

- MR SPEAKER The question is, is that Standing Order be, what was it Geoff,
- MR GARDNER 72A, provides that a Member may not refer to the conditions of service or conduct of a named or identifiable officer unless the House, has, on motion duly moved without notice, voted to exclude strangers and suspend broadcasting of its proceedings. I move that Standing Order 72A be suspended to allow discussion to continue in open forum for that purpose.
- MR SPEAKER Is that agreed Honourable Members. There is a No, a dissenting voice.
- MR. GARDNER Sorry, maybe if I just clarify that. For the want of reading the findings of the Committee into Hansard, and to read into Hansard the Chairman's forward. Sorry, I'll just rephrase that if I can. As I said before Mr. Speaker 72A provides that a Member may not refer to the conditions of Service or conduct of a named or identifiable Officer, unless the House has on Motion duly moved without notice, voted to exclude strangers and suspend broadcast of its proceedings. Mr. Speaker, I therefore move that, the strangers be excluded and the broadcasting be suspended for that purpose
- MR SPEAKER The question is that that is agreed. Do you want the House called Mr Brown
- MR BROWN Yes Please
- MR SPEAKER Madam Clerk, would you please call the House
- | | |
|-----------------|---------|
| MR SMITH | AYE |
| MR BATES | AYE |
| MR ROBERTSON | AYE |
| MR GARDNER | AYE |
| MR ION ROBINSON | ABSTAIN |
| MR McCOY | AYE |
| MR NOBBS | AYE |
| MR BROWN | NO |
- The result of voting Honourable Members is the ayes 6 the noes 1 with one abstention, the ayes have it. The Motion is agreed
- MR BROWN Mr. Speaker could I just ask a question Is it proposed that Members will be shown this Report.
- MR GARDNER If I can Mr Speaker, If I can I'd just ask through you, if I could ask Madam Clerk to circulate copies of the Report to the Members
- MR SPEAKER Mr. Brown your question has been answered
- MR BROWN Thank you

BROADCAST OVER AIR IS SUSPENDED

MR SPEAKER

We may continue. Mr. Gardner

MR. GARDNER

If I may I propose to read the Chairman's forward into Hansard, and also the findings of the Committee. If I may. It begins with 1.1 This enquiry is a first for Norfolk, I hope it never happens again, because it's just not Norfolk. These were the concluding remarks of a witness who appeared before the Select Committee appointed by the Legislative Assembly of Norfolk Island, the House, to enquire into certain allegations of political interference and intimidatory conduct by an Executive Member in the Norfolk Island Government. However, allegations of this kind by the very seriousness of their nature, made it necessary to hold an independent inquiry as quickly as possible. The appointment of a Select Committee of the House, was seen by the House as the only means by which justice was not only done, but seen to be done. 1.2 accordingly on 22nd December 1999, the house resolved: that a Select Committee be appointed to enquire into and report upon (a) whether the alleged political interference by an Executive Member in the selection process for the position of Cultural Affairs Adviser has any foundation of fact. (b) whether intimidatory conduct by an Executive Member towards a Public Servant employed by the Administration of Norfolk Island, alleged to have occurred on Friday, 10 December, 1999, has any foundation of fact. and 2... the Members of the Committee consist of Geoffrey Robert Gardner, James Gary Robertson and Allan John McCoy 3... the Committee report within fourteen days of the appointment. 4... the Committee is empowered to send for persons, papers and records, and 5... the Committee is empowered under Standing Order 214 to exclude Members, not being Members of the Committee from its meetings. The Committee commenced its inquiry on 23rd December, 1999. Section 1.3 ...A Committee of Enquirer looks to the Standing Orders of The House for its procedure. The relevant Orders are 186 to 188, 200 to 221, 222 to 223 and Standing Order number one. Which provides that any question relating to procedure or the conduct of business of The House not provided for in the Standing Orders, shall be decided according to the practice in the House of Representatives in the Parliament in the Commonwealth of Australia. 1.4... in determining its procedure for the current inquiry the Committee particularly relied on Standing Order 211, which reads "the Committee may determine the procedure to be followed on the examination of Witnesses, otherwise the examination of witnesses shall be conducted in the manner determined by the Chairman". And 215.. which reads "the evidence taken by any Committee of The House and documents presented to and proceedings and reporting and reports of such Committee, which have not been reported to The House shall not, unless authorized by The House be disclosed or published by any Member of such Committee or any other person. And determine 1...that all proceedings of the Committee be conducted in camera and that the Committee is not disposed to permit witnesses to be represented by council. This position is consistent with the practice of The House of Representatives 3rd edition. And 2... That under the power conferred on the Committee by The House on 22nd December, 1999 in paragraph five of its resolution to appoint this Select Committee, resolves that Members of The House shall be excluded from the Committee's proceedings unless required to attend by the Chairman of the Committee in accordance with Standing Order 226. Section 1.5..A number of witnesses were called to give evidence and produce documents relative to the Enquirer. The Committee wishes to thank those people for so appearing. Annexure one details the witnesses called and the capacity in which they appeared. 1.6...The Clerk to the Committee was the Clerk to the Legislative Assembly, Ms Robyn Eleanor Adams JP, Mrs. Patricia Anderson recorded the proceedings in camera, and Miss Clare Anderson transcribed the Hansard of those proceedings. The Committee thanks these people and all of the witnesses for their valuable assistance in the very short time frame available to the Committee to conclude its inquiry and report to The House. Signed by myself as Chairman of the Committee. Mr. Speaker, I now move on to findings of the Committee. Findings of the Committee, 3.1... The first issue (a) whether political interference by an Executive Member in the selection process for the position of Cultural Affairs Advisor has any

foundation in fact. There was no evidence tendered to the Committee to support this allegation. 3.11... Each of the Members of the Board were individually asked by the Select Committee whether or not at any stage of the Selection process had they had discussions with the Executive Member about any matter surrounding this process. Each Member of the Board deny having any such discussion with the Executive Member. 3.12...From the date of lodgment of the interview report from the Selection Panel and prior to that date, no evidence was tendered that the Executive Member had tried to influence or interfere in that part of the selection process in the exclusive domain of the Board. 3.13...There was no evidence tendered by the Members of the Selection Panel that the Executive Member had tried to influence or interfere in any way with the selection process. 3.14...The only contact between the Executive Member and Members of the Selection Panel was in relation to him seeking an indication of the time frame within which the appointment would be made by the Board. 3.15...The applicants for the position of Cultural Affairs Advisor, were interviewed between the 19th and 22nd November,1999. 3.16... The interview report from the Selection Panel was sent to the Board for endorsement on the 25th November,1999. 3.17...The Board did not confirm the appointment of Mrs. Evans to the position of Cultural Affairs Advisor when it met on the 2nd December, 1999, on the basis that it was felt by some Board Members that they had not had sufficient time to assess the report. One Board Member indicated that it is not the policy of the Board to 'rubber stamp' whatever is put before it. 3.18... The Executive Member was not provided with detail of the preferred applicant until the day after his return from overseas on 2nd December,1999. This information was conveyed to him by Mr. Rod McAlpine, Chairman of the Selection Panel. 3.19... The Executive Member approached Mrs. Evans on the 10th December, 1999, fifteen days after the interview report was sent to the Board. 3 one ten...However, the Committee noted from the evidence tendered from a number of witnesses, including Members of the Board, that the decision taken by The Board on 17th December,1999, that the position not be filled and the Board request the CAO to discuss the position specification with The Chief Minister to determine what the Government wanted. If the position specification is amended, the position should be re-advertised to give everyone the opportunity to re-apply, is a most unusual decision. The Committee addresses this issue further in the section headed Recommendations for Further Investigation and Consideration. Findings of the Committee continued 3.2... the second issue. Issue (b) Whether intimidatory conduct by an Executive Member toward a Public Servant employed by the Administration of Norfolk Island, alleged to have occurred on Friday 10th December,1999, has any foundation in fact. On the evidence tendered to it the Committee has reached the conclusion, that although there was no intent on the part of the Executive Member Mr. Ion Robinson to intimidate Mrs. Evans, it was clear to the Committee, that Mrs. Evans felt intimidated. This view is supported by evidence from the following witnesses. Mrs. Gaye Evans, and her quote" I don't believe he meant to be intimidating, but in the course of the action all those things happened, and it was intimidating". Mr. McAlpine, his quote "In my opinion the answer would be no. The man has not, the way I see it, has not tried to intimidate the Public Servant. 3.3...Further, whilst Mrs. Evans has stated that at no time did the Executive Member Mr. Ion Robinson raise his voice to her she did interpret that the tenor of his approach to her, was an affront to her intelligence. For example his suggesting that he needed someone who understands Norfolk Island" culture, and asking her if she understood what an anthropologist was. 3.4.. The Committee is of the view that it was premature and inappropriate for the Executive Member Mr. Ion Robinson to have approached Mrs. Evans as he did and as a consequence a major incident has developed. Thank you Mr. Speaker

MR. SPEAKER

Thank you Mr. Gardner. So for Members benefit we are still on the question, that the report tabled by the Select Committee in the House 5th January,2000, be printed. The written evidence tendered to the Select Committee be printed and circulated to Members of the Legislative Assembly and to remain confidential to Members of the Legislative Assembly and the transcript of the proceeding remain in camera. Is there any further debates. Mr. Brown

MR BROWN Mr. Speaker. I'm opposed to any further secrecy about this matter. What has occurred is outrageous. The basis of this whole Select Committee, and a total waste of two weeks of time, three Members of the House plus support staff, has been that one lady felt offended. The Committee itself has made findings that there was evidence tendered to the Committee to support any allegation of Political interference, and that there was no intent on the part of the Executive Member to intimidate the particular lady. It's all very well for the Committee to say it was clear to the Committee that Mrs. Evans felt intimidated, but how did that become clear. It became clear only by her words, only by her words which have been quoted as saying "I don't believe he meant to be intimidating, but in the course of the action all those things happened, and it was intimidating". Now, that is not sufficient for a Select Committee to make such a damning finding, because indeed that is a damning finding. The Committee has said that not with standing, that there was no evidence to the Committee to support the first allegation and not with standing that it found there was no intent on the part of the Executive Member to intimidate Mrs. Evans, nether-the-less, she felt intimidated. Mr. McAlpine is quoted as saying "In my opinion the answer is no. The man as I see it has not tried to intimidate the Public Servant.". It's time all of this was in the open. People have been happy to blacken the name of the Minister for Immigration and Resource Management. They have been happy for him to be sitting with a shadow over his head for two weeks, no-with-standing, I should add, that the Minister for Health was well aware in my understanding, at the time the Select Committee was formed, that there was absolutely no basis for the suggestion that there'd been interference with the Public Service Board. There was absolutely no basis for that, other than, perhaps, a vague allegation contained in a letter from the Public Service Association. A letter from people who had nothing to do with the proceedings whatsoever. It was good enough for the lady to make the allegations, in my view it is now good enough for the report to be public, for the evidence to be public and for the Minutes of the Committees Meetings to be Public, that's the least that we can do at this stage. I agree it is the first time this has happened, its something that doesn't happen usually in other places, as a matter of fact I don't recall being aware of it happening anywhere else, because it's not a usual way to handle such a vague allegation. Such things are usually handled more quickly and more appropriately. Never-the-less, it has happened, its time to now clear it up, and its time to be fair to everyone, not just to pander to the lady who made the allegation. Thank you.

MR SPEAKER

Thank you Mr. Brown. Further debate. Mr. Bates

MR BATES

Thank you Mr. Speaker. I am a little bit unclear as to what motion the secrecy really means, we've got part of this report already in Hansard so that secrecy has already been broken, because Hansard is available to everybody. We're going to pick pieces out of it that are confidential, and pieces that aren't confidential, I'm a little bit confused by what's intended, by that part of it. I find it's a fairly lengthy report and whilst we've had two parts of it read to us, I'd like time to absorb the complete report before I comment, too much on it. I think this has gone on for some time. I am a little bit confused by the further notice on the paper that we adjourn until the 9th February, my information was that we adjourn until next Wednesday, to give us a chance to discuss this matter on Wednesday when we have had time to become completely up to date with what's been said here. It's a little bit hard to make some positive comment on something when its only just appeared in front of you. So at the appropriate time I'd like to move that the matter be adjourned and made an order of the day for a subsequent day of sitting, and I'd also like to suggest that when we come to the next sitting day, that it be next Wednesday.

MR SPEAKER

Thank you Mr. Bates. I just might clarify that part of the motion that you may have missed, that the transcript proceedings remain in camera. That refers to Hansard, would, if that motion was agreed, that would remain in confidence.

- MR BATES So that's not this
- MR.SPEAKER No.
- MR. BATES Well that's good . That's clarified this.
- MR SPEAKER Further debate. Mr.Gardner
- MR GARDNER If I may Mr. Speaker. The report having been tabled is now in possession of the House, so as far as I am aware it is a public document.
- MR SPEAKER Mr. Nobbs
- MR. NOBBS Thanks Chief, Where are we today, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker. I'm, I agree with Mr. Brown actually. I don't think this matter should be kept in secret. I don't know I've only read up to page eleven, so I mean I've got no problems, myself personally that those, page one, to eleven, be made public. The
- MR GARDNER If I may, I don't mean to be rude Ron, breaking in there, but as I've just said the report is now in the possession of The House, and as such is a public document, no-one is attempting to keep that secret at all.
- MR NOBBS Okay, Yep. There was, regardless of what John said, there was an allegation made and we all know, and I believe, you should know now that I believe it should have been handled in the first day ,it wasn't handled in the first day, there were certain circumstances that occurred, and then it went to this Committee business, that has gone on and they've made their findings and I don't think anybody should be worried about it. The only problem I have is there doesn't seem to be any recompense on why it was leaked, and that is a problem that I have. The person should never have been advised, either the Minister or the successful, or preferred applicant should never have been advised. That's covered, I know its covered in the new, the new, under the new Act, but under the previous Act, I'm not to sure what the situation really is, whether it actually specifies that there or not, but I would have thought that there would have been something in there to say that there's no, you can't let it out until it's approved by the Public Service Board, and the boys are jumping up and down, so I'll listen to whatever you've got to say.
- MR. SPEAKER Mr. Gardner
- MR GARDNER Just if I can in reply to that. I realize that Members haven't had a chance to digest all of that, but I think that that particular point that Ron's just raised is in the recommendations and observations of the Committee. That's under Section 4.4, 441...The identity of successful applicants should remain confidential to those directly involved in the selection process until the appointing body has formal agreed. But really those just ideas that hopefully somewhere along the line those processes can be developed, proper procedure can be developed and documented so that these things are prevented from happening in the future.
- MR SPEAKER Thank you Mr. Gardner. Further debate. Mr Robertson
- MR. ROBERTSON Thank you Mr. Speaker. One of the things that we discussed was the report itself. The three sections or the three parts to the Motion that been moved, by Mr. Gardner. I was of the opinion that part of this should be read over the air today, because there are a number of people out there who want to know what is going on. And that part be the two parts

which were the reason why the Committee was formed in the first place. But this couldn't be done until such time as the document was tabled in The House, and then it becomes the document, and if the Members so wish it to be done, then it will be done. But otherwise, beforehand Geoff wouldn't have been able to state this over The House, because it was against the Standing Orders that apply. And so that's why it has been done this way, but I for one am more than happy to have Geoff read out over the air at this meeting, to go, to say what the findings were, because I agree, that there has been some allegations made from both sides and it needs to be cleared up, its been out in the public arena now for the last , I don't know, three weeks, what-ever, and it needs to be cleared, and there are a number of people I know, who are listening to this meeting, or use to listen to it, that wish to hear, what's happened, what's the findings. So we have no difficulty, but this House has to make that decision. Now, today.

MR SPEAKER Any further debate. Mr. Nobbs

MR. NOBBS Thank you. I agree that it should go over the air. We've been hanging about for two weeks now. That 44 that applies now. Under the current Act which hasn't been gone through yet, but under that Act in the Human Resources Policy, that's laid out, clear as a bell, that that process there, what I'm talking about is at the present time I would have thought that there would have been something in the current processes that prevented a person divulging before it went to the Public Service Board.

MR SPEAKER Thank you Mr. Nobbs. Further debate. Mr. Gardner

MR GARDNER Just in relation to a couple of comments that John made before. Yes certainly we appreciate that its not been a comfortable time for the Minister, it hasn't been a comfortable time for anybody involved in this process, and it's a dark shadow that's been hanging over the whole place. The reason that the inquiry was put in place was so that that dark shadow could be swept away and the air could be cleared and we could get on with the job that we are put here to do. And basically I think everybody should be happy that a process has been followed that has cleared the air. One way or the other. And I think that's what this has achieved.

MR SPEAKER Thank you Mr. Gardner. Further debate. Mr. Brown

MR. BROWN What this has revealed is a matter on which I've commented many times since I first was elected to the Legislative Assembly at the end of January 1982, and that is the dangers of allowing of a person to be a member of the Parliament, and a Member of the Public Service at the same time. Now here if you look at membership of the particular Selection Committee involved, the Head of that Committee was one David Ernest Buffett, Head of that Selection Committee, Deputy Speaker of this House, and a very long term member of this House, and throughout the whole of the period, from the commencement of self government in August 1979 until date, until today, David Ernest Buffett has been actively involved in the selection process of staff within the Administration. And at the same time has held various rolls in the Legislative Assembly. In the first one he called himself Chief Minister, in a subsequent Assembly life wasn't as kind to him and he was only able to call himself a back bencher, and since that time, he has consistently refused to resign from the Public Service in order to take Executive Office, not with -standing that it had been offered to him on many occasions, and he has been, as I said, very much involved in the politics of Norfolk Island and the Selection Processes. If we're serious about sorting these kinds of problems out, we need to be prepared to look at that one, because that has contributed very much to what has occurred on this occasion.

MR SPEAKER Mr. Brown, I just want to bring your attention to Standing Orders.

MR BROWN I noticed the Clerk raise a Point of Order Mr. Speaker, yes. But could I point out to you, that it's not appropriate for the Clerk to raise Points of Order.

MR SPEAKER Mr. Brown I was thinking along the same lines waiting to see where you were going to go with the direction of that, and just. I just let you know that you need to be careful of Standing Order number 62. Mr. Bates, I'm wondering if you could take the chair just so I can have a few words to. Further debate on the motion Honourable Members.

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Further debate, Mr. Smith

MR. SMITH Mr. Bates like every other member I've only just received the copy of the Select Committee report and at first glance like we've all had today here, it doesn't seem, well it wouldn't seem a difficulty to myself that once we go back on the air, that Mr. Gardner would like to read those recommendations out. I don't think I would have any difficulty with that, but there was comment made by one of the members that we should at the fixing of the next sitting day, bring that forward that a week. I would propose that we would suspend this sitting and meet again and I would suggest next Monday because we have other activities that the Assembly will be involved in during the week. So if that's suitable to other members I would be recommending that Thank you Mr. Bates

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Further debate. Mr. Ion Robinson.

MR.ION ROBINSON Perhaps if the findings, the findings of the Committee were made public because it is going, as it is in Hansard, and as it is tabled in the House it is a public document, perhaps if the findings were made public and we adjourned until the 9th of February is the suggestion I have. There's already been so much time spent on this that has been an absolute, in my opinion an absolute waste of time apart from what Mr. Gardner was talking about. But I'd quite happy to publish the findings and leave it at that until the next meeting when whoever wants to discuss it further can.

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Thank you Mr. Ion Robinson.. Mr. Brown

MR. BROWN Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, from a personal point of view I've changed travel plans to remain in Norfolk Island for this week knowing at some stage the meeting would be held. I have commitments in Australia for the whole of next week which I would certainly change if I needed to attend a meeting, but my personal preference would be that we not be meeting next week to discuss it and if we did feel the need to discuss it further. The document is already public document and could be published by the newspaper if it wishes and from a personal point of view I have no difficulty in it then being further dealt with on the 9th February when we propose to meet in any event.

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Thank you Mr Brown. Further debate. Mr. Robertson

MR ROBERTSON Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, I for one, don't feel the need to meet again next Wednesday. The point being that we need to clear those allegations and if we get on the air today and clear those allegations then the need is not quite so pressing, because if we don't do that then you still have got it hanging around your head. We discussed this, our Committee discussed this as to whether it should go, and our feelings were at this point, that yes it should go over the air today. Having done that, then there are a lot of other reasons, the documents as per the Motion moved by the Chairman of the Committee, this is part one of it, part 2 of it is this plus a bit more and part 3 is the Hansard which then remains in camera, and those are the

three parts, and I have no difficulty with that as he's proposed them. If we get this first one through, then it goes to air, straight away. Second part of it and the third part then gets circulation of documents and through to the 9th February, possibly a reasonable time to have to study it and come forward.

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Thank you Mr. Robertson. Mr. Gardner

MR GARDNER I'm just wondering if I could Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, if I could put that question of my Motion if I could and we deal with that first.

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Your Motion.

MR GARDNER Yes. That the report be printed basically that's the first part of it, or whether we take it in sections, I

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Well that's the only Motion we have dealing with this matter, that would close the matter unless there's another Motion on it I should imagine

MR GARDNER I look to Members

MR SMITH It's the first paragraph of your Motion, is that what your saying

MR GARDNER Well no, to the Motion, I'd just like hear Members comments on it to see whether we can deal with that today. I think obviously people want to see it made public, I think that's the feeling around the table. The written evidence tendered to the Select Committee, that would just support Members thoughts and give them some background, the documents that were and evidence that was tendered to the Committee, would give them some further background. The transcript of proceedings, the main purpose for wanting to retain that in camera is that there was a hell of a lot of evidence that was given there, that is of a very sensitive nature, its on the workings of the Public Service Board, its on the workings of the Select Committee, its on evidence given by the Minister, its on evidence given by the complainant, its on different areas of evidence which I think are probably are not in the best interest of the public, but that's for the House to decide, that's just my personal feeling on it, I think that what we have in the report and the body of the report and the written evidence that was tendered to the Select Committee, is enough for this House to make a decision on whether we implement the recommendations or where we go with them.

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER. Thank you Mr. Gardner. Is there any further debate on the Motion. Mr. Nobbs

MR NOBBS Yeah. What do you want to do. Do you want to print the thing. That doesn't mean its going out

MR GARDNER No, I'm sorry. If I may, if this is printed it's a public document. In other words someone could come down and have a look at this document if they wanted, it's in the possession of the Clerk, as far as I'm aware that means that copies may be able to be made available of it.

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER I think there's one technicality, in theory, they can only look at the document with the permission of the President, or Chief Minister.

MR.NOBBS Yeah. Sure

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER The Speaker, yeah. So that really in the hands of The Speaker, as to whether the public can have access to the document.

MR GARDNER Well maybe, I don't know whether it's preempting anything, but whether The Speaker having heard the thoughts of Members around the table, as to whether in fact that would be a reality, that it would be made available for members of the public to peruse if necessary

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Mr. Smith

MR SMITH Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, I'm not to sure what the rules are. I mean if somebody wants to come and have a look at it, I don't know whether I can agree or disagree to let people have a look at the report. Does that make it any less public or does it make it any more public. I mean I don't have any difficulty with that procedure as Standing Orders does point out, that maybe from the chair you may be able to give me some sort of advice on that Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker.

ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER I was only quoting Standing Order 19, which says unless otherwise ordered all papers presented to The House, maybe inspected at the offices of The House, by Members and with permission of the President by other persons. So other persons can only inspect that document with your permission. That is my interpretation of that Standing Order.

MR SMITH Thank you.

MR ROBERTSON Mr Acting Deputy Speaker. I would like to foreshadow an amendment to that, in that. In the first line, the Report tabled by the Select Committee in this House on the 5th January 2000, be printed, and that pages 8th 10th through to ten of that report be .

MR GARDNER When we order The Speaker to publish it or

MR ROBERTSON No, but I don't know what the word is here

MR SMITH Made public

MR ROBERTSON Made public through the broadcast, through today's broadcast. Do we have, can that, does that sort of help satisfy.

MR ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER You moving that

MR ROBERTSON No. no, I'm only sort of for shadowing it

MR ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Just discussing it

MR ROBERTSON Get some discussion going

MR ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Can I draw Members attention to Standing Order 221, which says there are basically four things that we can do with this Report. Unfortunately no where does it mention printing it. I'm not sure where this Report be printed came from, I think it maybe terminology used in other places instead of noted, but I think that the Standing Order really requires us to simply note the Report, or do one of those other things and my suggestion is that we should note the Report, that we should authorise The Speaker, in addition to whatever other

powers he has to provide a copy of those particular pages to the newspaper, that we should authorise the circulation in confidence of the written evidence to the Members, and if it's the Members with that the transcript remains sealed and in camera well so be it, we can decide to do that also. I certainly don't have a difficulty with giving the newspaper those four pages, as far as I'm concerned and they wanted to come down and see the Chief Minister and copy them all, they ought to be free to do that to.

MR ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Thank you Mr. Brown. Mr Nobbs

MR NOBBS I you don't want to do 1 to 11, or 8 to 11 , but number 11 has got to be in it, because that's the recommendations and observations of the Committee. I mean that's part and parcel of your findings, surely. So I mean I would suggest that that would be those four pages if you want to come down to that, but print them, I think it's a waste of time talking over the air tonight, because there won't be too many people listening now they've switched off, but with due respects to the Lady, the Broadcasting Officer, that they are out feeding the chooks or something, but the thing is with it, we must get these findings out, and whether you want to discuss them well I don't mind whether you're coming back on Monday or Wednesday or Tuesday or whenever you want to come back, but you know it's a bit of a fizzer at the moment, I'd say, and we should do something about it. And that's get these things out to the people and clear a bit of air

MR ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Thank you Mr. Nobbs. Mr Brown

MR BROWN Mr Acting Deputy Speaker, I move that this House adjourns until next Wednesday to give Members an opportunity to discuss this matter more fully

MR ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER Members, the question is that this House adjourns until next Wednesday to allow time for less formal discussion. Do Members wish to go down that road. Thank you, then Mr Brown you might move that

MR BROWN Mr Acting Deputy Speaker I move that the question be put

MR ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER I put the question that the House do now adjourn until Wednesday 10th January.

QUESTION PUT
AGREED

The ayes certainly have it. This House stands adjourned until Wednesday 10th January 2000 at 10am.

