

Submission No:.....31.....
Date Received:.....15 July 2003.....
Secretary: *Allement*

SUBMISSION RE GOVERNANCE INQUIRY – W. W. SANDERS

I will address the points listed in the terms of reference first

I am not happy with the election of the Chief Minister by the Assembly by choosing the person who has the highest number of votes because popularity does not equate with ability but at least the Assembly can vote the Chief Minister out of office if deemed necessary. I feel that an election just to choose the Chief Minister would just be a popularity contest and also would cost extra money to hold as it would need to follow the General Election. If the Chief Minister resigned another election would need to be held again costing extra money

I would not like to see a fixed term for Government. If it is really bad then there should be an ability to change the Government.

I believe the method of voting should be preferential.

To be fiscally responsible those who live here must be prepared to contribute to allow the Government to fund services which are deemed essential. Persons who come to live in a remote and isolated location with an extremely small population, cannot expect to have the same standard of services as on the mainland. The level of services provided must equate with the ability to fund.

There are two types of taxes which could be introduced both of which would affect me personally but if I want to live here then I should contribute:

1. Land rates and
2. A simple form of Income tax eg
 - Any person earning \$50,000 or more per annum pays \$5,000 per annum
 - Any person earning between \$40,000 and \$50,000 per annum pays \$4,000 per annum
 - Any person earning between \$30,000 and \$40,000 per annum pays \$3,000 per annum

A person can pay what he or she believes is correct but an authorised officer would have the right to investigate if it is thought that the assessment is incorrect.

This would alleviate the high cost of implementing a mainland type income tax system. There is no requirement on NI [except for companies] to keep books and the imposition of such a need would be met with dismay and probably incompetence by the many “one-man-bands” who serve the Island.

W.W.S

I believe Norfolk Island should have as much self-government as possible but it is too small to have full control. We need the Federal oversight to ensure that we have peace, order and good government. We should proceed under the guidelines of the Schedules in the *Norfolk Island Act* but only as we can show our ability to do so. Complete local control of land, for example, would be inadvisable as personalities over-ride environmental considerations.

I believe that persons standing for election to the Legislative Assembly should be Australian citizens. I object to foreign nationals having a say in how we should run this small part of Australia

I do not support the idea that any Australian citizen living on the Island for six months should have the right to vote in local elections. This is absolutely unrealistic for Norfolk Island. There are at present approximately 1200 persons on our electoral roll. If the Bill is passed it could allow approximately 500 guest workers with 12 months temporary entry permits to be added to this roll - an addition of approximately 40%. These short-term guest workers could dictate the way we live while they move on elsewhere.

If we had an electorate of 60,000 say, then 500 itinerants would not unduly affect election outcomes, but in an electorate of 1200 they could affect us drastically.

It is incorrect to say that Australian citizens are disenfranchised when they come to Norfolk Island. All Australian citizens living on NI have the right to vote in Federal elections, referenda etc if they so wish.

I believe that the Legislative Assembly should consist of 7 members - 3 executives and 4 non-executives

I believe that as many as possible sections of Administration should be privatised

W. W. Sanders