reason for ignoring this House and retaining the new description

MR I BUFFETT Thank you Mr Speaker I'll take that on notice. It's the first time that's been brought to my attention. As I said, I've been absent for a couple of weeks and I know there are some issues that have arisen as part of the proposal to establish a Norfolk Island Heritage Register. I don't think there's anything sinister in any misdescription of the KAVHA area but simply, probably the electronic medium that's been used to prepare it had

different descriptions input into them. I will look into that and certainly provide an answer to Mr Nobbs as soon as I can

MR NOBBS Can I have a supplementary to that. In relation to the Heritage Register why is it that in the proposed Heritage Register significant areas developed and utilised by the convicts such as KAVHA and areas now being promoted at Cascade and Longridge whereas other areas such as the Headstone area are not receiving such consideration and the next one is why is the Headstone Reserve not included in the Heritage Register list when all other Reserves are included

MR I BUFFETT Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker to be quite honest I don't know the full answer to that but I will certainly look at it. My understanding is that the matters that were to go onto the Norfolk Island Heritage Register were the first items that were already included on the Register of the National Estate which is the Commonwealth body and we were to reflect those because they have been previously nominated and on the Register of the National Estate and we were to reflect those on the local register to commence our own Heritage Act of Norfolk Island. The reasons why anything has been omitted I have no idea but certainly it was not by design as far as I am concerned or aware

MR D BUFFETT Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker I wonder if I might have the opportunity to respond to Mr Brown's earlier question if that's alright. He asked a question about studies in respect of hand held phones. In terms of this particular subject there was a question on the notice paper at our last sitting which I responded to. The question basically asked whether there had been any studies done about this in Norfolk Island and the answer to that was no. I did point out however that it was known that there were studies that had been carried out elsewhere and I refer to those although they are not on the tip of my tongue at this moment but further in responding to that question it was asked whether I would undertake a study if none had been done here and I said that I would and that study process has commenced. I have had discussions with the head of the service so that he might identify a suitable person or persons to undertake that and I have also provided to him details of reports of which I am aware but there may be others which I am unaware of about such studies in other places so the real response to that is, yes a study arrangement has commenced the process to respond to that earlier situation

MR SMITH Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker a question to Minister for Finance with responsibility for telecommunications. As I understand it the Telstra Reach Norfolk Island Operating Agreement expires sometime in the near future. Is the Government considering or reviewing the Operating Agreement to the degree where we may look at using another carrier to carry our telecommunications therefore possibly providing us with cheaper communications

MR DONALDSON Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker yes the current Carrier Agreement is operated by Reach Global Services. It expires in April 2006 so its got a little over two and a half years to go. About six months ago the service started looking at options available to them for replacement of the Service once April 2006 comes around. That at the moment is still being discussed. No decision has been made. The options are to negotiate an

agreement with another body or with Reach for another period of time or to operate it ourselves or a combination of both and its been recommended that we take some expert advise on this in the next six months and the direction will be set from that point on thank you

MR NOBBS Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker I ask the Minister responsible for the Public Service, I asked this question in July and I understood that there was to be an answer but I haven't had one and I ask again as part one of this question, is it correct that the Government has two bobcats, one owned by the electricity and Telecom or both and one owned by the Waste Management Centre; is it correct that the road sweeping attachment was purchased with each bobcat at a cost of some \$5000 each and that both of these units are operational and operated by qualified operators. Is it correct that at the time that I asked the question that the Norfolk Island Government hired exactly the same or similar machine and attachment from a private sector in the past few days, that's prior to the July meeting at an estimated cost of \$2000 and my second part of the question is this, is it correct that this practice of hiring machinery when the Norfolk Island Government already has its own machine, of hiring private machinery for even digging ditches and the like, is continuing and what is the reason for this. Is it because the machine that was purchased to do this job is unable to do it or is unsafe to do it or what is the actual problem in relation to this, if you understand my question. There are two parts. The first one is at a time prior to the July sitting and the second one is now, this practice of hiring private when the Government has its own, is still continuing and I want to know why

MR D BUFFETT Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker I'll endeavour to respond to some parts of it but I have to acknowledge that I don't have all of the information that Mr Nobbs is now seeking. I will certainly have to make some further enquiries as to what our current practice is in terms of whether we hire equipment when we might have that equipment on staff so to speak but in your earlier part of the question you identified two bobcats in the electricity area and I think you made mention of a bobcat in the Waste Management area. I don't have responsibility for those two areas nor control of the pieces of machinery that might operate there however, I do remember one of my colleagues on another occasion explaining that in some of the area those pieces of equipment might be dedicated for particular purposes and may not be necessarily more widely available within the service. Whether some of that is tied up in the answer to that I'm not really sure at this moment but I just mention it because it may be a particular factor. Madam Deputy Speaker, I'll make some enquiries about our present practice and indeed if I have the answers before we finish this sitting I might be able to provide them

MR SMITH Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker a question to the Minister responsible or education. I've been asking questions about apprenticeships over the last few months. I wonder if the Minister has good news in relation to whether apprenticeships will apply to Norfolk Island or not

MR D BUFFETT Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker I hope that we do have good news. There has been some advancement since you raised the question with me on an earlier occasion but just to repeat some of the earlier information so that you will see the sequence, towards the end of last year we approached the Department of Education and

Training in New South Wales to come and talk with us about extending their particular scheme which had changed significantly of recent times so that Norfolk Island might be part of their apprenticeship arrangements. We did have an arrangement at an earlier time but that has not continued given the new arrangements in New South Wales. There was a positive response to that. Mr Bob Smith who incidentally was a former teacher in Norfolk Island came to the Island because he is now Director in the New South Wales Department of Education and Training in this particular area, conducted a survey, spoke with people within the industry, and related areas, and went away to do some further work with his department. He provided an interim report which said that there was a positive attitude on the Departments part towards assisting this process for Norfolk Island. There were a number of things that probably however would need to be done by them. A. an adjustment in their policy arrangements, and may need to be B. an adjustment in their legislative arrangements but there was a willingness to walk through those issues if they were issues that needed to be addressed. In the past week plus, I'm just not too sure whether it's a week, week and a half but its thereabouts, in the past couple of weeks, I have received a more substantive report which sets out a number of options. I have provided that report to the headmaster of the Norfolk Island school and he I know have drawn together a group to evaluate the options within that report and then will come to me with some recommendations as to which of those options might be the best to pursue. When I've received that I will be firstly having discussions with Members as we normally do on our meeting of Members on a Monday to pursue the matter. That's about where we are at with it

MR SMITH Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker is it possible to give some idea of the timeframe of when we may have either some good news or some results

MR D BUFFETT Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker well I've said that what I think I've explained today is probably good news but it has not delivered the product I've got to acknowledge that at this moment, and until I see these options and the evaluation from the local participants I'm really not in a position to respond to that but as soon as I can I will

MR SMITH Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker a question to the Minister for Community Services and Tourism. A few months ago there was a discussion about the size of buses on the Norfolk Island roads and there was a report to be done. It may have already been done and I haven't seen it, but has that report been finished and if so can I please have a copy

MR D BUFFETT In terms of my presentation to Members the report has not been completed at this moment but there has been a significant amount of work that has been completed in the Public Service and a great deal of that has been lodged with me although not yet in its total final form but it is nearing presentation time

MR SMITH Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker a different question to the Minister for Community Services and Tourism in relation to Annual Reports. When was the last Annual Report done and when is the next one due.

MR D BUFFETT Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker I can't be conclusive about that except that my discussions over the past week have indicated that the last to be

published which is I think the financial year just concluded is about to go to the printer but I think I would rather like to check that situation but I seem to recall that that was said. It was in a more passing conversation that that information came to me in lieu of a direct question but I thought it might be useful to just convey it to you

MR NOBBS Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker I ask the Minister for Land and the Environment can he please explain the reasons for the earthworks at Headstone. Were the works subject to an application to the Building Board; was a tender called for the work; and what is the status of such works given the recently Plans of Management

MR I BUFFETT Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker firstly the work at Headstone was some remedial work following damage caused by wave and wind to the existing waste site there; the demolition of the shed, the moving of the cage, some erosion caused on the upside bank of that area. I understand that the work was done as I said, as a remedial operation. In respect of a planning application its in the Reserve and doesn't specifically require a planning application as I've been informed. Madam Deputy Speaker, the work carried out there I cannot answer as to whether it went to tender or not. I wasn't on deck at the time when the work commenced so I can't answer that but I will chase that one up for Mr Nobbs and find out if it did or it didn't go to tender. I understand that the end result was a decision to make the area more safe for the operation as exists at the moment then for any future operation, that the work was carried out on that embankment

MR NOBBS Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker could the Minister please follow this up. I'm really concerned about the Reserve situation and also, why did the Administration hire trucks to cart the removed soil when I was asked, and I repeat "it has its own vehicles capable and available to undertake this work, which was sitting in a shed"

MR I BUFFETT Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker certainly I will follow those matters up for Mr Nobbs and provide both him and the community answers to the questions that he's asked

MRS JACK Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker I ask this of the Minister for Finance who has responsibility for the airport. I refer to landing fees and the payment of those fees and ask, is it true that at the beginning of this month, the total amount outstanding for landing fees was almost \$500,000. Are these accounts thirty day accounts and if so, how can they be allowed to reach such proportions. I also want to know how much is owed at the moment and of this, how much is current and how much exceeds the thirty day account period

MR DONALDSON Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker yes it is true that two of the airlines are substantially behind with their landing fees and it got to the stage where we were going to invoke some action that we have available to us under the Norfolk Island Airport Act however the outstanding portion of the fees, and I'm not talking about the thirty days, I'm talking about the long outstanding portion of the fees, was paid and avoided that action. In August this year the Chief Executive Officer wrote to all three airlines operating to Norfolk Island putting them on a fourteen day payment basis rather than the original thirty days. This

was necessary as two of the airlines have become materially behind with it. I can't give Mrs Jack the exact figures at the moment as to what is outstanding and how much is outstanding at this particular day but it is being looked into and legal remedies are being addressed

MR NOBBS Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker. I'm not picking on you Toon but the Minister for Land and the Environment is there an approved Plans of Management for the Waste Management Centre and its surrounds and when will the community be provided with a copy of the plan layout of the area and what is the cost to date of the Waste Management Centre

MR I BUFFETT Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker yes there was a concept plan prepared earlier in the life when this whole thing commenced which included the construction of the shed, access roads, the green waste area, the preparation of the burns I think is the correct word, at the north-western end. Madam Deputy Speaker, my understanding is that to date the cost of the Waste Management Centre is in excess of \$600000 and I could find the exact amount of which \$175,000 was funded by the Coast and Clean Seas Programme of the Commonwealth and the rest has been funded from the local community by borrowings from the Water Assurance Fund. The budget for the proposed Waste Management Centre includes a payback of the monies that have been borrowed and in terms of the proposed levies that will be charged for Waste Management Centre in Norfolk Island part and parcel of that budget is to repay the money that has been borrowed from the Water Assurance Fund

MR NOBBS Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker I ask the Minister responsible for the Public Service is it correct that some Members of the Public Service are rostered on for seven days per week and in some instances continuously for at least four months and if so, is this not a very dangerous practice and also, what has happened to the proposal for staff to work spread of hours which would alleviate such safety problems and also reduce considerably the overtime costs to the Administration

MR D BUFFETT Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker there are discussions that are ongoing between management in the Service and officers of the Service about spread of hours and I've periodically reported to you about that. It has not been totally achieved by any means at this moment but there are continuing discussions to make significant achievements about that. There are still examples where people will work seven days a week although I do understand that there are days off in lieu that follow in those particular situations but if in fact there are some examples where it does not happen and in fact people are working without a break for months as you have indicated in your question to me, there are difficulties about that and I will immediately take that up with the head of the Public Service. I've got to say that I doubt that that is the situation but I wouldn't want to be categoric it is just something that I don't understand that that's happening at this moment

MRS JACK Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker I ask this of the Minister for Community Services and Tourism with responsibility for the hospital, I refer to several interviews recorded in our local newspaper as well as in Australia that have dealt with Health and Hospital issues and ask what procedures are you putting in place to avoid any more of the extremely poor impressions and reporting occurring

MR D BUFFETT Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker I think at the outset I need to explain that I'm not able to, in all instances, influence what journalists will write in the newspapers. Obviously when we have discussions with journalists and respond to their requests for interviews we endeavour to present a factual situation and obviously something that is Norfolk Island's best interests. It doesn't always write like that at the end of the day and yes, over the past week there have been some unfavourable reports. I've got to say, not always totally accurate reports but nevertheless unfavourable impressions put about. In the particular areas that have been mentioned I have spoken with the principals, that is, directors at the hospital and the like to point out the difficulties that sometimes arise in these situations and the care that should be taken and pointed out that if there are future indicators that press people would want to be active, then there should be a consultative process with at least the Minister so that extra efforts might be made to ensure that things are within perspective

MR NOBBS Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker I ask the Chief Minister is the Minister prepared to provide to the community updated details and negotiations related to the 200 mile zone and following the visit by the fisheries people from Canberra in the last week or so, has he any information of interest to the community in relation to the future management of the 200 zone outside the box

MR GARDNER Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker I'll deal with the second part of the question first. Any discussions that I'm aware of that took place in relation to fisheries outside of the box are non existent. I don't believe there was any discussion to assist and clarify on that point on the matter of fisheries outside the box and extending into the 200 mile zone surrounding Norfolk Island. Suffice to say that the Commonwealth Department of Forestry and Fisheries, the officers, did explain that they would continue to provide advise to the Norfolk Island Government on illegal fishing activities that occur around Norfolk Island and I would take that as meaning that that would extend to illegal fishing that could occur within the 200 mile zone surrounding Norfolk Island. As far as discussion on the question of delimitation of maritime boundaries there is currently in train between Australia and New Zealand, I can advise that since the last time this matter was raised in the House there had not been further discussions, there were due to be further negotiating discussions taking place in New Zealand last week. That was postponed and it is envisaged now that those further discussions to try and bring the matter to finality will take place in New Zealand in early December

MR NOBBS At the time of the visit of the fisheries people from Canberra the responsible Minister was off sick, so I haven't asked him the questions and I don't intend to ask him, but I ask you Chief Minister did anybody from the Government talk to these people in relation to what is happening in the 200 mile zone bearing in mind that there are some exploratory fishing licences operating in the area and that those licences will cease in about twelve months time

MR GARDNER I'm unable to comment on the detail of those licences that Mr Nobbs' is referring to but I can confirm that I did meet with officers of the Australian Fisheries Management Authority and officers of the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry on the 9th September which was last week in relation to the Norfolk Island fishery so that is, in

relation to matters within the box. That was the primary purpose of those discussions. Certainly I didn't take those discussions any further to discuss other issues outside of that, primarily in relation to the management of the Norfolk Island fishery which is the fishery which is contained within the boundaries of what is referred to as the Norfolk Island box

MR NOBBS I ask the Minister who is responsible for liquor, I haven't asked him for a while and I ask him again, when will the proposed new Liquor Licensing Act be available for viewing by Members and when is it scheduled to be introduced as a bill to the Legislative Assembly

MR DONALDSON Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker I can make the draft Liquor Licensing Bill available to Members this week. It is currently with the Liquor Licensing Board for comment. I understand that one of the Members is away at the moment and that is probably the reason for the delay. As soon as it is circulated to Members I intend taking Members comments on it and progressing it from there. Hopefully, the lovely expression, by Christmas

MR NOBBS Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker I ask the Minister responsible for the Public Service, another ongoing issue, has the process set in place some time ago of job evaluation within the Public Service been completed as yet and if so, can he give details such as the process taken and who was involved in the evaluation etc etc

MR D BUFFETT Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker. The job evaluation process is not complete. I assume that you are referring to the relativity study more than the job evaluation situation. We did undertake a number of processes to try and complete that task and I've got to say frankly none of them totally successfully and I've reported that to Members on another occasion. The head of the Service has picked up the package to say that it needs to be revised and we need to go through some of the processes again so that the relativities are in fact addressed whereas the results from the other were felt were not sufficiently addressed. That process is ongoing and if you want to ask me for a time frame for delivery, I'm afraid at this time I'm not able to give you a particular time frame. I can have further discussions with the CEO to try and put a handle on that but it is ongoing. Could I just respond in part to an earlier question that was raised with me and I said I would try and find out, it's about the Annual Report Madame Deputy Speaker and the information that I have is this, that the Report 2001/2002 is with the printer, and is expected within a week or so to be delivered, that's the latest information I have about that. The year that has just completed which is the year 2002/2003 is under preparation. In terms of the last year's Report that obviously is a long time frame, the CEO explains to me that we've had some significant staff changes in areas that are involved with the preparation of that and it has taken longer than we would have liked, but that's where those 2 periods of time are situation in terms of preparation or presentation of the Annual Report.

MR NOBBS Yeah I ask the Minister for Tourism. Minister you recently attended a tourism meeting in Australia, do you propose to report to the community by way of a Statement in relation to this or was there anything of interest which you may wish to give us at this time.

MR DONALDSON Thank you Madame Deputy Speaker. I table Virements that have been made since the 16th July 2003 until now. There's only 3 amounts that have been made and in accordance with existing policy I table the virements.

MR DONALDSON Thank you Madame Deputy Speaker. I'm required by Section 32 (c) 2 of this Public Monies Act to table in the House particulars of expenditure charged against a vote called Advance to Executive Member and accordingly I table a Statement setting out such expenditure. Madame Deputy Speaker when appropriation was approved in June 2002 for the 2003 year it included a discretionary amount of \$20,000 which is really put at this disposal of the Executive Member for Finance for the purposed of meeting any contingencies as they arise throughout the year. At the end of the year only \$7,500 of this has been spent, the major items and the total list will be tabled by just for the benefit of the people listening and the Members of the House the major items were the cost of the Referendum on mobile telephones, that was \$1,810-00, the cost of employing a ? lobbyist on some of the electoral issues was \$2,563-00 and a grant to the Youth of Norfolk Island Sporting Trust was \$2,000-00. That accounts for about \$6,000 of the total amount of \$7,500. The balance of it was made up of miscellaneous amounts which appear in the paper that I'm tabling. Thank you Madame Deputy Speaker.

MR D. BUFFETT Madame Deputy Speaker I table the Inbound Passenger Statistics for August 2003. These have been circulated to Members but I would like to put them on the table now. Just to read some of the relevant parts, for the month of August 2003 we have received 2,784 visitors to the island, this compares with last year 2,505 and the year before that 2,340. So it is up obviously on the last 2 years and it gives a total in the particular financial year that we are in now of 5,592. Again just to highlight where the principal visitors have come from. 32% have come from NSW, 24% have come from Queensland, 16% have come from New Zealand and 15% have come Victoria, there are smaller and more minor percentages from other places but they are the main figures in terms of those. There are some further attachments which gives a break up of age groups and the like and other information that Members might want to see as useful and I table that information Honourable Members.

MR BROWN I move that the Paper be noted.

MR BROWN Madame Deputy Speaker I've asked a number of questions of the Minister over recent months in relation to these statistics and in particular I have asked if the Minister can inform us whether the statistics, when they refer to the average stay of our visitors refer to the number of days for part of which a visitor was here or as was the method of reporting up until recent times at least the number of bed nights. Is the Minister able to advise whether the passenger statistics which he has tabled refer to days or nights. If they refer to days can the Minister advise when the form of reporting changed and finally can the Minister confirm in the event that the reporting is of days or part thereof that the statistics which he has tabled, when compared with those for 2002 and 2001 are firstly misleading, and secondly in error in the case of the July month by 2,808 bed nights and the August month by 2,784 bed nights, and finally is the Minister aware that in the case of the August month a deduction of 2,874 bed nights from the reported figure would, rather than showing a growth actually show a decline compared to last year.

and the Administrator Designate the Honourable Grant Tambling. Madame Deputy Speaker as Members are aware and I'm sure listeners are aware from the I guess the promotion of the Administrator Designate in the Norfolk Islander in recent weeks, I have been advised that next week I believe from the 24th until the 26th September the Honourable Wilson Tuckey and his wife Jenny, accompanied by the Honourable Grant Tambling and Mrs Sandra Tambling and also Minister Tuckey's staff Mr Norm Hayward, Mr Dick Sherwood and Ms Margaret Backhouse from the Department of Territory and Regional Services will visit the island for those 2 days. They will be arriving at this stage I've been informed by VIP aircraft on Wednesday the 24th and depart on Friday the 26th. This is an advance visit by the Honourable Grant Tambling as Administrator Designate to Norfolk Island as Members and listeners would be aware. He does not take up his official appointment until the 1st of November 2003 and this flying visit will provide him an opportunity to meet with Members of the Legislative Assembly and other members of the community. Thank you.

NOTICES

OUTSOURCING OF ROADWORKS

MR SMITH Thank you Madame Deputy Speaker I move that this House requests the responsible Executive Member to investigate the feasibility of engaging outside contractors to upgrade and maintain all necessary roads on Norfolk Island over the next 10 years with the following to apply. A) That the upgrading be carried out in the first 2 years of contract B) That funding be met annually from the Roads budget to avoid the need to borrow funds C) The Administration assist with resourcing the project to help reduce costs and 2) To report back to the House on the feasibility of this concept at the next sitting of the House.

MADAME DEPUTY SPEAKER Thank you. Debate.

MR SMITH At the last sitting of the House I asked a question of the Chief Minister in relation to this particular concept that is proposed in my Motion here today. This was an issue that was raised about 2 or 3 years ago where there was a concept that is used in other places where I'll say a company for the want of a better word may tender for or contract to do roading in particular areas. When that was put to me at that particular time I spoke to our Roads people, our long serving Roads people to see what they thought of the concept. At that time they thought it would be a good idea particularly with the lack of crushed metal over the last 2 or 3 years where the roads are now getting further and further behind in the upgrading. So now we have the prospect of having crushed metal again very soon as I understand it, it may be a good time or I believe it's a good time for us to look at such a concept as is proposed here. Now I need to say at this point in time that there's a couple of things that probably needed to be added to my Motion, it doesn't matter, I've stated in here, engaging outside contractors, that doesn't mean to say outside of the island, it can be within the island, it could even be the Administration that takes on such a concept themselves. I've also said that the upgrading to be carried out in the first 2 years of the contract, well I don't know whether that's possible because it would be subject to weather, by rock, man power etc. But from my knowledge of roading which is not great but I understand that it was costed to do roading at about \$125,000 per kilometre, mind you that figure is a little old now, that's probably from a few

years ago. So if that was the case if it was around about \$125,000 per kilometre as a total number to do 10 kilometres of road that obviously costs about \$1.2m and to do 10 times that, 100 kilometres of road would obviously be around \$10 or \$11m. As I understand it also standard roading, upgrading of roading takes 2 to 3 weeks to do half a kilometre at the moment, therefore to do 5 kilometre would take 10 weeks or to do 50 kilometres would take 2 years. Now Members will note that I've said maintain all necessary roads on Norfolk Island and by necessary I don't mean every road to be expected to be done in that time, but the ones that are needed to be upgraded. Some are still in quite good condition at the moment. I think it's worth us checking out this concept to see if it can be done to see if it's acceptable to the community which I'm sure in a lot of cases it would be, to the people who are living on roads that are in very bad state of repair. I'm sure that people who are already involved in roads will still be involved in roading, the way I see the concept. It may even be that an outside contractor as stated in my Motion here could be simply a team that will run the whole project using some of our own equipment as we do have roading equipment here, we have people that can use it but I think the whole thing needs to be managed to make it work properly. Madame Deputy Speaker I won't say any more at this point in time I'd like to see what other Members have to say if they have anything. I don't see any point in pushing this to the end of the debate today and I would like to at some point defer the rest of the debate until next sitting.

MR GARDNER

Thank you Madame Deputy Speaker. I look on this Motion with interest. I understand why it's been brought forward, it's being provided as an option and I commend the bringing forward of an option to Members for consideration. I do have some concerns with the Motion as it stands. That first concern relates to outside contractors and Mr Smith has indicated that they may just be a management outside contractor utilising as much local skills, equipment and expertise as is necessary. Again I commend that, I think that's a reasonable proposal when considering any major project on the island as best to utilise the bulk of local expertise and equipment that is available on island. My question is, is it felt that maybe the skills to undertake this contract in it's entirety on the island is felt that those skills are not available on island. I would question that and probably suggest that our Roads Team and the expertise that they have amongst them and also persons that have been involved in the Roads crew on Norfolk Island, if they were encouraged to probably themselves put together a fairly good proposal for the upgrading maintenance of roads over the proposed 10 year period. Other than the spelling mistake that's obviously occurred on the Notice Paper, after A), the word contact should read contract so I understand, just to clarify that for Members around the table. But the proposal talks about from what Mr Smith has said this morning approximately 50 kilometres would be upgraded in the 2 year period at a total cost, working on his calculations of between \$5 and \$5.5m if my calculations are correct. I guess my concern in adopting a contract with an outside contractor who is expected to fund this project, themselves obviously would be a \$5 to \$5.5m project in 2 years, the true cost of that over a 10 year period, and I would probably suggest that any contractor that was looking at putting up front \$5 to \$5.5m would probably be looking for a return of at least 50% of that amount over that period to cover their costs, charges, fees, it may even be far greater than that, and so that's something that needs to be considered. If that is to be the proposal that is put forward then I would suggest that I would rather see all of that money retained on island and that we pay nobody interest and that if we are to pay interest of any description it should be to ourselves and not to an outside contracting organisation. I will be interested to hear other Members thoughts on the proposal. I would be interested to see just

problem. From the expenditure on roads to date for the last 14 years, now we've done considerable amount or the Administration and also the Government at the time did considerable work on trying to work out how we could actually do the roads and what it comes down to is very simple, it's called dollars, and that's the hold up. We've got the equipment, we've got the guys, we can get the rock, we can get the tar but it's just who's going to pay for it, and that's always been the problem. In the 14 years from June 1999 to an estimate and that's all I'm giving in June 2003 and there's been some saving so I'm just going on a figure of \$707,000 that the figure has been annually a might over, and I'm talking about a few grand over half a million dollars per year on average. That's for fourteen years. We've actually expended that sort of money on roading. Now I'm assuming that whether this is contracted out or whatever we do that that's expenditure will continue because there haven't been a heckova lot of road works done in the last fourteen years. There's been some. There's been the Burnt Pine upgrade which has included in that and a few others, but that's been the cost to the Administration every years. Two years ago we looked at the possibility and the aim was really to get a pool of funds together of about \$3m and commence doing the roads. I looked at a proposal that would be about \$250,000 per kilometre just for the average run of the mill road. It would cost more to do other roads such as up hills that would need better drainage facilities and concrete sides etc, so a rough costing would be \$250,000. \$3m you can work it out to about 12 kilometres offhand. To get that going. Do something. Then say to the people, this is what we've done but we need some more money to do some more. Because that's what is needed. If we are to upgrade the roads there's going to be a need for payment, additional to that which we already expend, so that's something that whoever's doing it, and I assume it will be the Minister for Finance who will be doing this or will it be the Minister for Roads. Somebody's going to be designated but I won't hold the system up with that, but they are the sort of issues. There are ways and means of doing it but it all comes down to dollars and that's what we have to look at. Thank you

MR DONALDSON

Thank you Mr Speaker I would like to make some brief comment on this. I agree with the concept of look at other ways of doing up our roads. Ways of kick-starting something that seems to have stalled but I notice Mr Nobbs mentioned that it was dollars that's holding us up in the last few years. Just some figures I've got from the finance section here. In the year ending 2003, that is the 30th June 2003, \$284,000 was allocated to capital works on roads. There were a couple of roads nominated to be done but I just noticed in my jaunts around the island that those roads haven't been done. There has been money spent on roads around the Island. There's been \$130,000 spent in the last twelve months on roads. That's only 46% of the total amount allocated. That suggests to me that the problem hasn't been of finances. There's been unspent funds there. The problem would seem to be resources whether manpower or metal. There have been some calculations done by a previous executive director and I'll just read out a couple of them. A basic road with no culverts, no sumpheads, no footpaths, costs \$73.60 per metre for a 6 metre wide road. Take that up to a road with curbs, culverts, sumpheads and walls, whatever a sumphead and a wall is, \$127. per metre for a six metre long road. Those figures aren't too different from what Mr Smith suggested in his earlier talk. The question arises, have we got the resources to do it and then have we the funds to do it. I know this proposal looks at the way of arriving at funds, but I think it's an expensive option to get someone else to come and do the work and then it's almost a hire purchase

arrangements where you pay them over the next five years for work they've already done. I would much prefer if we have to spend a big slab of money on roads, we go out and borrow that money a bit like we've done with the airport undertaking, dedicated a source of our revenue to repay it, such as the petrol tax and move along those lines, but this proposal before us at the moment is just to investigate and report back on several issues and I think that investigation or report could be widened to include whatever other opportunities appear whilst investigating the three items mentioned here, thank you

MR SMITH

Thank you Mr Speaker and thanks for the comments from my colleagues around the table in relation to this. A couple of things and it has been mentioned in debate, that this motion is only a proposal to investigate the feasibility of such a concept. If that is agreed to then the Government goes away and carries out the feasibility study which I don't imagine would take very long or much resources. How it would be done from then on in would be based on what is discovered during the time period. With the cost of such a concept, as I understand it from what I was told, if there is a company that was going to do this, if the cost was going to be say \$10m they would accept that they would have to spend a lot of money in the first couple of years of the contract then the maintenance of the road that they've upgraded would be for the first ten years so they wouldn't have a lot of expense in the later years of the contract so as far as their wanting their money in the first place it doesn't necessarily ring true because if they are going to make more money in the following years, like if they did all they had to do in the first two years and they are going to get \$10m at the end of it it's to their advantage but it makes them do the road properly so they don't have any extra expense in the later years of the contract. That's only one part of the concept and maybe there are other options but lets look at 1982 when the airport was being done. It may have been just an urban myth but whoever did the airport at that time has said that they said we'll do all your roads for \$1m. Whether it was every true or not I have no idea but if it was true that would be the sort of time you could do the roads. We are going to do an airport upgrade in the next twelve months. Maybe some of the equipment and expertise that will be here may be able to help with this project. But let's go the other way. There's some hesitation in some Members' minds. They are saying, we have a roads team. Why can't they just do the roads. Because they have their limitations. Unless we change the limitations like they are restricted to the hours they do; to the funds we give them. I remember only two or three years ago we put \$1000 up for upgrading roads. They've got limitations but the thing with this concept, I don't think people should be misled by the words of the contract. It doesn't have to be an outside contractor. It can be the Administration or any other person. But we, if we agree, will say yes, we'll have a ten year roads project and we will commit ourselves to the cost of it over that period of ten years, however it's funded. If we need to borrow the money like the Minister for Finance said, okay, I didn't think we would need to, but we need to make the commitment. Because as the Roads Team themselves will say, there's so much roading to be done, and so much maintenance of the good roads, they have difficulty in keeping up. I may be wrong about the time period but I believe they've said that roads need to be resealed after about seven or eight years even though they look in good shape, they've got to be resealed to protect them otherwise they start to deteriorate as we can see with Burnt Pine. I mean, when did we do that. Nearly six years ago. That has potholes appearing in it already because it hasn't had the final coat. Things like that. However, to go back to my original point, to investigate the feasibility, I don't mind if in the end the Government says we don't like what you've proposed Smith but what

old roller and grader working, the roads Team in full employment in doing that so that you get rid of some of the tarseal, pay the tarsealing we can afford and get on with it

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Speaker I think I've found that executive member that Mr Nobbs was talking about. Toon said he's quite happy to go away and do these sorts of things so that's fine. I think it's something that needs more discussion or debate at our MLA's meeting because the concept is here, it's on the table. Either we agree with the concept or we don't then how do we go from there on is really up to all of the Members I guess. I would like to think that whatever we do we look at it in a positive way rather than try and find holes in the concept. It does work. There's no doubt about that. How it's done here is up to us and the roads are the important factor in this and I think it's time to move the adjournment to the next sitting and I so move

SPEAKER Thank you I put the question is that this matter be adjourned and that resumption of debate be made an Order of the Day for a subsequent day of sitting

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

That matter is so adjourned thank you

DEVELOPMENT OF A VIABLE PRIMARY INDUSTRY SECTOR ON NORFOLK ISLAND

MR NOBBS Thank you Mr Speaker I move the motion standing in my name on the Notice Paper

SPEAKER Thank you. The question is that this motion be agreed to

MR NOBBS Thank you Mr Speaker. The motion is in four parts, and the first one is that this House re-affirms its support for primary industry on Norfolk Island and whilst the term primary industry is extremely broad it includes quite a few areas but the major emphasis really is on agriculture and the animal industry; the second part that this House Understands there are specific difficulties in the development of a viable primary industry sector. I just want to make comment on that, that there are limitations such as marketing which is the limited size of the market on the Island here, the operation of the market and those sorts of things, there's insects and disease and input costs which are all constraints which I am sure this House recognises is a difficulty; the third part is that it Expresses its concern at the limited range of primary production on Norfolk Island and I think we have opportunities which are available which are not being covered now and I think those are areas that we can be looking at an some encouragement given, whether professional or technical advise including some economic assessment which could be done with the assistance of the Administration possibly, those sort of areas, and the final one is that it Requests the responsible Executive Member and it's no doubt that it falls into the area of the Minister responsible for Minister for Land and the Environment Mr Toon Buffett, to investigate and where appropriate provide suggested

solutions. I know that Minister Toon – and I'll call him Toon – has had wide experience in this area as far as the land regime and he's fully aware of reports and what have you that are held within the Administration and he would be the ideal guy to lead a team which I assume is the role of the Minister in reporting back and investigating and providing some possible solutions in relation to what's happening. What we really need to do, I believe, Mr Speaker and this goes, I've got four motions on the books, and they are all inter-related to a degree and some of them to a large degree, and this one is also inter-related because it puts value back onto land at the present time on Norfolk Island, that's the value for the landholder apart from the value of selling that land and that's an area which I think that we need some considerable support. We haven't had an Agricultural type of professional officer on the island here for some considerable time. We've had a part time one which has not been replaced as yet and I think that there are areas that maybe we need to look at or do we get advise from outside from say the Queensland Department or the New South Wales Department and outsource that advise but I think there is a need for a complete investigation into primary industry on the Island and therefore I move the motion

MR I BUFFETT

Thank you Mr Speaker I've got no real difficulty in the concept proposed by Mr Nobbs. I do understand, I think one of the most important things that Mr Nobbs has said so far this morning is that he's got four motions on this Paper and they are all inter-related. Some of them are quite spectacular for those who got them for the first time in the newspaper on Saturday. I wasn't too sure whether I was going to the BOP, the SOP or the VETS or whatever it is in part of the motion in respect to immigration but they are all inter-related. The other aspect that I would like to make mention of is that Mr Nobbs had mentioned at least at the Members meeting that he would hope that at least notice numbers 2 and 3 would be dealt with to finality today. I would not wish for that to happen today because I think we need to adjourn these matters at least for a month because most of us have only seen them for a couple of days when it got published in the paper last Saturday then the Notice Paper being issued and there have been a number of comments from various community Members in respect of the whole issue. Some of them have looked at them separately as individual matters, some have looked at them as a collective of the whole picture but I think we need to get that quite clear, that what Mr Nobbs had got before us is a total picture thing, in other words, we look at the amount of people we're going to have here, what we are going to allow to go backwards and forwards, how we service that group of people, how viable it is to service it, and so they are all as he says inter-related. In respect of this specific motion I have no difficulty in looking at these issues or putting it to the community because we have some basis already on which to work. ABAE which is the Australian Bureau of Agricultural Economics, did exactly the same sort of exercise as part and parcel of the process that we looked at when we looked at progressing to self Government in 1979. They looked at, well okay, you are going to self Government, primary industry and rural development in Norfolk Island as part and parcel of this whole process and we should look at that. I think that the basis of that report, we look at where we've come from since 1978 given that the report was I think published as an occasional paper and parliamentary paper in 1979 which co-incidentally ran along with the Norfolk Island Act over that August 1979 and I think that's got all the basic ingredients upon which we can determine some of the issues that Mr Nobbs has raised in this motion and I have no difficulty in doing that. Let me also inform Members and Members of the community, that I have no difficulty in setting up and probably have still got contacts with the Bureau of Agricultural Economics in Canberra

that do the statistical and ground work that was the basis of the original report, and perhaps what we are really looking at, is to have that as a tool, and I think that's what Mr Nobbs is after, so we can have that as a tool to go along with the whole package of issues perhaps we need to look at what are the prospects of rural development on Norfolk Island after 24 years of internal self Government where are we going and whether in fact some of the basic ingredients that were commented upon at that time, have changed. My personal view is, I doubt very much whether it has and I doubt very much whether we are going to have much joy in some of the outcomes that I think Mr Nobbs might anticipate but let's at least have a look at them and if we end up with that exact same result, then we know where we stand in 1979, twenty-four years on, thank you

MR GARDNER Thank you Mr Speaker I've always supported the development of a viable primary industry on Norfolk Island and part one of the motion seeks a reaffirmation of that support. I've no difficulty with that. But for the same reason I have no difficulty in supporting any industry that is developed on Norfolk Island whether it be animals, plants, growing trees, tourism, bus tours, whatever the case may be, and it's important that we don't lose sight that there are other industries out there that are probably looking for a similar level of support as well and so the ideal would be I think in my view that this was a far broader and it looked at the development of any industry for Norfolk Island save just for a reliance on primary industry. Part two of the motion reads that this House understands there are specific difficulties in the development of a viable primary industry sector and the examples that Mr Nobbs gave was marketing size, insect disease, input costs. It's interesting the inter-relationship with some of the other motions that are on the table today that are looking at providing specific limits to some of the other activities on the Island including population and things like that so immediately you have placed a limit on just how far the primary industry development can go on Norfolk Island if those other methods are to be agreed to. Part three seeks this House to express its concern at the limited range of primary production on Norfolk Island as I said in my introductory remarks Mr Speaker my view is that I'm concerned at the limited range of industry in general on Norfolk Island not just primary production and really at the end of the day, we can't be spoon fed every step of the way of the private sector to get on with this sort of thing, that's what imagination is about. That is what entrepreneurial spirit is about. That is why people who are successful in the private sector in whatever industry that they pursue, have those attributes. If you don't have those attributes you will not succeed. The fourth part of the question directs the responsible executive member, I have real difficulty with a motion that directs somebody to do something, unless it's absolutely clear that the executive Member is not willing to pursue it and at the appropriate time I would seek to amend that, let's get the wording right, amend it and request the responsible executive Member to investigate and where appropriate provide suggested solutions and options. I would be interested in Mr Nobbs further, please for my benefit, providing me with some of the examples of the areas for development within primary industry. I know he talked about agriculture and animals and things like that but I think it's useful for the discussion if this is going to be pursued to be able to try and identify some of those things around this table but apart from that, I certainly support the concept. Have no difficulty with it save for that minor amendment where the courtesy would be to request rather than direct, thank you

MR I BUFFETT Thank you Mr Speaker I omitted to do something I was going to do first off. I got carried away with the euphoria of the motion and that is to declare some interest that I have. I have two small properties where I have an interest in horticultural industry and a current application with the RIRDC in respect of personal agricultural pursuits and I just wish to make those interests known

MS NICHOLAS Thank you Mr Speaker. I'm pleased to follow some of the words that the Chief Minister has spoken because he touched on areas that concerned me about the motion. He spoke particularly of perhaps favouring an industry. In the 2001 census there were 39 people aged fifteen years and over who described their occupation as a farmer, fisherman, timbergetter or related. 3% of the surveyed ordinarily resident population and if one reduces that number by say forestry employees which is about a dozen that's not so many people who directly describe their occupation as producer of primary product. There hasn't been enough time to ascertain how much primary produce we import. Obviously is a significant one, potatoes, onions, garlic, ginger, beef, chicken, fish, a lot of our fresher produce at the supermarkets including frozen. It would be an interesting statistic and one which I would have expected perhaps Mr Nobbs to have brought forward today, because it would have been a good argument in his debate. What is Mr Nobbs seeking. He talks about the motions today being inter-related but costs apply across the board to all businesses here and how does he justify singling out just the primary producers for benefit. He would probably argue quite capably that to benefit them would be to benefit us all but I'm not so sure that we are doing so badly now. Particularly now. A few years ago, yes we were. Struggling for fresh fruit and produce but that's improving all the time and private enterprise is achieving that. Mr Nobbs talks in clause three about the limited range of primary products. Granted the variety is not huge but its fresher certainly then most people visiting the island are accustomed to. Fish is available if weather permits, I think that's the only limiting factor there, so other than visitors who are used to be able to purchase food, fruit in particular, which is out of season, I really don't think we do too badly. One of our major milk producers, gave away milking some years ago. He told me it was because of drought conditions which had been prevalent for some time and I would certainly like to see that industry revived. I'm sympathetic to the cause but hesitant to single out primary industry for special conditions. I wonder if Mr Nobbs is able to estimate how many people would be involved in this exercise, particularly in Administration staff who could be tied up in the exercise should we agree to the motion. Perhaps I would like to suggest that Mr Nobbs might form his own investigative team fro outside the sphere of Government and Administration to answer some of the questions and that team could then put proposals to the Government about what their findings have been in relation to the industry and what support they might require. Hearing Mr Ivens Buffett the Minister for Land and the Environment I'm more inclined to go along with the motion when it reaches it finality but I certainly have some hesitations and some reservations however, I understand you intention is to adjourn at this sitting

MR BROWN Mr Speaker it sounds very nice to be supporting primary industry and it's hard to imagine that anyone would take a view that they wanted to not be supportive of primary industry but we do need to be sensible. Where is the market. We are kidding ourselves if we think we are going to be exporting primary produce by air to Australia New Zealand or elsewhere. That simply is not going to happen. We are absolutely kidding ourselves if we think we are going to export it by ship so we've got to be talking about

something in the nature of import replacement. Already there's a ban on bringing in fresh fruit and vegetables apart from potatoes and onions under certain circumstances. I accept that that leads to a certain amount coming frozen tinned or dehydrated. But I'm not too sure that there's a massive industry out there waiting to be discovered and I think we need to be very careful that we don't fall for the trap of actually creating a new quite different industry, that is, an industry full of public servants and advisors which booms and at the same time the primary industry that we are wanting to support falls apart as a result. I don't have a difficulty with an investigation. I don't have a difficulty with hearing suggestions to support and improve not only primary industry but all industry but lets keep our feet on the ground. Pipe dreams are just that. We need to be dealing in reality, thank you

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Speaker I support this motion. Some of the wording might be different or could be changed but I think what's behind the motion is what we would all really like to see, that we do support the agricultural primary industry on Norfolk Island but there are limitations with what already occurs. There's limitations on importing some fruit products and particularly people who want to grow apple trees and pear trees and the other things that they do. It's not easy as I understand it. Maybe that is something that is part of this motion that we may be able to find ways of making it easier and I know that Toon has already mentioned at times that there are ways to do that. There is the import replacement part of it that Mr Brown just talked about, for example, we import all our milk. All the commercially sold milk which relates to discussions that I have had with the Minister for Land and the Environment over the past year or so which relates to a packaging plant that would allow for production of things like milk, where it can be packaged, but it also has the benefit if you have a packaging and pasteurising plant that those who are growing vegetables or fruit can actually grow more without having a fear of throwing it out, they can actually possible turn it into juices rather than having to throw excess tomatoes and other things out so there is opportunity there as well but it has been a concern for many years about the possible lack of support from primary industry here and I don't have any difficulty with the motion as it stands

MR NOBBS Thank you Mr Speaker everyone's had a go so I'll just sum up if I may. The reality really is that they talk about limited markets. First of all I would like to say that pipedreams and realities, having grown up on this island and farmed through times and ended up going away because of various issues, the situation is that there's no way in the world that this is a pipe dream, and export proposal or anything. If I'd come here and said this is what we should do, and these are the proposals that you should be looking at everybody would say, oh he's just trying to jam his own way through. What I'm saying here is that we have got, and it won't take much I can assure you, to actually go through some of the information that is already available in the Administration and come up with suggestions. We are looking now at changes to our tourism marketing proposals. I understand that we are going ahead and it's been talked about for some time now, to change from one particular classification of tourists to another. Now if we do that we are going to need supporting mechanisms. That's one so there are opportunities I believe which are not currently available on the island here from a marketing perspective. The current local market is about 2,700 people per week on average and I would suggest that that is now a reasonable market and we should be looking more at import replacements. I don't want to go into it and put my stamp on this. I would like to get it from people who have the information available. For sure I can run around and dig out from my

records the imports and customs figures that were available to me two years ago. The customs figures that are available at the present time are not really there unless I go through a long convoluted process of gaining access to those and going to the Minister and the like. Now these guys have got it at their fingertips and it shouldn't take them long to provide it and that's why I'm saying that it should be dealt with by the executive Member who should actually, or I've always felt as an executive Member here that I was here to be the workhorse for the Legislative Assembly and whether you have to direct him, or request him, or stand on your head, the situation is that if the Legislative Assembly says that the executive Member does something, then he darn well should do it or see you later, he's out. So the words in the motion, if they've given offence to Minister Toon Buffett in any way I'll withdraw those words but the thing is as far as I'm concerned, he's the man to do the job, so I could leave it on the table if you like, and I so move

SPEAKER The question is that this matter be adjourned and that resumption of debate be made an Order of the Day for a subsequent day of sitting

QUESTION PUT
MR GARDNER NO

SPEAKER No. do you wish the House called

MR GARDNER I was looking to move my amendment that I gave indication of in my debate Mr Speaker

SPEAKER Yes. Well I'll need to look at the mover of the motion for adjournment. I'm obliged to put an adjournment motion immediately it comes forward. But if you want to pause for a moment Mr Nobbs to allow that amendment to come forward or amendments however you would want to put them Chief Minister and then I might turn to Mr Nobbs in terms of the adjournment. Would you be comfortable with that Members

MR NOBBS I don't mind

SPEAKER Okay then let's do that. We will pause on the voting on that matter. Chief Minister

MR GARDNER Thank you Mr Speaker for the purpose of the motion I would move that the word "directs" in clause 4 be deleted and the word "requests" inserted in its place. No further debate Mr Speaker\

SPEAKER Any further debate from Members

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Speaker I don't think I support the Chief Minister's motion if the parliament decides that an executive Member should be directed to do something and I've been in that situation many times, that that's how it is. You can make it sound nicer by saying requests, or asks or whatever but if the proposer of the motion has said directs, that's as it stood. If the proposer of the motion is happy to change it then I don't see any

difficulty but as far as I understand that is the way an Assembly should work, that is, if an executive Member is directed by the support of the House, that's how it is

MR GARDNER Mr Speaker I'm moving an amending motion which the House can agree to or not agree to inserting the word requests and wanting to take out the word directs. Simple

MR BROWN Mr Speaker, my understanding has been that we don't have the power to direct an executive Member to do anything. We can request him and if he chooses to not heed our request an appropriate motion can be brought before the House to sack him but we don't have the power to direct him so I don't have a great difficulty at all supporting the Chief Minister.

MR NOBBS I mean you can do it for the lot of them if you want, if you so think.

MR SPEAKER Well we'll have to tackle them one at a time but I understand that you foreshadow that situation. Are Members agreeable that the proposer of the Motion adjusts his Motion by putting the questions in lieu of directs. Are we comfortable that that adjustment be made. Yes, thank you

MR SPEAKER The Motion before us now reads in terms of No. 4 requests the responsible Executive Member. Mr Nobbs I will now take your Motion in terms of adjournment and we will go through that process and conclude the matter. There is a proposal before us Honourable Members that this matter be adjourned and made an Order of the Day for s subsequent day of sitting.

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED

MR I. BUFFETT There's been some changed airline schedules and things for this Wednesday. I'm not too sure that other people have got commitments but what's the likelihood for time frames for completing this Notice Paper or what are the Members commitments.

MR D. BUFFETT My aim Mr Buffett was that we might tackle the next one and see how that goes. I would have hoped that we might be able to adjourn for lunch and 12.30pm and then return after that. If Members are of another view let me hear what it is. Ok let's continue on then.

LAND SPECULATION

MR NOBBS Thank you Mr Speaker. I move that this House requests, please note, the responsible Minister to provide to this House at the earliest opportunity 1)an assessment of the community's concerns in relation to land speculation and 2) following the

assessment of the community concerns, provide recommendations to this House as to how such concerns may be alleviated.

MR SPEAKER

Thank you. The question is that that Motion be agreed to.

MR NOBBS

Thank you Mr Speaker. The Motion speaks for itself. There is concern in the community in relation to land speculation, there has been for some time. I don't believe that the issue is insurmountable. There have been talks of various things that can be done to improve the situation, including the capital gains tax arrangement, this has been going on I think for some time and I believe that it's also one of those issues that in relation to immigration that should be looked at and I ask that the responsible Minister do precisely that and I don't think it will take a lot of time. There's been works done by the previous Government in relation to this particular proposal, it never was concluded because of the early election but there has been works done and I mean it's just a process of picking those up and proceeding. Assessment of the community's concerns, will be rather subjective if it's to be done fairly quickly I must admit on that but we need to get as much information or we would need to get as much information as he can in relation to that and I think that it should be able to be done fairly quickly and with not a lot of time tied up by the relevant Administration staff. Thank you Mr Speaker.

MR BROWN

Mr Speaker I wonder just when it is that, let's use owning a home as the example, when is it that we have a change of description from that fellow owns a home and he lives in it, that fellow owns a home and he rents it to someone and that's where that someone lives. That fellow owns a home and that's an investment, and that fellow over there he owns a home and that's speculation. How do you draw the distinction. When looking at the bundle of Motions that we have before us today it may be that that distinction gets drawn between a person living on the island with a particular immigration status, it might be any person living on the island that might be limited to one of Pitcairn descent, it might be limited to residents, it might be limited to GEP's and residents, it might be limited in some other way but are we saying well the person who lives on the island, that's ok but the person who lives away from Norfolk Island, he's automatically a speculator. If we are going to take that view how do we assess the situation where someone is living on the island that finds they need to move to the Mainland. It's maybe for health reasons, it's maybe to take their children for school, do they then become a speculator straight away as soon as they move. There are a lot of issues that need to be looked at before it's suggested that a capital gain tax be introduced in Norfolk Island because the simple introduction of a capital gains tax to day by a Legislative Assembly that has a fixed idea of the reason for it can be followed by 1 or 2 Assembly's later by a fairly massive expansion of that capital gains tax, and in any event do we have the power to impose a capital gains tax or is taxation in the nature of income tax and capital gains tax beyond our power. I don't have a difficulty with the Motion nevertheless because it's asking that an assessment be made of the community's concerns, if there are any, and that following that assessment the Executive Member provide recommendations to the House as to how the concerns might be alleviated. They could perhaps be partly alleviated by all local people undertaking that they won't sell land at a profit and then we are able to focus on those Mainlanders that are living away from here and speculating. If that is the view, the Motion at the end of the day isn't going to come to anything, but if what the Motion is about is to say well are we concerned about the extent to which prices can go up from time to time, are we concerned that the difficulty that

an assessment of those concerns and what may be the solutions, and as I said there's been considerable work done on this by the previous Government and that it's a matter of just picking it up and going for it.

MR SPEAKER Thank you.

MR NOBBS Can I move that it be adjourned and made an Order of the Day for the next day of sitting.

MR SPEAKER Thank you Mr Nobbs. I put that question.

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED

MR SPEAKER Honourable Members we will now pause but before I do could I just mention that whilst Mrs Jack has been briefly with us this morning she has had to leave and to attend the Hospital and so I seek your leave for her absences that may need to be on her part for today. Is leave granted. Leave is granted thank you. We suspend and we will return at 2.00pm.

POPULATION CONTROL

MR NOBBS Thank you Mr Speaker. I move the Motion in my name under Population Control.

MR SPEAKER Thank you. The question is that the Motion be agreed to.

MR NOBBS Thank you Mr Speaker. I put this Motion in place because as you or Members that have been around this table for the time that I've been here, it's been my belief that there is no real population policy in relation to the island in place at this stage and that I have consistently voted against the quota system, not only in relation to population but also for a full immigration review, and as a consequence to the immigration review which I believe is long overdue this is another Motion which has a closer relationship I guess than the previous 2 but it is one that I believe is necessary at this particular point in time and I say at this particular point in time because policies do get reviewed from time to time or they are supposed to. The Motion states and I understand that there is some concern in relation to directs and now there is some concern about amending the Minister amending the Act and we'll probably hear more about that shortly but I've got no problem long as the thing goes through as it is, from where I'm starting and it's 1) accepts that there are environmental constraints involving not only the natural and built environment but also the social fabric and economic capabilities of Norfolk Island and that without consideration of population dynamics adverse pressures are placed on the environment. Environment, the word has a number of connotations to different people and I'm suggesting that the environment is our surroundings and the conditions of life or growth and I use that as a definition. It goes beyond the natural environment that people seem to consider that it's solely involved in, it goes beyond that and I'm saying that the social fabric and economic as well as the built environment are most important considerations and should be considered in

the population dynamics. 2) asks the House to agree the need to give consideration to placing a sealing on the ordinarily resident population of Norfolk Island and that as at interim measure the sealing be capped at 2,200 any point in time. The proposal to cap the population is one where I believe that there is a need to look at where we are actually going as far as the island is concerned. We have a Norfolk Island Plan in place, that was to a degree aimed at the subdivisions and where we could go with the actual splitting up of the island which is something the minimums were set. These were actually increased in some areas considerably and increased in others quite a deal. Some areas it was actually split I think in the rural area it was an original proposal under the Plan from the planners was for a 20 acre minimum subdivision and this was reduced to 10, so it increased the number of potential subdivisions considerably in that particular area, but I believe that if we just sit back and let things flow there is a potential and I've said it before and I say it again for the island to end up under one roof with maybe a roadway or two in between and that's fairly far fetched that some people may think but I would suggest that they look around at the developments that are allowed around in other areas be it Australia or New Zealand and the potential is there. There is a need for a economic base we fully appreciate that but as far as the island is concerned this has potential. Now people may argue that we've sat at around the same population for a number of years and whilst that may appear to be correct there have been variations in that and increases to both the resident population as well as the GEP and TEP population. Statistics show us that the present time now we are looking at a rough estimate of residents as around about 1400 and that the TEP/GEP component is around 600, maybe a little under 1400 or a little over depending on the time of the year and it's usually possibly a little over the 600 for the permit holders. The situation we've found over the last 5 or 6 year is that the population, total population that's when I call the ordinarily resident population and it includes residents, TEP's GEP's has reached a figure of over just 2,100. So what I'm saying here is that the actual cap sealing is no less that what we've actually experienced to date and I believe it's maybe a little under 1400 or a little over depending on the time of the year and it's usually possibly a little over the 600 for the permit holders. The situation we've found over the last 5 or 6 year is that the population, total population that's when I call the ordinarily resident population and it includes residents, TEP's GEP's has reached a figure of over just 2,100. So what I'm saying here is that the actual cap sealing is no less that what we've actually experienced to date and I believe it's a measure that we should put in there. 3) recognises the need to ensure that in setting a sealing on population an adequate provision is made to appropriately service the tourist industry. This is fairly important as it appears that from following through on the statistics that there is a relationship between the number of permit holders and the number of tourists that come to the island from year to year. As the number of tourists increases so does the number of people that are required to service them and therefore the number of people that are brought in from outside. This is something that we need to ensure that we don't cut the rug out from under the tourism industry and to achieve that, point B) that the granting of residence status should receive special consideration and that's consideration under the proposed Act when it increases the island's ordinarily resident population above a sealing of 1900 and that allows a 300 person gap there to allow for some adjustments on the persons that are required to service the industry. C) the need for review once the tourism figure exceeds 45,000 visitors per annum. This is the third point, I believe that once we get above that figure that there is a need for a review of those particular figures, whether we have to have the sealing of ? in either case I'm not too sure, that will depend on the assessment at that particular point in time but there's a need to recognise that

with visitor numbers increasing above say 45,000 that in all probability be a need to adjust these figures, and the final one is D) endorses the cancellation of residence held by those of non Pitcairn descent who have not been ordinarily resident on Norfolk Island in the preceding 12 months. There is a provision in the Act now where a review can be made of those who are absent from the island after 3 years. I think that time limit is too much and I would have thought that it would be closer to 12 than 36 months. I'm also of the understanding that that requirement of a review does not include persons who are actually born on Norfolk Island that they are in my understanding of it and I quote from a particular part of it. "A person who at any time whether before or after the commencement of this Act was born on Norfolk Island and one of his parents at the time was a resident is subject to this Act the resident of Norfolk Island and the provision under in relation to review excludes those people from the review" as far as I'm aware. I believe that there is a need for a recognition of those of Pitcairn descent on the island here. I think there is a need for the Assembly to recognise that the people came from Pitcairn, were a separate group of persons and therefore if anybody suggests that there is discrimination involved I would suggest that they would look closely at whether those people are being discriminated for or against. The situation Mr Chairman is that in final summary I guess is that we need to look at the actual carrying capacity of the island. It's most important that we look at the carrying capacity and we need to look at it to the extent that the island retains its uniqueness I guess you can say, that it doesn't become built out, that it doesn't become as I said under one roof which is going the long way around, but we need to look at those sort of issues, we need to look at what it can actually support as far as the other environmental issues and I've left this to last, with our water and waste and those sort of things, what we can actually support on the island here and that's why I believe there is a definite need for a sealing on residents and ordinarily resident population and that includes and I repeat, residents and permit holders, that's the ordinarily resident population of Norfolk Island should be capped at a sealing. I'm suggesting a figure at this stage as an interim measure of 2,200 which is a few more than actually experienced to date I believe and probably hasn't been achieved since the convicts were here but anyhow that's the gist of the Motion, that we look at where we're going. I believe that we need to go about it from an environmental perspective and this will I believe douse some of the concerns that are experienced from the Australian situation where we are looking arbitrarily at the present time at a quota system which is said to control our population and I leave it at that. I would not want this to go to the vote today Mr Speaker. I think with the others it be left and I'll be very interested to hear what the other Members say. Thank you.

MR BROWN

Mr Speaker Mr Nobbs commenced his debate by stating that as far as he knew there was no population policy in existence in Norfolk Island and it may be that that misunderstanding has given rise to the rest of the Motion. There has been a population policy in existence for Norfolk Island for quite some years and it is, that we allow a 2% growth in the permanent population each year. I don't recall that we have ever honoured that policy when setting our GEP quotas, but nevertheless that's what the policy was agreed to be some years ago and that policy, to the best of my recollection has never been amended. Ron gave us various figures for the existing population of the island. One that I wrote down was 1,400 residents and 600 Temporary Permit Holders. I don't have access to accurate figures so I'm not able to say whether those figures are correct or incorrect but I expect that the Minister with responsibility for Immigration will be able to give us some reasonably up to date figures. However I will be very surprised if the resident and GEP figures are less than 1500 and I'll be

very surprised if the TEP figures are greater than about 460, but that brings us to the first important question, when we're talking of numbers what are we talking about. Are we talking about people who are physically on the island as at the instant of counting or are we including people who are temporarily away from the island. They might be in Sydney, Brisbane, Auckland for medical treatment, they might be in New York on a holiday, they might be over for their son or daughter's graduation, we need to understand what it is we are talking about. Mr Nobbs has suggested that we should cancel the residency of those of non Pitcairn descent who have not been ordinarily resident in Norfolk Island in the preceding 12 months. Now contrary to some I think ordinarily resident has a particular meaning which is very easy to understand, and it means exactly what it says Mr Speaker. But those in Canberra that are wanting to shoot us down in flames must be rocking and rolling in the aisles at present in the face of a Motion such as this. A more discriminatory Motion than this is difficult to imagine. Someone born on Norfolk Island of parents who came here, let's say in the 1930's from New Zealand is not of Pitcairn descent and if he chooses to go to Australia for 18 months to do a degree he'll lose his Norfolk Island residency if this passes. If he needs to go to Australia for health treatment for 13 months, he'll lose his residency. There are situations in which discrimination is lawful and it is situations like let us say the North American Indians a particular group which is under threat of almost extinction can be discriminated in favour of. I wouldn't go so far as to say it allows you to discriminate against others but it does allow positive discrimination under the International Conventions. The talk of setting a ceiling on population that's sufficient to appropriately service the tourist industry, well how do you determine that, and in particular how do you determine it in an environment in which we have not been able to convince young local people that there is a career for them in the tourist industry and most young local people are not interested in getting themselves involved in the tourist industry. Perhaps they see the starting position as one that they feel is beneath them, perhaps they don't want to work shift work, perhaps they don't want to be on call, perhaps they don't want to work weekends. There might be lots of reasons but I can tell you that the bulk of them are not interested and that is their right. But if they are going to acquire the dollars that the Government earns from the tourist industry in order to maintain a lifestyle that the Government earns from the tourist industry in order to maintain a lifestyle then indeed it is necessary to be able to have sufficient people here to serve not only the tourist industry, but all of the other industries which are ancillary to it. If someone grows vegetables Mr Speaker he's in the tourist industry because without our visitors the business he works for wouldn't be viable. If someone is a Carpenter he mightn't know it and he mightn't like it but he's in the tourist industry. If someone fixes potholes in the roads he's in the tourist industry, because if we didn't have a tourist industry we could do exactly as Minister Ivens Buffett said earlier today, we could pick on a few hundred metres of road, keep that tar sealed and turn the rest back to bitumen and we wouldn't be unique Mr Speaker because many many parts of Australia have done exactly that. They've ploughed up the bitumen and they now maintain it as gravel roads. I talked a moment ago about cancellation of residency, there is already a provision as Mr Nobbs rightly acknowledged in the Immigration Act for the cancellation of residency but Mr Speaker I'm not sure that it's ever been used and the reason it hasn't been used is various Legal Advisers over the years have said you can't do it, it's too hard, you've got to give notice to people. Now I recall at least one Member of this House saying time and time again until he got sick of saying it and stopped doing so that it would be a simple amendment to the legislation to make provision that a notice published let us say twice in the Australian and twice in the Auckland Star or whatever the Auckland paper may be and three times in the

Government Gazette which is repeated in the Norfolk Islander shall be deemed to be notice for the purpose of Section such and such of the Immigration Act, and then if the concern is that perhaps to a lesser extent than somewhere like Nuie but nevertheless to a substantial extent there are as many or more residents living away from Norfolk Island as there living on the island you could sort that problem out. But what do you then do when the person you have just stripped of his residency comes along and says I've got a special relationship with Norfolk Island because I've been coming here every 2 years for the last 25 years, I was born on Norfolk Island, I was made a resident, sure my parents weren't of Pitcairn descent but I've got a special relationship with the island. I've done all these wonderful things, 27 school kids used to stay at my house every night and the beginning and end of school terms while they waited to go to boarding school, 843 people a year used to come and stay with me when they were on the Mainland for medical treatment, I've got a special relationship and Mr Speaker that person would have, because the special relationship is a special relationship with Norfolk Island, it's not a double bed relationship. Mr Nobbs has told us that he doesn't seek to have this Motion dealt with to finality today and that will give us an opportunity to consider not only what I've said but what other Members have said before we vote on it, but let me turn to two final things. Firstly Mr Nobbs made reference to carrying capacity. I was at a cattle station in the Northern Territory late last week, it was 550,000 acres, it had 5,500 cattle, so suppose one would say that carrying capacity was 1 beast per 100 acres. Norfolk Island's carrying capacity could perhaps be looked at in the context of the carrying capacity of a number of other small country's and if we look at places like Bermuda, I expect some of the Channel Islands, various other small jurisdictions you will find without the slightest doubt that their carrying capacities are perhaps 1,000 times the number we have per hectare, and if you wanted to talk about carrying capacity and you did in human terms something similar to pasture improvement, you would say well, instead of being sympathetic when everyone comes along with a block of land that he wants to split in 4 so that each of his 4 kids can inherit a block of land and make no mistake Mr Speaker that happens and make no mistake we always try to be as sympathetic as we can to that request because we have a view that land ownership is a right and the right to distribute that land amongst your children is a right and the Government shouldn't stand in the road of it, should stand in the road of speculation Mr Speaker but it shouldn't stand in the road of ever smaller subdivisions in ares that are simply unsuitable. If instead of that we said ok where can we accumulate several hundred acres of land, put together a long term plan for subdivision of that into $\frac{1}{4}$ acre blocks and work out how the population of the island could be multiplied threefold by virtue of that sensible subdivision with a little bit of high density accommodation built in, then apart from water Mr Speaker the carrying capacity of Norfolk Island would be huge. So we then look at water, each of those areas has a roof so you make sure as is presently intended that rain water isn't wasted and that it is collected. If you find that doesn't quite provide you with enough, you don't have to go to more bores and wells, you might go to desalination but there is no doubt that you can provide an adequate amount of water in a place surrounded by as much ocean as Norfolk Island is surrounded by. And the funny thing is, that then makes the island big enough for primary industry to be viable and for all kinds of other things to occur, that earlier in the day we were all saying were beneficial. This is a difficult Motion, it is very important that the community understand that it is Mr Nobbs' Motion and it is a Motion as to which I will defend his right to move it until my dying day because that's important. I won't necessarily support it, I won't necessarily even support it in an amended form but Mr Nobbs should have the right to move it, and he should have the right to have the Motion sensibly debated by each and every one of us,

and no one should attempt to take that right away from him. Could I close Mr Speaker by telling you of something else that I noticed in the Northern Territory last week. I attended a Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Seminar and at the commencement of each section where the particular session was presented by a Northern Territory person, be it the Headmaster of the School of the Air, or a Northern Territory Labour Member who'd been heavily involved in the new railway from Alice Springs through to Darwin, they commenced with words to the effect, before commencing I would like to acknowledge the traditional landowners of this area, and I actually asked the question when did that kind of acknowledgment start to be made, and I was told by the particular Labour Member that this is something that has been done in the Northern Territory since the commencement of the reconciliation process between the Australian Indigenous landowners and the rest of the Australian community, and I wonder whether that's something that we should introduce here. At the start of each of our meetings we should acknowledge the traditional landowners of Norfolk Island, that is the people of Pitcairn descent and I certainly make that acknowledgment. I think more acknowledgment should be made of it but I think that we've got to do it in a context where we comply with the legislation that is applicable here and where we comply with what is expected of us in international terms. So could I close by acknowledging the traditional landowners of this place Mr Speaker.

MR GARDNER

Thank you Mr Speaker. I've listened with interest to Mr Nobbs' Motion, his debate and also that followed by Mr Brown. I don't think I differ widely from what Mr Brown has said but certainly I have some comments to share and those relate to the 2% population policy. I agree with Mr Brown on that factor, it's been around for a long time, I don't think we've ever adhered to it, not for lack of wanting to try but simply because there haven't been enough people to fulfil the 2% over that period of time and each year that follows. Mention was made about the quota I think in Mr Nobbs' introductory remarks but I do note that in his proposed immigration regime that follows this that there is not mention that there about following a quota at all rather than just relying upon the setting of the maximum population number here, so I guess one could argue that the intent is that if the population numbers are reached in 12 months, that's it and that we would have to absorb that in one foul swoop. Mr Speaker should there be support for this Motion I will be proposing to move a number of amendments. Should it be proposed as Mr Nobbs has indicated and agreed to by Members I would seek at the appropriate time an immediate amendment taking place so that this, part of the Motion does not continue through adjournment, and that is Clause 4 in its entirety be deleted but I'll come back to that later on. The other amendments relate to, as Mr Nobbs pointed out my continuing difficulty with the words "directs the responsible Executive Member to amend". We talked about directing in an earlier Motion today, Mr Brown was quite correct in that area, it's not possible to direct an Executive Member to do something likewise it's not possible for an Executive Member to amend an Immigration Act. That is a matter for the House, not for the Executive Member, so those would need to be tidied up so that we get at least the wording right. Clause 1 of the Motion, accepting that there are environmental constraints. We've had this discussion on a number of occasions in this House in the last couple of years. It was discussed by the last Government when it was looking at amending and revising the planning regime on Norfolk Island and the Norfolk Island Plan which I've got in my hand, which was adopted by this Assembly sets out exactly those principles within the Plan. Those same principles and objectives that are trying to be established by 1) is addressed in objectives to the Policy and Guidelines documents that attaches and supports the current immigration legislation

on Norfolk Island. Clause 2 – agrees that there need to be given consideration placing a sealing on the ordinary resident population on Norfolk Island. I've heard what Mr Nobbs has said, I've heard what Mr Brown has said. I am not convinced that there is pressure on that 2,200 sealing in any form or fashion. A reference to the current ordinarily resident population on Norfolk Island, the latest figures from the Immigration Department as of the 12th of September were there are currently 1392 residents on island, 208 General Entry Permit holders and 399 Temporary Entry Permit holders which is a total of 1,999. I would argue and argue very strongly as I do when we discuss the quota on an annual basis Mr Speaker that the population, the maximum population, the sealing that's proposed for Norfolk Island is driven purely by the economic activity within the island at the time. We are at this stage looking for record numbers of tourists this year as an early indication with the figures that we've seen today that have been provided. We certainly picked up last year, yet these numbers have moved very little, if at all, in fact I believe they have gone backwards from some of the figures that have been provided in relation to the ordinarily resident population on Norfolk Island and unless there is a significantly marked upturn in the number of visitors that are coming to Norfolk Island I simply do not believe that we are going to push our way through that 2,200 limit. I think there would need to be a significant amount of work done on that if one wanted to look at setting limits because as Mr Brown correctly pointed out it depends how you manage the system as to what your carrying capacity may well be. 2,200 is a number in my view that's just been plucked out of the air without any real reasoning behind it because as Mr Brown very clearly stated in his debate the carrying capacity of the island can be moulded to such a degree that we could have 10 times that, 100 times that or 1,000 times that depending on the will of people, the resources that are available to them and in this day and age those resources are limitless with the technology that is available and probably the most important one of those is access to water. The technology is available to produce copious quantities of water if that was the desire. However I'm not supporting an outright opening of the doors, I just simply do not believe that in the near future or at least in the next 10 to 15 years that we are going to approach that unless there is a marked increase in the number of tourists to Norfolk Island. We have other control documents that are in place in relation to that, including Unity 2005, a need to revisit that obviously from tourist figures depending on the wealth and the benefits that are provided to the island. So my view on that Mr Speaker is that as far as total population is concerned it is directly driven by the economic activity on the island at the time. When I get onto Clause 3 – Part A, the argument is the same again. It's based on the economic activity on the island at the time as to the number of people that you are required to appropriately service the tourist industry and again as Mr Brown has pointed out, also the persons that are ordinarily resident on the island and not necessarily involved in the tourist industry. Part B of that talks about the granting of resident status should receive special consideration when it increases the island's ordinarily resident population above a sealing of 1,900 yet I note in the Motion to follow again that there is a request that residency status should receive special consideration at all times, just not when it approaches 1,900, and again I question on what figure is the 1,900 based. As we approach that, as we get up to 1,880 and 1,890 and Alliance Airlines or Norfolk Jet or Air New Zealand come at Christmas time and the students return who are residents of Norfolk Island or who were born here, return to the island and they clamber off the plane, is it envisaged that your going to have an Immigration Officer standing there going 1,893, 1,894, 1,895 and so on until you hit 1,900 and then say sorry, back on the plane, we can't take the rest of you. Look there needs to be flexibility in this, I don't believe that it's appropriate to try and set a sealing on that

and a lot of people that have a very strong connection with this place and we shouldn't be impeding their ability and their desire and their wants to return to their homeland. As seen the need for review once tourism figures exceed 45,000 visitors per annum. Mr Speaker I appreciate that. My understanding is that is set in our tourism or our guiding tourist document about doing exactly doing that. Reviewing all of the different factors that are in place in relation to the island both environmentally and economically when we reach that 45,000 figure, but again I have a question well should that rather be bed nights. Which one are we basing this on is the 45,000 visitors is the problem, or is the 350,000 bed nights or whatever the desired number is, because if we were to have more frequent flights for example in the next year or 2 or even 5 years you may find that you have more 2 and 3 day visitors to the island which means in 2 or 3 years time immediately we'd have to be revising these figures. Clause 4 – oh Clause 4 Mr Speaker that really does give me some angst. I find it abhorrent, I haven't got a better word for it. That is blatant racial discrimination and I have spent a lot of time scouring over the International Convention that Mr Brown talked about earlier on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination and I cannot find an avenue within that that allows this type of Motion to go ahead. I guess the thing that pleases me is that even if this House were to endorse that and even if, and even if that piece of legislation were to be drafted and passed by this House, because Immigration is a Schedule 3 matter it's not going to go anywhere. It will not be assented to, it cannot be assented to and my proposed amendment as I indicated to you Mr Speaker is that at the appropriate time I would seek to amend the Motion to delete in its entirety Clause 4, and whilst that it is retained Mr Speaker, whilst it's retained in the body of this Motion, I will not personally entertain support for adjourning the Motion or passage of the Motion. Mr Speaker Mr Brown touched on some of the situations that might arise if somebody was to have their residency cancelled if they have been off island in the preceding 12 months. Both Mr Nobbs and Mr Brown made reference to the provisions of the current Immigration Act which talk about the cessation of residency, it's Section 35 of the Immigration Act for listeners and Members purposes if they want to refer to that and it talks about the process that you have to go through, where you want to, if there is such a desire to remove somebody's residency and it's set out fairly simply and clearly, it hasn't been progressed as Mr Brown said for a number of reasons. It is possible to progress that, it is only possible to progress that in relation to somebody that has become a resident by declaration rather than a resident by birth. So currently the situation is somebody that is born on Norfolk Island cannot in any form or fashion have their residency revoked if they have acquired residency by birth, that's what's commonly referred to as a birth right. It's no different to an Australian who is born in Australia, a New Zealander born in New Zealander, somebody from the United Kingdom born in any of the countries in the United Kingdom and for that I think any country on the face of the planet the same arrangement is in place. It protects the birthright of an individual and that is the way it should be. We were talking about the removal of residency or the cessation of residency for somebody that has been off island for a period of 12 months if they are not of Pitcairn descent but gee Mr Speaker there is a myriad of reasons why people may be off island for 12 months or longer. They may be a person who is a resident of Norfolk Island who is not of Pitcairn descent who is on a Social Welfare benefit on Norfolk Island who has spent all their life here and for some reason, whether it's to look after family, whether it's to go away for education purposes, and education purposes I mean taking their family away for education purposes, they may even want to be a mature age student and want to study an area of particular interest. They just may wish to travel, they may just be on holiday. There is just such a range of reasons why people

lock us all up for a week to discuss that issue and perhaps we still need to, he's out of the Chamber. From statistical information available to us it seems that our population base does not increase despite the 2% policy that has been spoken of, it simply doesn't happen and therefore in terms of this Motion I'm not sure what Mr Nobbs wants to achieve. Does he seek an increase or does he seek natural attrition in the population base. I'll say only that from my point of view Paragraph 4 of the Motion Mr Speaker is discrimination on the basis of race is not a lawful option and I cannot support the Motion as it stands.

MR BROWN

Mr Speaker some of the speakers have raised some interesting issues. Ms Nicholas has been under the impression that we simply can't achieve the 2% per annum population growth. Well my understanding of what has occurred year after year is the Members around this table have not been prepared to set a GEP quota large enough to accommodate a 2% per annum quota growth. The minute they are told the number that would have to be and in most years it's in excess of 60 because you've got to cater, not only for the growth but also for people who are leaving. As soon as they hear a number like that they shrivel up and die in fright. So we shouldn't just think 2% is not achievable, we should acknowledge that we have not been willing to allow it to occur. But in making that decision year after year when we set the quota I wonder to the extent to which we take account of some fairly important facts. Norfolk Island, quite like everywhere else in the rest of the world has an aging population and that is in an environment where less and less Returned Service people have the benefit of DVA entitlements. So we've got a higher proportion of the population are in the senior category, fewer and fewer of those are funded by DVA and when we look at the numbers that have been given to us by the Chief Minister a few moments ago it is clear, once you take account of the level of growth in the senior component in the population that we actually have less and less people contributing to the taxation purse. That's occurring in an environment where the cost of healthcare continues to escalate totally disproportionately to our retail price index. The same thing happens with the cost of education where many suggest that more and more of those children whom we educate without charge are actually the children of Commonwealth Government and appointees to the island and the children of School Teachers that come to the island, children whom we will educate for a certain time and who will then move off and be replaced by others. The degree of assistance we provide to children who want to go away to the Mainland to complete their education, perhaps because there is a wider subject choice or perhaps because they want to be in an environment where there is more competitive spirit or whatever might be the reason we don't really give them any adequate assistance. We have really fortunately a number of Hurlstone Scholarships and we have a pitiful degree of other assistance for those families. When we look at it all we've got a cost of Government which is simply exploding, we've got less and less residents contributing to that cost and we need to think very carefully before we're going to decide to try to empty the island out a bit. Minister Ivens Buffett was quite correct when he expressed a doubt as to whether clauses such as Clause 4 of this Motion are lawful in any event when we have regard to the provisions of the Norfolk Island Act because amongst other things that Act provides that we cannot take people's property from them without providing proper compensation and I'm not hearing a suggestion that people be compensated, I'm just hearing a suggestion that they be given the boot. If the suggestion was that an overwhelming majority of the traditional landowners of Norfolk Island would like to take the place back to what it was before Mr Nobbs went to Australia to work, now to go back that perhaps 40 year period and if there was a suggestion as to how people would be

compensated, and there mightn't be such a problem with that because those who wanted to go back 40 years would be able to. They probably wouldn't have electricity, they probably wouldn't have telephones, they certainly wouldn't have tar sealed roads, they wouldn't have education and health in the way we know it now, but they would be able to go back to a subsistence existence and if that's what the community wanted then I wouldn't stand in the road of that provided there was a mechanism to properly compensate everyone, but where would the tens and tens if not hundred and hundreds of millions of dollars come from for that compensation because you'd have even less people paying the tax bill, and the people that were about to get booted off certainly wouldn't want to say, well here's a hundred grand from me to contribute to the cost of what your wanting to do. Having said all of that I certainly defend Mr Nobbs' right to move the Motion. I'm not sure that I agree with much of it at all in the absence of a well thought out system for compensation and in the absence of a well thought out system for determining whether in fact the overwhelming majority of the community wants to pursue the regressive step that's suggested by Mr Nobbs. Thank you.

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Speaker. I think I would start with Clause that is concerning most Members and that's Clause 4 about the cancellation of residencies. I certainly don't support that, not only because of the issues that have been raised but for difficulty of anybody who is off the island for any period of time for the reasons I think the Chief Minister said before, maybe education, maybe taking family away it would just be very hard to do but it's also been talked about in the past from what I recall from the past Minister's of Immigration have talked about doing away with the residency classification or GEP classification, people who have got it and haven't been back to the island for years but in fact even I think the 6th Assembly there was a letter written to us from what I recall residents and GEP's at the time who weren't living here and hadn't for a while to ask if they wanted to retain their residency status but I can't remember what the results of it were but nothing happened after that, so I don't support Clause 4 anyway. But the rest of it, well there's some interesting things amongst that. From my short time in the Assembly I've heard the population numbers bandies around and they always seem to show that we're having less and less people here which has always been a concern and it's quite right what the Chief Minister also said that it's the economic climate that decides really the population because there's no point saying you can have another 500 people on the island when there is no work for them or they don't have any money to support themselves which is why the numbers do stay as they are. However having said that which is quite incidental I would like just to record that when Adrian Cook was the Minister for Immigration he did an exercise with the GEP numbers when we were debating the GEP quota at the time and in his research and I can't remember it exactly but it was something like those people who apply for a GEP generally left the island before they became residents or shortly after they became a resident except for the I think it's Section 18 GEP holders who had a special relationship and generally stayed on to be a longer term resident which is interesting which he was thinking about putting as far as I recall, putting a sealing or a quota on the resident population which is similar to what Mr Nobbs is talking about here. Just how to do that would be interesting or you'd probably treat it the same as we do with the GEP quota which is done on the amount of people who are born on the island and those that have passed away in the previous 12 months and things like that. If it was done something along those line it would probably work. So I don't have any difficulty with the first part of the Motion in that sense but of course there's other things that are in it, I mean it depends what the Commonwealth does. If

the Joint Standing Committee comes along and says we're going to pay income tax you might see a huge increase in the population or you might see the opposite, you might see a whole lot of population disappear away from the place. They also might come back and say that we shouldn't restrict anybody coming into the island but if we have something in place to control that, stronger than what we've got now maybe there is something in that. But Mr Speaker there's quite a few bits more on this programme about Immigration so I think I'll just leave my debate at that point except to say I don't support Clause 4.

MR DONALDSON

Thank you Mr Speaker. Just briefly I'd like to say I agree with just about everything that the Members have said around the table today and I appreciate what they've said and sitting here listening to it. Just reading the 4 points of this Motion that's before us, it deals with specifics, 2,200 people on the island 1,900 ordinarily resident, 45,000 visitors. I'm not sure what the science is behind those figures, I don't if they stack up, I don't know if they are true today they won't be true tomorrow, if they are not true today they might be true tomorrow so I don't know how we can talk about those things but ignoring all of that, just to look at the general thrust of the whole Motion it really is a Motion that restricts and creates a very conservative approach to immigration on the island, it restricts immigration to certain people and if you look at the first line it directs the Executive Member responsible to amend the Immigration Act and any attending legislation to achieve its aims. I really question the need for any of these things. If you look at the population controls we've had in place over the last 20 odd years on Norfolk Island since the Immigration Act came in, if you look at the increased controls we placed on land subdivisions and building applications, number of buildings per block. We already have restrictions in place, we have tools that we can use to control the population. To go out there and amend them again or replace them with more legislation seems totally unnecessary so I really can't see the need for setting out to achieve when we've already got the tools to do it and I'd just like to finalise by saying that I totally endorse the removal of Clause 4 from this because I see this as being totally racial and discriminatory and totally damaging to progression of self government in Norfolk Island.

MR I. BUFFETT

Mr Speaker the more you discuss this particular Motion it takes you to a really interesting position. Now let me take you to a small proposition that takes you to this position. If we were to adopt and strictly adopt the principles and concepts that are proposed in this Motion that I think what we're really doing is saying we should abandon the proposals and the situations that were put up in the Norfolk Island Act of 1979 and I think that's what this really says because you have a small land mass, you have a controlled population, you have restricted activity, surely they don't go hand in hand with the dynamos that's created by the self government issue that we all called for in 1979 which allowed us to go out and to prove two things, that we can be financially and administratively capable of running issues. If we look at restricting a population that takes us back to a stagnant population which does not provide economic growth or you go back to a population which has mentioned by Mr Brown and a couple of other speakers where it's an aging population and we haven't got the dynamism to generate the income to service the style of government and that leads us only to one place, that yes we will accept all these controls but on the clear understanding that you have a higher authority such as the Commonwealth saying well ok we will preserve that, because we are going to preserve that in a bit of a time warp where your not going to have over development and in other words we're looking at the virtual Lord Howe Island model. Were looking at this

very similar to the Lord Howe Island model when we start talking about these concepts which means that because you haven't got the population and you haven't got the activity and the stimulus to create the income there is no other way you can exist by other than by, having an external federal warrant arrangement to make up the differences whilst you preserve the status quo that your trying to preserve very similar to what we're trying to preserve in accordance with the concepts that's included in this. Now I mention that because I think you really need to think about that and be aware to accept some of these who take it to the nth degree in conjunction with what I said earlier in terms about the unjust acquisition without proper compensation and those issues. The only way you can address that issue is if you are part of a larger Federal authority. The fact of life is we have all 3 here, we have all 3 here and I think we're trying to, or if we accept this and go strictly along the lines of I think what's envisaged in some of this well I think we're really cutting off part of our nose to spite our face in order to try and achieve something that is unachievable because of the process that we're following and I think we really need to think about where we sit in that framework because I believe that once you do that, when you have a finite population, stagnant population those questions really need to be asked, where do you go and can we justify it, because the proposition is I would suggest that an arrangement in a government arrangement that's set up exactly how we're set up and the people who are listening to us today I think that the arrangement we've got here can service 22,000 people and you wouldn't need any more and you wouldn't need any less, I suggest to you, and if you set it up to service 2,200 or 1,900 persons I think there's some really interesting issues we need to look at when we start tampering with this sort of control. I put that up for discussion purposes Mr Speaker.

MR NOBBS

Thank you. That's very interesting Mr Speaker. I'd just like to start with the last first as being something to do with the self government arrangements and we've got a finite and stagnant population, all these sort of things, they sound wonderful, same as the poor old pensioner that's gone overseas and can't get the, it sounds really good but when you look at it underneath you'll find that it's not really correct, that these things are. We've got a finite population at the present time, people say we've got 2,000 people here at the present time, we have 2,000 people for X amount of time and that's it. I mean what are we talking about a finite, I'm trying to set here a finite population. What I'm trying to do here is to establish a figure where the Australian Government will I believe accept that on environmental grounds, bearing in mind that what Mr Brown said about people trying to take you back to the dim dark ages if people like to call it the dim, dark ages when we didn't have electricity here, that is not either, this Motion doesn't envisage that at all. This Motion envisages maintaining the place to a degree where people will come here and that's the difference between those sort of dim dark ages that people talk about and I reckon they weren't too bad after all, those dim dark ages what the difference between then and now is the tourist industry, that's it, and people have to realise that and if we're going to retain that as our main source of income and the likes and I've got no problems with the tourist industry in particular the way they are handling it, that's what we have to be prepared to look at, and that's why it was stated in this that we have to recognise and another one was that oh gee all the other industries that are important to the tourist industry aren't considered. The words in C A state that adequate provision is made to appropriately service the tourist industry and that goes right down to the bloke milking the cow if you can get somebody to milk cows again. I mean they are servicing the tourism industry, so that's the thing. As far as the 2% population is concerned we've heard all about it here and

that's fine and we know that it hasn't been since 1974 nothing has happened, probably since that time we would be looking at, if we went for 2% we'd probably be looking or it's been said in this House actually that we would be looking at a population now of over 3,000 people if we'd gone on 2%. Now that's really an interesting concept to go on that because you can have 5 people sitting around this place in a few years time and saying look, we've had a population policy in place and where is it, haven't seen it for years I mean it's not written anywhere, it's not distributed to the Assembly Members when they come in to the place, we've had this population policy of 2% we should be at 3,000 people, right 5 people put their hands up, pew, overnight we may have, there's potential and possibility of that happening and that's what I'm saying now this should set a sealing as regards to this and go from there. There is already in place an ability to take away from a person here their residency. I'm still looking through this Act to see where they get compensation for that, where do they get compensation for that. If it's so bad why was it passed by the Australian Government in this Act. Let's be fair about this thing, if you agree with it well vote for it, if you disagree with it, don't vote for it but please don't bring out these furrphies, that's what I'm on about and I so I don't get too exited Mr Speaker and I need to go onto the next one I will move that it be adjourned and made an Order of the Day.

MR GARDNER I think it would be appropriate Mr Speaker I'm getting clear indication that there is a desire to want to move onto the next matter, but I would like to have recorded for the House my desire to want to move the amendments I foreshadowed in my introductory remarks. This motion calls into question our ability as a Government established by Commonwealth legislation of which the Commonwealth is a signatory party to an international convention of the United Nations on the elimination of forms of racial discrimination and that the Commonwealth Government being bound by that international covenant are to ensure that all forms of racial discrimination are nipped in the bud and I can find the appropriate reference in article 4 section c that the signatory states parties shall not permit public institutions national or local to promote or incite racial discrimination. It is for exactly that purpose that I believe that clause must be immediately and forthwith withdrawn from the motion

MR NOBBS Thank you Mr Speaker I just say again that I would like it left in abeyance until the next meeting. I say that we need an acceptance that the people who came from Pitcairn were not a separate group of persons at that point in time and I think that if that was accepted ... and I understand the concerns of the Members in relation to discrimination but if they were to accept that as a particular issue, then it would go a long way to justify the fact that it is not a discrimination in favour of, but what is happening now is a discrimination against and I'm saying that that's why this motion I would prefer left in abeyance and you can tear it to pieces and it would probably be a lot easier for me if you would pull it out but I don't believe it's right

MR GARDNER Thank you Mr Speaker I move that the question be put

SPEAKER I earlier had a foreshadowed adjournment matter Chief Minister and I think in fairness to Mr Nobbs I should allow that matter to be heard. You will recall that I paused on that to give you an opportunity to raise these matters but Mr Nobbs' earlier call in respect of the adjournment should now be hear. So the matter is that this matter

be adjourned and that resumption of debate be made an Order of the Day for a subsequent day of sitting

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

QUESTION PUT

Would the Clerk please call the House

MR BUFFETT NO

MR GARDNER NO

MR DONALDSON NO

MR IVENS BUFFETT NO

MR NOBBS AYE

MS NICHOLAS NO

MR SMITH I thought we were voting on an amendment, but we are voting on the adjournment. Did I miss that. NO

MR BROWN Could I ask a similar question to Mr Smith. Did the Chief Minister's proposed amendment fail to cause us to now be voting on the adjournment

SPEAKER No. The Chief Minister's amendment now remains on the floor. It has not been determined

MR BROWN But we are voting first on...

SPEAKER On the adjournment. Mr Nobbs at an earlier time moved an adjournment. He then...

MR NOBBS I deferred to the Chief Minister Mr Speaker

SPEAKER You made that proposal and then I asked if that would pause to allow the Chief Minister's proposal to be put on the table and that was how the matter was running. Those matters are now on the table. We have voted on one of them and it has been agreed that was the first bit about requests

MR BROWN My vote will make no difference so I abstain

SPEAKER Thank you.

The result of voting Honourable Members the ayes one the noes six with one abstention, the noes have it. The matter is not adjourned at this moment. We are continuing debate

MR GARDNER Thank you Mr Speaker if there is no further debate on my proposed amendment I move that the question be put

SPEAKER The question is that the question be put

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

The ayes have it, I therefore put the question Honourable Members that the amendment which is the deletion of clause 4 be agreed to

QUESTION PUT

SPEAKER Mr Nobbs do you wish to have the House called

MR NOBBS Yes please

SPEAKER Would the Clerk please call the House

MR BUFFETT	AYE
MR GARDNER	AYE
MR DONALDSON	AYE
MR IVENS BUFFETT	AYE
MR NOBBS	NO
MS NICHOLAS	AYE
MR SMITH	AYE
MR BROWN	AYE

The result of voting Honourable Members the ayes seven the noes one, the ayes have it. Therefore clause 4 is agreed to be deleted. The motion now stands Honourable Members with the preliminary adjusted as we have earlier heard, and then it runs on to three, there is now no four. That is the state of play in terms of the amendment motion before us. Any further debate? No further debate

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

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

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

That matter is so adjourned

IMMIGRATION REVIEW

MR NOBBS
in relation to an Immigration Review

Thank you Mr Speaker I move the motion in my name

SPEAKER
adjustment that this House requests at the very outset

Can we commence by setting in train the matter of the

MR NOBBS

Minister to bring back to the House.. we've fixed that

SPEAKER
that that's how it is to be proposed

and can I just read into your proposal before the House

MR NOBBS

Yes

SPEAKER
agreed to

The question before the House is this motion be

MR NOBBS

Thank you Mr Speaker. The proposed motion provides for a different category of entry permits and a clear process of assessing resident status. That's in point one that the practice of regulating entry to Norfolk Island by the issue of permits shall continue but the current Temporary Entry Permit (*TEP*) and General Entry Permit (*GEP*) be replaced and the assessment of applications for residency be treated as a distinct and separate process. I believe there are failures within the temporary entry permit and the General Entry Permit system at this point in time. It's unclear to not only those applying to it but also the community in general and that there is not an open assessment I don't believe. I don't believe there is a need for the secrecy that appears to go on with the immigration as it's a critical issue for the community as a whole and whilst I don't condone in any way the particular personal details of people being available I believe that there are issues that should be more openly discussed. I think that there's an advertisement process that could occur and could be expanded to deal more clearly with people who are applying for particular permits and I think that there is a need to look very closely at the residency situation and come up with a clearer process than we have at the present time and where there is a continued assessment or additional assessment at the time that a person applies for residency where as at the moment if you get accepted as gaining a the General Entry Permit it is virtually tantamount to residency. There are other issues that will come out as I go through this but point two, "that a new Permit system which shall include the following categories to replace the present system" what I'm suggesting here is that there are particular permit categories that we should be looking at and that is employee permits and then there's of course the business ownership permits and the special relation permits. Now the Employee permits, the first one is the Short Term Employee Permit (*STEP*) would virtually replace the current *TEP* except for proposed variation related to environmental aspects and any restriction that may be placed on ordinarily resident population numbers and we've just been through that. The *STEP* would be valid for one year but may be renewed provided that a person may not hold short term employment status for more than 5 consecutive years. The difference is that we have here an occupational visitor permit as a separate one on its own now which is also involved in the Employment category as well but that provides a clear indication of a person working here on the Island for seven days, as you would expect with a lawyer or doctor coming over on specialist visits, and any other person, a

salesman who might come over and those sort of things. The Extended Employment Permit (EEP) kicks in after a person has held a *STEP* for 5 years. This would clarify the situation whereas people are virtually forced now, as I've been told, not forced themselves but forced by circumstance to apply for a GEP after five years because of the fact that they are sick of having to renew their permit after each year. The cost is different, usually extra and so what I'm suggesting here is after the first five years when a person is temporary, that we go to a longer term one which allows a person to reside and be employed on the island for a maximum of 10 years but would be subject to review after the first 5 years and that permit can be extended for an additional period of ten years if the person so desires. It doesn't force anybody. A person can come here, work, do whatever they want to, without being required to get a GEP and then work into a residency status. With the temporary employee there's an open advertisement system as is required by the Public Service and an acceptable selection process are prerequisites to the issuing of an Employee Permit and Employers are required to sign a commitment to their employees permit conditions before a permit is offered to an employee for signature. I don't believe that is too onerous.

The second one is a major change and it provides a person with a permit, a Business Ownership Permit is required for a person, other than a permanent resident, to purchase a business and operate that business as an economic entity capable of supporting the Permit holder, their spouse/partner and any other dependants under the age of 18 years. Sale or closure of the business would see withdrawal of a Business Ownership Permit. Conditions in relation to health, character and financial arrangements would apply. Specific proof would be required as to the viability of the business both prior to purchase and also through an annual auditing procedure during operation of the business and that's what I see would be as we would for a public company arrangement as we do down at Kingston for any of the sporting organisations that wish to become a public company because it's the only protection that we have for the members, that same sort of arrangement would apply to a business which is operated by a Business Ownership Permit. Issue of a permit under this category to be notified in the Gazette.

The next set of permits is the "Special Relationship Permits". The current arrangements for a "Special Relationship Permit" (SRP) to be retained but the granting of an SRP will not ensure automatic residency and that should be made perfectly clear. That there is also in the Special Relationship Permit an assessment for residency at the time when the permit expires. There will be a specific assessment procedure before residency status is achieved. Specific conditions as to health, character, financial and status of the relationship will apply. A Special Relationship Permit is eligible to apply for residency status if -

- 1) The SRP holder is a Grandchild of a person born on Norfolk Island to parents who held Norfolk Island resident status, and the SRP holder has been ordinarily resident on Norfolk Island for a period of seven years. It provides a little, not great, it only halves the time really that is suggested for any other Special Relationship Permit holder or any applicant for residency it virtually halves the time, but it does recognise that this Special Relationship exists by virtue of the fact that they are long term and I think that if you look at other areas you will find that similar sort of provisions apply, except I think that you can get them virtually automatically

- 2) The SRP holder who is not part of 1), that is, the grandchild of a person born on Norfolk Island to parents who held Norfolk Island resident status, if they are not of that status

they would if they have been physically on the Island for 15 years, in a total of no more than 18 years, as an SRP holder would be able to apply for residency. Applications for, and the issue of, both an SRP and Residency status are to be notified in the Gazette.

Visitor Permits are the same I think as they are now. A visitor would be able to enter and reside on Norfolk Island for a period up to 30 days under conditions as apply at present. An Extended Visitor Permit (*EVP*) – May be issued to a visitor who wishes to reside on the Island for more than 30 days and is able to fulfil conditions as to health, character and finance. An *EVP* would allow a visitor to spend an additional 60 days on the Island. An *EVP* does not allow the holder to seek employment or conduct a business and can not be extended beyond 60 days. At cessation of the permit the holder must leave the Island and an Occupational Visitor Permit (*OVP*) – Caters for the “bagman” type operation eg Doctors, Lawyers etc for a seven day period as at present. As we move through it Mr Speaker and we get to resident status, the granting of Resident status shall be treated as a distinctly different process to the issue of a Permit. There shall be no compunction to either apply for or be granted residency other than when a child of a resident is born on, or deemed to have been born on Norfolk Island. Now that is in the current Act and is also the deeming if a child is born off the Island for medical reasons then they are automatically deemed to have been born here. The issue of a Permit does not imply that those named on the Permit have any right to resident status. However, a person may apply for residency after being physically on the Island as a permit holder for 15 years in a total period of no more than 18 years except in the case of holders of certain “Special Relationship Permits” and that’s the grandchild and what have you’s. An applicant, or applicants if there are more than one, would be required to undergo a stringent assessment as to health, character and must prove they are capable of maintaining themselves, their dependant families and any other dependants and that’s as applies now, that same sort of thing and the benefit under the Island’s Social Services Scheme would not be available until the person has held Resident status for at least 15 years. Applications for, and the grant of, Resident status are to be notified in the Gazette. The issue there, I’m not too sure where we are with the Social Services Scheme Review and when we’ll actually be dealing with that so I’ve placed in there a figure of fifteen years, which I think from memory was the proposal in the first place. It’s been suggested by Mr Brown at last Monday’s meeting that the 15 years in a total period of no more than 18 years be made days, the current Act has a proposal in there I understand for ordinarily resident on the Island for residency in five and seven years. I’m happy to change that to days and will do so if Members feel that’s the way it should be. There’s no problem about that. The process of applications for immigration status include that an environmental assessment shall be undertaken on each application which would include an assessment of the impact on the built, social and economic environment, as well as on the natural environment and I think that in itself, whilst it sounds a mouthful and it sounds fairly high falutin it’s really not. What it’s talking about is this. That we ensure there is adequate accommodation available and that the impact on the Island of 99 kids or something to that particular permit holder can be covered. Those are the particular issues that should be dealt with in that sort of arrangement, not to say that you can’t bring 99 children onto the island here, but we would have a look at it and assess whether the Island’s infrastructure can support that sort of arrangement and I don’t know whether that’s actually operational at this point in time. An application must be completed and signed by the applicant and that’s whether they are here, there or elsewhere. A permit may only be issued to the person or persons who will be accepting the category of entry as specified in the permit. The Permit does not become operational until appropriate conditions as required by the permit

are fulfilled. That is appropriate in the sense that the conditions that are appropriate to be fulfilled at that point in time are completed, and the applicant has been offered and signed the appropriate permit. Penalties shall apply for employing a person without an appropriate permit or not fulfilling the permit requirements as an employer/guarantor. Persons without a permit shall be placed in custody and deported which is a condition you will find almost everywhere else except on Norfolk where they are given thirty days grace and the like. If they are without a permit what I'm saying is, see ya! In all other respects, current processes in place for considering applications for immigration status shall apply. Mr Speaker that is just dealing through it very quickly in relation to this particular motion. I would ask that it be retained on the Notice Paper to be discussed at the next meeting. I've had some contact from people outside already following the notification in the paper and what really got me is that I've had calls from former members and I'm saying former Members in case you start jumping up and down and looking at who's what, former Members of the Immigration Committee who have congratulated me on trying to do something because they've been trying for years to get some clarification in a lot of these areas. Now I don't say this is an answer the Immigration Review. We have over the years talked about immigration reviews. We have had a lady who was Miss Bronwyn Paddick who Members of the Legislative Assembly in the 1997/98 period she was in Mr Brown's office up there for weeks I think from memory doing up reports and what have you and she came out with three reports which we haven't dealt with and whilst her proposal is that we have far more permit categories than these my suggestion is that we should cover those ones that we are using at the present time. There is no retirement permit in there because Legislative Assemblies in the past, and I assume that this one as we were talking about policies being carried through a while ago I didn't think they really were but anyhow, the policy in the past has been that the retirement policy be not accepted anymore while they were trialled for a while. I tried to set these out as the basic permits that are required and also to get something in relation to resident status, that there was a clear indication that an assessment be made at that point in time and I'll leave it there Mr Speaker. I see you going to sleep

SPEAKER I beg your pardon Mr Nobbs

MR NOBBS Sorry. I didn't mean to say that Mr Speaker but I just saw you scratching your head in dismay and I wondered

SPEAKER Well I may have done that!

MR NOBBS Thank you Mr Speaker I will leave it and listen to the Members with interest

MR I BUFFETT Thank you Mr Speaker to say that this is comprehensive is probably an understatement. To say that it's confusing would also be an understatement to most people who are not fully aware of the ramifications of the total immigration system in Norfolk Island and to endeavour to have nine people, who most of which most probably only have the basic working knowledge of the immigration arrangements in Norfolk Island discuss it with any great depth on this afternoon at this hour, is probably an impossibility. Like Mr Nobbs I've had a number of phone calls too. Some saying yes they agree with one thing and the rest saying where the hell did we get it from and the range of comments

that have varied in between. It was my clear understanding, and I've discussed this with the Minister responsible, that one of the issues that was clearly on the agenda first up for this 10th Legislative Assembly was a Review of immigration. I don't believe that's totally gone off the agenda but one thing that we have the benefit of, is that we have a Minister that's totally responsible for immigration and we also have an immigration Committee that operates and that works the existing system in arrangement. I'm not sure what the other Members would feel about this proposal but I would certainly as a Member of this Legislative Assembly see great benefit in perhaps not going into great depth on the issues that have been raised with this motion on this afternoon but to do exactly what the motion seems to say. To ask the executive Member responsible to do a couple of things in respect of the proposals in this motion. I would certainly benefit from hearing what the current immigration Committee believes this will achieve where it differs wildly from the existing arrangement and I would believe that given the complexity of the motion as put by Mr Nobbs that we certainly won't be finalising this at the October meeting but there will be a number of meetings before this particular issue is finalised. Having said that, I also express a couple of reservations in respect of some of the specifics contained in some of the various areas right throughout this issue but at this point I will be concluding my debate on the issue on the basis of the shortness of time that we've had this which was last Saturday, with the clear understanding that it is probably a continuing episode of the October sitting of this House but certainly urging that if the Minister for immigration and his Committee can see fit to at least put explanatory memoranda out to apart from Members of this House and some people in the community as to what this means and where it differs wildly from what exists, I think it would assist both Members and the community. Thank you

MR GARDNER Thank you Mr Speaker before I respond substantially to what's been said this afternoon I just wonder if I could clarify a couple of point with Mr Nobbs regarding this motion. The first one is the short term employee permit, that is for five years

MR NOBBS It's an annual permit that goes for a maximum of five years, same as a TEP

MR GARDNER Thank you Mr Speaker the second one if I could just clarify it with Mr Nobbs, the EEP or Extended Employment Permit is a ten year, review after five but with a possibility to extend for a further ten

MR NOBBS Yep

MR GARDNER Thank you. My substantive response Mr Speaker which will probably assist Mr Ivens Buffett in his understanding and certainly hopefully Members, is that really what is laid out here is not terribly dissimilar to the exact arrangements that we have in place now, save for a couple of tweaks on the edges as far as periods of time on the Island are concerned. Mr Buffett in his debate talked about the Review and indicated that the Review was not entirely off the boil and as Members are aware I've given a number of statements in this House over the last twelve months in relation to the status of the review and exactly what's happening with the review of immigration and I think my most recent report to the House discussed the substantive internal review that have been taking place with the immigration regime on Norfolk Island which was looking at the processes, the papers, all the

machinery that makes the system work on Norfolk Island and a need to consolidate our current range of responsibilities and make sure that we are dealing with immigration in an up front and professional manner. I would be the first to acknowledge Mr Speaker that our system has its weaknesses. Some of those are related to resourcing of the immigration section and some areas relate to policing of the permit system. There is an internal review of that that has been finalised. A substantial document and whilst the move is taking place up to the Customs building of the immigration section, things haven't been in abeyance. There has been a review of the paperwork documentation associated with applications has been taking place and has been progressed, so progress is being made. We have difficulty now with the four specific categories relating to immigration status on the island. One of those is visitor permits, temporary entry permits, the General Entry Permits and resident status. To now go and make that an even more complex system is going to cause significant problems in my view with resourcing and policing as far as the different categories that are proposed by this. I've always been brought up on the principle that we should keep it pretty simple. The KIS principle Mr Speaker and with those four categories that we currently have it's probably about as simple as we can make it. The environmental principles that are espoused in this motion put forward by Mr Nobbs are very worthy obviously, but they too have already been encapsulated in the Policy and Guidelines document that I referred to in earlier debate on an earlier motion and the objectives of that document. For reference that is clause 1.6 dot points a through f. they have also been encapsulated in our planning legislative package which again I referred to in earlier debate. I'm surprised that there is the perception of secrecy surrounding immigration applications. As Mr Nobbs quite correctly pointed out, there is no requirement, neither should there be, a requirement to make public, people's personal movements, save for those positions that are accepted under our current legislation in gazetting residency applications and the success or otherwise of those applications and I would probably go as far to say that as far the review is concerned and the Paddick review that was undertaken that that provides us with some substantial documentation which in effect gave us the Commonwealth's Migration Act. It's not to say that there are not principles within that that are worthy of further consideration, but at this time, as we sit with our current review I don't believe that we are in a position to be able to embrace those and bring them forward in any meaningful form. Dealing with the motion as it stands clause by clause, clause 1, the discontinuance of the General Entry Permits, that clause with all due respect appears to be surplusage, in that in clause 2 it talks about a new permit system replacing the present system so it would be taken that the new permit system were it adopted clause 1 would be a natural occurrence anyway. It does beg the question, what would happen with transitional arrangements with people who have temporary entry permits and the General Entry Permits. The Employee permit or STEP as it is referred to here, would replace the current TEP. Mr Nobbs in his debate talked a lot in his debate about lots of this happens now. He's quite correct. Basically this reflects with some tweaking at the edges, pretty much the situation that we find ourselves in now. Except for considering variation related to environmental aspects As I said, those things are taken up in other pieces of legislation that we have and certainly in the Policy and Guidelines. Its proposed that the STEP would be valid for one year. Well a current TEP is valid for one year under section 16.1a of the current immigration Act and may be renewed which is dealt with section 16.2 of the current Act with the TEP as it is now provided that a person may not hold short term employment status for more than five consecutive years. This is a TEP. Our policy and guidelines that we agreed to unanimously as a House last year, established under Policy and Guidelines clause 4.2 that you

can't hold short term employment status for more than five consecutive years, so the short term employment permit is what is a TEP now. The EEP or Extended Employment Permit, which I clarified with Mr Nobbs, would allow somebody in effect to be here, for twenty years on an extended employment permit, so you've got to have a short term employment permit first for five years, then it is possible to stay another twenty years on an extended employment permit. Twenty five years effectively you can stay on what is considered a temporary type arrangement. That is an interesting consideration when you consider that now a person only needs to be resident on Norfolk Island for five years before they can be elected as a Member of the Legislative Assembly of Norfolk Island. It's interesting that we would be having a temporary permit system that would allow somebody to reside on Norfolk Island for twenty-five years and not to accumulate any rights whatsoever as far as long term or permanent residency is concerned. I see no reason why the extended employment permit should be notified in the Gazette. I would be interested to hear the reasons why it should be notified in the Gazette. It goes on to say under the Extended Employment Permit that an open advertisement and an acceptable selection process are prerequisites to the issuing of an employee permit. Well I see that the short term employee permit is an employee permit, the other one is an Employment permit. I guess that's just a clash in the wording. I take both of those to be referred to as an Employee Permit.

MR NOBBS
through that

also look at the resident side of it when you're working

MR GARDNER No I'm just saying in regard to the Employee permit that's satisfied that one. That's a system that operates now. There are required to be advertisements in the paper for a temporary entry permit of this type. The acceptable selection process is the selection that is acceptable to the employer, whether that be the Administration or a private person or elsewhere, that's the system that exists right now and that's dealt with in the Policy and Guidelines document Clause 4 – 6.1. It goes on to say that employers are required to sign a commitment to their employees permit conditions before a permit is offered to an employee for signature. That is exactly the situation that is required now under the Employment Act so my understanding is. The Business Ownership Permits is required for a person and basically when you read through those 4 lines that's a GEP, that's what a GEP is now. Sale or closure of business would see a withdrawal of the BOP, that's what happens with a GEP now. If the purpose for your entry under a GEP changes, in other words you sell your business, you are no longer in business, you can make application, granted, for another permit, but normally those persons depart the island, so that happens under a GEP now. Specific proof would be required as to the viability of the business, this is the buyer beware principle, it's the process that the current Immigration Committee go through when people are looking at purchasing businesses for immigration purposes. Those things happen now. And again I ask why is it required that for a General Entry Permit it should be notified in the Gazette. What purpose does it serve. There may be a simple answer to that. The question about manual auditing procedure for a business for an immigration purpose really calls into question, what is that all about. Surely if somebody is not making the dollars and cents and it's not supporting the applicant under a current GEP process those persons will look at either disposing of their business, closing up shop and leaving the island or looking for a job, under a TEP or amending a current GEP. To impose an annual auditing procedure on all businesses for a Business Ownership Permit I

believe is unfair. If your not going to impose it on every business on Norfolk Island. Then we start to get pretty close to putting in place the required structure for looking at taxation, a proper and thorough taxation regime on Norfolk Island. I don't believe that's the intent of that but gee it opens up some options. The Special Relationship Permits. The current arrangements for a Special Relationship Permit to be retained. Well there are no current arrangements for a Special Relationship Permit. There are arrangements for a General Entry Permit, and under the arrangements for a General Entry Permit you can be issued a General Entry Permit based on a special relationship with Norfolk Island, based on the purchase of a business, based on a number of other things, and so there's different ways that you can achieve a General Entry Permit. So it needs to be made clear that there are not current arrangements for a Special Relationship Permit. It goes on to say that they would need to be retained and will not ensure automatic residency. I think Mr Nobbs in his debate seemed to indicate that there was an understanding that a GEP leads automatically to residency, that is not the case at the moment. There is a process in place for assessing a residency application. It is not an automatic process. It goes on to say there will be a specific assessment procedure before residency status is achieved, that happens now. There is as I've said a specific process in place, specific conditions as to health, character, financial and status of the relationship will apply. You only have to look in, again Policy and Guidelines documents 7 1.1 – 7 1.6 to see that all those things are a requirement of a General Entry Permit now. An SRP holder is eligible to apply for residency status if, and it goes on about who you have to be to apply for residency status. There is some inequity here that for some it's 7 years and others it's got to be 15 out of 18 years, and in affect your providing Special Relationship Permit for those other than a person born on Norfolk Island, the parents who held Norfolk Island resident status of a 15 GEP where currently there is a GEP process of 5 years and 6 months. Applications for and issue of both an SRP, again I question why they have to be Gazetted but as far as residency status application for, and the issue of, are already notified in the Gazette. Visitors Permit, Clause 2.4 – a VP would be able to enter and reside on Norfolk Island for a period of 30 days, that happens now, it happens now, that's what a Visitors Permit is, an extended Visitors Permit, and this is I grant a step away from the current arrangement in that the proposal here for an extended Visitors Permit lessens the current arrangements by 30 days. My understanding is is that you can extend a Visitors Permit up to a total time of 120 days, this would take it to 90 days in total, 60 days on an extended Visitors Permit, 30 days on a Visitors Permit, so that's the change, 30 days, and at the cessation of the Permit the holder must leave the island. 2.4.3 Clause – Occupational Visitors Permit. That's an interesting one, it's something that's normally catered for under a Visitors Permit but I think the language that's used is far as a bag man is offensive to some. I'm sure it would be to some of our visiting Doctors and Lawyers who are here for a 7 day period at present. There is absolutely no problem with the current arrangements for those visiting professionals to Norfolk Island and they don't need to be, in my view provided with a separate category of permit. It can be dealt with quite adequately and has been for many years dealt with under a Visitors Permit. The resident status – the granting of resident status shall be treated as a distinctly different process to the issue of a permit, well it is now. Residency status isn't a permit process, residency is not a permit, your not issued with a Residency Permit, you are granted residency status, your not a permit holder currently under the legislation. A person can apply for residency after physically being on the island as a permit holder for 15 years and a total period of no more than 18, accept in the case of Special Relationship Permits. It's interesting that you can apply for residency after you've been here for 15 years yet an Extended

Employment Permit where it's possible to be here for 25 years doesn't grant you the same right. I see that as a significant problem. The next paragraph deals with an applicant and about qualifying under the Social Services Scheme, well that's a matter for the Social Services Scheme, not for the Immigration Act and needs to be dealt with there and I understand is being dealt with in the review of the Social Services Act. I made some reference to that this morning I think there was a proposal here for 15, Social Services Act may well have been 25 but I stand to be corrected on that. Applicants and the grant of resident status again here to be notified in the Gazette, that happens now. Clause 4 – processing of applications for immigration status. 4.1 and environmental assessment shall be undertaken on each application, on each application, there are 45,000 visitors to these shores each year, roughly, give or take a few. How long is it going to take to process an EIS for every one of those 45,000 visitors before we allow them to land on Norfolk Island, before we grant them a Visitors Permit. I think that needs some significant more thought. Those environmental assessments have been done as I said in a number of other areas, whether it be in the Unity 2005 document, whether it be in the Norfolk Island Planning document and all of its supportive legislation. All of these objectives and principles are all contained in those documents. 4.2 – an application must be completed and signed by the applicant, that's done now, other than in extreme cases because legislation prevents somebody coming to Norfolk Island who is a prescribed person to allow them to currently apply for a permit they must apply from offshore, but other than that it's the applicant who currently completes and signs the document and sometimes is completed and signed by an agent on behalf of them. 4.3 – a permit may only be issued to a person or persons who will be accepting the category of entry as specified in the permit. Well I'm not sure exactly what that means. I would have thought if somebody applied for a permit they were granted a permit, they would accept it, but I seek some clarification on that. The next 2 Clauses 4.4 and 4.5 dealing with the operation of a permit and not being able to employ a permit, those things are provided for in our legislation in our Policy and Guidelines now. Again as I said in my introductory remarks the system is not without its warts at the moment but really the problems that we face come down to resourcing and our ability to police those things at the moment, and it's not just immigration that we have to look at problems with policing. There are a range of others, we've dealt with number plates, we're dealing with compulsory third party and registration of motor vehicles, those are real problems and look we really have to come to grips with making sure that we can resource those things before we start to try and chew off another piece and introduce another layer of permits or seek to take over transfer of further powers from the Commonwealth, make sure we do what we do now properly before we go and have another bite. Clause 4.6 – persons without a permit shall be placed in custody and deported. I think Mr Nobbs said that there's people here that are without permits, in some cases there are, very few. However anybody that lumbers up to Norfolk Island without a permit as currently exists are granted a Visitors permit. They don't actually physically get a piece of paper that says they've got a Visitors Permit but it's valid for 30 days when they climb off the aircraft. They can extend that by application and if they are applying for a Temporary Entry Permit until that Temporary Entry Permit comes into being, if it's within that 30 days they hold a Visitors Permit. Clause 4.7 – in all other respects current processes in place for considering applications for immigration status shall apply. Well we've talked about I think in my debate all of the things that apply now as the Motion shows. On the whole it's restated what currently happens now. If I support the continuance of the current system then there is no need in my view to support this Motion. However what I will do is provide Mr Nobbs, Mr Speaker with my copies of the Immigration Act,

Policy & Guidelines, the Employment Act, Social Services Act and any new proposed provisions to those Acts that I can find to demonstrate to him the things that I've explored today. Thank you.

MR BROWN Mr Speaker I commend Mr Nobbs for having prepared this material himself. In earlier times Members had a habit of going to the Legislative Counsel taking up massive trenches of the Legislative Counsel's time, in this case I could imagine it being a 6-9 month task and bringing back to the Assembly a Bill for an Act to change things around in an environment where there might be absolutely no support for it. So it's to be commended that Mr Nobbs has gone about this the way that he has. I'm uncertain as to the reason for a number of these proposed changes for example, the STEP appears to be very little different to a TEP and rather than change the name of the permit if we were of a mind to make the modest change which is proposed we could make that change to a Temporary Entry Permit. Similarly there doesn't seem to be much difference between and EEP and the existing GEP and if we were of a mind to make those changes they could be made without confusing people by changing the whole legislation. Since the weekend I've had a large number of calls about this Motion from people who thought that the Motion was a Government Motion and I've had questions asked of me, what's going to happen to my GEP application, am I going to have to put in a new application. Well the situation as I understand it is that Mr Nobbs is asking the responsible Minister to give thought to it all and to bring back some appropriate amendments in order to seek to achieve the aim, but Mr Nobbs is not asking us to vote in favour of the changes. He's asking us to vote in favour of the amendments being drafted and brought back to the House. I've had difficulty for a long time in the different ways in which GEP applicants are treated, there's really 3 categories of them, there is someone moving from a TEP where there really is very little real attention given to it in practice. There's then someone buying a business who are put through hell and then there is the special relationship GEP which as I described earlier seems to have been treated for quite some time as a double bed permit, rather than what was intended and in fact, the way in which those GEP's have been issued could give rise to a very strong argument that they are contrary to law. I find offensive the reference to bagmen, I'm not sure what Mr Nobbs meant but traditionally a bagman is someone who goes around collecting bribes.

MR NOBBS Point of Order, I didn't realise that. I thought bagman was hopped off the coach.

MR BROWN I'd ask for those comments to be withdrawn Mr Speaker, they are offensive and Mr Nobbs is not dumb, he knows well what a bagman means in the Northern Territory, he knows well what a bagman means in other places and it would seem that he has been intentionally offensive and has intentionally had a cheap crack at professional persons, and that is not on in this place Mr Speaker. I ask that it be withdrawn.

MR SPEAKER Yes I'm not able to ask Mr Nobbs to withdraw the words of his Motion of course, that is something for Members to vote upon, but in terms of any comment that you have made Mr Nobbs you might withdraw those.

MR NOBBS I withdraw it Mr Speaker but can I clarify the

MR SPEAKER I'll give you opportunity to make any clarification you wish after Mr Brown has had his opportunity to speak.

MR BROWN Mr Speaker again in the case of this Motion, those in Canberra must be rolling in the aisles laughing at us. To suggest that anyone without a permit be placed immediately in custody and deported without a hearing, without the opportunity to know what's been alleged against him, without the opportunity to comment on that and be heard, it does us no favours. I have no difficulty with the Motion coming forward to amend specific parts of the Immigration Act if that is what's desired but I think that in the case of this particular Motion the best thing to do is to vote it out of the House today and that's what I intend to support. Thank you.

MR NOBBS I just want to seek clarification on that. A bagman in my belief is a person who travels around and I've been one myself from job to job and or appears at a place and that's the type of thing. I didn't realise that a bagman was one collecting bribes and I would say that I've never ever heard of it being in the Northern Territory, particularly as Mr Brown says I should do, but anyhow I've withdrawn my thingo and that can be pulled out as what, it's a description of and operation actually, it's a bagman type operation not a bagman type person. I did listen with interest to Mr Brown saying that he, now he is a part of the immigration system for want of a better word, he's involved in that sort of thing here very closely and I am pleased that he is able to say that there are some confusions in relation to these particular areas. As far as the Minister is concerned there's no problems everything's kosher, virtually and you know I mean I find that a bit difficult but if I could at this present time make reference to a couple of issues. The first one is why that this change from an STP to TEP and a EEP was not really what a GEP, doesn't cover all the GEP now. The STP was just to get a change from that system so your concentrating on that particular permit and the second part is that the Extended Employment Permit is one where a person can stay on. What the Minister didn't indicate was that in the residency situation a person can apply after being physically on the island as a permit holder for 15 years and a total of 18 years, he overlooked that part of it. So I mean it doesn't say that a person has to stay on the island for 25 years but what it does say is that a person can be here for that length of time without having to actually apply for residency status should they not desire and it gives them the opportunity, and that's all I wish to say at this particular point in time.

MS NICHOLAS Thank you Mr Speaker. As a member of the Immigration Committee and I state that I'm able to see some problems with the present system but I do believe that it's possible to resolve the majority of them by enforcing the existing legislative and policy provisions as the Chief Minister has already acknowledged and that's a resource issue. However having said that, and I need at this stage to make clear that any comment I make henceforth is my own and not necessarily as a member or on behalf of the Immigration Committee. Having said that outside this place I've had discussion with Mr Nobbs and we spoke about our existing regulations and policies in respect of immigration and I remain uncertain about what problems Mr Nobbs perceives in the present system. He hasn't made that clear today, he's read his Motion but I'm still not clear on what he sees the problems are and what is it that needs to be fixed specifically. The Minister for Immigration is presently working

on a proposal to have appeals against immigration decisions heard locally by an administrative tribunal, that will be a big step forward, not only for the applicants, but for the people who process the applications in a bureaucratic sense along the way. People involved in processing of applications must be held accountable for their decisions and those decisions must hold up to scrutiny. Our Immigration Act is already seen as discriminatory and running against certain international covenance to which Australia is a signatory and perhaps it needs to be said at this point that immigration is, after all, a retained function and the Minister has already referred to that. It's a matter over which Australia retains power of veto and some of the terms of the Motion before us today will serve to stir up the Commonwealth in this regard. As Mr Brown as said and has been said by the Chief Minister we'll be in danger of losing our immigration affairs or having control of them being taken away from us. Provisions of our present legislation need to be enforced but not necessarily changed and I regret that Motions such as this should it pass, will demand time and energy which our Administration simply does not have to spare. The immigration system is not so bad at present that it needs radical change, modification perhaps, but not such change as suggested by the Motion. Thank you Mr speaker.

MR BROWN I have a particular Motion that I wish to move so perhaps the Chief Minister would like to speak before me.

MR GARDNER Thank you Mr Speaker. Just briefly Mr Nobbs referred to me as indicating that I believed everything was kosher, those were his words with the current system that we have. I didn't say that at all. I recognise that there are warts, that there are bumps, we're working through those with an internal review at the moment and it is my view that as we steadily work through those matters and we deal with them that it is going to give us time to then come and pay the attention that it needed to make sure that the current arrangements that we have in place continue to serve us well into the future. I just wanted to clarify that Mr Speaker.

MR SMITH I see the thrust of this Motion and all its bits. It's quite interesting. I think if I was asked to support today the Motion as it stands I wouldn't be able to support it but the thrust of it appears to be quite interesting and probably some very worthwhile pieces in it. I think somebody mentioned before about the Paddick Report where amongst all the stuff that was in the Paddick Report there was a proposal to change the Permit systems that we use and I think out of the whole of the Paddick Report was one of the things that was quite supported at the time by the Legislative Assembly to revisit what we use as our permit system, because there is faults in the system and there's no point any of us denying that whether it be TEP GEP or the residency system that we use. It's just that we're so used to using that as we have done over the years since the 80's I think. For example a person who is a Temporary Entry Permit holder who can now stay for 5 years, once they want to stay on past the 5 years, if they haven't got a house or lots of money or things like that they have to basically go as I understand it, I may be wrong about that but if they want to stay on they generally have to ask for a GEP or make an application for a GEP. Now whether that's easier these days or not I don't know but if they want to stay that is the only avenue that they have that they apply for a General Entry Permit but vice versa with the General Entry Permit using that same scenario, a person who is a Temporary Entry Permit holder has been for some years, at the end of that 5 years basically has to either go or go through this other process but somebody that wants to buy

a business can get a GEP straight away which gives them a huge advantage over a person who is a TEP because they can apply for residency within 5 ½ years or 5 years whatever the time frame is. I think the Paddick Report suggested something along the lines of a Business Ownership Permit and Extended Employment Permit where somebody who may have worked for the same employer for year after year after year which I don't know whether that is possible under our system now, where somebody doesn't really want to commit to becoming a resident over maybe up to 10 years but they have to do something about it half way along that process. So I see there is some interesting things amongst what is in this Motion but hearing what the Chief Minister has said that the review is looking at the difficulties in the system that may pick up a lot of the stuff that is being talked about in Ron's Motion here. That's all I'll say for the moment. Thank you.

MR BROWN

Mr Speaker I move that the question be put.

MR SPEAKER

The question is that the question be put.

QUESTION PUT

MR SPEAKER
you please call the House.

Do you wish the House to be called Mr Nobbs. Would

MR NOBBS

Yes please

MR D. BUFFETT

AYE

MR GARDNER

AYE

MR DONALDSON

AYE

MR I. BUFFETT

AYE

MR NOBBS

NO

MS NICHOLAS

AYE

MR SMITH

AYE

MR BROWN

AYE

MR SPEAKER

Ayes's 7 the No's 1, the Aye's have it. Therefore I put the question, the question is that this Motion be agreed to.

The result of the voting Honourable Members is the

Therefore I put the question, the question is that this

Motion be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT

MR SPEAKER

Do you wish to have the House called Mr Nobbs.

MR NOBBS

Yes please.

MR D. BUFFETT

NO

MR GARDNER

NO

MR DONALDSON

NO

MR I. BUFFETT

NO

MR NOBBS	AYE
MS NICHOLAS	NO
MR SNITH	NO
MR BROWN	NO

MR SPEAKER The result of voting Honourable Members the Aye's 1 the No's 7, the No's have it. The Motion is not agreed.

AIRPORT RUNWAYS LOAN BILL 2003

MR DONALDSON Thank you Mr Speaker. Mr Speaker I present the Airport Runways Loan Bill 2003 and move that the Bill be agreed to in principal.

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

MR DONALDSON Thank you Mr Speaker. Mr Speaker this Bill relates to the management of the loan agreement we have recently entered into with the Commonwealth for the purpose of funding the reseal of the runways to the Norfolk Island Airport. The Bill is quite short but it establishes 2 funds within the Public Account of Norfolk Island being the Norfolk Island Runways Loan Fund and the Norfolk Island Airport Runways Trust Fund. The purpose of the Norfolk Island Airport Runways Loan Fund is to establish a new head in the Loan Fund into which will be deposited all loan funds provided for the purpose of resurfacing the runway. The Loan Fund shall be managed in accordance with the loan agreement, withdrawals from the Fund can only be made for the purpose for which the Fund was established. The second Fund Mr Speaker established by this Bill is the Norfolk Island Airport Runways Trust Fund. This Fund is established to accumulate funds to be applied to the next reseal of the runways expected in the year 2015. Funds are provided for the Trust Fund from the following sources. An amount equal to the notional interest payable on the outstanding loan monies from the Commonwealth. Although the loan is interest free we are required as a condition of the loan to deposit an amount equal to the interest commercially payable into a Trust Fund for future reseal works, which over the life equates to an amount of about \$2.162m, that's over a 10 year period. In addition to this amount an additional amount of \$100,000 per year for 10 years will be contributed to the Trust Fund from the Airport Undertaking. The Trust Fund will also earn interest during its life. This is calculated to be \$1.113m. Finally in the 11th and 12th year after the principal amount of the loan has been repaid the Airport will contribute \$1.8m each year. This is possible as there will no longer be any capital to repay or any other contribution required. The 12 year forecast of receipts and payments has been prepared for the Airport Undertaking and it demonstrates that the required contributions are achievable. In total we expect to have a balance of \$7.875m in the Airport Runways Trust Fund as at the 30th June 2015 and that will be available for the next reseal. Mr Speaker this Bill is an integral part of the funding arrangements for the runway reseal and I commend the Bill to the House.

MR SPEAKER Thank you.

MR BROWN Mr Speaker could I ask if it's intended to attempt to deal with this Bill to finality today. The reason for the question is this is the 3rd draft of the Bill it's

much better than some of the earlier drafts but there are a large number of matters which I wish to raise. If the Bill is to be adjourned today I can raise them later with the Minister and he can attend to them at his leisure but looking at the time if I'm to deal with all of these matters today in order to enable the Bill to be finalised then we better start getting some menus down for takeaway for tea.

MR SPEAKER The Business Committee has not declared this an urgent Bill. This is on its first introduction therefore the traditional arrangement, unless the Minister wishes to make a separate proposal to the House is that it will be introduced now and then a Motion will be entertained to adjourn.

MR BROWN Thank you Mr Speaker. In that event to save Members time now I'll take these matters up with the Minister during the adjournment period.

MR NOBBS Mr Speaker how urgent is this. I mean we've been playing around with this Trust Fund and the whole issue of a loan and in the meantime the Airport is not progressing. How urgent is it Minister.

MR DONALDSON Thank you Mr Speaker. It is urgent but if it's held over until the October sitting of this House it won't delay the progress of the reseal in any way shape or form.

MR SPEAKER Thank you Minister. Any further debate. No further debate.

MR DONALDSON I move that this Bill be adjourned and made an Order of the Day for a subsequent day of sitting.

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED.

MR SPEAKER The Ayes have it, that matter is so adjourned.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

HEALTH CARE REFERRALS

MR BROWN Thank you Mr Speaker. I seek leave to make one amendment. It is to the fifth last line of Paragraph No. 4 and I seek leave to amend the word "solely" to "personally" in order to make it clear that the patient is to be personally responsible for bed costs to such extent as they exceed the shared ward Public Hospital bed rate. Mr Speaker subject only to that I don't intend

MR SPEAKER Can I just clarify with Members that they are comfortable to have that adjustment without us going through a prolonged process.. Are Members comfortable about that adjustment to the Motion.

AYE

MR SPEAKER Yes we are. Thank you Mr Brown that adjustment is made and therefore we are proceeding on that basis.

MR BROWN Thank you Mr Speaker. The Motion does not differ greatly to the policies which have been in place for many years but what it does seek to do is to cause those policies to actually be followed. Paragraphs 1 and 2 in particular only restate existing policies. Paragraph 3 is commonsense. I don't recall whether it's actually in the existing policies but it suggests that referrals should be to Hospitals with which the Healthcare Scheme has reasonable arrangements in terms of costs. Those arrangements exist in the case of Public Hospitals in NSW and it's time that they were put in place in relation to Hospitals in Queensland and Auckland. I am aware that in past times discussions have taken place in both of those jurisdictions but to the best of my knowledge they've not been finalised. Paragraph 4 largely restates the existing situation but it has become a real problem I'm told in that Doctors are being put under significant pressure by patients to refer them to Mainland Practitioners and Mainland Hospitals in an environment where they could within the principles of the Healthcare Fund await treatment in Norfolk Island but the major difference is that Clause 4 goes on to make provision that if it is found to be absolutely necessary to refer a person to a Private Hospital then theatre fees and similar fees should be recognised as fees which are claimable from the Fund. A substantial degree of hardship has been incurred by people who say that they didn't understand that in being referred to a Private Hospital they would receive large bills which would not be covered by the Healthcare Fund. Mr Speaker in your role of the Executive Member with the responsibility for the Hospital you've made inquiries to endeavour to ascertain the cost of this change if it was made, you've made it clear that it's quite possible that some people have not lodged claims and therefore the information provided to you has been provided in the best fashion that it can but it may be incomplete, but that information from recollection indicated that if this Motion was passed there would be a cost of \$30,000 to \$35,000 per year to the Healthcare Fund and it's my suggestion to Members that having regard to the doubling of the Healthcare levy a few years ago the fund is in a position to accept that impost. I am aware that Ms Nicholas and Mrs Jack have a slightly different view to mine in relation to the theatre fees and I understand that Ms Nicholas will move an amendment to the effect that ½ of the theatre fees and similar fees be recognised rather than the whole of them. If I had to make that concession I would be quite happy to do so Mr Speaker because it would put people in a better position than they are in now and provided that we can obtain solid co-operation from those at the Hospital in order to ensure firstly, that people understand what their liabilities will be if they are referred to a Private Hospital and secondly if they are only referred to a Private Hospital in a case of substantial urgency then one will have achieved a worthwhile result even if it is only to the extent of half of the cost. I commend the Motion to Members Mr Speaker.

MS NICHOLAS Thank you Mr Speaker. Yes as Mr Brown has mentioned Mrs Jack and I in fact had discussion with you as the Minister for Health in respect of the possibility of capping the theatre fees and similar fees as expressed in Mr Brown's Motion because we have yet to be in a position to ascertain the difference, the variation in charges which might be levied by Private Hospitals. I'm happy to move the amendment at this stage but

it may well be and it's regrettable that Mrs Jack's not with us this afternoon, it may well be that further information is required to ascertain whether that 50% is a reasonable capping figure, to what extent there is variation between the charges levied by private Hospitals.

MR BROWN Mr Speaker Ms Nicholas' suggestion is not an unreasonable suggestion. If other Members do not have anything to add I would happily move that the matter be adjourned.

MR SPEAKER I think we are at that stage Mr Brown.

MR BROWN I move the adjournment.

MR SPEAKER Thank you Mr Brown. There is a Motion to adjourn therefore this matter is proposed to be adjourned and made an Order of the Day for a subsequent day of sitting.

QUESTION PUT
QUESTION AGREED

MR SPEAKER That matter is so adjourned. Thank you.

ABSENTEE LANDOWNERS LEVY AMENDMENT BILL 2003

MR DONALDSON Thank you Mr Speaker. At the August sitting of this House I introduced the Absentees Landowners Levy Bill 2003. This Bill amended the basis of the calculation of the levy liability from 2% to 1% and restricted the absentees residents to a maximum levy of \$500 per title per year. This amendment stemmed from a fourfold increase in the average unimproved value of land on Norfolk Island since the previous official evaluation. This fourfold increase resulted in a corresponding increase in the levy payable by non residents and a similar or lesser increase in the levy payable by absentee residents, depending on the valuation of their land. The amendment promoted by this piece of legislation can be summarised as reducing the percentage rate on which the levy is based from 2% to 1%; increasing the maximum levy payable by an absentee resident from \$350 to \$500. If approved the Absentee Landowners Levy Bill will result in the following; a non resident absentee levy calculated at 1% of the unimproved value, eg land valued at \$75000 would incur a levy of \$750. land valued at \$300000 would incur a levy of \$3000. A similar situation for residents. An absentee levy for a resident would have the levy calculated at a ¼ or 1% of the unimproved value. Land valued at \$75000 would incur a levy of \$170.50. Land valued at \$300000 would incur a levy of \$500. That's simply because it's capped at \$500 if this legislation goes through. If it wasn't capped it would incur a levy of \$750. The threshold of capping cuts in when the land value is \$200000 for a resident living offshore. Total levy receipts, the Administration is expecting to receive under this new arrangement \$115000 per year. Prior to the revaluation of land the Absentee Levy system brought in about \$56000 per year so we doubling the amount of income we are getting in as opposed to quadrupling it if this amendment didn't go through, if it's felt that the quadrupling is unfair or unreasonable and this brings it back to a fair and reasonable situation. I move that the Bill be agreed to in principle

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Speaker I said when this was introduced that I didn't support it and I haven't changed my mind thank you

MR NOBBS Thank you Mr Speaker I support the reduction from 2% down to 1% but I don't support 5. which is actually an increase. I have difficulty with the whole system actually and its been said to me that the last review of the land values was not what people expected and there was probably some doubts about it in some people's minds because of the way that they went about it or the actual guides that they used as to what the land value should be and therefore I have difficulty with the whole system and would suggest that it should be reviewed in total and that in the interim period the 2% be reduced to 1% as in paragraph 4 of this Bill but paragraph 5 remains the same, at \$350, and not increase

MR DONALDSON Thank you Mr Speaker I would just like to clarify something that I think may have been overlooked by some Members, although we are reducing the levy from 2% to 1% an absentee landowner who is a resident of Norfolk Island only pays a quarter of that 1% but there's a subsequent section of the Act that reduces the liability down to a quarter so they are already substantially benefited compared to a non resident person

SPEAKER Further debate. No further debate Honourable Members? Then I put the question 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
MR IVENS BUFFETT	AYE
MR NOBBS	NO
MS NICHOLAS	AYE
MR SMITH	NO
MR BROWN	AYE

The result of voting Honourable Members the ayes six the noes two, the ayes have it, the Bill is agreed to in principle thank you. We progress to the next stage Honourable Members, do you wish to dispense with the detail stage. OK. We dispense with the detail stage. Mr Donaldson I seek a final motion thank you

MR DONALDSON Thank you Mr Speaker I move that the Bill be agreed to

SPEAKER Final debate. No final debate Honourable Members? Then I put the final question that the Bill be agreed to

QUESTION PUT

MR NOBBS Thank you Mr Speaker I agree with Mr Smith. I would prefer that it be an agreement with the two parties concerned and not arbitrarily say this is all you are getting, thank you

MR DONALDSON Thank you Mr Speaker just a clarification on what Mr Smith and Mr Nobbs has said. There is still room for negotiation between the employer and the employee on what overtime rate will be paid and that is the same as the original motion that came to the House before. I'm a bit confused about what appears to be the mandatory nature of this Bill in their interpretation. The original motion was 120% of the minimum rate. This is 150% of the minimum rate and that establishes a minimum rate for overtime hours. There is nothing to stop an employer and employee entering into an agreement that they will get 150% of their normal rate for overtime or 200% for overtime whatever suits them. This bill doesn't take away any rights, it just doesn't make it compulsory to pay 150% of the normal pay for overtime

MR SMITH Thank you Mr Speaker I do understand what Mr Donaldson has just said. It is still different to what we were talking about or what I understood we were talking about some months ago where the Employment Act stands where you are paid 150% of your normal hourly rate if you do over your excess hours in a day or over a forty hour week. By changing it the way it's been changed here it will apply to everyone whereas I thought we were talking about having a system where an employer and employee could come to some agreement and if they both agreed that would happen but this way, the employee doesn't necessarily have any say in it at all

MR GARDNER Thank you Mr Speaker if I could just record again my desire not to participate in debate on this matter as I am an employer and therefore I won't be participating and voting

SPEAKER Further debate. No further debate Honourable Members? Then I put the question that the Bill be agreed to in principle

QUESTION PUT

Would the Clerk please call the House

MR BUFFETT	NO
MR GARDNER	ABSTAIN
MR DONALDSON	AYE
MR IVENS BUFFETT	AYE
MR NOBBS	NO
MS NICHOLAS	AYE
MR SMITH	NO
MR BROWN	ABSTAIN

The result of voting Honourable Members the ayes three the noes three, and there are two abstentions. On the polity of the vote the motion is negatived. Interpreted into layman's language, it means the Bill has not passed Honourable Members

BILLBOARDS REPEAL BILL 2003

MR I BUFFETT Thank you Mr Speaker this is in my name. I had intended that other matters would have been before this particular sitting date, and therefore before I repealed the old Billboards Act and I wish to adjourn the matter at this point to the October sitting if it pleases the House

SPEAKER In fact I won't call it on if we are at that stage Honourable Members unless there is some discomfort in my adopting that procedure. I won't call that on and I move to the next sitting day, thank you

FIXING OF THE NEXT SITTING DATE

MR SMITH Mr Speaker I move that the House at its rising adjourn until Wednesday 15 October 2003, at 10.00 am.

SPEAKER Thank you Is there any debate. The question is that the Motion be agreed to.

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

The ayes have it, that motion is agreed to

ADJOURNMENT

MR BROWN I move that the House do now adjourn

SPEAKER The question is that the House do now adjourn. Is there any debate Honourable Members?

MR GARDNER Thank you Mr Speaker in relation to the recognition of the people that make up our broad community and some of the roots I would like to acknowledge on ABC news this morning I believe or yesterday, a new's report that for the first time in seventeen years a child has been born on Pitcairn Island to Randy Christian and I would like, in this forum to acknowledge that birth on Pitcairn as maybe a revitalisation of that population and I hope that, that continues

SPEAKER Thank you Chief Minister. Is there any further participation Honourable Members? The question is that the House do now adjourn

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

Therefore Honourable Members this House stands adjourned until Wednesday 15 October 2003, at 10.00 am.

