

Advantages -

- a) a beach exists on site.
- b) nearshore waters are protected from Northwester storm energy.
- c) parcel sizes are appropriate for commercial development.
- d) walking distance from existing commercial centre is within reason.

Disadvantages -

- a) road system would need major rerouting.
- b) small reefs exist offshore.
- c) major dive sites located immediately offshore.
- d) mixed medium to low density residential use.

Candidate Site 3 - Zoned Scenic Coastline, present land usage - mixed commercial/residential.

Advantages -

- a) beach exists on site.
- b) some commercial activity exists.
- c) nearshore waters protected from Northwester storm energy.
- d) proximity within reasonable distance of the commercial centre of the town.

Disadvantages -

- a) distance from main roadway.
- b) major dive sites in area.
- c) church site in area.
- d) the landing is not a compatible use with Scenic Shoreline zoning.
- e) zoning change required.

Candidate Site 4 - This area was given the most attention. Zoned Low Density Residential, present land use is predominantly commercial/mixed residential.

Advantages and disadvantages of this site are presented in detail in this Report, in the section outline "Assessment of Proposed Development by Governmental Departments".

back requirements need to be considered:

In the evaluation of all these candidate sites the following set

- In a low density residential area the requirement is 75 feet on sand from the low water mark, and 50 feet from the ironshore coastline.
- In the zoning of a scenic coastline, this could be rezoned at the discretion of the Central Planning Authority to affect set back.
- Within a beach/residential or beach/resort/residential zoning the set back is 100 feet from the low water mark.
- In a commercial zoning it is 100 feet from the low water mark on sand and 50 feet from the low water mark on the ironshore.

various candidate sites.

I will give a brief synopsis of the Committee review of the

On Site 1 - Public Boat Launch and Harbour. The advantages and disadvantages of this site were reviewed. It was concluded that although the presence of an existing facilities confers certain advantages there were overriding considerations against this site. These are:

- a. The existing facility is too small and would need major modification to accept the cruise-ship tenders.
- b. This would severely reduce the local public's accessibility to this facility therefore representing a loss of public usage.
- c. It is too far from the centre of West Bay and other existing or potential tourist

attractions. The only local attraction would be the Turtle Farm.

- d. The site accessibility would be so restricted by weather conditions that it would be effectively unusable for significant periods both from the point of view of the tenders attempting to negotiate the channel and dock inside the harbour and for the cruise ships anchoring offshore.
- e. There would be no available beach amenities in the area for the tourists which would present a major disadvantage.

Site 2 - At the Junction of Northwest Point Road and Town Hall Road. This site had certain advantages. The nearshore waters are relatively protected, except during periods when the wind is from the south or west and the land acquisition costs would possibly be lower than other sites. However, there is no available Crown land. Land acquisitions would be essential before development. The road system would require major rerouting and road safety would present a problem. This is an area of mixed medium to low density residential land use. There are major dive sites immediately offshore which are probably the most popular areas with the international diving fraternity which represents a major source of tourist income. Many small reefs exist offshore representing a navigational hazard.

Site 3 - West End of Boggy Sands Road, Seaward of the Church. There is already some commercial activity adjacent to this site which is closer to central West Bay. A beach exists on-site and there is similar shelter to candidate site 2. The proposed usage would not be compatible as this area is zoned "Scenic Coastline", and the site is adjacent to a place of worship. There is no available Crown Land and land acquisition cost should be considered. As with Candidate site 2 there are internationally-famous, and commercially-important, dive sites offshore as well as patch reefs.

Site 4 - Boggy Sands Road at Junction of Four-way Crossing. This is the site originally proposed. Most of the considerations applying to Candidate site 2 and 3 apply here also. The major advantage is the presence of two parcels of Crown Property (Parcel 163 and 164) although these strips are very narrow. The strips have been measured and it was found that the total length of Crown Land available was 262 feet. The maximum width of the strips was 56 feet and the minimum was 39 feet. Regardless of the restrictive nature of such narrow strips, this could present setback problems when seeking planning approval.

Against this background the Committee concluded that Candidate Site 1 represented too many disadvantages to be worthy of further consideration. Principal among these disadvantages would be the exposure to the weather. Candidate Site 2, 3 and 4 were all of similar consideration but site 2 was ruled out due to major traffic flow problems. Sites 3 and 4 were so close in proximity as to be considered as falling under the same constraints or promotions. Generally, it was agreed that site 4 was the major candidate due to the presence of Crown Land and the potential for existing land-use modification, however, the severe limitations due to the small size of these parcels was noted.

The report has taken into account the following considerations:

- The Planning Departments view;
- The economic and social impact of the local population;
- The land acquisition cost;
- Public works and construction consideration.

It shows an estimated cost of support facilities at \$1.2 million based on a jetty 100 feet long. However, the Committee felt that to give sufficient depth to the jetty it would have to be extended to 200 feet. This additional 100 feet would cost approximately \$400,000, bringing the total cost, excluding land acquisition, to \$1.6 million. With the land cost included we were looking at a final estimated cost of at least \$2.1 million. This is based on very conservative estimates with no consideration for the aspects of staffing or improvement to the Boggy Sand Road. Therefore, it should be noted that the provisions of a second rate, poorly planned and ill supported landing area would do more harm than good to the Cayman Islands tourist industry.

There were also other considerations including water supply and sewage treatment, environmental considerations, Police and Fire Department and, of course, the Watersports Association, Customs and Immigration and security and administrative considerations, etcetera. Perhaps the most relevant and important consideration were those in respect to the tourists themselves, the cruise ship lines, the cruise ship captains, the pilots and the shipping agents. I would like to read a few comments and considerations from those particular areas.

*Tourist considerations.

The cruise ship arrivals are up 30 per cent from 1988. However, the forecast for 1990 is for a 5 to 8 per cent decrease in this number due to increased competition in the region. What these figures actually show is that the Cayman Islands are getting more passengers but less ships. This is due to the fact that the cruise lines are building larger ships which are more cost effective. There is no doubt, therefore, that the facilities in George Town need improving and there is much concern over this within the Government.

The Department of Tourism does not believe that a cruise ship landing in West Bay

is either necessary or desirable. The Department is particularly concerned with protecting the existing tourism and especially diving tourism, which represents, by far, the major source of income from tourism.

These divers come to the Cayman Islands because they are politically trouble free, provide a good standard of living and provide easy and rapid access to spectacular and internationally famous diving sites, especially off the West Bay coast.

From this point of view, the Department of Tourism would be strongly opposed to any development which represented a threat to the marine environment and particularly to the Cayman Islands famous dive sites. It is generally agreed that the diving areas off West Bay provide the Islands' best diving all year round.

The burden on George Town is recognised and the Government is working to improve this situation. It is the opinion of the Department of Tourism that West Bay has the potential to attract tourists in any case. Already many passengers go to the Turtle Farm and Hell. If West Bay were to develop other attractions, they would get plenty of trade from the passengers transported from George Town.

However, these passengers will always want to go through George Town first and if they were landed in West Bay would almost certainly insist on going directly to the Capital, leaving them less time to tour West Bay.

The Department therefore feels that West Bay should go ahead and develop its attractions and then tourist trade will follow. However, the Department is strongly opposed to any attempts to land passengers in West Bay for the reasons stated.

In their views the Department of Tourism stated that it was their considered opinion that the cruise ships would not go to West Bay by choice and they would certainly not wish to apply pressure to the agents for fear of losing their trade. If cruise ships were diverted away from George Town it is almost likely that they would take their passengers elsewhere, which would be detrimental to the economy of the Cayman Islands.

I now wish to comment on the views from the cruise ship lines, as it was felt by the Committee that a Motion as important as this one should be given as thorough and comprehensive research as was possible. Thus the reason I am taking some time to present this very important report.

The comments from the cruise ship lines. Of the five cruise ship lines contacted, the Committee received replies from all five. A sixth comment was obtained directly from the Captain from the Song of America, which is a Royal Caribbean Line Ship. All the spokesmen for the lines stated that existing facilities at George Town were no longer adequate. They wished to see an improvement of facilities and were in favour of a pier. The Cayman Islands represents the only Caribbean port of call that does not have a pier. I would like to repeat that. The Cayman Islands represent the only Caribbean port of call that does not have a pier. They all agreed that George Town is the preferred location although they stated a landing elsewhere might take the pressure off George Town. They stated they would only consider West Bay as an alternative if the George Town anchorage was full and that they would not use it otherwise. They commented that the adverse weather conditions that would affect George Town would often prove worse at West Bay. They generally felt that West Bay was not the best choice.

All of the lines insisted that they would need readily available transport for their passengers to get to George Town easily and that any landing facility would have to be big enough to handle the number of passengers. The general consensus was that the ships would go to Spotts at the first sign of a Northwester. None of the lines were in favour of sitting out off the dropoff under engine power. This was considered to be both uneconomical and unsafe due to the lack of maneuverability. They were all in favour of the idea of a permanent mooring system using single point moorings with a 360 degree swing. This suggestion was warmly received by all parties concerned. The Lines felt that this would represent a major improvement over the existing situation both from the aspect of knowing exactly which vessel would go where and from the safety angle, bearing in mind the ability to effect a quick release from the mooring.

The Lines also felt that there was a need for bigger, and a greater quantity, of tenders, especially with the advent of larger ships carrying over 2,000 passengers. It was also generally agreed that a landing facility at West Bay would need an offshore break water to protect it and to ensure a comfortable ride and safe transfer for the passengers. West Bay could only be used as an alternative if the winds were northerly or northeasterly and George Town is the most suitable anchorage under such conditions. They commented on the types of facilities that would be needed. These would include covered rest areas with seating and restrooms, a large taxi and bus waiting area. A long suitable pier capable of taking many tenders and with lighting in case of overnight calls.

Finally, the cruise ship lines stated that they urge serious concern be given to conserving the environment and the natural beauty of the Islands before commencing with any further such development.

Mr. President, we also had the comments from the cruise ship captains. The captains of two of the ships that regularly visit the Islands were interviewed separately for their comments. They both felt that West Bay was an undesirable anchorage as the area is open and subject to the weather, and they were worried about water depths with regards to the safety of their vessels and the comfortable transfer of their passengers. It was felt that the shallow water in the West Bay Bight produced difficult ground swells which would make for an uncomfortable trip to the landing point as well as a difficult transfer. They also felt that the passengers' preference would always be George Town. Fifty per cent of the passengers are elderly and of limited mobility. Any passenger who wished to go to West Bay already has every opportunity to do so under the present situation. There is certainly no majority demand to do so. Once again the captains were in favour of a permanent mooring system, even if there were future plans for a pier. The moorings would then be a useful backup facility to take any overflow.

In a Northwester both captains agreed that they would take their ships to Spotts for safe anchorage. They wished to see George Town better developed rather than starting new developments elsewhere. Both captains stated that if there is a problem, rather than encouraging more ships to call, the Cayman Islands Government should now start to restrict the number of ships. This policy of control is used in other Caribbean Islands.

One captain was asked for the dimension of his vessels and future vessels coming into service. He told the Committee that his ship was 727 feet long, with a draught of 26 feet and carried 1,800 passengers. Other vessels already in service with the same Line were 850 feet long, 29 feet in draught, and carried 2,200 passengers. Some Lines have vessels carrying up to 2,600 passengers. It was also felt necessary to get the views of our local pilots. Mr. Scott, the Port Pilot, surveyed the area proposed on the 22nd of September, 1989. He felt that the disadvantages heavily outweighed the advantages. The weather conditions on this particular day were 10 knot wind from the southeast, and the sea had a moderate chop. The Pilot felt that even with the wind at only 10 knots, the swell was such that a tendering service would be difficult, if not impossible.

The water depth offshore increases much more gradually than it does off George Town but the water depth is still only 5 feet some 125 feet from the shore. At 800 feet offshore the depth is between 24 and 25 feet, after which the depth increases gradually over a distance of another 700 feet until the drop off is reached. The last 250 feet of bank is very rocky and is unsuitable for anchoring. The pilot was concerned that this site would afford no protection from winds blowing from the southeast around to the northwest. The anchorage might be suitable for winds from the north and the northeast, but it would be unusable under any other conditions. Even with a permanent mooring near the dropoff, this could only take smaller vessels of under 600 feet in length, and less than 24 feet in draught. Even then the margin for safety would be insufficient. The Pilot recommended that bearing in mind the disadvantages which he has outlined, other alternatives should be sought as the solution to accommodating the cruise ships.

The Committee solicited the views of the shipping agents. The two shipping agents in the Cayman Islands were also approached for their comments. It is their understanding that the passengers and the crew prefer George Town due to the convenient access to banks, the Post Office and the major shopping centre. They also feel George Town is a good focal point for sight-seeing, with easy access to all other districts. Unless West Bay could duplicate facilities in George Town, especially the banks and shops, then there is no doubt that the passengers would prefer George Town. They pointed out that quite a number of passengers and crew required emergency medical and dental treatment and sometimes hospitalisation which is more readily accessible in or from George Town. They agreed that the ships would use permanent mooring if they were on the single point system with a 360 degree swinging radius.

The Shipping Agents generally felt that the ships would prefer to anchor and only sit offshore when the winds are unfavourable, as they use up a lot of fuel in maneuvering. However, if it was a choice between anchoring in West Bay and staying offshore under power at George Town, they would prefer to stay on their engines near George Town, even if the weather was favourable and George Town was overcrowded. The anchorage at West Bay would provide no protection in a Northwester, and they would go to Spotts for safety. The Shipping Agents also stated that the problems involved with larger ships such as S.S. Norway, and the Sovereign of the Seas would cause problems at West Bay. These ships have larger tenders needing more berthing space. The Sovereign of the Seas can carry up to 2,600 passengers. They suggest expanding the dock area at Hog Sty Bay to the south.

The Shipping Agents felt that should the development go ahead in West Bay, the facilities required in West Bay would be as follows: a) a Customs area; b) some form of shade; c) toilet facilities; d) a taxi area; e) a four lane highway to George Town. However, the overall opinion was that, although there is plenty of potential in West Bay, this will not be realised in the immediate future. A good deal of development would have to be considered before they would recommend cruise ships to anchor there. Any development to satisfy a landing could not be economical for the few, if any, cruise ships which would go there. They would prefer to see energies spent on improving current facilities at George Town and Spotts.

The Shipping Agents expanded their opinion on these points to point out that the West Bay area would be most inconvenient because of the following considerations:

1. Traffic congestion. This is already a problem on the West Bay Road as has been noted by many people that drive that road.
2. Distance from the airport. Passengers, luggage and crew members frequently join the ships in Grand Cayman.
3. Taxi fares would be expensive for the tourists.

4. Very inconvenient for medical emergencies, etcetera.

Finally, from the Shipping Agents they finally provided the Committee with the draught for the small tenders, which was 4 feet, but stated they need at least 6 feet in a swell. Larger tenders would draw more water.

In addition to the consideration of the tourists, cruise ship lines, cruise ship captains, and others, a polling was carried out to obtain the views of the local residents. Some of the comments I had to make on this I have decided against.

On the polling of the local residents. A voluntary questionnaire along with a brief explanation of the proposed development was handed out to local people on Boggy Sands Road, West Bay Road, Northwest Point Road and Church Street. The questionnaire and explanation are enclosed in appendix 2, to this Report. This survey was done in two stages, due to time and staff constraints. The first stage was Boggy Sands Road and lower Northwest Point Road. This received a very good response with every person wishing to make their comments for or against the proposed development. The Committee managed to collect 27 replies, mostly from the immediate area of Boggy Sands Road. Of these 27 replies 10, or 37 per cent, were in favour of the proposal. Sixteen, or 60 per cent, were against it, and one person was uncertain and wanted more details. However, our initial contact with these people proved otherwise. These people were all residents except one. Furthermore, over 80 per cent owned the land on which they were residents and 63 per cent of the people who replied to the questionnaire were Caymanians. Fifty per cent of the Caymanians who replied to the Questionnaire were in favour of the proposed landing stage, and 50 per cent were against, with only one person being uncertain.

Of those in favour most wanted to encourage existing businesses and bring in new business. They also felt that it would provide more income for small businesses, such as the basket and hat making, and the taxis, which they felt should be from West Bay. Some felt that it would encourage more banks. Business in West Bay has declined in the past six years and they wish to see it commercialised and less residential. They wish to see an improvement in the established businesses in West Bay and an opportunity to provide for themselves and their families by depending on the tourist industry. The development in George Town should be reduced. Most people in favour felt that they would wish to see a plan of some sort.

Also, commenting on the views of the people who were polled, the majority of people were against the proposal. Some of them were very strongly opposed, especially in the Boggy Sand Road itself. Generally people felt that there would be too much congestion and that the traffic situation would be unbearable. They could not see where all the necessary facilities would go without people being forced out of their homes. Most people felt that there were enough cruise ships already, and the Island, particularly West Bay, did not need the additional discomfort for a relatively small financial return.

Many of the residents of this area also expressed concern that any development in Boggy Sands Road would alter existing property values. They said that they could not see where the space is available in the area proposed. The project is not needed at this time. It is too large, there is not enough room and too much is proposed. If it was a small jetty, like in the old days, that would be different. But they, too, realise that we are not anchoring the little boats of 50 feet long that we depended on to transport our passengers as we did in days gone by. It was felt that to site this development on Boggy Sands Road would destroy a delightful residential area and drive away much of the tourist rental business. Certain residents were strongly opposed to the landing in West Bay in any form. The residents felt that the tourists would want to head straight for George Town anyway, and could not be forced to stay in West Bay, as some would have us think. Such a desire for more dollars would merely give the tourists a bad impression. The cruise ship facilities in George Town should be developed and improved without ruining West Bay. It was felt that the Government was going too far with trying to develop more and more uncontrolled tourism. Such a "fast buck" approach was dangerous and detrimental to the community.

The residents of the area also stated that the development would ruin the beach and the watersports, especially the diving. It would not satisfy the needs of the cruise ship passengers. A small jetty alone would be welcome but not a landing facility for the cruise ships. I would repeat that. The population in that area felt that a small jetty alone would be welcome but not a landing facility suitable for cruise ships. They did not want it on their doorsteps, and neither would the Elected Members if they lived there. This was their views. This is a summary of the replies collected from local residents who filled in these questionnaires voluntarily, and without any duress, favour, pressure or bias.

Additionally, the Committee considered a report prepared by a Mr. Clairwell M. Tatum, better known as Mickey Tatum, whom, it is understood, was privately commissioned to undertake a feasibility study of this project. Since much of his recommendation was relied on, as I understand, I will take time to comment on his Report. Review of a document received from Mr. Clairwell M. Tatum Associates, discussing a proposed landing stage and facilities: A document prepared by Mr. Clairwell M. Tatum has been reviewed by the Committee. This document was apparently prepared as a guideline for the last Legislative Assembly in September. It makes the assumption that there must be such a facility and suggests certain amenities that would be needed.

The document prepared by Mr. Tatum agrees with this report on the following facts: 1) Under any wind conditions in the Northwester season Spotts is the preferred anchorage. Therefore, West Bay does not provide an alternative anchorage during Northwesters; 2) there would need to be a relocation residents in the immediate vicinity in order to accommodate the required facilities. These points I am reading from the document prepared by Mr. Mickey Tatum, which was privately commissioned, not commissioned through this Government. Such facilities would need to include on-site medical and police presence; 3) that in order to ensure success the landing development should include all the facilities listed and any reduction of these

could jeopardise the project. The document prepared by Mr. Mickey Tatum disagrees with this Report in the following areas:

1. This Committee's report finds that the Watersports Operators are definitely not in favour of this facility. The Watersports Association, which represents these operators, has spoken out very strongly against this development.
2. The statement that the development of a cruise ship landing in West Bay would have a positive impact on the whole Island is questionable and has no basis in fact.
3. The berthing of dive-boats, etcetera, would require an additional pier in order that such watersports operators could continue to function when the landing jetty was being used by the cruise ship tenders.

Further to the review of this document prepared by Mr. Tatum, the Committee noted that there was no discussion of the harmful effects on the environment which is surely one of the major considerations in building such a project. However, the Natural Resources Lab has stated that they are completely against the provision of fuelling facilities for commercial operators within a Marine Park Zone.

The budget prepared by Mr. Mickey Tatum was costed by the Public Works Department, and the total costing of his report amounts to \$1.4 million. This was prepared, as I said, by Mr. Mickey Tatum who was privately commissioned by some individual. But, his report does not include any of the landscaping addressed in this report. Also the 100 foot jetty which has been quoted would not reach far enough out to be in water deep enough for the tenders and the toilet block would require amenities for the disabled. As mentioned in this Report there would have to be purchasing of land. Several other aspects have not been considered in the Report prepared by Mr. Mickey Tatum.

It was also felt appropriate by the Committee to solicit the views of the representatives from the district of West Bay, namely, the Honourable Member for Education, Recreation and Culture, the First and Third Elected Members for West Bay. However, unfortunately, we did not receive any comments from the Third Elected Member. In fairness to all the Members from that district I would like to basically cover the areas of discussions we had with them contained in this Report: "The discussion between Mr. McKeever Bush, the First Elected Member for West Bay, and the Chairman of the West Bay Landing Committee at 1200 hours on the 20th of October, 1989..." I am reading from the Report:

"Mr. Bush was concerned about the wording of the Questionnaire which was being used to poll the residents of West Bay. He felt that it suggested too large a development within the Boggy Sands Road area. He also felt that leading questions had been asked of the residents by the people distributing the questionnaire, in so much as they suggested that 50 taxis might be in or around the Boggy Sands Road area at any one time. Mr. Bush was assured by the Chairman that no leading questions had been asked and that all questions were written in the questionnaire. The 50 taxis were, in fact, mentioned in the questionnaire.

Mr. Bush explained that this jetty/cruise ship landing had been his idea for the last 11 years and it was one of the main planks in his Election platform. He explained that although he did not know who on the West Bay Landing Committee he felt that there should be representation from West Bay..."

I would like to point out that even though the Assistant Scientific Officer may not be residing in West Bay, she was born in that district and grew up there and has a fairly good, practical knowledge of the area.

"He stated that the preliminary plan is already in existence for such facilities". I imagine this was presumably referring to the document prepared by Clairwell M. Tatum.

"Mr. Bush felt that a parking area was unnecessary and that any form of compulsory purchase could therefore be avoided. There was enough existing Crown Land... [and you have heard that some of the Crown Land was as narrow as 39 feet, with some areas requiring 100 foot setback. So perhaps those building would have had to be on the road] He stated that there were enough gift and souvenir shops existing in the area which could expand to serve the influx of tourist. Likewise the two existing restaurants in the area could expand to accommodate the tourists. Additional shaded area near the jetty would be unnecessary as the tourists could use the trees.

He did not want to see the jetty placed at the junction with the Turtle Farm Road as this would be a good area for development for beach entertainment. He was generally in favour of the Government providing the minimum facilities and leaving

the rest in the hands of private enterprise.

The Chairman asked if the close proximity to places of worship might present a problem as there would probably be intoxicating liquor involved in any such development. Mr. Bush replied that there was no reason for there to be any intoxicating liquor on sale.

Mr. Bush pointed out that he would be calling a Public meeting in West Bay to discuss the proposed facilities and the Chairman agreed that this would provide an excellent opportunity for the general public to air their views."

It is my understanding... as a matter of fact, I am in possession of a tape of a public meeting called in West Bay, and I am not satisfied from that tape that the general public supports this project in West Bay. If I need to say more on that I can do so. Comments received from Mr. Benson Ebanks, who is the Honourable Member for Education, Recreation and Culture were received in reply to a letter which was sent out by the Committee to all three Elected Members.

"The Honourable Member (who is also the Second Elected Member for West Bay) advised the Committee that they should consider that the jetty be built of wood on pilings probably of PVC pipes filled with concrete. It was stated that this design would prevent interference from the tides which might result in erosion.

He further discussed the available land and roads and how they might fit into the scheme.

He felt that the experts appraising the project would be able to come up with a formula for the number of taxis required and the amount of shopping space needed.

He urged that it was important to ascertain how many days of the year might be lost due to bad weather and stated that the area could not be used when the wind is blowing between the southeast to the west.

His second concern was as to whether the cruise ships would use the facility. This, he felt, was a more urgent, initial issue before even considering the planning, environmental or ecological factors.

In considering the Members comments on the construction of the jetty the Committee notes the aspects of tidal and current-induced erosion. The Committee has, so far, considered only a solid construction in order to stand up to the wear-and-tear from the tenders. This is already very noticeable at the landing site used by the tenders at Spotts. However, such a solid construction might well interfere with the natural tides and currents in the area and cause considerable modification to the coastline. This would require a more detailed hydrological study than is within the capabilities of this report. Mr. Ebanks' proposed design would overcome this problem but would almost certainly be unable to stand up to the vigorous abuse it would receive from the tenders. This problem would need to be solved before jetty construction was considered."

I would like to refer now to the findings of the Committee regarding the feasibility of a cruise ship landing at West Bay:

"It is the finding of this Committee that the proposed cruise ship landing at West Bay would not be economically or environmentally feasible. The Committee finds that the creation of a tourist landing in West Bay does not conform with any national economic strategy for the development of the Island's tourist industry. It is also the view of the Committee that this Island is too small to warrant this level of capital expenditure when there is still a desperate need for resources to improve and develop the existing cruise ship landing facilities"...

Mr. President, might I add, many other needed infrastructure facilities in this country.

"However, the Committee strongly urges that specific outlying districts, particularly West Bay, be encouraged and aided in developing tourist attractions. This would be of particular importance to West Bay when it is made more accessible by the Master Ground Transportation Plan (MGTP). It will then be in a position to fully realise the potential economic benefits of the cruise ship tourists from George Town. From this point of view the Committee feels that the West Bay area should take greater advantage of its existing facilities and potential tourist

attractions.

For its part the Government could assist in this process by initiating a West Bay development strategy. Such a strategy could include a small jetty for the use of residents. A jetty of this nature was previously sited on this coastline.

These findings have been soundly reached based on an overwhelming strength of supportive expert evidence received from both governmental and non-governmental parties who are directly concerned with such an issue."

I would now wish to turn the attention of this Honourable House

to the recommendations of the Report.

Recommendations:

"That the Government should now define a firm and considered strategy for cruise ships and their tourists. This should be based on a policy decision with regard to how the Islands' may wish to develop or limit cruise ship facilities might have on the social, economic and environmental welfare of the Islands.

Such a strategy must consider the following aspects:

That the George Town cruise ship landing and reception facilities be given priority for further improvement and development to accommodate not only the existing volume of tourist traffic, but also the predicted volume for the next twenty years. The level of such development should include applied planning for the whole of George Town and should consider the construction of a pier in Hog Sty Bay capable of berthing two cruise ships.

That the upgrading of the basic facilities at Spotts is an urgent requirement to effectively accommodate cruise ship passengers when weather conditions prevent anchoring in Hog Sty Bay."

As can be seen from the Budget, Government is now in the

process of upgrading the Spotts jetty.

"...the basic comfort and safety of these passengers needs to be assumed in the best interest of the Islands' tourist industry..."

The recommendation continues:

"...that the provision of permanent moorings both in George Town and Hog Sty Bay be pursued with every expediency in order to (A) prevent further environmental damage; and (B) improve the safety of the cruise ship landing facilities. Such mooring anchors are available on the Island and have been certified for insurance purposes. Both the cruise ship lines and the Captains have agreed to and, in many cases, warmly welcomed the suggestion that such moorings be provided as long as they are correctly positioned.

The siting of such moorings is now of extreme urgency in the Spotts area, which is already beginning to show severe, but not yet irreversible, signs of damage from anchoring. They would play a very important role in Hog Sty Bay even if a pier were provided. These moorings could service the additional ships and prevent the chronic siltation effect, caused by continuous anchor and chain movements which is killing the reefs down-current from Hog Sty Bay.

That the Government initiate a development strategy for West Bay and other outlying areas that could benefit from better exploitation of the tourist industry. Such a strategy should consider improvement of the tourist industry. Such a strategy should consider improvement of existing facilities and the development of new attractions. Areas such as West Bay should be encouraged and assisted to this end. The advantages of the Master Ground Transportation Plan could be further realised and utilised in any such strategy. This would help outlying areas to attract some of the tourist resources from the Capital whilst at the same time easing the burden on George Town."

In closing I would reiterate that in reaching its conclusion and recommendations, the Committee acted objectively and impartially and conducted itself in a proper and professional manner. Again, I wish to thank the Committee for the sterling job performed by them in the

preparation of the West Bay Landing Feasibility Study.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Proceedings are...

**NOTICE OF MOTION
SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS 19 AND 24(5) & (8)**

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:

Mr. President...

MR. PRESIDENT:

Short questions are permitted...

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:

Standing Order 19 and 24(5) and (8), to permit the following Motion to be put, that the Report be debated and its recommendations rejected.

No, Mr. President, I rise under Standing Order 83, to suspend

MR. PRESIDENT:

Orders again which you quoted?

Would you please give me the second and third Standing

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:
and 24(5) and (8).

Under Standing Order 83 I beg to suspend Standing Order 19

MR. PRESIDENT:

Standing Order 24(5) and (8)? Thank you. Just give me a moment to look at that will you? Right, I think we will suspend proceedings for 15 minutes while I would like that Motion in writing and we will consider it. Proceedings are suspended for 15 minutes.

AT 11:31 A.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 11:51 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Proceedings of the House are resumed.

Before the break, the First Elected Member for West Bay gave notice of a Motion, in effect two Motions. These are now in front of Members. The first one to be taken is the Motion to suspend Standing Orders. Would the First Elected Member for West Bay please so move?

MOTION I

TO SUSPEND STANDING ORDERS 19 AND 24(5)&(8) TO ALLOW DEBATE ON THE WEST BAY FEASIBILITY STUDY 1 & 2 AND TO REJECT THE RECOMMENDATIONS

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:

suspension of Standing Order 19 and 24(5) and (8).

Mr. President, I move that under Standing Order 83, the

MR. PRESIDENT:

Please continue with the rest of the Motion as tabled.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:

having been tabled and currently being presented by the Honourable Member, to be debated and its recommendations rejected.

To enable the West Bay Landing Feasibility Study one and two,

MR. JOHN D. JEFFERSON, JR:

Mr. President, I beg to second that Motion.

MR. PRESIDENT:

The Motion has been duly moved and seconded. Before I invite the Mover to speak to it, could I just point out this Motion is about the suspension of Standing Orders for a purpose. The next Motion is about that purpose. Would the Mover wish to speak to his Motion?

Would the Mover wish to speak to his Motion?

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:

my reasoning fully on the debate on the next Motion.

Mr. President, it is very plain what we want. I believe I can give

MR. PRESIDENT:

Member for Communications and Works.

Does any other Member wish to speak? The Honourable

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON:

Mr. President, the Motion before us, I feel, is unnecessary. I will not comment on my reasoning at this point, but I would ask Members not to support this Motion. Thank you, Sir.

Mr. President, the Motion before us, I feel, is unnecessary. I will not comment on my reasoning at this point, but I would ask Members not to support this Motion. Thank you, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT:

The Third Elected Member for George Town.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN:

prepared to support any effort which moves that freedom of speech forward. I believe that only by debating things openly and publicly, as we do here between Members, can we really come to what is good for the country. This

Mr. President, I believe in freedom of speech, and I am always prepared to support any effort which moves that freedom of speech forward. I believe that only by debating things openly and publicly, as we do here between Members, can we really come to what is good for the country. This

Motion is only on whether the Standing Orders be suspended, it is not a substantive Motion as you impliedly pointed out, Sir. I would ask Members here that they do give the right to debate it and what they decide on that debate is different. I say this openly, I am normally prepared to support, whether it is the Government side or this side, any move for relevant debate by suspending a Standing Order even though it is not something that is done often, but in this case it is the only way to do it would have been this route.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Mover wish to reply?

Does any other Member wish to speak? In that case does the

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:

Just get the will of the House, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT:

suspended. Those in favour please say Aye... Those against, No.

The question is that Standing Orders 19, 24(5) and (8) be suspended. Those in favour please say Aye... Those against, No.

AYES AND NOES

MR. PRESIDENT:

Would you take a division please, Clerk?

CLERK:

DIVISION NO.30/89

AYES: 8

NOES: 7

Mr. McKeeva Bush
Mr. John Jefferson
Mr. Truman Bodden
Capt. Mabry Kirkconnell
Mr. Gilbert McLean
Mr. Roy Bodden
Mr. Franklin Smith
Mr. John McLean

Hon Thomas Jefferson
Hon Richard Ground
Hon Lemuel Hurlston
Hon Norman Bodden
Hon Benson Ebanks
Hon Ezzard Miller
Hon Linford Pearson

AGREED BY MAJORITY: STANDING ORDERS 19 AND 24(5) & (8) SUSPENDED.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Member for West Bay has leave to move the second Motion standing in his name.

The Motion is carried and, accordingly, the First Elected

MOTION II

TO ALLOW DEBATE ON THE WEST BAY FEASIBILITY STUDY 1 & 2 AND TO REJECT THE RECOMMENDATIONS

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:

having been so suspended I do move that the West Bay Feasibility Study 1 and 2 be debated and its recommendations be rejected.

Mr. President, further to Standing Orders 19 and 24(5) and (8)

MR. JOHN D. JEFFERSON, JR:

Mr. President, I beg to second that Motion.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Mover wish to speak to it?

The Motion has been duly moved and seconded. Would the

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:

Members of this House to debate matters affecting the country, especially their constituents, and under Standing Orders that Members on the Government bench have prerogative of dealing with such reports, anything in this House can. We, on this side of House, rarely have occasion to question their remarks or any decision that they make. It is a known fact that when certain Members on the Government bench get up under those Standing Orders, they use it to their every advantage to make people on this side look bad at certain, given points.

Mr. President, it is a privilege and an inalienable right of Members of this House to debate matters affecting the country, especially their constituents, and under Standing Orders that Members on the Government bench have prerogative of dealing with such reports, anything in this House can. We, on this side of House, rarely have occasion to question their remarks or any decision that they make. It is a known fact that when certain Members on the Government bench get up under those Standing Orders, they use it to their every advantage to make people on this side look bad at certain, given points.

In regards to those feasibility studies, I wish to thank some of the members who were on that Committee for their time and effort. In the very first instance though the work done to get these documents was started well below a standard of quality becoming of a Government-supported project. Those conducting the so-called survey were most unprofessional, some of them. They were biased and, of course, some of them were very arrogant and high handed in their attitudes in polling.

The Report is not factual in parts and the survey remains incomplete and did not take in all landowners in the immediate area, much less the entire district of West Bay. It is biased because everything in the Report speaks and leads to George Town and attempts to show that the solution for West Bay, and the Island, as a whole, is to develop the George Town facility into berthing facilities. Coupled with that is their recommendation, pointed recommendations, to the Master Ground Transportation Plan. The Master Ground Transportation Scam, it is being referred to in the country.

I cannot accept the Report as something that is in the best interest of landowners and business people of West Bay central. The Report says that it would not be economically feasible to establish a jetty in West Bay. Why not? There are already businesses dealing in jewelry, and there is a great possibility for expansion into duty free shopping. How many buildings are lying empty and unused in West Bay central? As far as restaurants are concerned, they are there in the general vicinity. If Government happened to establish this jetty, it could only help business ventures. It is as plain as day that what the area needs is an injection, a flow of people, so that businesses can be viable. In my opinion, increased activity in that area it will bring about that effect.

The Report says that West Bay needs to develop its tourist potential and facilities before it attempts to attract cruise ships. Here again, the Committee which established the Report must have been talking about some other place and certainly not West Bay. West Bay today has a lot of facilities and attractions, conducive to tourists. What of the Turtle Farm? They made mention of it. What of Hell? Horseback riding is being developed in West Bay. The trouble is that the West Bay tourist attractions enhance the George Town facility because tourists landing in George Town only have shopping and a few restaurants. They must come to West Bay. But the difference is that the people that own those businesses and presently have shops could do a lot more business. The majority of tourists coming to West Bay go to the Turtle Farm and Hell, therefore, there is not much chance of the small shops doing any business. Naturally the West Bay central business residents would want more traffic, more tourists on a regular basis.

The Report says that the money would be more economically spent in George Town for their facility. That is what I feel is so biased about it. Everything is pointing to a policy, which I know the Honourable Member responsible for Communications and Works has expounded upon time and time again, that is, to develop the George Town Port facility into a berthing facility. I do not know who was pushing what policy but somebody was pushing somebody's policy. In fact, what they are saying is that they are willing to spend millions in George Town in order for ships to tie up to further add to the frustrations already existing in George Town. If they are talking economics, I wonder whether they have checked the cost of land in George Town. Do they not know that the land in George Town is valued at around \$45 per square foot?

I am well aware that there may be some problems environmentally, but not so much that we should take it upon ourselves, from a few people on a committee, to let the business potential of West Bay die. I also see where my old friends in the diving cartel have made some objections. I do not wish them any harm. I would propose that we have a demarcated entrance to the jetty which would protect dive sites and would also assist in the proper control of the flow of traffic. This could be similar, if Government so wanted to do, to the marker facilities for the dive operations in front of the Lobster Pot Restaurant which protects divers there from boat traffic. Also ships could approach the moorings from a south to a southwesterly direction which would offer protection to dive sites to the west or northwest of the anchorage. Certainly, there would be or should be permanent moorings placed for anchorage. This would assist in keeping safe from posing any danger to dive sites and some cruise ship captains have recommended permanent moorings.

On a whole, I believe the dive operators would have minimum worry. But then, if they continue to be unreasonable, I must tell them that while I acknowledge the contribution of the industry, they cannot have control of the entire ocean around these Islands. We must try to minimise the danger of damage to sites. They, however, must not expect to forever keep down the ventures which can help West Bay. It is my opinion, and the opinion of many people in West Bay not yet polled, that this landing facility is such a venture.

Let me explain to the House the position of this so-called survey that was done by some of these people who just happen to be involved with Government somehow or another. First of all, the survey papers were very poorly put together. There was no identification whatsoever that it was a Government survey. The people who carried the questionnaire around asked very leading questions which got some residents irritated. Leading questions like, "would you really like to see 50 to 100 taxis parked along side your door?" On top of that, the way the questionnaire was put, in my opinion, it was put especially so that it would irritate people and get the residents unhappy. They talked about land being taken from people. That is one thing, if nothing else, that gets Caymanians angry when you start talking about compulsory property taking. Those questions were inserted there a long time before they even knew what property existed around the area. So why would they have put it there before they even found out what property was there? There is no doubt about it, it was pushing the George Town berthing facility which the Honourable Member for Communications and Works has been pushing for quite a long time.

Besides that, it was political. It was very political. Why should I carry my name on the questionnaire when I moved the resolution but there was another Member who seconded it? It could have easily said that it was the Legislative Assembly that agreed to have this study done. But they knew there were residents who would oppose McKeever. I heard the Member making a remark one day sitting there in that seat, that those people would certainly vote against me. It makes no difference to McKeever. As I have told you I do not own any property out there. I have nothing to gain.

To a very large degree people did not get a questionnaire at all. I should add that people living opposite, some two or three houses up the street from the proposed site had no one approach them. Yet they come to this House and say this is a factual Report. If they had talked to those people they would have gotten a different hearing, but the questionnaire was not carried out properly, simply because the people doing it were henchmen and did not know where to go.

There were some very uncomplimentary remarks by that Committee concerning this Member. But it is all right, because I am only doing my job. I am only carrying out a proposal that at one point in 1980, 700 and odd people who voted for the now Member of Education supported, and in respect to 1984, 1204 voted for him and 1132 voted for me. It was still in our manifestos and again in 1988,

1316 voted for me and 1137, I think, voted for him.

To give an example concerning the whole scenario of this Report, while opening our Church one night for choir practice a gentleman came up to me and asked who lived in that building. I told him it was a Church and the Pastor lived up the road in the Parsonage. He asked me whether people lived in the building across the street, which was a home. I said, "yes, they are houses and they should be there now." I really thought that man was doing the census. I later found out he was Mr. David Vousden, the Chairman of the Committee, because he wrote me a letter and I went to see him. But he was running around at that time of the night with these two pieces of paper with no Government department marked on it, nothing whatsoever to say it was a Government sponsored questionnaire. It does not surprise me that people would not talk to them or refused to complete the questionnaire at that time of the night. People did not know who they were, or where they came from or where they were going or what they were doing. Yet they had the temerity, the audacity to blame me for not getting the questionnaire to people. I was not doing any survey. If they are getting paid to do a job, let them do it right. If they are getting paid to do a job, let them be professional about it. If they are professionals, let them act in accordance with professional rules and regulations.

This Report is certainly not something that is conducive to a Government report and I take strong objections to certain things said by the Honourable Member for Communications and Works. Do not look at me, Member for Health, because you had some words in it as well, I understand...

Please, you must address the Chair, not Members directly.

MR. PRESIDENT:

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:

They did not care who was being polled or how many were being polled. They thought (and I guess they took the attitude, too) that, "oh, they are just natives and we can pull the wool over their eyes". Concerning the poll and some of the remarks made by the Member presenting this Report, I specifically referred to one, which he said that some of the remarks he had to make he decided against. He should have told the House what those remarks were. Concerning the meeting - When I found out about this study, which was sometime early in September, I went to see the Chairman. It took me a long time to find him because he, in his letter to me, did not indicate where he came from. I said it was early September, it was late September, I have found the letter in the book, the 29th of September, in fact, that the letter was sent to me, and mail does take a few days to get to me. But in any event, that letter contained in this Report does not say where this man, David Vousden, lives - in a chicken coop or whether he lives in Webster Estates, or whether he lived in Rock Hole. I did not know where he came from but I searched. There are so many people who work there now that you do not know, that you can hardly keep track of them, but I found him and I had a chat with him.

The other thing I take strong objection to is the fact that in the letter to me he said; "With your consent we would also like to discuss the draft of the Report with you at a brief meeting before we pass this over to Government for final presentation to the Legislative Assembly." Nothing like that took place. I found the man, went and had a chat with him, and I contend that if they were the professional people that they say they are, they would have called me back and said; "do you agree with this letter or these remarks we are going to imbed in this public document that we call the West Bay Landing Feasibility Study?" Instead they chose to make uncomplimentary remarks against McKeever Bush in the Report without coming back to me, even after writing me and saying, "come and see me, you do not know where I am, but come and see me". The bunch of rascals.

I take objection to it, Mr. President...

MR. PRESIDENT:

about Members of the House, it is about outsiders.

I think a point has been raised. That is not unparliamentary. The House is privileged in that regard.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:

They certainly know that. They know what is privileged, Mr. President, and what is not.

So this Report in its finality cannot be a true report. It cannot be final. I take objection to it. I believe that this landing jetty can help to, once again, put West Bay businesses in a viable position and make West Bay central a thriving business community. As I see it, building a jetty in West Bay, and I say that for the benefit of the Member for Communications and Works, will not detract from any expansion of the George Town facilities, if expansion is what the Member is crying for.

There are many cruise ships today which desire to have another port of call. They would gladly come to this Island. West Bay would only offer another area on this Island for those ships to come to. I am only asking what I believe the majority of West Bay wants. Sure, there is opposition, but the genuine opposition of some West Bayers in the area is because they got the wrong impression from the beginning. We are not saying stop the cruise ships in George Town. We are saying that it is high time for other areas of this country to benefit directly and in more quantities from the cruise ship trade. In other words, share it around.

We are not asking for a Miami terminal. There again, is where I contend that they were wrong in doing this project. Why do we need to have all those things that they do not have in George Town? We are asking for a small structure to be placed there, that can be used. Do they not know that cruise ships used to anchor in West Bay before? Do they not know that? We are not asking for a Miami terminal. We are asking for a jetty along the lines of what we had before, only a bit more sturdily built.

Whether or not West Bay gets a jetty that will enable cruise ship passengers to come to West Bay is a decision that will be taken, as far as I am concerned, when it is properly determined. But this Report, in great parts, stinks of biasness. I hope, as Members agreed with me with the Motion, that they will agree with me now to reject these bias and unprofessional recommendations contained in this

biased Report. I say again, we are not asking for a Miami terminal. All that was put in to get people irritated - up in arms, so to speak, against the project. They were pushing the George Town project which the Member has been pushing for a long time. The Report pushes a specific programme. I want Members to come to their own conclusions and, as far as this Member is concerned, I have nothing to gain from it.

A jetty should be built in West Bay. I will only take the very considered opinions of those residents living in the immediate area because I have respect for them. On the other hand, I will also have to look and make my decisions accordingly of the entire West Bay district, which I represent and am responsible for.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT:

The Third Elected Member for West Bay.

MR. JOHN D. JEFFERSON, JR:

Thank you, Mr. President.

I must say that the recommendations of the Committee do not surprise me. I agree with my colleague from West Bay, the First Elected Member, it is totally unprofessional and I also object to the members of the Committee - the majority of which probably learned to swim after they got here.

I also received one of those letters from Mr. Vousden and, like the First Elected Member for West Bay said, no address, no telephone number, no nothing. I did not know who he was. If the Committee was that interested in getting my thoughts and views on the matter, all they had to do was come to this House and get a copy of Hansard on my contribution to the debate.

The whole objective of the original Motion was that we felt, and I still contend, that some measures have to be taken in order to encourage business or commerce in West Bay. We were not looking for any massive project. We do not think we need it and it is an untruth that the Cayman Islands is the only cruise ship destination that does not have a docking facility. So the members of the Committee should take a cruise of the Caribbean personally to determine for themselves which do and which do not.

From reading the Report, I got the impression that it was a report on the Master Ground Transportation Plan. The conclusions were ridiculous. We need a four lane highway from West Bay to George Town to accommodate the passengers. Why do we not need a four lane highway going in the other direction? Passengers are being taken to West Bay now. Taxi fares are going to be more expensive. That is a joke. That is a joke! It is the same distance between West Bay and George Town, as it is from George Town to West Bay. What would happen, because I used to be in the transportation business, if we had a cruise ship landing in West Bay, it would encourage more of them to take advantage of visiting the attractions in the area.

I dare say that if it was not for the tourist attractions in West Bay you would not have anything to show the tourists on tours because the majority of them are located in West Bay. What would happen? Rather than the tour originating in George Town, it would originate in West Bay. They would go and see the Turtle Farm, Hell and Morgan's Harbour and then, naturally, they would visit some of the shops in the area and chances are they would also want to come to town to do some duty free shopping, which could only help the people employed in transportation.

We would need a medical facility on the site. Do they have one in George Town? Do they have one at Spotts? Polling. That was a joke. I had some people call me and say, "you know John, you know something. Somebody just came to my house and asked me how I would like 300 taxis parked in front of my place in the mornings." They frightened the residents in the immediate area. They gave people the impression that we were coming in and acquiring their homes because we needed it for facilities.

There was also the misinformation that we heard at the meeting we had in West Bay the other night, where some residents had the impression that the facility that was being built was for more cruise ships. In other words they were coming and docking in West Bay. Naturally, when you talk about taking a Caymanian's land he is going to become very angry, and I do not blame him. But I would not support any move by Government to acquire any property for any purpose whatsoever, especially for a jetty in West Bay without the wishes of the people involved.

Some key residents in the immediate area were not contacted. I wonder why? And they based their findings on something like 27 people being polled out of a resident population of probably 3,000 or 4,000 people? The project that they presented was not what we had in mind. It is too large. It is not what we asked for. It is not what we expect.

I mentioned it was very unprofessional. Let me just quote something on page 18 and I read:

"Realistically, West Bay would need to develop its tourist potential and facilities BEFORE it attempts to attract passengers from the cruise ships. This should be a serious consideration in the siting of any further tourist amenities. A good example here might be the development of craft and culture attractions and/or theme-parks."

Listen to this, Mr. President:

"The question has been raised as to why the new fun-fair that has been proposed is not being sited in West Bay to attract more tourist to that area?"

The only reason they put this in was because they know that I personally am involved with the idea of putting an amusement park in the Cayman Islands. That is the only reason. What does a remark like that have to do with our request for a jetty in West Bay? Totally unprofessional and irrele-

vant.

They also said that tourists coming into the area would want to go straight to George Town. For what? As I said before, those people who go on tour, their main areas of attraction are located in West Bay. Everyone has heard about Hell and everyone is interested in seeing the Turtle Farm. The only reason why we were saying that the jetty should be located along the Boggy Sand area is because, first of all, Government owns property in that area that we felt was sufficient for the purpose. In this way we would be able to minimise costs, because we knew that would be one of the excuses they came back with - it cost too much. All we are asking for is a similar facility to what we had there before, only something that is much more durable that would be able to withstand the weather conditions in that area.

We are not looking for an alternative to George Town. That is not the idea. This was also the impression that was relayed by members of the Committee that Government was looking for relocating the cruise ship landing out of George Town and the other possibility would be West Bay. That is not the idea. We only envisage one or two cruise ships a week, if that many. As far as the cruise ships are concerned, I really do not see them having any problem whatsoever with regard to any landing site as long as the proper facilities are in place. We, in the Cayman Islands, have always been known to do things first class. I do not expect any different approach to be taken on this, but it does not have to be a massive project.

I was fortunate enough, as I mentioned before in my original debate, to take a Caribbean cruise this summer. That was very enlightening. On the Island of St. Martin, where the cruise ships do not seem to have any problem stopping at all - as a matter of fact, it is one of their favorite destinations because of good duty free shopping and prices. The only thing they had there was exactly what we are talking about - a wooden jetty. I do not know what it was moored on, what kind of piling it had. It allowed tenders to come in and dock and land their people. That was it.

So, the recommendations of this Report really do not surprise me. I was expecting this from the beginning because, as I said, the members of this Committee did what they were told to do. I do not support or accept the findings of that Committee.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Proceedings are suspended until 2:15.

That seems to be a convenient moment to take the lunch break.

AT 12:45 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 2:18 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Proceedings are resumed. The Private Member's Motion on the West Bay Feasibility Study debate continuing. Does any Member wish to speak? (pause) If no Member wishes to speak... the Second Elected Member for Bodden Town

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH:

On the matter of a jetty for West Bay, from the West Bay Landing Feasibility Study, the Honourable Member for Communications, Works and Natural Resources in laying out the Report said that there were some recommendations to a four lane highway leading from West Bay to George Town in order to transport tourists. At present we do not have a four lane highway leading from George Town to West Bay, which takes the tourist down there now.

Some remark was made that the taxi fare would increase from West Bay to bring the tourist back to George Town. Tell me what is the difference from George Town to West Bay, then? He also said it had been recommended - and I find this hard to believe - that the Committee to do this study would not have put a footnote and said that the present facilities in George Town or in Spotts do not have a place to cover the tourists from sun or rain. In making submissions in their report they should have put a footnote explaining that neither of the two areas that are presently used have that facility.

Also restrooms are needed. Yes, Sir, I agree! But the Spotts area that they use to unload the tourists in times of bad weather does not have toilet facilities either. They are using private land to accommodate the taxis also. They also said they needed amenities for the handicapped. Tell me where the amenities for the handicapped are located in George Town or at Spotts. They also said that a Post Office would be needed. I think we have a small Post Office in West Bay which the tourists would probably be glad to walk to. As far as I understand it, we have one in Hell which they want to post their letters from, something they have never done before.

I do not know whether it was the Committees' suggestion, perhaps the Honourable Member could tell me whose suggestion it was for this piece here. It says: "Presently, many of the tourists are passing right through the West Bay area to reach Hell and the Turtle Farm." I find that hard to believe that they would do anything else besides that because when you go to an area, and I will use Miami for an example, I take my wife and children and they want to see Parrot Jungle. When I leave the Hotel we are staying at and go directly to the Parrot Jungle, I do not stop anywhere else. That is what we wanted to see. So when the tourists leave from George Town and pass through West Bay and go to Hell or the Turtle Farm. I find it very hard to believe that a Committee could submit something like this. It is biased. Why did they not put something that was not biased?

When I supported this Motion in September to have a study done I, for one, would not support the Motion that the Members from West Bay had before the House. I asked for

him to amend it to what it presently stood at now, because I could not agree. My argument was always that if you build a facility down there and the cruise ship operators say they were not going to allow their cruise ship to go there, where would we be? I am not saying that we must build a tourist landing there, but these points that I have just raised, I object to these.

I notice where it said after the Master Ground Transportation Plan came into effect, you could go after these facilities then. I am sorry, but I said it before, and I will say it again, unless they can tell me where they are going to get the money to pay back. I am not concerned about the money to build the roads, I am concerned about where they are going to get it to pay back. That is the one that concerns me. As long as I am in here, not one red cent will be voted to do anything on the Master Ground Transportation Plan until they can convince me of how they are going to pay it back.

They also said the costing for this was made by the Public Works Department. I am not saying the Public Works Department cannot do costing. My guess is they looked at this the same way they looked at the back road for Boddien Town - a rough estimate to throw it out of proportion. It also said this situation will require additional policing by the Traffic Department. George Town requires that too, and half the time there is no one there. Spotts requires it too and there is nobody up there.

I could have swallowed all this if they had put a footnote saying the other two facilities that are presently being used do not have any of this either. I can understand it if this is their recommendation that it must have it in the future. I would take that. But put a note saying the other does not have it either. This little piece here would be a serious consideration to the cruise lines: "As it is estimated that 50 per cent of their passengers are old and immobile." I agree with that. That perhaps, stops a lot of those visitors from coming ashore because they have to use the launch facility. I am not saying they would not have to use it in West Bay either, this is why I have always said that they need to get where boats can dock. But do not try to play down that the handicapped would not be able to get ashore there. If they cannot come ashore there, they cannot come ashore in George Town or Spotts the same way.

They said cruise ship lines and Captains stated that they would prefer to go to George Town and would only ever consider West Bay if the George Town anchorage was full. I think that is the same argument that the Third Elected Member for West Bay wanted this facility for - so that it would have some spin-off in case George Town was full and we had an extra ship and it could be diverted to West Bay.

It is hard to estimate now as to whether the tourists on the ship would want to go ashore in West Bay or not, because they have never had the chance to. I am saying that if they went ashore in West Bay and the Turtle Farm and the Hell Post Office and there were other facilities there, they would probably enjoy that more than coming right into the heart of George Town. Of course I understand that because there are no banks there (I believe there was a bank there at one time but I do not know if it still operates), but I am almost sure that if the facilities were provided you would have banks vying to go there. But until you make the move, until you provide the facilities, no bank is going to go there. I see here. [It says]: "However, the Committee strongly urges that specific outlying districts, particularly West Bay, be encouraged and aided in the developing tourist attractions." Tell me what George Town has as a tourist attraction? Only banks. What particular importance to West Bay when it is made more accessible by the Master Ground Transportation Plan. That is the whole crux of the matter. That is what is wanted.

As I said before, when we look here where it says some of the traffic considerations might be improved after the realisation of the Master Ground Transportation Plan. Boy! That is it. It now says: "Furthermore, permanent moorings would need to be installed in order for cruise ships to land their passengers at West Bay." It says that, "these would also represent a further financial consideration." Tell me, did they have to provide that for George Town? Do they have it for George Town? Do they have it for Spotts? This is, as I said, very biased. This Report is very biased. And they say it is professionally done! A little school boy would have done better than this.

It says the number of taxis allowed for, in an assessment of facilities and requirements, is 50. How many are required for George Town? How many are required for Spotts? When those boats come in and anchor at Spotts, every taxi goes to Spotts - everyone comes to town. They would do likewise going to West Bay. So I cannot buy that that particular place would need all of these amenities. It says here: "There would need to be a relocation of residents in the immediate vicinity in order to accommodate the required facilities. Such facilities would need to include on-site medical and police presence." Again, where are the medical facilities at Spotts? Where is the medical facility in George Town? They would have to go to the hospital in George Town the same way. I will agree, that might be a little closer, but that is all. The way I look at it, you have a clinic in West Bay, if that is not capable of handling the case, then you transport them to George Town. What you need then is a helicopter. (Members' Laughter) That is what you need to transport them fast, then you will not have to build any highway.

What really bothers me is that if it was Government wanting to put this landing in West Bay, they would have no fear of having to relocate people, the residents. On the Rock Hole Master Ground Transportation Plan they are going to have to relocate residents and they do not care about that.

MR. MCKEEVA BUSH:

Hear, hear!

MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH:

They are hell bound, and hell bent to do that, if they get the go ahead. But, because it is someone else's request to do this, it will be a bother and a burden to the rest of these people. But let Government be the one that wants to do it - this is what grieves me, sir. Anyway, I believe I have had my say. I will leave it now for someone else to have their say. Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT:
Elected Member for the Lesser Islands.

Does any other Member wish to speak? (pause) The Second

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN:

Thank you, Mr. President.

What I have to say on this Motion will be brief. I tend to agree with the previous Speakers, that the Report which I have seen - The West Bay Landing Feasibility Study - (some of the various descriptions apply), that it is biased. It has a political leaning. In presentation, I think, there is unprofessionalism in it and I think it is rather personal.

I have seen various Government reports and I have read many of them. I wonder, for example, why, in the circular letter which was sent out to various persons in the West Bay area. It was so worded that it included the name of the Member who moved the Motion. I would have thought it would have stated, "Following a Motion moved in the Legislative Assembly", regarding such and such, without having to name the particular Member who moved that Motion. I think that creates a personal situation that was unnecessary. Particularly that the individual is a politician and he will have those who support him or who do not. It certainly creates somewhat of a bias and a personal condition there.

I also note in this questionnaire that it has, what I consider, preconceived ideas about what was wanted or what was requested, as it says in its simplest form this would consist of a solid dock, large enough to receive between four and six cruise ship tenders, a parking lot to accommodate about 50 taxis, a number of associated buildings including restrooms, Customs and Immigration, Police, tourist information, refreshments, shaded seating areas, telephone and a medical facility. I would have thought that a feasibility study - a questionnaire - would have left it open to the persons who were being circularised to say what they thought, if they agreed with it or not and what they thought might be necessary. I would think it was certainly within the terms of reference of the Committee to request from the various Government Departments named here to give their views on it.

I have also noticed that each letter that was sent out to the various Government agencies tended to be worded in a different way and it did not necessarily leave it open for their unbiased approach in reply. I noticed in one letter, I think it was the one from the Water Authority, the person replying noted that they did not know specifically what was being asked of them, but then they commented on the part of the water and so on. So I think, and I do not want to blame any particular person, if this Report follows the trend of normal Government reports that I have seen, this is definitely off mark from that type of position.

I also note that, for example, even in the reply from the Police that they seem to not speak specifically to areas that I think would normally affect them, or that they would be responsible for, such as the parking. There was mention of that to some extent. They were quite specific on the question of illicit drugs. But there were other statements such as, whether the cruise ship visitors are likely to use local dive/snorkel ventures as opposed to those in the George Town area. I find that peculiar for the Police to be really offering an opinion on that, when I think that would be more in line with the people who are in that particular type of business. And as it has been noted by other Speakers, there also arises the question of the Master Ground Transportation Plan. That seems to run fairly central through this Report.

In another letter included from this Report from the Police, there is comment as to whether the police officer writing cannot understand the need to consider West Bay when considerable Government investment has recently made to the George Town jetty. Again, that seems to fall outside the ambit of comment that might be expected from that particular specialised agency.

It appears to me that the question of this jetty has been blown way out of proportion, at least to the extent that I understood it, because as I recall when the Motion was passed there was considerable adjournments in the House that day and changes on it when it was finally passed. My understanding was that it was supposed to be a jetty of a size which could take cruise ship tenders, cruise ship tenders could come to it and it would accommodate them. It was certainly not my understanding that cruise ships would be expected to anchor off West Bay. I understood it to be the tenders would come from cruise ships but they would not necessarily be anchoring in areas such as I hear now and are reported to be from the Report.

I did a bit of inquiring about it, including one sea captain in Cayman Brac, who told me that he has rode out a Northwester in that particular area three days on the *Miro*, a ship that used to ply these waters. I could not quite understand it because I thought it would be rough there, but I was made to understand that there is somewhat of a nook in there and it is not as rough in that particular area as one might expect. So from that point of view there was at least one person who agreed that a dock could be created there. It is also my understanding that historically, a dock has existed in this area in the past and, whether or not that was the case, my understanding was that it was not something as grandiose as [what is] being envisioned in this Report.

I find that it is unfortunate. I think, that the persons involved with this Report have had to come up against the criticism that they have today, but one approach precipitates another. Something that stuck me very severely was, in the presentation of the Member, that he said that he had a tape of the meeting which the two Elected Members for West Bay held. I am told it was held inside a Church hall and it was, for all practical purposes, a closed meeting. The press and so on were not allowed. In fact, I heard one of the Members telling a reporter that afternoon of the meeting in the Legislative Assembly that the press was not welcome or not required and that it was strictly for the people in the surrounding area.

I find it questionable, for from what knowledge I have of the service I realise, particularly the special branch, covers just about all areas of existence in this society. But there are certain times when it is not expected that they would, and if they did, I would have thought that any reports or tapes they may have had, they would have passed to the Member responsible and that it should not have been the case that the Member presenting this Report would be threatening anyone in the House with the extent of the

knowledge which they had of the particular meeting as was taped.

I really cannot see the need for the extent to which this matter has gone and I believe the whole Report is very biased and very political. If the Government was against the idea of opening a jetty there, it was easy to say so without going to the extent that has been done in this Report. From a professional point of view, I wonder if approval was given by the Portfolio, or if the person preparing this Report had the permission to reproduce in this Report letters from various persons, as has been done here. From what I know of such reports, you get replies from the various people you solicit them from and you extrapolate the facts from that and you present a summation of the facts with conclusions and recommendations.

This is a most peculiar two volume Report. I agree with the Member who has moved the Motion that if Government is not going to approve the jetty, so be it. He is not further asking them to, but it would be better for all concerned to pretend that this Report did not truly exist and think it would be wrong if the recommendations here were to come forward, truly, as what Government in truly recommending under the circumstances.

So having said that, I would simply vote that this Report does not exist, or that the recommendations not be taken as they have been presented. Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT:

The Honourable Member for Education.

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS:

Mr. President, as one who has always advocated a jetty for landing of tourists in West Bay, I find this a rather interesting subject to debate. Suffice it to say when the Motion that gave rise to this study and, hence, this Report was being debated, I said at that time that my advocacy and support for the jetty in West Bay was always conditioned by the fact that I knew that some form of feasibility study would have to be made before we could undertake the construction.

When I was asked by the Chairman of the Committee that prepared this Report for my comments as recorded in the Report I had two overriding concerns. My view was that those were the two issues on which the landing of tourists in West Bay would stand or fall. They were - how many days of the years would be lost to inclement weather, and secondly, whether the cruise ships would use the facility if it was built.

In reading the Report, throughout the comments made by the local pilot, the Captains of the various cruise ships and the cruise lines that were questioned, one thread is interwoven and that is the weather conditions that would prevail at the site. On page 42 of the Report it states: "The winds that blow from the southeast around through to the northwest for 20 per cent of the year", which represents 73 days. I understand this information to have been obtained from the weather bureau which is located at the airport in the centre of the Island, if not nearer to the side opposite south. It goes on to say: "That for 12 per cent of the time [which is 44 days], the wind from that direction exceeds 8 knots." I made the point about the location of the station merely to emphasize that it is my belief that if you are registering 8 knots at the weather station, if you are at an exposed part of the coast such as where this dock would be located, you could expect it to be at least 10 knots and above.

The letter from the local pilot mentioned that on the day when he surveyed the area, the wind was from the southeast at 10 knots and he considered the conditions at that time dangerous, if not impossible, for tendering passengers to and from a cruise ship. As I understood the facility which we have been talking about all of these years, and I still understand it, we are talking about a facility that would permit the Port Authority, or whomever would be controlling the traffic of the ships, to be able to say that on Thursday of each week or Tuesday and Thursday, or Tuesday and Friday, whatever, one or the maximum of two ships, we have always talked principally of one, would be allocated to the West Bay area.

If, for 20 per cent of the year, the dock would be unusable because of weather conditions, it would seem to me that it would be impossible to roster ships coming to the Island on the basis that they could always go to West Bay. So it would mean that if they could not use West Bay because particularly of a south/southeast wind, then they would have to be diverted to George Town or by-pass the Island altogether. So it would seem that if the research did nothing else it assured us that we need to think very seriously, and probably study more closely, this whole question of the use that could be made of such a facility, if it were built and because in addition to the winds being from the southeast through west, there are times in the year when we get what we call spring-tide seas, that you would also not be able to use a dock located in the area we are talking about. So you could add those days, however many they might be, to the 73 we have already determined from the weather bureau.

For example, this morning it would have been impossible to use the dock in West Bay, even though George Town was like a mill pond. There was a heavy sea running in West Bay this morning in the area - so much so that I changed my direction and came around the back road to see properly what the weather looked like. It is a fact that many of the passengers on the ships are old and we have to give special consideration to them. I am not going to get into the argument of whether the Report has been professionally done or anything else.

The argument that I am going to stick by is that it seems to me that a red flag has been waved, as far as I am concerned, on the construction of the pier - simply on the use that could be made of it - by what they have found from the weather patterns. I would suggest that we certainly give very serious consideration to further studies of the weather before we talk about investing any money in the pier.

With those few remarks I am going to do as the last Member said, or the one before him, leave it for somebody else to have their say.

MR. PRESIDENT:

The Honourable Member for Tourism.

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN:

Mr. President, I rise to speak to the Motion that is presently before this House, which refers to a feasibility study which was prepared on the West Bay Landing. I, like the last two or three Members who spoke on this, will be very brief, but I felt that it is only fair that I put in my small contribution for whatever it may be worth. I think it is unfortunate that the discussion in the House today has taken the turn that it has, because I have to say in all honesty and sincerity that I do not believe that the Committee which prepared this study went into this with any preconceived ideas or thoughts. I think it would be unfortunate for anyone to glean the impression that Government is against development in the district of West Bay that would further enhance the business community there, extend business opportunities to more Caymanians and to improve the facilities that are provided and now offered to cruise ship passengers.

I, for one, can assure any Member of this House, and the public in general, that I would certainly never stand against any development that will improve and offer those opportunities to our people. West Bay is a good attractive district. It is certainly worthy of and entitled to any development that any other part of these Islands are entitled to and has been said, it presently provides two of the main tourist attractions for us. Far be it for anyone drawing the faulty conclusion that it is because of Government standing against any new development of this kind in West Bay.

I believe that the conclusions reached are certainly from the result of an examination of most of the facts. The cruise ship business is important to our economy. There are many arguments put for and against this. But I maintain that this business is important to our economy. I also believe it is important that the facilities be provided, upgraded and improved so that we can provide a desirable service to the cruise ship passengers that we now have.

Two years ago a policy decision was taken for us to only allow three cruise ships per day. This policy has generally been adhered to, except maybe three or four times per year - I think this year there were three times, and next year there will probably be two or three. There is an overlap of various cruise line programmes and for those two or three days we end up with four ships instead of three. This does create an overcrowding situation in the centre of town, and I believe that we need to examine means of trying to relieve the pressure on the centre of town on those days.

When the cruise ship facility for West Bay was being discussed, it was my understanding that it would be used not only as a weather alternate, but in addition to the George Town anchorage as well, because Spotts has been mentioned. If we look at the number of times that the Spotts anchorage is used in a year, I am sure it does not exceed three or four times. Government has purchased land there and is in the process of providing facilities there that should be provided for our visitors. But if you look at the size of the investment for the number of times it has to be used as a weather alternate, you could not justify that investment.

Regardless of any argument that is put for or against this cruise ship facility in West Bay, to me my overriding concern, as the Member responsible for Tourism, is certainly on page 25 of the Report, the points which have been made by the Watersports Association, and in the second paragraph and I quote: "The Association's concerns are with the economic and environmental impacts of such a development. The association states in its correspondence that the directing of cruise ships to the West Bay Bight area will cause severe damage to the most popular and internationally reputed reefs in that area."... They go on to list their reasons. To me this is an overriding factor. This is a serious concern that certainly has to be taken into consideration because we would in fact be penny wise and pound foolish if we were to provide a facility and divert a cruise ship there and destroy the very attractions that we now have to bring divers to our country.

So, that is my concern and I trust that, in spite of all the exchanges that have taken place here today, in the final analysis we can find a way to improve facilities and, if not to the satisfaction of all concerned, certainly to the satisfaction of the cruise ship visitors which make a valuable contribution to our economy.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT:

The First Elected Member for Bodden Town.

MR. ROY BODDEN:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Originally I had intended not to speak on this issue but I believe that someone needs to try to neutralise some of the emotions and tempers. Few issues in this recent sitting of this Assembly have been debated with such venom and bitterness. Quite frankly, I am left to wonder where are we going to end? I believe that the lesson that was supposed to have been learned, has not been learned. I have to say that if things continue it is not going to have a good ending.

I am reminded, and I would like to remind the House, politics is the art of compromise. This particular issue should not have reached this level. I am not going to comment on the Report, I am not going to comment any further on the debate because I believe that some sides and some arguments have been eloquently, even if temperamentally, argued. What I am going to comment and debate on is the path that I think we are taking because we are letting our arrogance and our pomposity run away with us.

If I recall correctly, when this issue was first aired here in September, I do not think it was the understanding of the Member who brought it, namely, the First Elected Member for West Bay, to have any elaborate jetty. I believe that the rest of us, at least those of us on this side of the House, agreed. I was under the understanding that the Government had agreed. I cannot see why there is so much intransigence that the Honourable Member presenting this Report was so stuck and so intent on running rough-shod over the rest of the House that it had to come to this kind of battle royal.

I am saying again...

POINT OF ORDER

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: On a Point of Order, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: State your Point of Order, please.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Under Standing Order 35(4), I think the Member is imputing improper motive. I did not run rough-shod on this House. I presented the Report as it was given to me, sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: I do not think the Member imputed improper motives. He is referring to what he sees is the manner, rather than motivation.

MR. ROY BODDEN: Thank you, Mr. President. I have to say again that as a new Member, quite frankly I am disillusioned because these kinds of confrontations I believe serve us no purpose because we are wasting the time of the Honourable House. We are arguing against odds and I am afraid that in the end it is calling for a show down for which we may not be prepared. I am saying that what is expected for a jetty in West Bay is entirely logical. I was a conservationist before many people were concerned with the issue in Cayman, it is not out of the financial ambitions of what we can afford in this country now. It is not unreasonable. I would like to make the point that as a developing country we have to be careful that we do not develop the centre to such an extent that we crowd it at the expense of the periphery.

I do not see what is wrong, where is the grave sin in putting a little jetty in West Bay to accommodate some of the cruise ship business. I can understand the concerns of the Watersports Association, of the conservationist and the ecologist, but I say it is practical. I say it is needed because anyone who travels through George Town on cruise ship day will know that we need some sharing of facilities. Spotts is only seasonal. My question is what is the big deal?

May I end on a cautionary note? This kind of confrontational politics is leading us nowhere, and leading us nowhere fast. Thank you, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Honourable Member for Communications and Works.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, I share the view with the First Elected Member for Bodden Town, that arrogance gets us nowhere. He has repeated this several times and I am sure even he is convinced of this. In this House, as in other aspects of our lives, politics is the art of compromise. I am the first to say that. As a matter of fact, that phrase may have been taken from the many times I have repeated that - even in the Common Room today.

Like the Honourable Member for Tourism, I, too, am somewhat disappointed that so many nasty remarks were passed about the members of this Committee. They were called 'rascals', and other similar uncomplimentary names. That is the sort of behaviour we do not need in this House. When we talk about behaviour, when some Members talk of their experience as school masters, they must realise that we are not now in a class room. We must accept our colleagues on equal standing. We must give due respect to our colleagues. We are not dealing as a school master would deal with little children. We must show due respect to our colleagues and we have been bending backwards on the Government bench to try to accommodate the Backbenchers.

I am not going to make this very long because I did, in fact, enter into a very lengthy presentation of this Report. But it would be remiss of me today, if I sat down and did not come to the defence of the people who were part and parcel of this Report. For certain Members to state that the people involved with this were biased, that they were unprofessional. This is not fair to these individuals who assisted with this. They are not in this Assembly to even speak for themselves. That is not right, especially with the civil servants. They are given a job to do and they tried to do that job to the best of their ability. We, the Members of this House, are protected by the Immunity and Privileges of this House. Not the civil servants, or other people who carry out their duties from day to day.

I am satisfied that the Chairman and Coordinator, Mr. David Vousden, did a very good job. I am satisfied that the Deputy Director of Tourism, Mr. Timothy Hubbell, did a good job. I am satisfied that Mr. Errol Bush, the Director of Ports, did a good job. Miss Sara Webster, from Lands and Survey; Mr. Peter Barlas, Mr. Parke Patterson, both from the Planning Department; Miss Gina Ebanks, from the Natural Resources Unit; Mr. Peter Riley, an architect at Public Works; and, Mr. Donovan Ebanks our own Chief Engineer. I am satisfied that they all presented an unbiased and professional document for presentation to this House. They have no reason to do otherwise.

As a Member of this Committee, the Members of this House have my authority to approach any member of the Committee and ask them if I ever approached any one of them and made any suggestions for any inclusions in this document. As a matter of fact, when I received the letter, I called Mr. Vousden to my office and told him that I did not intend to make any comments at all as I wanted to be able to get up in this Honourable House and say that I had no part in the preparation of this Report. So for Members to get up in this House and lambaste the members of this Committee is totally unjustified and unfair to them. They did a very good job. I feel very strongly about that because if those members had been in a position to

speaking up for themselves, then I could understand this unreasonable attack on them here today. But, Members did not take time to mention all the input into this document. They tried to give the public the impression that this was biased, and a document that was schemed up by a group of people that were opposed to a jetty in West Bay. As the Honourable Member for Tourism just said, there is not one Member on this side of the House that would be opposed to seeing improvements in any district of the Cayman Islands - be it West Bay, Bodden Town, East End, North Side or wherever.

The question here is the feasibility of certain projects being put forward by the other side of the House. It is the feasibility we are looking into. That is the reason why this study has been called the West Bay Landing Feasibility Study. It is a feasibility study.

When I heard the remarks made about the people who were involved with this, I could not believe my ears because had the Members read both volumes of this study they would have seen comments made by some of our leading citizens in this country. Comments from such people as Mr. Atlee Bodden, and Miss Maureen Bodden from the Bodden Shipping Company, people who have been in the cruise ship business for years. They are highly respected citizens of this country. Also, comments made by people of the calibre of Mrs. Vita Bodden, the Managing Director of H.O. Merren and Company, who has also had a tremendous amount of experience in shipping in this country. I must submit that this Report was made on the basis of the information received from those people who were contacted. There is no truth that this questionnaire was misleading. The questionnaire was quite straightforward. It did, in fact, mention the name of the First Elected Member for West Bay, but the reason I understand that this was mentioned, was because that Member had brought the Motion and the Coordinator and Committee and point forward that this was, in fact, a Motion coming from the Member of that district. Maybe the name should not have been mentioned. But, I can assure you, Sir, and this Honourable House that no bad faith was intended in mentioning that.

The contents of the questionnaire that went, because we have heard so much about it, I feel it is only fair that we should know what that questionnaire contained. The questionnaire read:

"Following a Private Member's Motion from the First Elected Member for West Bay (Mr. McKeeya Bush) the Government is looking at the possibility of developing a cruise ship landing jetty and associated shore facilities for West Bay. The most likely area for such a development would be along the Boggy Sands Road.

In its simplest form this would consist of a solid dock large enough to receive between 4 and 6 cruise ship tenders, a parking lot to accommodate about 50 taxis, a number of associated buildings including rest-rooms, customs and immigration, police, tourist information, refreshments, shading seating areas, telephones and a medical facility.

However, in order to attract tourists to the area and to satisfy their requirements it would almost certainly be necessary to develop further than this. Small cottage industries such as weaving and basket-making would prove attractive and gift/souvenir shops would be necessary. Some duty-free facilities would need to be provided also as well as restaurants and a well kept beach area.

The Government feels that it is important to seek the opinion of local residents on this matter and we would therefore appreciate your voluntary cooperation in completing the following questionnaire."

Even though this questionnaire may not have been headed on Government paper, there is no question from the initial reading of it that this was in response to a Government Motion. So there is no question that this was a legal document.

The questionnaire had seven points on it. First, the name of the individual, the address, how long they had lived in that area. The fourth question asked was do you own a business or land in West Bay. The fifth question, have you read the statement above concerning the proposed landing facilities? Question number 6, are you in favour of such facilities as are proposed above being developed in West Bay? Question number 7, would you give your reasons for your answer to question 6? Number 8 was, are there any further comments which you would like to make regarding this project or the cruise ship issue generally? It was to be signed, "I the undersigned have answered all of the above questions. I have read the comments as recorded on this questionnaire and state that these are a true recorded of my answers".

I have seen a number of questionnaires and I cannot see where this questionnaire could have gone afloat, or of where it could have insulted any member or resident of that district. It is a fair, straightforward questionnaire that is seeking to get factual answers - objective, in order for the Committee to prepare an objective report. I had intended to comment on a number of the points raised by the Members on the other side, but, as was said by previous Speakers, this whole matter has been totally taken out of context. It is most unfortunate that this unbiased, comprehensive and objective Report should have been used to cause so much confrontation in this House today. It appears that every opportunity that Backbenchers can find to tear into the Government bench, they do so.

I agree with the First Elected Member for Bodden Town, that the situation in this House is getting so bad that we may not be able to continue this way. The people of this country put us in here to represent them, not to continually fight in this House about simple matters. Every matter of

consequence that is brought here is torn apart. Even the Budget is being torn apart when, in fact, it is quite clear that that was following a certain path in accordance with the Economic Development Plan.

Even the Master Ground Transportation Plan that was agreed and tabled in this House from March, 1988, was an area for much debate. Every chance they get, they are using it to try to discredit this side of the House. They talk about cooperation. I would like to see them demonstrate that cooperation. We, the four Elected Member of Executive Council, have tried on many occasions to sit with certain Backbenchers, certain of them, and discuss matters. Even some of the meeting that were called were not attended.

All I am saying today, I am not trying to make a confrontational issue out of this. I believe in the spirit of compromise, because politics is the art of compromise. Rather than have confrontation I believe in cooperation but, cooperation works both ways. If we are to be a Government in this country, then we must get some support from the Backbench. I do not mind criticism, because when I was a Backbencher myself, I often did not agree with the Government bench, but at no time did we try to pull down every issue that was brought before the House...

POINT OF ORDER

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:
debate the Member is giving.

On a Point of Order. I would like to know the relevance of the

MR. PRESIDENT:

it is true that the debate has ranged widely, but I think at the moment he is addressing points made by the First Elected Member for Bodden Town.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Also the points raised by the points raised by the First Elected Member for West Bay.

The debate on this Motion this morning, when Standing Order 83 allowed for Standing Order 19 and 24 to be waived, this was the due regular parliamentary process. We accepted that. There was nothing wrong with that. The Motion before the House follows the parliamentary and democratic process of this House. But let us, in discussing this Motion, try not to include too much sensationalism, too much emotion, let us deal with this as a Report that was made in good faith - a professional Report. Let us desist from name-calling and from referring to the members of the Committee in derogatory terms.

We are all trying to do our best in this House. We have certain responsibilities and we are trying hard to carry them out. It would be very helpful to the Government bench if Members of the Backbench could sometimes show some degree of support to us.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Proceedings are suspended for 15 minutes.

MR. PRESIDENT:

AT 3:36 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 3:56 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Proceedings are resumed.
The Honourable Member for Communications and Works.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON:

Mr. President, I beg the leave of the Chair to rise on a Point of Information.

POINT OF INFORMATION

MR. PRESIDENT:

Proceed.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON:

Mr. President, during the presentation of this Report, reference was made to a tape in my possession. I wish to clarify any misunderstanding which any Member of this honourable House may have concerning this tape. This tape was not obtained from any Government department, including the Police Department or the news media.

Thank you, Sir.

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE

MR. PRESIDENT:

Continuation of the debate on this Motion. Does any Member wish to speak? (pause) If no other Member wishes to speak, would the Mover wish to reply?

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:

Mr. President, I would like to thank those Members who spoke forthrightly and agreed with me that the Report is biased. It is unprofessional and I move that we reject it. Whatever happens to the West Bay landing facility would be left up to Government and Executive Council since they are the policy-makers and they have the final say. I cannot do anything more than I have done to carry out what I think was a genuine promise and request from the people from West Bay. We look at that proposition, it has been long standing for 11 years.

I would like to comment on some of the things that were said here although much of what was said by the Government response was neither here nor there. A lot of crocodile tears have been shed - I will refer to them in due course.

It seems weather was the greatest concern of the Honourable Member for Education. Was it? Or is it because certain people say that it would destroy the environment? He agreed for it to go in the Turtle Farm area. I wonder how often it would be used in that area? The other point he made was the reference to elderly passengers on the cruise ship. I wonder if he could explain to the House what those elderly people do in George Town. I hope I am not misquoting him, but I thought he said, "that we must do a further study before investing money". I do not know why he would want another study, especially if the same people were going to do it. I think this thing has been studied, and studied, and studied long enough.

We have done our part. It is in their hands. They are the Executive Council in this country, the cabinet, the policy makers, the decision makers - it is left up to them. This Motion only reads that we reject this bias and unprofessional Report. I am not making any other move. It is left up to them now. The ball is in their court.

The Member for Tourism seemed to feel like the diving cartel does - that the provision of a landing site in West Bay would destroy the dive sites. I wonder how it would destroy it? I wonder how the cruise ships anchored out in what is known in West Bay as White Hole would destroy the dive sites? They seem to worry about a Marine Park. I had urged Government before, they had better take a serious look at that policy of where they have the fishing rights now and where the Marine Park is. I have talked to them before about it. But, of course, we hear that we do not make any proposals to them.

But in relation to what the Member for Tourism said, I find it hard to see how both the Member for Tourism and the Member for Education could be against it. They were for it before, and the reefs were there in 1980 to 1984 when the Member for Education was in this Honourable House as the Third Elected Member. The reefs were there then too, but he was for it - right in that chair proposing it. It is in the Hansard, proposing it for that area. And the First Member from George Town, the now Member for Tourism was for it. The reefs were there. The divers were there. What is the big change with the two Members now.

POINT OF CLARIFICATION

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN:

Mr. President, on a Point of Clarification, sir, if the Member will allow me. The Member speaking refers to me being for a cruise ship facility to be built in West Bay. I am not clear as to exactly what he is referring to but in any event, regardless of what my position was at the time, no proper study was done. I suppose, at any given time, a person can offer what their position is. However, once the facts of a study are revealed, there is nothing wrong with that Member then viewing that proposal in another light. That remains my position.

Mr. President, on a Point of Clarification, sir, if the Member will allow me. The Member speaking refers to me being for a cruise ship facility to be built in West Bay. I am not clear as to exactly what he is referring to but in any event, regardless of what my position was at the time, no proper study was done. I suppose, at any given time, a person can offer what their position is. However, once the facts of a study are revealed, there is nothing wrong with that Member then viewing that proposal in another light. That remains my position.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:

Mr. President..

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS:

Would you give me an opportunity?

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:

Not I am not giving way anymore, Mr. President. That should be the last Member who would want to stand in this House to contradict me. They had their chance to speak...

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS:

It just seems that he is hard of understanding, or has a bad memory.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:

No, I do not have a bad memory. He was the Member in 1980 for it! He was the Member in 1984 for it, and again in 1988 he was for it, in the same spot that we are proposing! Why has he changed his mind? He had not seen the study or had not put it together. Which one? Mr. President, I contend that might be so...

[addressing Hon. Benson O. Ebanks] Sit down! I am not giving way, sir. I gave way to the Member for Tourism, he is usually not a bad fellow, but the rest of them? (Members' laughter)

I distinctly remember the Member for Tourism promising me up until last year that they would support that proposition. However, now he says he has changed his mind because he has seen the study. Well, I cannot say what is in their mind except I can see what they have told me.

We object to this Report because we feel that it is biased. It is wrong for them to have done the kind of report, acting on behalf of Government, that they did. Now, I want to move to the Member responsible for this subject. The Member started by talking about cooperation from Backbenchers. He went into talk about the Civil Service and name calling. I do not have to stand in this House, under any kind of privilege to tell that man who did that Report that he is a rascal. I would stand in the streets of George Town and let him know.

I agree that we should at all times hold the civil service in high regard. This Member certainly does. I realise that Governments come and go but the civil service lasts forever. But should I, as a politician, as an Elected Member of the Parliament in this country, stand by and let those kinds of people lick me and get away with it? No, Sir! If they want respect they must give it.

I stand up for the civil service. Nobody ever saw me striking any civil servant down. I stand up for the civil service. So they do not need to come here with their crocodile tears talking about anybody lambasting the civil servants. We love the civil servants so much, and we respect their

position in this country so much, that we are going to put a figure in the Budget in the Finance Committee for that raise that they should have put themselves. Yet they love the civil service, you know. They must think they are talking to fools. The civil service knows them quite well. If that Member did not want a reply, why did he, as the Member, allow the personal things to be put into the Report by those members of the civil service (if that is what they are)? I do not know. Sometimes I hear they are co-opting people now in the civil service. I do not know if that is true or not. You really do not know who is in the civil service these days.

I would like to find out for the House that it was the Member who got into the naming of persons and the promotions of them. But, he got caught. He thought he was having the last say, as he usually does, beating up people and making smart remarks. Listen! Listen! Take the tape and listen how the Member read the Report. Take the tape and listen to it! And I must sit and take it? He was the one who had to jab me in his presentation. Now he is trying to be suitor to everybody.

Confrontation? We have not, on this side, asked for any confrontation. We have tried to work with the Executive Council time, and time again. But it is them. When they cannot have their way, when we refuse to vote money for things that we do not know about, when we refuse to give them money, figures that we know nothing about, that is when they get up on their high horses. Like the Master Ground Transportation Plan and other projects that they have in mind. But they are not going to get that kind of support.

Now, the Member said we were invited to a meeting. I would like him to tell the House which meeting I was invited to that I did not attend, and what time that meeting was held. I will give way for him. I would give way for him. Which meeting? The fact is - the Budget was mentioned, I want to refer to this - this is the first time in my life here as a Member that the Estimates were put together and this Member was not called and said McKeeva, what do you think about this, and we do have your list from 1984 and this is what we are going to include. How can you run a country like that? Now you want us to come here and vote blindly for you? The old extension cord was voted out in 1988. She is not here now to help you.

We refuse to be extension cords and whatever happens, will happen. I just want to let the world and this House know this. I was not born in this Legislative Assembly. If it happens that the West Bay people remove me, fine. But until such time that that is done, I am going to carry out my Constitutional duty and that is to oppose the wrongs, the injustices that those Members in Executive Council are perpetuating in this country, and I will continue, where I can, to give my constituents good representation.

Mr. President, they talk about trying to work with them. They have consultancies for nine months. Professional, or supposedly professional people, from the United States who went to universities and all sorts of things, nine months helping them and they come in that Common Room and expect this side of the House to okay everything in half-an-hour and when we do not do it then they said we are fools. We are fools! No, we are not fools. It is because we are so smart that they are having a difficult time. We do not tear everything apart, as the Member said. What we tear apart is the rubbish that is brought to this House and pushed down our throats and when we do not stand for it, then you hear them talking about, crying, trying to blame us and about confrontations. They are the biggest confrontationists.

This country did not forget who went out their with a petition and tried to stir up the people and call new Elections - the Member for Communications and Works. I have to live in this country. I do not want anything to happen to this country. I have a business, I have employees, I have a family, I have children and everything I have is here. I do not have anything in Panama.

As far as trying to work with them, I did that time, and time again. When we had the problem with Cayman Airways, who was the Member that went out there and said: "look fellows, we do not want anything to happen to this beloved Isle Cayman?" While we can disagree, or we must agree to disagree, and what happened - we signed an accord. Then what happened - the Members of Executive Council went out the same night and took a sledge hammer and licked us in the head. I gave way for him that, they had to get something off their chests. So I said: "look, be that as it may, let them go". But what happened. They came to West Bay then, they were not satisfied beating their chests like King Kong, "we are the professionals and you are a bunch of idiots." I must sit and take that? Thirteen hundred and sixteen people voted for McKeeva, and no King Kong is going to make me change my type of representation - assertive and honest.

There was some other propaganda being spread that I was going to get something out of this. If I had gotten anything out of putting a jetty there, it would have been in an honest, legal manner. Not on the backs of this country. I have never, and will never, be a 10 per center.

We asked them to meet with us on the Labour Law. They promised they would meet with us on the Labour Law. What did they do? They brought it to the House. They did not want to hear what we had to put in after we gave them the okay for the things they wanted, they did not come back. I tried to get it done here. They refused. And they are trying to blame us.

They must understand that we are not little boys. We are not extension cords. We try to do what is best for this country. But they must understand that they cannot rule in isolation. We will work with them, but first they must be truthful, they must tell us what is going on so that we can make proper judgments. They cannot get out there and give you cock and bull stories, and when you try to make a decision you do not know what is left from right. How can we operate as representatives like that?

I am tired about hearing this thing about confrontationists every time we oppose one of their little grandiose schemes. Anytime they need to be whipped in line, that is what we are here for. We are the watchdogs for the people, and you can believe me, we have a lot to be on guard for. You hear what I tell you. There are things happening in this country that people never thought it would happen and if we get out there and say anything about it you hear that we are trying to disrupt the country. No, Sir! We are only doing what is right - keeping people informed, standing by what is right, opposing them in the foolishness they come up with.

Enough has been said on this matter. Believe you me, I do not like to have to move this kind of resolution, and it has no reflection whatsoever on those honest people on the Committee. And there are honest people and people I respect. But there are some scruffs there, and I am not going to sit down and let them bamboozle me and put the kind of foolishness that they put in that report after promising that they would call us and discuss with me whatever I had to say before he tabled it. If the Member was the kind of representative and the person he is projecting himself to be he would have told them before it was printed that it should not be put in there because it is not conducive to a proper, professional Report, becoming of the Cayman Islands Government.

On those grounds I ask this side of the House to vote with me. Whether or not West Bay gets a jetty that will enable cruise ship passengers to come to West Bay is a decision for those four men over there. As far as I am concerned, when it is properly determined, they can do what they like. But this Report is a great insult to this House. It is a great insult to Members on this side of this House and I ask all Members on this side to throw it out in the garbage bin where it deserves to be.

Before I take my seat, there was one remark that was made, and that was concerning some tape of a meeting. I would like to explain that to the House. When we brought this Motion I was going to have a public meeting. But in fairness to the Committee I said no, let them carry out their work. After they have done their Report, I will take it to the public and discuss it with the residents, whom I knew were really upset about certain things. I called a meeting in the Church hall so that it would not be any rough meeting - no adversarial tactics would go on. I was asked by the reporters if they could come and I said no, this is not a public meeting as such. I aired the meeting on the Bulletin Board on Radio Cayman as a round table discussion. I was surprised to find a policeman there, but I did not object. The police can go anywhere they want, but I was surprised to find a policeman, as much as I respect that policeman, taping the discussion of that nature. I felt at that time that they could be better employed in situations where they were more needed but, nevertheless, I did not object. But it was not a public meeting, as such. It was a round table discussion to get views and ideas from residents. I just wanted to clear this matter up. Enough has been said.

I thank all Members for their support on this. As I said it casts no aspersions on the entire civil service, but there are, and I repeat, there are some people who are not professionals and very biased on that Committee. Therefore the Report needs to be thrown out. Thank you.

The question will now be put. Those in favour, please say Aye...

MR. PRESIDENT:
Those against, No.

AYES AND NOES

Would you take a division, please, Clerk?

MR. PRESIDENT:

CLERK:

DIVISION NO.31/89

AYES: 8

NOES: 7

- Mr. McKeeva Bush
- Mr. John Jefferson
- Mr. Truman Bodden
- Capt. Mabry Kirkconnell
- Mr. Gilbert McLean
- Mr. Roy Bodden
- Mr. Franklin Smith
- Mr. John McLean

- Hon Thomas Jefferson
- Hon Richard Ground
- Hon Lemuel Hurlston
- Hon Norman Bodden
- Hon Benson Ebanks
- Hon Ezzard Miller
- Hon Linford Pearson

THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE WEST BAY FEASIBILITY STUDY 1 AND 2 REJECTED.

MR. PRESIDENT:
to adjourn a few minutes early.

The House has had quite an active day and might be prepared

ADJOURNMENT

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON:
adjournment of this Honourable House until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

I think that is well deserved, Mr. President. I happily move the

MR. PRESIDENT:
tomorrow morning. Those in favour, please say Aye... Those against, No.

The question is that the House do now adjourn until 10:00

AYES.

The Ayes have it. The House stands adjourned until tomorrow

MR. PRESIDENT:

morning at 10:00.

AT 4:25 P.M. THE HOUSE STOOD ADJOURNED UNTIL 10:00 A.M., WEDNESDAY, 29TH NOVEMBER, 1989.

**WEDNESDAY
29TH NOVEMBER, 1989
10:05 A.M**

MR. PRESIDENT:

I will ask the Third Elected Member for West Bay to say prayers.

PRAYERS

MR. JOHN D. JEFFERSON, JR:

Let us Pray.

We beseech Thee so to direct and prosper the deliberations of the Legislative Assembly now assembled, that all things may be ordered upon the best and surest foundations for the glory of Thy Name and for the safety, honour and welfare of the people of these Islands.

Bless our Sovereign Lady Queen Elizabeth, the Queen Mother, Philip Duke of Edinburgh, Charles Prince of Wales, Diana Princess of Wales and all the Royal family. Give grace to all who exercise authority in our Commonwealth that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety may be established among us. Especially we pray for the Governor of our Islands, the Members of Executive Council and Members of the Legislative Assembly that they may be enabled faithfully to perform the responsible duties of their high office.

All this we ask for Thy great Name's sake. Amen.

Our Father, who art in Heaven, Hallowed be Thy Name, Thy Kingdom come. Thy will be done, in earth as it is in Heaven. Give us this day our daily bread: And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us: And lead us not into temptation; but deliver us from evil: For Thine is the Kingdom, the power and the glory, for ever and ever. Amen.

The Lord bless us and keep us: the Lord make His face shine upon us and be gracious unto us: the Lord lift up His countenance upon us and give us peace now and always. Amen.

MR. PRESIDENT:

The proceedings of the House are resumed. Government business - Bills. Continuation of the debate on the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill. The Honourable Member for Health continuing.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

BILLS

SECOND READING

THE APPROPRIATION (1990) BILL, 1989

(Debate continues thereon)

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER:

Yes, Mr. President, thank you.

Way back when the House was adjourned on Monday afternoon in the middle of my contribution on the Throne Speech, I was challenged to name the Members to whom I was referring when I said that in my opinion, my interpretation and my understanding of what they were trying to do from their political soapboxes, was to overthrow the Government. They preferred to use the word "step down". I would draw Members' attention to a publication of the *Caymanian Compass* for Monday, the 7th of August, 1989. The headlines reads: "Step Down Gracefully", and there are a number of pictures and a number of names. I will read the names under the pictures in order from left to right as they appear on the paper: Roy Bodden, Franklin Smith, McKeever Bush, John Jefferson Jr., Truman Bodden, John McLean and Gilbert McLean. The highlights of the article says, and there are three points: 1) "The seven MLAs are calling on the four Elected Members of Executive Council to step down"; 2) "They are considering whether to bring a censure Motion (vote of no confidence) to the House"; 3) "They can control the country's expenditure because they are the majority in Finance Committee." The *Newstar Magazine* of the same newspaper, special news bulletin of Monday, August the 7th, carries a similar story.

They might say that they were exercising their democratic right and they were not going to overthrow the Government. I assume that it was just coincidental that that all happened and they tried their democratic coup, while three Members of Executive Council were off the Island. History will prove whether the issue that brought about that political turmoil has slowed down the Government by some months because Executive Council had to answer their criticism is right or it is wrong. I believe the Government is satisfied for that to be put to the test of history.

Now, the Honourable Financial Secretary clearly demonstrated in his Budget Address that in spite of the position put forward by certain Members, the public Debt of this country is still very manageable and represents prudent financial management and fiscal policy by this and previous

Governments. The fact that the Public Debt service payments rose by only 4 per cent from 1983 to 1987 does not suggest that we are mortgaging our children's future, nor do the other statistics which the Honourable Financial Secretary gave in his Budget Address in direct relation to that point.

What the Opposition has described as grandiose, prestige projects of this Government are, in fact, necessary investments in the infrastructure in order to preserve, not necessarily to allow additional development in this country, but in order to simply preserve the status quo and the present quality of life that Caymanians are enjoying. That is what those projects are for. They will, in all likelihood, allow a certain amount of continued investment and development in the country.

Are they saying that modern, comfortable, top-quality dental care and other health services are too good for our people? The Government's position which is reflected in the Budget Address and the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure, including Capital, clearly demonstrates and clearly puts forward the position that Government believes that modern health care facilities and management systems and proper payment methods is not a frill nor a prestige project of some Member of Government, but is, in fact, an essential development step which is not wanted, is not desired but is, in fact, desperately needed for this country. I intend to demonstrate that here today.

The statistics to prove it because they oppose it and say we have not given them the information, we have not consulted them. I intend to tell the other side of that story before I sit down today. The country, the people in our communities, can decide whether we are giving them the information, whether they are being consulted and whether they are, in fact, simply putting stumbling blocks in the way for political expediency on their part with no real concern for the true genuine needs of the people of this country.

The people of this country deserve better. The Government is all we are trying to do in the Health Services. That is all we are trying to do in the Community College. That is all we are trying to do with the Pension Plan. That is all we are trying to do with the Master Ground Transportation Plan. That is all we are trying to do in the airline industry, and that is all we are trying to do in all the plans that Government is putting forward.

Let us look at the hard, cold facts of what is going on at the hospital and whether we need a new facility or whether that is just some pie-in-the-sky, some dream, some long term dream, the present Member responsible for Health Care and he is really only interested in putting up a white elephant that we really do not need. "We really do not need a new hospital", that is what they are saying.

Here are a few statistics. The surgical ward at the hospital presently has eight beds. During the month of January there were 19 days out of the month that we had more than eight surgical patients. The average was about 14. The month of February, there were 13 days that we had more than eight surgical patients. The month of March, there were 14 days that we had more than eight surgical patients. The month of April, there were 19 days when there were more than eight surgical patients. The month of May, there were 13 days we had more than eight surgical patients. June had 11 days where there were more than eight surgical patients. But we do not need a new surgical ward.

I will go on. Maternity - the maternity ward has seven beds. The month of January there were eight days when we had more than seven. Five days of that month we had 16 patients for seven beds. The month of March, we had one day. The month of February, we had none. The month of April, there were none except for one day we had an overlap - people checking in and people checking out. While that was going on there were 15 patients being shuttled around for seven beds. The month of May we had three days - 10 patients and one overlap day. The month of June we had one day where we had 18 patients for seven beds. We do not need a new maternity ward, that is a pie in the sky for Ezzard Miller. The prestige project for him. It is a grandiose project for the Government.

Newborn - we have seven beds. Eight days in January we were over capacity. February we had none. March there were three days. April there were 10 days where, at one point, we had 25 patients for seven beds. The month of May there were 10 days we were above capacity by an average of 4. In June we had 18 days out of the month of June when we were over capacity. The intensive care unit at the Pines where we have eight beds. January, February and March there was no overcrowding. Once in April we had seven over the number. Once in May we had 12 over the number. Once in June we had nine.

Yes, a new hospital is unnecessary they claim. Expansion, upgrading can take place at the present site. I am going to deal with that because I would like them to come up with a plan where either the maternity ward, the surgical ward or the neonatal area can be expanded on the present site without total disruption of the service. But they say the Government getting consultants to try and help us identify properly what our needs are and what we have to put in place, in terms of facilities to better serve our people, is a grandiose thing. Is a prestige project by the Government. We do not really need it.

None of those statistics that I quoted really mean anything unless and/or until you or I, or one of your loud ones, are being turned away because there is no room at the Inn. Maybe they would be satisfied if Government put up a tent outside to put them in. We have not arbitrarily decided that we need new facilities. We are working to try and improve what we have until we can get such facilities, if that is the final decision by Government.

I will tell you some of the things we are doing to try to deal with this urgent overcrowding. They are aware of it, I brought it to Finance Committee. They funded the Study. We are reviewing the surgical procedures. We are reviewing the way the operating theatre is utilised. We are trying to get more items put on ambulatory surgery and to discharge people as quickly as possible. But I wonder what our feeling would be when it comes home, when you have to be told, "Sorry old boy, can't deal with your appendectomy (which is about to kill you in 24 hours) today, we have no room at the Inn. We cannot operate on

you and leave you in the operating room. We do not have any space outside to put you. It does not appear that Parliament (the superior power) is prepared to give you funds to solve the problem." We have all heard the threats, "Not one red cent is going to be voted." Yes, Mr. President, this is a grandiose project of Government; this is a pie in the sky for the Member for Health. The people do not need adequate health care.

They say the consultants are a waste of time, that any person can draw a dental clinic; that any person can design a health service; that anybody can come up with a plan, the Government does not need to pay any experts to do that. In 1973 and 1975 Government did exactly what I am doing now - they got consultants to come in and draw up a 15 year plan. They started to implement the Plan. That Plan would have given us 90 beds by the year 1990. We now only have 60. That Plan gave us a physical layout for the present site which would have been conducive to quality health care. That Plan was done by the present Member for Education. The present Third Elected Member for George Town replaced him as the Member for Health, Education and Social Services (as the Portfolio was called prior to November 1988) and that Plan was kicked aside, put in the basement, not followed. We prevailed on the Member to continue with the Plan. It was not followed, and that is why we have the complex, uncoordinated, the almost unworkable unexpandable facilities that we presently have.

No one plans to fail. People only fail to plan. Even if your plan fails, the fact that you have a plan put together says that at least you are trying to identify the direction in which you wish to go. But they tell us that planning by Government is a waste of Government funds and time, that they can decide, that they are the only ones listening to the people of this country and Executive Council does not have time; that they know what is best for this country and that they will use their authority of a majority of votes to tell us what is best, irrespective of what we feel and what the experts tell us. They say that they are the experts on everything.

I have been fortunate to have been here for five years. I have never appointed myself expert on anything. I have put forward arguments for and against things proposed by Government within my area of expertise. But I have never appointed myself 'Poet Laureate' after quoting Julius Caesar, or purported that I am the only one that knows what is going on in the community. I guess they figure that we are imprisoned in the Glass House and that we do not really know what is going on. But I believe we will all soon find out what is going on. As the Honourable Financial Secretary said, and I quote:

"Given the fact that the manner in which a Government manages public finance, influence the growth performance of our economy, I would boldly state that our approach to fiscal management has played a large and supportive role in the growth and expansion of the economy throughout the 90s."

I agree, and I support his making that bold statement because I believe it is a fact. But what has to go along with that is the provision and the planned provision of a good and sound infrastructure for this country. If we are going to maintain our quality of life, we have to continue to improve the infrastructure in this country. If you look around you will see (and history will bear this out) that the Government of 1972 to 1976 put a lot of infrastructure in place. They faced, at that time, the same political badgering in doing that, which the present Government is facing today. Some of the players were different, most of the players are the same. At that time they were outside the Assembly, now they are inside. We lost eight years of keeping up. Some infrastructure was put in place during those eight years at the middle school; we had the great expense of Cayman Airways; we had a couple of other things. But each area was not evaluated properly and provided for because there was no plan. In 1984 the economy was in a shambles. That is borne out in the Financial Secretary's Budget Address and the reasons he has given for it, in terms of the influence of world economy, are sound reasons.

The economy has been rebuilt. Now the Government has to come forward. Now the Parliament, it holds the 15 Members of the Parliament - not as they are trying to make the public believe, the four Elected Members of Council - to come forward with plans to provide needed infrastructure. We are not over zealous. We are not over anxious. We are not really concerned about the title they have given us and the description of grandiose projects. We are reasonable, practical people. We understand it cannot be done in one year. We understand it cannot be done without funds. We understand it cannot be done without their support - they demonstrated that a few days ago when they vetoed the Master Ground Transportation Plan. Not a particular road, not a particular provision, but the Plan was vetoed. Are we now supposed to sit back and build roads only at the constituency level? Build roads that are only identified by the politicians involved because of representation from their constituents, and have no Plan? That is what they are telling the people of this country. Because they did not veto the funds for one road, they did not veto one road, they vetoed the Plan, because that part of the Plan which was previously approved becomes a nonsensical Plan without what was turned down here a few days ago. It is totally useless to build a road from Governor's Sound and terminate it at the garbage dump. That is what they say we should do by approving in May one set of Plans and vetoing the Plans that were going to make those roads useful and effective here, a few days ago. That is exactly where it terminates now - in the garbage dump. And that is political expediency, because they will now come back in the next Election and tell you that you have not done anything.

The Government is not foolish. The Government is not stupid. We are not about to build a road from Galleon Beach to the garbage dump that nobody can use at the cost of several million dollars. That is what they would like us to do, because then we would really be stupid and they could really convince the public that we are stupid - and we would be if we did that. So the only alternative is to put it all on a shelf. Effectively, because of rules of Standing Orders, nothing can be done for six months unless we take the route which they choose to take for the majority and suspend Standing Orders for political expediency to get the Plan brought back within six months. The people must understand that it was the Plan that was vetoed.

The transportation system is a part of a series of Plans that the

Government has proposed - it is an integral part. The Interim Report of the Hospital Consultants, their site selection was based on the fact that the Government had accepted the Master Ground Transportation Plan in 1988. The Government accepted that it was a good thing. The Government accepted that it was needed. The roads in the areas that they considered as alternate sites were approved in May. But it is unlikely that any of those roads, in fact, none of those roads can now be built.

They have eliminated the site because it is no good to build a hospital which you cannot get to. We could probably get trucks and bulldozers up there to build it, but they need the roads to get the people there. It was selected because with the Master Ground Transportation Plan eventually the north/south arterial way would give us expedient transport to West Bay and the Seven Mile Beach. The east/west arterial way would have given us expedient travel to the eastern districts, but we hear that the two Bodden Town Members are not going to allow Government to build any road behind their constituency because of two or three commercial entities in downtown Bodden Town, irrespective of what the people of East End or North Side want.

They have claimed that the health system (like the dental clinic and other areas which Government might accept based on recommendations by the International Health Care Corporation) is too good - too good, too impressive. That is for industrialised countries; that is too good and too impressive for the people of our country. Expand on the present site, there is plenty of room.

We looked very carefully at the alternatives. I just want to make the public aware of what is involved in this Health Care Consultancy (which is a waste of Government funds) and what kind of service and what kind of recommendations and input we are getting from it, because one Member says if he is not assured and given the full details of the \$900,000 in the Budget, they are going to veto it. My Portfolio has done its homework and the necessary research. We have done the necessary studies. We have looked at the problem and I will tell them what the \$900,000 is for. Then it is in their hands. They can veto it and put up a tent.

Earlier this year the Cayman Islands Government signed a contract with International Health Care Corporation. This is the consultancy that is being battered around these walls as a total waste of time. That contract called for two things: first, a review of the present health service systems as they are being provided; a review of the diseases and other demographic material to determine if there was any weaknesses in the present system and then to make recommendations to improve and/or correct the present weaknesses in this system. To recommend a management system and improve funding (if that was one of the areas of concern) and how it could be done.

Then there is a concurrent exercise going on with that which reviews the present physical facilities and identifies the shortcomings in those. It is to make recommendations on what physical facilities are needed, not desired or wanted by the Member for Health, but what are needed to deliver quality health services to the people of this country who deserve it.

Before those consultants can bring anyone to the Island, they have to have that person approved by my Portfolio as the person who appears to be capable, qualified, willing and able to do what they are bringing him in to do. When they bring him, they have to bring what is called an Activity Plan. That Activity Plan must cover the days they are here and tell us what they are going to do. The first thing they have to do when they come to this Island is to meet with my Portfolio to discuss that Activity Plan and have it approved.

What is an Activity Plan? Here is an example for the 1st of May through the 9th of May:

- Staff: J.M. Conti, T.J. Keller, D.L. Sellareo, D.J. Wildman.
- Activity: Task Force Meeting, (That is the meeting with my Portfolio)
- Allotted time: One quarter of a day.

- Staff: J.M. Conti, T.J. Keller, D.L. Sellareo, D.J. Wildman.
- Activity: Visit Northward Prison
- Allotted time: Quarter of a day.

- Staff: J.M. Conti, T.J. Keller, D.L. Sellareo, D.J. Wildman.
- Activity: Visit the Lesser Islands, Cayman Brac and Little Cayman.
- Allotted time: Two days.

- Staff: J.M. Conti
- Activity: Gather information and equipment inventory.
Meet with Miss Solomon, re: Needed equipment.
Meet with Marvin Connolly to review equipment.
Meet with general management for overview, with D.J. Wildman
- Allotted time: Three days.

- Staff: T.J. Keller.
- Activity: Meet with Rupert Ackerman,
Meet with Director of Owen Roberts Airport.
Visit Lands and Survey and talk to Mr. Terry Fenton for locations of Government property.
Visit Caribbean Utility Company, location of power plant.
Document existing industrial areas generating smoke, waste, etcetera.

Field Measure West Bay Clinic.
Meet with George Town Hospital maintenance staff.
Review existing mechanical system.
Visit with Public Works Department.
Floor plans of existing facilities.
Field measure existing building at George Town.
Six days

Time allotted:

Staff: D.L. Sellareo
Activity: Meet with Marvin Connolly
Time allotted: Quarter of a day.

Activity: Meet with Dr. Peter Pain
Interview George Town hospital staff, all shifts, physicians, nursing supervisors, psychology, substance abuse staff, clinical supervisors.
Time allotted: Four to six days.

Staff: D.J. Wildman
Activity: Overview
Time allotted: One day.

Activity: Gather information on equipment inventory.
Time allotted: Half of a day.

Activity: Begin equipment inventory
Time allotted: Four to five days.

On the next visit they have to bring to that Task Force Meeting with my Portfolio a Report on each one of those activities that they conducted on the previous visit.

I am satisfied, the Portfolio is satisfied and the Government is satisfied that we are getting value for money on this consultancy and that it is money well spent and the people of the Cayman Islands are going to be well served. Of course, that is all going to come to naught if not one red cent is going to be voted by Parliament for the necessary improvements for the grandiose project of the Government.

They say we should make improvements in staffing at the present site. They tell you that you do not give them any information, they do not know what is going on. They approved 10 areas for action this year out of 20 that the consultants recommended needed urgent attention to improve the quality of care. All of those areas that they are telling you we need to improve now are included in that. They know they are ongoing. But it is politically expedient to come here and tell you that it is a grandiose project of the Government and they are not going to give it one red cent.

In the final analysis, because I made it quite clear that any funds expended now to improve these areas, they must be improved in such a way that if the final decision is for a new institution, these management systems can be moved. Not to spend money now that you will have to correct later on. The Government does not operate like that. That is what they would like you to do. Do these things in isolation, so they can say that they have done some little thing.

Some of those areas are inventory control, equipment maintenance, budgeting, staffing, infection control, medical records, pharmacy, patient flow, charges and billing. The Government is only interested in grandiose projects.

They say expansion can take place at the present site. We have also looked at that. We looked at three alternatives:

1. To expand the present site.
2. Go to a completely new site, and abandon the present site to other uses by Government.
3. Look at splitting the services, retaining at the present site basically what are 9 to 5 operations and putting a new inpatient, 24 hour facility which would include a 24 hour emergency.

We have done the key advantages and the key disadvantages of each of those alternatives. In the interest of the time of the House, I will deal only at this time with the split alternative which, from the exercise, comes out far over and above the most suitable alternative.

The key advantages of splitting the two sites are:

1. Flexibility in design.
2. Possible location nearer new highway, etcetera.
3. Inpatients can be accommodated at new site, out patient accommodated at existing George Town Hospital site.
4. Dual locations enhances disaster response capabilities.
5. Allows for better utilisation of existing George Town hospital compound as outpatient health care centre in part, or in total.

6. Site for inpatient services does not have to be as large as alternative 2.
7. Inpatient services can be relocated away from the airport flight pattern and industrial areas.
8. Construction costs can be minimised by scaling outpatient work at George Town Hospital compound, to be executed by PWD while only inpatient facility on new site may go to tender.
9. Capability of meeting overall target completion date is enhanced by simplifying site selection and minimising scope of new construction.
10. Permits the improvements of existing George Town compound immediately in areas that will remain as outpatient facilities.

The key disadvantages:

1. Public disorientation initially, where to go for what.
2. Staff increase, sharing becomes necessary in certain areas.
3. Must find new adequate site.
4. Timetable as affected by the acquisition of property and the scope of new construction, at this time unknown.
5. New equipment must be purchased to provide availability at both sites.
6. Most shared services must be accommodated at both sites.

We went further in testing those alternatives. We applied a 70 point test for comparison of these alternatives. We said that at least one of the three alternatives must receive a rating of 10 on each of the 70 issues. I will name a few of those issues.

1. **Public orientation acceptability:** We looked at Caymanians/tourists initial long range. Alternative one received 10 in all those areas. Alternative two, eight in the first three, 10 in the long range. Alternative three, 10 in three areas, 6 in the initial.

I will just go on to name a few of the 70.

2. Relationship to airport flight pattern.
3. Disaster planning response capabilities.
4. Relationship to new highways.
5. Compatibility to adjacent properties
6. Relationship to pedestrian ways
7. Relationship to satellite clinics.
8. Relationship to industrial areas and prevailing winds.
9. Staff sharing potential
10. Usable site area.
11. Permit total one story construction.
12. Provisions for future expansion.
13. Parking for patients, visitors, physicians, staff.
14. Cost of site development.
15. Cost of property availability.
16. Adequate utilities.
17. Ongoing maintenance

We are just getting to number 20 and we did 70 of these.

Since they are convinced that the present site can be expanded and upgraded to accommodate what needs to be done. Again, let us look at a few facts.

We assumed a 20 per cent land coverage with buildings to allow for decent landscaping and for patients to enjoy some greenery and not have to look at concrete walls all day long. To allow for at least a 50 to 60 per cent expansion capability in the future. Looking at the relationship of bed size, the bed area required, as compared to per bed, you will find that the accepted standard in health care is approximately 1,000 square feet for all of your services per bed.

So, for 100 beds you would need 100,000 square feet to allow for the kind of expansion we envisage in the future, you need a site size of 11.5 acres. To go to 150 beds, you need 150,000 square feet or a site size of 17.25 acres, to allow for all the ancillary services such as parking, future development, etcetera.

I would hazard a guess that we have neither 11.5 acres nor 17.25 acres vacant at the present site, nor is it possible to purchase it at the present site. But they are not really worried about a long term plan. They just want to be able to say that we voted for 10 things to be approved. The long term plan for the needs of this country is a dream by Government. It is a grandiose project, not needed. We need to leave it to the private sector.

Government has made it clear that they have no objection to anyone building a private hospital. It is their money. If they want to build a private hospital to the standards that the Portfolio and the Government sees for health care in this country, go right ahead. But I would venture to guess that

private enterprise will look very carefully before they build a 100 or a 150 bed hospital in this country with their own funds, to serve the needs of these people. I would not say it is impossible to get your money back, but I have done a few feasibility studies for a few people, not locals, who were interested and when they saw the demographics in the feasibility study, that was the end of it. But, if Parliament and the majority of voters believes that it should be left to private enterprise, then [there is] nothing that I, the Government or the Portfolio can do.

I repeat and I challenge them to present to the Portfolio plans which will allow expansion of the present site, even to meet the present overcrowding - not to talk about the year 2025 and still being adequate. I will be happy to look at those plans. Let me have them.

I would be very interested to see where on that compound we can adequately expand the surgical, maternity, the general ward, paediatrics, not to even consider things that we are not presently providing, like a day-care area for the mentally ill. But maybe they are satisfied to continue to lock them up in prison. That was a solution to it some time ago. The Government does not accept that. They are sick people. We have to make provisions for them and that is included in the Plan.

I was asked to explain the consultancy for \$900,000 that is in the Budget. That figure includes the following: 1. A study on solid waste management for Grand Cayman, Cayman Brac and Little Cayman. Because whether they want to believe it or not, solid waste - garbage - is becoming a serious problem in this country. We are presently doing about 300 tons a week. We have one large hotel coming on stream in the very near future that is probably going to increase that by about 30 per cent. I have said publicly that the Portfolio believes that the answer lies in a combination of recycling and incineration, because the great expense is land plus the threats of pollution from leach heads, the threat of a methane bomb going off on the outskirts of George Town at any time.

People claim we are burning garbage out in the open at the garbage dump. That is not the case. Environmental health is not lighting any fires. The good Lord is lighting them through methane gas and lightning.

But if they think it is not a problem go up to the dump and walk around. Look at the leach head that is threatening the North Sound. But you hear that all that is going to do is create big pollution. Incinerators are being used all over the United States, to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) standards. It would be a simple matter for us to make the same requirement. In fact, that is, was, and will be the recommendation of the Portfolio that if we go to incineration, it be done to the EPA standards in terms of emissions and cooling of the gases and all of that.

It is my opinion, from my limited knowledge of what is involved, that the solution to it is to contract the private enterprise to put in the incinerator, because I do not think the Government has \$12 million to \$15 million to put one up. But that is another grandiose project that is designed to create pollution, not to solve any problems.

I have no axe to grind to put that there, so I am prepared to get people who are knowledgeable in the industry to make recommendations as to what should be done. Those recommendations and the terms of reference by which those consultants will be hired are not taken out of the blue. We have been using a PAHO and WHO consultant on a regular basis for sometime. We have done such exercises as to determine whether the possibility exists for alternate sites in other areas. The fact is that they do not. It basically has to do with the type of soil and rock in those areas. It is not conducive to landfill and environmentally safe landfill operations. That \$900,000 also includes:

2. Design Plans and working drawings for the new hospital, if Government accepts that is what is needed after the final Report and all the facts are before us.
3. Implementation and design of management system for health services with the recommendations of the consultants are accepted.

It is the belief of the Portfolio and Government that the introduction of the management systems exercise alone, coupled with improved facilities, that the savings, the increases in revenue will more than exceed and pay for the cost of all these consultancies that they tell us are a total waste of time.

If I was doing it on my own, they would tell you that the Member for Health is exercising his will on the country and he has no right to do it, he should seek advice because he is not equipped to do it. But they are equipped to give us all this advice.

The Honourable Financial Secretary suggested in his Budget Address that we have two alternatives to look at in the economic environment in this country. One of those was that we leave the status quo of *laissez faire* development - supply and demand - to continue. I would propose that Government in the sense used by him in that means all 15 Members of Parliament introduces controlled, contractual development. We do not hear them discussing which of those two alternatives we should take because it gets back to that thing about responsibility, accountability and who should have the authority. They would be quite happy to have us, the Executive Council, make the decision and all they are required to do is be critical.

But, either of those two roads which might be taken is going to mandate an improvement in the health services. It is going to mandate an improvement to transportation. It is going to require the introduction of the Pension Plan. It does not matter which two roads we take at this crossing. But you see the Financial Secretary, in his wisdom, gave some scenarios of what is likely to happen if we introduce controlled, contractual growth, what it is going to mean in terms of lost revenue, etcetera for the economy and they are happy not to debate those two issues.

Because if we go to controlled, contractual development and

the revenue is not there to fund the Budget, and the revenue is not there to put up street lights and the revenue is not there to build roads in constituencies. They can say, "You fellows were wrong". They can then be exonerated because all they are interested in is that they do not want the accountability, they do not want the responsibility, they are only interested in the authority that they perceive their majority gives them at the present time.

MR. PRESIDENT: Proceedings are suspended for 15 minutes.

AT 11:20 A.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED.

HOUSE RESUMED AT 11:45 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Proceedings of the House are resumed. The Honourable Member for Health continuing.

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER: Thank you, Mr. President. Just prior to the break I was trying to demonstrate that Government is trying to take a planned, coordinated comprehensive look at providing proper solutions to the various infrastructural needs of the community because investors (the people in the financial industry) continue to be attracted to the Cayman Islands because of the expediency with which they can transact business. They can come here and in a day (in most cases) they can register their company, open their bank account and set their business up.

We are getting to the stage where it is taking longer to do that. Some of those people do not enjoy sitting in a traffic jam for an hour, or they want to know that if they need health care it can be provided. If we do not do something and take a planned approach to the provision of these essential services we will not be able to continue the quality of life that our people have because the people are going to find somewhere else to go.

The tourists do not want to come here. We were told they do not come here to drive on super-highways. That is true. But they do not come here to spend all their time in a traffic jam or to risk their lives in the hands of some taxi driver who, because of the traffic jam and is in a hurry to get to get tourists to or from the airport, is overtaking 15, 20 or 30 cars on the wrong side of the road between Merren's and Seven Mile Shops, at blinding speeds; or he is taking them through the dike roads which are littered with garbage going bumpety bump. Is that a good impression for our visitors? I am sure they are expecting at any minute to disappear into the jaws of the dike or the gully while being whisked along that dike road.

I have been overtaken by taxi drivers at the intersection of Merren's, and they are going to West Bay on the left hand side. They cut across in front of you and to save your car (which you owe the bank for) and your child in the front seat, you stop and let them by. Otherwise you, the child, the car, everybody gets wiped out.

But they say we do not need the Master Ground Transportation Plan. Grandiose project. Drive them on the dike roads and risk their lives. It is only going to get worse if we do not do something about it. All the Government is saying in the Master Ground Transportation Plan is that this is a Plan. It is not going to happen overnight. And this red flag they keep waving in front of everybody about 'we did not support it because we do not know where the money is coming from', the money to improve the 'Fours T's' intersection was put in the Budget in 1989 from ordinary revenue. The money for what can be done out of the Master Ground Transportation Plan in 1990 is in the Budget from ordinary revenue. Maybe they did not look, but it is there. So that is no excuse, no reason.

They say they want solutions from us, not excuses. That is a solution. They are opposition to the solution without an alternative. "We do not have enough information, we want to know where the money is coming from." They have it all before them. "We do not need the Health Services Plan. It is a prestige project that our people do not deserve and do not need - that is only for industrialised countries." We have to be practical and realistic. The Government is trying to be. It is time that the other Members of Parliament demonstrate likewise and stop relying only on political expediency and one-up-manship and their great desire for propensity to whip the Members of Executive Council in line. Is that what we are all about? Or are we here to weigh carefully the solutions to these problems, as put forward by Government, and take rational decisions and not worry about who you have to kick or who you have to whip or who you have to show; that all you have on this side is accountability, responsibility. "We have eight votes. We have the authority. Do not tell us about expertise. We are the peoples' representatives. We have the authority. We are the only ones listening to the people. We are the only ones listening to the special interest groups. We are going to say no."

I hope and I pray that the people of this fair country of ours are listening very carefully to the content and are observing what is going on in these hallowed Chambers. I hope they are taking careful note of the kinds of programmes, solutions and plans that the Executive Council is bringing forward - plans that are not pulled out of a hat. We do not have a bin in the elevator for the fourth floor that every time there is a meeting for the Legislative Assembly we scrounge around there, like a suggestion box, and try to find what we can bring forward this time and it is taken out of the bin.

They would make you believe that is exactly what we do. There is no time spent to develop these programmes. There is no time spent to properly prepare these plans and solutions. They are somewhat right in that they have more time to wander around the byways, the bars, the Churches in the Community, than the Members of Executive Council have because most of us are working late hours, trying to come up with these plans. Trying to be as thorough and complete in trying to find the correct

solutions. Then we come down here and they act like we picked them up on the way down on the drive that morning. They use their majority to vote it down and they are going to use their majority in Finance Committee to correct the Budget.

We were told yesterday that the Government has made no provisions for the civil servants' salary in the Budget. But they (in their love and affection and their great concern and sympathy for the civil servants) are going to do it with their majority in Finance Committee.

The Government contracted the services of a Salary Review person and appointed a Committee to do it. The Government is fully aware of the responsibility that that carries with it. The Government is fully aware that funds have to be put in the Budget, but should we be so brave (as they say they are going to be) and put an arbitrary figure - just pick a figure out of a hat - \$1 million, \$2 million, \$3 million, \$4 million, \$19 million? Let us pick a figure, we will put that in the Budget. Then when the civil service overspends the account because it was not adequate, they have to experience the wrath of the Public Accounts Committee. The Government does not operate like that.

The Financial Secretary said in the Budget Address that it was not there. There is a reason for that. The quantum is not known, the Report is not finished. But is it love? Is it affection, concern and sympathy for the civil servants that they are looking about? Or is it political expediency to say they put a figure in the Budget which might be inadequate? Is that real concern? I do not think so.

I think the proper way, the right way to address it is the way the Honourable Financial Secretary and the Government have addressed it. We contracted to have the exercise done. Let us not preempt the outcome of the exercise and put \$1 million or \$19 million and then, when the exercise is complete and the recommendations are made take only those that fit that pattern. That is not the way to do things.

They believe that these programmes and policies (because my Portfolio came into more stick than any other one about not having policies)... by the time I am finished today the public will know who has policies and concerns or those who are just being verbose and vociferous. This country needs leaders that are prepared to plan for the future, who are prepared to put their petty prejudices aside, to seek and take expert advice on what needs to be done and to get on with doing it not worrying about whether it is political to defeat the Government.

We were told that our record as a Government is far from good. We are measuring our progress on a faulty report card. They hold tenure. All the statistics in the Budget Address differ with that view point. Maybe, just maybe, the Government is using a faulty report card and we should not be judging the performance of the economy and the Government on a national level. Maybe that report card that they deal with refers only to the Budget provisions and allocations to their constituencies.

I believe the words they used was that they had been "shafted" and they were going to whip the Government in line. My Portfolio, which is responsible, for in a nutshell, Human Resources, Health, Social Services, Drugs, Rehabilitation and a few other things, and to date it has received no requests for Budget allocations. The decade of the youth, with your own street lights and roads, do not worry about their health, do not worry about their education.

The Government operates at a national level. In 1989 it cost the Government, through my Portfolio, \$64,661.30 to operate the District Health Clinic in Bodden Town and over \$100,000 in West Bay. But the technocrats in my Portfolio and I have to go out there and see when it needs painting and see what else it needs, see what the staffing needs and the patient loads are and make the necessary Recurrent and Capital Expenditure allocation. Yes, I accept fully the challenge that the 1990s should be the decade of youth. Let us get on with it. But they have other concerns - street lights and back roads.

The Second Elected Member for the Lesser Islands said that it was good that my Portfolio had some reports and these reports were all done by these consultancies that they are telling the public are a waste of money. These reports detail actual positions of these services in the country. But you know what confuses me is that he went on to say that these reports cannot and should not direct performance, policies or set procedures. What are we supposed to do? Ignore the facts, ignore the statistical needs and just let the majority of the politicians in these hallowed Chambers dictate what the policies are - not based on facts or reports or assessments of what the needs are, but based on their decisions, however arrived at? That is what should direct this country? No, Mr. President, I will differ with that point of view. I believe that it behooves the Government, it behooves the Parliament, it is incumbent on the Parliament to use identification methods for problems; to make assessments of those problems, to review those problems and find solutions to those problems. We should then use sound, scientific, decision-making processes to select the best possible alternatives for future developments in this country. And we must not stop there. Then we must apply sound management principles of planning, organising, implementation and evaluation of the results, because the resources of this Government are not a bottomless pit.

Decisions must be made soundly and that is what the Government is doing. It is making the best possible choice, based on the information, the problematic, the alternative solutions and the resources we have to implement them.

Let us get back to that grandiose project for which I have been maligned and verbally abused - the \$20 million for the new Hospital. That figure came out as a result of a question I was asked at the presentation. I suggested that, based on \$100 per square foot for what was being recommended, the total programme would probably be around \$20 million. But that \$20 million is not, as they and others would have the people believe, to cover the cost only of a 100 bed in-patient facility. That is to cover the total programme, including, and it is an estimate on my part, it might cost a lot less. I doubt it will cost any more. It will cover the building of the new in-patient facility, if that is what is decided to do in the final analysis. It will cover the furniture and equipment for that new facility. It will cover the upgrading of the present facility, to a comprehensive out-patient ambulatory centre. It will cover the cost of upgrading the District Clinics to better serve the community based on the needs, because the public will understand from early on in my presentation that this exercise by the

consultants is not confined to the George Town Hospital, it covers the total health care needs of the Cayman Islands. It will cover the upgrading of the District Clinics. We have great plans to convert those Clinics into District Centres which will provide for a more comprehensive and a broader scope of services than they presently do. It includes the necessary reworking and upgrading of the Faith Hospital in Cayman Brac. Maybe even some upgrading of the First Aid Centre in Little Cayman.

It is this kind of comprehensive, detailed study, this kind of exercise from which the Government is putting forward its policy in health care. I do not believe that the provisions for those kinds of facilities are excessive or above and beyond the needs of the people of this country. They will tell you that they are wondering where the money is coming from.

I believe that if and when the Government makes a decision to commit this country's expenditure in any area, it is not too bashful to tell the people where the money is going to come from, once the quantum is determined. That whole question is almost ludicrous because it should be obvious to anyone where the money will come from. It will come from patient revenues, plain and simple.

I am happy to see the recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee. I have already had a management meeting to review the fees. I am not worried about Item eight, where they see no easy solution. I knew that all along. They will bail themselves out, but they will be faced with the opportunity to upgrade the fees in the very near future. We will see what will happen to that because I have never hidden the fact that the fees need to be reviewed. What I have said and what I am still saying is that I am not prepared to do what was done in the past, that is, to increase fees without putting in place the management systems to collect them because all that will do is increase the amount asked by Finance Committee to write-off from \$1.5 million to \$3 or \$4 million if you upgrade the fees.

We can put the management systems in place, take their recommendations and upgrade the fees. We are also going to ensure that no one who needs health care and cannot afford it will be denied. But what we will not allow is political interference, that is, people telling people, "Go to the hospital, it is a Government hospital". "They cannot refuse you". "You have a sore throat and you owe them \$5,000, they cannot refuse you". "Go and add to the \$5,000".

I believe the Government has a responsibility to deliver care to the needy. We will find a mechanism, be it through a national health insurance or any other one, to ensure that. What they should be doing is helping us to get to that position; helping us to lean on the health insurance companies who, in my opinion in some cases, are selling health insurance under fraudulent pretenses. They are paying, the people go to the hospital, but the hospital is not getting paid. They are paying them more than it costs to go to the hospital because that is how they market the programme. You can make a profit. That is what the Chamber of Commerce and the people like that should be helping us with so the Government can do something about it.

I have had a very preliminary discussion with the Insurance Superintendent. That will be followed up in the very near future. I hope that we get the support that we are going to need to do something about it when the special interest groups start leaning on them not to support it, because we are going to need the support. They tell us that we have no policy, that we are not doing anything; we are not doing enough. It is necessary to repeat things for some people to understand. All of us learn by emphasis (or most of us learn by emphasis) and repetition. They are well aware that the Government is conducting an exercise to lead us toward the ability to introduce national health insurance in this country. Some of them are going to get up and tell me I am a socialist because I am talking about this. The Government is conducting an exercise that will give it a better handle on what would be a reasonable premium for health insurance in this country. But they do not agree with that kind of planned research. They think you must pull it out of a hat when you are coming down here...

POINT OF ORDER

- MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:** On a Point of Order, Mr. President. The Member is saying...
- HON. D. EZZARD MILLER:** Quote the Point of Order.
- MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:** The Member is saying that we knew about some study. We do not know about any study, Mr. President. We cannot agree with it if we do not know anything about it.
- MR. PRESIDENT:** That is not a Point of Order, it is a request for clarification.
- HON. D. EZZARD MILLER:** Mr. President, they can deny that they know anything about it.
- MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:** Mr. President, is the Honourable Member saying that I am lying?
- MR. PRESIDENT:** It certainly does not appear to me. He says you can deny it. That is not saying you are lying.
- MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:** Well, if I said we did not know it and he says we can deny we do not know it...
- MR. PRESIDENT:** I am sorry, I am not prepared to have a debate within a debate.
- MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:** *[Inaudible comment from across the room.]*

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER:

I do not stoop that low.

Anyway, Mr. President, I do not have a recording. I will not argue with whether they knew about it or not but all that changed since September. Any presentation that I make to them now is done at the Glass House and it is recorded verbatim. I have my reasons for doing that.

They make a big to do that we should simply expand the present site for the hospital. The hard cold fact is that even if we expanded or tried to expand at that present site the life of the site from today would be a maximum of three years and it would take us that long to get the adequate expansion done. Unlike them, I am not afraid to do my homework. I am not afraid to take a decision and put my neck on the line and be responsible and accountable even when I do not have the authority.

They say there is no need for the Dental Clinic. That is another grandiose, prestige project by the Government. Maybe they are content to have the public attend the present inadequate facilities, content to have the public suffer for three months waiting for an appointment because we cannot accommodate them at the Dental Clinic. That is what they think is good enough for the people of this country. It is quite clear. It is in the Budget what the Government thinks.

I think the Member is accusing me of getting 10 per cent of something. I would just like to clear that up once and for all and I crave your indulgence, Sir, because this has happened before in other forums and I would just like to read something into the Hansards of the House to put it clearly and concisely before the public.

I have in my hand a set of affidavits. I think it is very important that we put the public's mind at rest on this nasty little issue. These are affidavits from the International Health Care Corporation who has been contracted to provide the services and who, it has been implied, that I am getting 10 per cent. After I read the affidavits I can tell the country what they are getting out of it.

The first one says:

"I, James M. Conti, of 5627 London Drive, Austintown, Ohio, Zip Code 45515, U.S.A., being duly sworn make oath and say as follows: I am the sole shareholder and a director of Ambulatory Health Care Corporation, hereinafter, the "Company", a Company which is incorporated under the laws of the State of Ohio, U.S.A. and having its principal office at 47 North Canfield Niles Road, Austintown, Ohio, U.S.A.

That neither the Company nor myself or anyone on our behalf have or have ever had any agreement either expressed, implied, oral, written or otherwise to compensate either the Honourable D. Ezzard Miller, Executive Council Member for the Portfolio of Health and Social Services, or any of his staff or personnel or family or associates, either directly or indirectly or otherwise, whomsoever in connection with such agreement.

That the Honourable D. Ezzard Miller has never been compensated by the Company or myself or by anyone on/or behalf either directly or indirectly. That the Honourable D. Ezzard Miller is not now, nor has he ever been, a director, shareholder whether beneficial or otherwise or officer of the Company and has never acted as an agent, employee or representative of any affiliated Company.

Signed: James M. Conti.

Sworn to and subscribed before me at Youngstown Ohio, this 16th day of August, 1989. Signed by: Josephine D. Gussareo, Notary Public, State of Ohio. My Commission expires May 4th, 1990."

"From the Law offices of Manchester, Bennett, Powers and Ulman Company, LPA 11th Floor Bank One Building, Youngstown, Ohio.

August the 16th, 1989

Re: Ambulatory Health Care Corporation.

To Whom it Concerns:

This office represents Ambulatory Health Care Corporation, the "Company".

The Company was incorporated and is doing business under the Laws of the state of Ohio and has its principal place of business in Austintown, Ohio.

All of the shares of the Company are presently held and have since the date of incorporation been held by James M. Conti. There are and have never been any other shareholders of the Company.

The Honourable D. Ezzard Miller is not and has never been either a shareholder or an officer of this Company. The Director and officers of the Company are as

follows: James M. Conti, Director, President, Treasurer; Patricia Conti, Director; Dr. Fred Peachman, Director; John F. Zimmerman, Director; Richard Stoy, Director; William S. Malloy, Secretary.

Yours truly, Manchester, Bennett, Powers."

"Four Shore Corporations Services Limited, P.O. Box 1994, 4th Floor, Westwind Building, Grand Cayman, Cayman Islands, British West Indies.

Directors:

D.E. Ritch, LL.B., W.W. Connolly, OBE, JP, Peter O. Pollack, LL.B.

To Whom it May Concern:

Re: International Health Care Corporation Limited.

We provide the registered office for the above mentioned company. This company was incorporated by us on the 8th of March, 1989, as an ordinary resident company and holds a license under the Local Companies (Control) Law.

There are 500 issued shares of the Company, all of which are held by Mr. James M. Conti. There have been no other shareholders, save for Jetta A. Bodden, who as corporate Manager of our Company held 100 shares as subscriber. These shares were transferred to Mr. Conti on the 16th of March, 1989.

The Director and Officers of the Company are and have always been as follows: James M. Conti, Director, President, Treasurer; Patricia Conti, Director; John F. Zimmerman, Director Four Shore Corporation Services Secretary.

George Town, Grand Cayman, Cayman Islands.

Affidavit:

I, James M. Conti, of 5627 London Drive, Austintown, Ohio, 44515, U.S.A., being duly sworn make oath and say as follows: I am the sole shareholder and a Director of International Health Care Corporation Limited. A company incorporated under the Laws of the Cayman Islands and having its registered office at P.O. Box 1994, Grand Cayman. That on the 6th day of April, 1989, the Company entered into a written agreement with the Government of the Cayman Islands to provide a Health Systems Plan and a Health Care Facilities Plan.

The contract sum for those services is C\$120,000. That neither the Company nor myself or anyone on our behalf have or have ever had any agreement either expressed, implied, oral, written or otherwise to compensate either the Honourable D. Ezzard Miller, Executive Council Member for the Portfolio of Health and Social Services or any of his staff or personnel or family or associates either directly or indirectly or otherwise howsoever, in connection with such agreement.

That the Honourable D. Ezzard Miller has never been compensated by the Company or myself or by anyone on our behalf either directly or indirectly in order to secure such agreement, or in return for the agreement or services to be performed thereunder, for the Government of the Cayman Islands by the Company.

That the Honourable D. Ezzard Miller is not nor has he ever been a Director, Shareholder, whether beneficial or otherwise, or Officer of the Company who has never acted as an agent, employee or representative of the Company or any affiliate company.

Signed, James M. Conti.

Sworn before me at George Town, Grand Cayman this 18th day of August, 1989.

Signed, Jenny Manderson, Justice of the Peace."

I have no need or desire, nor do I want to obtain any benefit

whatsoever, from any company or anyone with whom I transact business for and/or on behalf of the Government of the Cayman Islands in my official capacity or otherwise. The same accusation has been made about the Government's contractual relationship with Hazeldon International. These companies are international in magnitude. They do not need to bribe Ezzard Miller, or anyone else, to get a contract in the Cayman Islands. In fact, the said companies are presently obtaining legal advice as to whether such comments put them at risk of the Corrupt Practices Act of the United States.

The now Member for Tourism, the Honourable Mr. Norman Bodden (and I crave your indulgence to call his name) told me in the heat of the 1988 Election campaign (when he was being bamboozled in certain forums and similar accusations were being hurled at him), I asked him, "Mr. Norman, how can you take it?" He said the greatest thing in the world is a clear conscience. I now know what he meant, because I also have a clear conscience.

I hope that has put that unpleasant nastiness to rest. The Member has been talked to, I believe, by my Attorneys. I do not wish to get involved in a long legal suit with him or anyone else, but my integrity, my name, the respect of my family means a lot to me, and if it continues I shall spare no expense because I already have the necessary sworn statements.

I just want to make one thing clear. A couple of days ago that Member, the First Elected Member for West Bay, referred to me as his friend. I would just like to set the record straight. I do not know whether he considers me his friend or not, but I would much prefer if he did not, because I do not consider him mine.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:

That was a joke.

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER:

Mr. President, I apologise to the public for that unnecessary, uncalled for diversion in my debate but, I believe the public knows the kind of person I am.

Before we were so rudely interrupted - and you know I have taken a lot of stick in this Budget debate and I have sat here taking it, now I am replying - it would have been nice to be courteous to be a good example if other Members would do likewise and stop their constant, unnecessary bickering and commentary while other people are speaking. As I was saying, the Government is concerned about the overcrowding at the Hospital. The Government is concerned about the weaknesses and the inadequacies caused, I must point out, by physical limitations at the hospital. We have good individual professionals at the hospital. They are doing the best they can under the constraints and the adverse physical environment in which they are asked to perform, in many cases, their lifesaving functions.

The Government recognises their valuable contribution. The Government is trying to correct the inadequacies in the system to allow them to offer better quality, improved patient services. You hear that because they have eight votes we are not going to get one red cent. I hope the public is listening.

On one hand they do not want any more development: they do not want any more hotels; they do not want any roads; they do not want any Master Ground Transportation Plan; they do not want any more expatriate workers. But they want more employment in certain constituencies. They want certain things done in their constituency level. You know they come to us and say, "Where is the funding package?" "The Master Ground Transportation Plan is going to create social and political revolution and upheaval, never before heard of in this country".

But their plans, if they have any - because we have yet to hear about them, their opposition, their strangling of the goose that is laying the golden egg in this country, their determination to whip the Government in line, to kick them, to bring them down if necessary, is killing the goose.

They say that we do not have any Housing Policy. I believe that I have demonstrated that the Government has a Policy in Health Care. The Government has requisite plans to improve and to direct the improvement of quality care that is so desperately needed in this country. So now, I will move on to demonstrate that the Government also has done something about Housing.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Proceedings are suspended until 2:15 P.M.

AT 12:48 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 2:16 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Proceedings are resumed, but before we call upon the Honourable Member for Health to continue, I would like to say a word about interjections, and I want to say this with great care because the Chair does not take sides and I do not wish anybody to draw an inference from it which is not meant.

Interjections are a normal feature of parliamentary life, there is no objection to them. It is when they become too frequent that things become difficult and the temperature gets raised when the interjections made, perhaps, may not be connected directly with the subject of the debate. As I say, they are a feature of parliamentary life and I would not wish that they be stopped altogether. I am simply asking the Members of the House to keep them to a reasonable, relevant minimum.

The Honourable Member for Health.

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER:

Thank you, Mr. President. When we took the break I was raising the matter of the Housing

Policy. The Government has been accused of doing nothing, or not doing enough. My Portfolio shares a dream of every Caymanian to own his or her own home. On our part and on the part of Government, I believe we are doing everything possible to help them realise their legitimate ambition, in particular in the areas of the less fortunate, covered under the Housing Development Corporation (HDC).

For their part I wish to personally encourage every young person to start saving and putting aside some of their present earnings towards purchasing or constructing a house so that in the near future they can come, those who qualify, to the HDC and obtain funds to supplement what they already have. I wish to take this opportunity to challenge and to call on my colleagues to help us get this message across.

I want to briefly touch on what has been done by this Government with regards to the Housing Development Corporation. Some Members are no doubt aware that Government issued a new debenture early this year - a US\$5 million at 7.5 per cent. The subscription to that bond has been good, but not spectacular. The 'A' class banks and the 'B' class banks have come forward with reasonable subscriptions. What is missing are the insurance companies, the accounting firms, the law firms and private individuals who can also take out subscriptions in this Bond issue.

Just to assure Members that the HDC is not sitting on its laurels and are just letting it sit there while we are paying 7.5 per cent, we are not getting anything on it. The number of loans approved since November, 1988 are 14. That amounts to \$508,900. For the fiscal year of 1989 to 1990, we have already approved, since July of this year, eight loans amounting to \$265,300. Three are presently before the Sub-loan Committee, having been recommended by management to the Committee for approval. Twelve applications are being processed at this time at the HDC. If we compare that to other years, we will see that the HDC is active and, I would postulate, doing a fairly good job. For the fiscal year 1988 to 1989, we did 9 loans amounting to \$376,600. For the fiscal year 1987 to 1988 we did 14 loans amounting to \$489,400.

Now the funds for the debenture are not sitting idly in somebody's desk drawer while we are paying 7.5 per cent to the subscribers. It is, in fact, on fixed deposit earning, at present, an average of 9.3 per cent while we are paying the subscribers 7.5. It is on lend to people who qualify at percentages varying from 9 to 11 per cent. The Corporation is not, in spite of what one Member has suggested, paying money to debenture holders and just letting the money raised from them sleep. If the money is not on lend immediately, and we can only do that when qualified people come forward, it is put on a fixed deposit.

Aside from that, the Board of the HDC took it upon itself to review the guidelines. I would just like to tell Members, rather briefly, what has been reviewed because we are attempting to make it easier for people to qualify and to help a broader amount of people.

- Occupancy - as a guideline, remains the same. It is only lent for families and home-owners. It is not lent for speculation.
- Equity - the minimum of 10 per cent equity is still a requirement.
- Maximum income of Applicant - is \$25,000 per annum or a maximum combined income of joint applicants of \$35,000 per annum. The computed earnings are defined as 100 per cent of an applicant's salary, plus in the case of a married couple, 50 per cent of the co-applicant's salary.
- Income Ratio - This basically remains the same. Monthly mortgage payments should not exceed 25 per cent of the applicant's computed earnings. Total monthly payments should not exceed 33.3 per cent of the applicant's computed earnings.
- Maximum Loan Repayment Period - Is 20 years.
- Maximum Loan Amount - This has been increased and the maximum loan from \$45,000 to \$55,000. However this increase would have two components because one of the problems we were faced quite often with is people do not own land, or they have made a small payment on land but do not yet own it to the extent where the HDC can take a first mortgage on it. There would be a ceiling of \$10,000 to assist with the purchase of the land and a ceiling of \$45,000 to assist with the construction of the house.
- Maximum Value of Property - Both the house and land has been increased from \$55,000 to \$70,000.

Interest Rate -

We have made some changes on this based on the computed earnings and this is where we offer variable interest. Up to \$20,000 in computed earnings we charge 9 per cent, \$20,001 to \$25,000 we charge 10 per cent, \$25,000 to \$35,000 we charge 11 per cent. Presently the Corporation has an arrangement for group insurance to cover property and we are trying to negotiate a similar group coverage with some of the insurance companies to provide a group life policy.

In addition to those revisions, the Board has approved (and I might say that the Government has approved) those provisions as recommended by the Board. We saw the needs of the community in terms of housing in four distinct areas. Those who make more than \$35,000 per year and can therefore qualify for the commercial mortgage arrangements provided by the private sector.

Secondly, those who can qualify for a housing loan and make all the commitments and meet all of the requirements. Thirdly, those who need a home but really cannot come up with the total monthly payment. And those who need a home but cannot come up with anything.

We addressed the first one by adjusting the guidelines to broaden the spectrum of people which would be covered. We addressed the other two areas by meeting with Social Services who is presently renting quarters for several people on a short term and long term basis. We worked out an arrangement whereby people who can only afford a percentage of the mortgage, in that instance they would be referred to Social Services and Social Services will, where possible, take up the mortgage and become the mortgagee to HDC because we have to ensure that the HDC remains a completely viable financial institution.

The Social Services Department will then have a legal document drawn up, after they have assessed the person's capability to pay whatever they can, and they will pay the whole mortgage to the HDC. Then that person will make those payments to the Social Services Department and from those payments they will earn equity in the property where they are living.

In an attempt to try and alleviate the problem of trying to find houses on a short term basis and maybe on a somewhat longer basis for some of our real indigent and hand-capped people and elderly, it is proposed that the HDC would build two fourplexes - one in George Town and one in West Bay - which the Social Services could use on an interim period and the Social Services Department would become the mortgagee for those two properties and they would remain the property of the Government. Hopefully, and we are trying to negotiate the use of Government land for those two buildings because there are instances now where Social Services has to rent property on Seven Mile Beach to put people in, on a short term basis.

I believe that the Government is doing what it can in housing. I believe that in the years ahead we should be able to make a reasonable and serious contribution to the lack of housing amongst the less financially fortunate among us. In conjunction with that, the Assistant Manager of the HDC is trying to work with developers to ask them, the people who are presently in the development business, if they will consider constructing some houses of a low cost nature scattered throughout their developments. One thing the Government does not want is to have 500 or 600 houses built on one piece of land and everybody can refer to that as the poor area and they all have the same coloured roof and the same front porch, etcetera. So we are trying to work with the private enterprise in trying to overcome that and encourage developers to be willing to make a little less profit and help us with this dire need in housing.

Combined with that one of our Board Members volunteered to draw a series of plans, because one of the other problems we have is that people come into the HDC and they really do not know what they can afford, or what they want in terms of a house. When they are asked to go out and come back with a plan that is costed, number one - they have a hard time finding somebody to draw up a Plan; number two - when the Plan is drawn and costed it is usually beyond the realms of the HDC. So one of the Board Members has volunteered and he has drawn four basic Plans. One 2 bedroom Plan which is a very basic, simple house. Another 2 bedroom Plan which is a little better, a little more fancy but well within the bounds. The same for three bedroom houses. One that is quite modular and square and low construction costs, and one that is a little more advanced. It has a front porch on it and it would be easy in the future to tack on a carport and things like that. Also, one of the 2 bedrooms is designed in such a way that it can be easily expanded into a three bedroom.

We hope to have these on display so that when clients come to the HDC, we can be in a better position to guide them into areas and give them a choice. Then they can go to any architect of their choice and have the Plan done at their expense. But we needed to have some guidance to give people.

I would like to assure the House that the Government is trying. I believe we are having some success in the area of housing. What I would like Members to do is try to encourage their people who they come into contact with to subscribe to the debenture offer. We are a long way from \$5 million. We believe it will take approximately that to make the fund a rolling fund and any effort that they can make to increase it, we would certainly appreciate.

In the essence of time, because I do not believe Members would be minded to suspend Standing Orders to allow me to continue, I will have to move on to the Social Services because there again they say we have no policy and that we are doing nothing. That is rather unfortunate and unfair to the people in that Department.

The Portfolio, in consultation with the Department has conducted various reviews of what is going on. One of the problems that Social Services has had in the past is that

services were, and that is why I am taking this first. Without going into any amount of detail, when one looks at the Budget in relation to Capital Expenditure, which, to me, is one of the main areas, that you can see where the priority of Government rests, one finds that education is not really where the money is going to be spent.

Education is the highest with Recurrent Expenditure, but it always has been the highest and nothing has changed over the years, from the time when I was the Member or the time earlier when the present Member for Education was Member, or in the last few years. Education's Recurrent Expenditure is a big Budget. But, when you look at the priorities in the Capital side of the Budget, you find that, out of the total amount voted there, the construction of roads carries \$4.1 million, followed by land purchases of \$1.75 million, then you find schools of \$1.21 million and medical at \$490,000. So we find that the larger part of the Capital Expenditure seems to be going in areas not directly on Education. I am dealing with the Capital Expenditure here. The Member for Education obviously has a heavy Portfolio to deal with, but it is one which I feel is the most important because we are dealing with the youth of the Islands.

While on this, I also noted that the Estimates, at page 135, have five token votes. It appears to me it is the most token votes under any one head. I would like to explain this. These are votes where \$10 are put in for projects which are needed but the full amount is not voted because there is not sufficient money or sufficient priority given to it, and the hope is that during the coming year there will be money to pay for these.

Dealing with the question of priorities one of these, unfortunately, is to deal with the Special Education rooms. In the Government policy that has to be a very important area. Special Education is an area that definitely needs to be looked at and given the necessary funds. I also note that the new infants school is, once again, in that token area.

It seems to me that priorities, as far as money goes in the Budget, and especially if this House had passed the Plans for the Master Ground Transportation Plan, obviously there would have been more Capital Expenditure put on that project than the schools have ever seen in the last 10 or 15 years. So I believe we did the education system and the Member for Education a good turn in freeing up some of those funds for roads so that he can get and spend it on what we regard, and what the Government pays lip service to regarding as a priority, that is education.

What I would like to see is substantial increases in the grants that are to be made to private schools. I asked a question in relation to education and this brought out very clearly the very high cost of educating children. We saw that with, for example, a student in the Primary School gets an average Recurrent Expenditure of about \$1,500 per annum, the Middle School, \$2,102 and in the High School about \$2,284, when you average these out and they vary from school to school.

Significant to this was the fact that the cost to Government of Capital Investment in the schools, for example in the Middle School per child was \$6,858 and in the High School, \$5,533. When you multiply that by the number of students in these different areas, at many hundreds of thousands of dollars, in fact, I would think over a short period of time in the millions of dollars, that the Government would have to pay if those students were in the Government system and out of the private system.

So looking at it purely from the point of economics, I feel that Government should double, or at least increase substantially, the grants that are being made to those private schools, because we are here more or less debating economics of the country I believe even more important than the economic side. However, the fact that it is good for the education system to have private schools because they provide the competitive edge to keep the standards of education high. They also provide the diversity within a community where you can get children in different schools with different views and being taught while following a common education system (at least on the English side), but both systems, the American and the English, running side by side.

I think that this diversity and the competitiveness is good. Further, it does give a feeling from the private schools, many of whom are supported by Churches, in fact all of them, that they too are contributing their share to society. I would like to see that grant moved up. I would like to see it doubled because even while doubling it, the Government is saving many, many times what it is paying out. I am not saying to give it out. So, it will have to be looked at and the question of need, but I believe that money put in this area is well spent.

I also feel the scholarship funds could be increased even though I know that the Member has mentioned from time to time that there has been sufficient funds to meet the applicants who have applied during that period. I would just like to make sure that the Scholarship Fund is sufficient for the further education of the children who can carry on, either on the academic or the vocational and technical side. I do believe the Scholarships should continue to be spread, which I know is the policy that the Member had prior to my time. He had it after the time I was in Government.

It would be somewhat remiss of me not to mention in this the Law School. That, I think, is the pride of these Islands. It has proven itself over the years. The standards are high and this can best be seen by the fact that the calibre of students that have graduated from there over the years, the fact that the Liverpool University accepts the standards as being those which will allow students to sit for their degree.

I would like to take this opportunity of congratulating those students who have gone through the rigid 5 years and have now become new attorneys to join a very old and Honourable profession. I think that the Law School has shown to the world that you can take a small and limited number of students in a very small island and achieve the results you get out of the larger universities and teaching institutions in either Europe or North America.

I wish the school and the teaching staff every continued success and I can assure the Member for Education that I can support him on anything that is necessary for the

school. I understand that I should really be saying that I support my learned friend, the Second Official Member, but I also do that and wherever the funds are necessary I would give my support to those.

The Member for Education definitely has the Community College under him. Now that he has found an area on the site that is capable of being built on, I once again assure him that, despite that bit of humour, I do support the Community College. I would like to see it expand and grow from strength to strength. It is very important to the education system and I believe that the continued development of this must be given every priority. However, it is a lesson that one learns early. The cost of this, like all buildings or all physical facilities for schools, will be expensive and I feel the country can justifiably bear it and move forward with this important institution. I would like to see it develop and I believe that the Member will do that but it has to develop and mature, which only time and the right nurturing can bring about, to an institution which I hope one day will be of the high standard which has been shown in the Law School where we have seen very high achievements.

I do appreciate that it is a lot more widely based and a different type of institution in some respects, but it is one that I will watch very closely, as I always do education, and whenever the Member appears to need a bit of help or nudging, I can assure him that he will get that in a very nice and polite way.

So, getting back to the hard economics, if education is the Government's priority, as they say it is, then I would say let us obviously necessary where we have these token Capital Expenditure on it. Let us increase it in the areas that are obviously necessary where we have these token \$10 votes. Let us take some of that money from areas of less priority, be they what the Member for Health has continued to coin the word "grandiose schemes" and put it where the society is going to get the most benefit.

From there I would like to move on to another head. The head of agriculture has had quite a bit of featuring in the Budget and herein one of the principles propounded in the Budget comes an area where this country should attempt to seek, as he has pointed out and justified, an area of self-sufficiency in agriculture. I believe that we must diversify the economy because it is always a fallacy, as has been pointed out by the Honourable Financial Secretary, to have too many eggs in one basket. We do have some areas of the economy which are fairly heavy at this stage - banking, insurance, tourism, to name some of the main ones.

In other countries, as the Second Elected Member for Bodden Town has quite ably put forward, it has been found that there have been developments on the Agricultural side. The retailing of jams, juices and fresh produce not only adds to the stability of agriculture but it also provides, in an Island such as this, not an overabundance of fresh fruit or vegetables, it provides something that the population, as well as tourists coming here, can find helpful and desirable.

I believe that we can learn from the way many of the other countries have, as small Islands, diversified in this area. I know you would find many of them in the stores in stalls a lot of the produce that cannot be consumed fresh, is turned into other things such as jams or into canned fruit so that there is an overall spreading to the whole area the marketing of this. But, it is not good of this Government saying on the one hand that we must push agriculture, when on the other hand it is going out to foreign countries and inducing them to send foreign fruit into the country. There must some of that but I believe the Government policy should be very careful that when they court other countries to export to here, that it is not an area that could hurt us locally.

I believe that if we mean what we say then we should not just pay lip service to it and we should get on with developing not only the production of agriculture not. Most importantly, I think, the Islands is badly lacking the marketing, the selling of the produce to the public, not only as to where they should go to find the produce but in comparison, for example as the Second Elected Member for Bodden Town has pointed out, the difference between local produce and local meat, the freshness of it and this sort of thing.

On the other hand, I think, as responsible people we have to make sure that the cost of the produce is something that is competitive. In fact, just about every country I would think in the western world does subsidise agriculture to a certain extent. And where that is necessary, I believe, the Government should give its support to it...

MR. PRESIDENT: break?

Sorry, are you changing subjects? Would you like to take the

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN:

If I may just say one other thing, I will get off the subject, Sir. Lastly on this, I do feel the abattoir has been talked about for many years and perhaps the time has come to try and build that and I believe that more than \$10 dollars should be put in. We need to get on with this and try to increase the area of supply of meat and the processing of meat in an area that is up to the necessary health standards to ensure that it is something, when it goes on the Market that it is healthy and free from any problems that may otherwise come from it. Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Proceedings are suspended for 15 minutes.

AT 3:22 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 3:50 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT:
George Town continuing.

Proceedings are resumed. The Third Elected Member for

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN:

Thank you, Mr. President.

The franchised companies provide vital public services such as the water and electricity and the telephone service. These are monopolies. They are franchised and it is very important that the Government ensures that the public has the necessary protection since the competitiveness is taken out of that specific business in the specific area in which they are franchised.

I was very concerned to know that in the George Town district there had been the diesel contamination of water and the Member for Communications and Works has undertaken to ensure that in the future we have the water checked on a daily basis. This should not have had to happen after there was this contamination. These checks are only common sense and they should have been carried out as a matter of course.

I recently noticed the Caribbean Utilities Company had a release about what to do when there are surges of electricity. I would hope that the standard of electricity under the franchise would be such that it should not be necessary for the public individually to take the measures that they mentioned in this, such as having surge suppressors put on equipment and into ones electrical supply lines. If I am wrong, that the surges are acceptable under the franchise, which I do not know, then I feel since they are causing these surges, they should contribute something to individuals towards the cost of regularising their electricity for which they pay. While these are little things, they do affect and, in fact, annoy the public when a refrigerator or television is made defective as a result of power surges.

I believe on the average the franchise companies provide good service. I also feel that Government should continue, as it has been doing, to ensure that any rises in rates for any of these services are fully justified after very careful and detailed checking by Government or an agent of the Government.

Moving on to a very important area. We find that the Budget Speech has dealt in some considerable depth with the Caymanian Foreign Person imbalance that may be coming about. I will deal with this in a bit of depth under the Immigration heading. There is a Select Committee sitting and anything I say here are naturally only my views and have no relation to that. We have heard a lot from Members of Government that we should be giving them advice and providing solutions for the subjects for which they are charged for responsibility under the Constitution. Well, nobody minds giving advice and solutions, but as I will show in due course, when that advice is given and they do not like it, they do not accept it. The little twist in all this is when you ask for advice, be it from the Chamber of Commerce or from the Backbench or from anybody, speaking generally, you do not always get the answer that you may wish. But that is a democracy.

A lot of the dilemma that is rising now in the area of Immigration stems back to what I feel was one of the solutions put forward in the Caymanian Protection Law in 1984. I believe the amending of the Caymanian Protection Law is not going to solve the problems we now have because the Law has many good basic sections which have either not been used or, alternatively, the directives that have been made under the Law do not solve the problems of Immigration.

One of these sections was section 43 which provided permanent residence with the right to work. I believe if the Government had used that section more, then they could have provided the security of tenure for the non-Caymanian but it would also have satisfied Caymanians because the use of permanent residence with a right to work does not carry with it the right to vote, to sit in the Legislative Assembly nor an unlimited right to work in any other business as Caymanian Status, at present, allows.

That section was carefully drafted and very briefly it says: "...the person to engage in gainful occupation of such type, at such place, for such period and under such other conditions as may be specified by the Board.". A lot of the problems arose when people who were working as lawyers or as bankers and then got Caymanian Status, the next day they were in the retail business competing with Caymanians.

Under this section people could have been given the right to work for a limited period of time - for life, for five years or 10 years - in the area that was needed in the economy. So if we needed specialists in an area - be that anything from specialised people in steel construction to lawyers - then the permanent residence could have been limited for that person to remain in the area of work that was needed. For example, if that person the Board felt that area would be open and jobs needed for 10 years, then the grant could have been limited to the 10 years. So we would have had, at this stage, a much more satisfied population both from the point of view of Caymanians who would have protected and continued with the competitive edge in businesses that were more localised, but could have attracted people on a more permanent basis in areas where there was a need for skills that were not here locally.

I do believe that unless there is communication between the Protection Board, the Planning Board, the Labour Office and someone in either personnel or the Public Service Commission who can look at the overall aspect of the development of the economy, in these Islands, that we are not going to get an overall total policy that is satisfactory. If, on the one hand, the Protection Board feels there is somebody undesirable, and they withdraw a permit and he is employed in Government, or vice versa, Government has cause to terminate the employment of a person, and he finds employment in the private sector for whatever reason, it seems to me that we have the right hand not knowing what the left hand is doing and developing an overall effective policy in immigration will not come about.

After the Select Committee sits, I would hope, I would like to see that the Draft, together with whatever information is necessary of the proposed Law, would go back to the public for the final input from them.

There are a few areas of the Budget I would like to read here. I will be fairly brief on this. That is at page 74, where there is a summary over the medium term and in the little (b) paragraph the Financial Secretary mentions:

"If the level of immigrant labour importation is increased or decreased across the board at an average annual rate of about 6 per cent, the direct effect on the economy is likely to be an average annual increase or decrease in GDP of about \$22.2 million in nominal terms."

He mentions in the subsection (d):

"If the Government cuts back or increases the public sector capital investment programme in economic infrastructure alone at an average annual rate of about 2 per cent, this would likely result in an average annual direct nominal gain or loss to the economy of about \$3.5 million over the next three to 4 years."

The decision that is going to have to come about which has been clearly set out in the Budget, as to whether there is a slowing down of the economy or to let it continue, obviously is probably one of the most important decisions that this country will have to take.

In doing so, while it affects immigration, its effects are very far ranging. We find that the alternatives have been very clearly set out in the Budget. The advice is there and quite frankly what we do not find in the Budget is the decisions by Government as to what they intend to do. But the impact of what is done is something that is going to affect not only immigration, it is going to affect the economy and it has to be looked at with the overall spectrum and not just from the immigration point of view.

The Financial Secretary has set out in the Budget the way in which the imbalance has come about in recent years where we have had a more rapid increase in non-Caymanians' in the different sectors of the economy. He touches, at page 39, on what I think is an important, perhaps one of the very few important statistics not in this Budget is that we do need to know and if I may just read this:

"In other words, while these statistics may suggest that there was no discrimination against Caymanians in the statistical allocation of jobs in the sectorial job markets during the 1980s they do not inform us of the qualitative differences (if any) in the allocation of jobs. Even though there may be an insufficient amount of professionally-trained Caymanians, from a policy perspective, it would be instructive to find out how well the labour market has functioned in the objective allocation of quality jobs between the available trained Caymanians and non-Caymanians."

I definitely feel that those statistics will probably show that we must push education and training because many of the top jobs will be filled by non-Caymanians. Do not get me wrong, I think until a person, be he Caymanian or otherwise, is qualified and competent to hold the position, they are not entitled to hold that position. But it does give us some idea of where the thrust has to be and it is one which will impact on the immigration policies.

I know that the Third Official Member who is responsible for Immigration is looking at the re-housing of immigration and I know I will support it. However, I believe on the short term between now and the middle of next year when this building is completed, we must try to do something to speed up and make more efficient the operation of immigration in the Islands. Many times the frustration comes from delays because if you know the answer yes or no that is many times something that is acceptable to people. It is when the people are left in limbo for any length of time then that is unacceptable.

So whatever necessary staff or implementation of policies that need to be brought, especially to speed up the decision making process which I understand in one which has its problems on the administrative side to a large extent as well. I am not here saying that the Board is not making its decisions in time. There are probably both areas where there are delays. But I believe that once the Board has made their decision, if we have the information going out expeditiously to people, this will cut down on a lot of the frustrations.

While on this, we used to hear from time to time, about the problems that arise around fear of Boards or Government departments, and I noticed the controversy between the Chamber of Commerce and Government. I wonder, again, that along with the letters which time to time no names are put on or more recently the meetings where people asked the press not to quote them. Here we have what is unfortunately a frightened society. Therefore it is so important that the powerful areas of any Government are efficient, effective and that there is the proper communication with the public.

I believe that if we can get the communication process between the different arms of Government worked out - such as the Planning Department, the Public Service Commission and the Labour Department - that we are bound to be able to ease the problems that have obviously risen in this area. I know and the Member responsible has my sympathy and so does the Chairman of the Protection Board, it is one of the most difficult areas in any Government. Not just this Government but in any Government to deal with. That is why it is so important that the full effort of this Legislature and of the public to assist with the smooth operation of that Department is carried out.

Further, I believe that no matter what we do under that new Law, unless the policies which are ultimately made under it by the Executive Council are such that they are good and

effective, we still are not going to get any further ahead because I do believe that there are not a lot of problems in the Law, I do believe that it is in the detailed policies that many of the problems are arising. That I would hope would be looked at very carefully by the Government. Quite frankly, I am sure if they need a bit of advice there, they will be able to probably find someone to give it, either ourselves or the Chamber of Commerce or one of the other organisations who will assist them - the Builders Association or someone. Lastly, the process has got to be better refined with the way the committee is going about this with listening to the organisations, to people individually in due course before this important Law is finalised.

I would now like to go on to deal with Cayman Airways. Firstly, this company is one of the largest employers in these Islands. It is a very important company. It is a very integral part of the Cayman Islands economy. More so of the continuity and stability of the economy of the Islands. I wish Cayman Airways and its staff well. However, that does not relieve me of the responsibility which I owe to the public to look extremely carefully at what used to be, at least, one of Governments largest assets and to see what areas where there could be improvements or any areas where the airlines should look more carefully at, in the future.

What is significant is for the first time in, I guess, in a decade or 10 or 12 years or so, Cayman Airways has made a profit of nearly \$1,000,000. More significant is the fact that it is showing \$2,000,000 better off, I should say, than it was from a year ago of June of this year. The accounts we have received are up to June of this year. This is significant because the company has done, in the last financial year, what it has not been able to do in the past decade and what every Member for Tourism has stood up here and wished it could have done over those many years. That is the company has shown a profit.

Now, it is an accepted practice when you have a company which is in a very improved and continued improving position, you have finally got everything in it right and pulling together. The last thing in the world one does when you have a company finally making some money is to begin to dismantle the major areas of it, which have caused the making of that profit. That, to me, is unaccepted financial principle. If you make a million this year, you improve by \$2,000,000 in one year. Then it is so simple to keep on making the profit. But, even if you use this by whatever methods, single entry bookkeeping or double entry or whatever you must be compelled, I think, to have to look and give the public absolute justification for changing and altering, really selling the assets which have caused you to make that profit.

I would have thought it would have been foreseen, prior to getting the audited accounts, that the airlines was on the road to making a profit, at last. I do not know what the accounts for the projections are for the next year. I would hope they would better the \$2,000,000 that the end of the financial year in June, 1989 bettered the 1988 accounts. If so, I would say to them well done. But time will be the only way of knowing as a fact whether the decision to have sold the 727 jets and to have leased the 737 - 400s was a correct decision. What I am saying here is basically if something works and better still, Sir, if something makes a profit, do not touch it.

MR. PRESIDENT: If I may interrupt you, I feel I have to interrupt you, on several counts. This matter has been debated thoroughly in the House in recent meetings. It was covered succinctly by the Second Elected Member for the Lesser Islands in speaking. I really must ask you to move on.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Mr. President, while I accept your ruling, may I just mention that there is a subsidy of \$1,050,000 in the estimate? That is where I pulled the relevancy from, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that is fair. I am asking you to move on. I think you have covered it, and it was covered previously.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: As you rule, Sir. Are you saying I should go completely off Cayman Airways or only off the subject of the sale...

MR. PRESIDENT: I am asking you to stick to the bounds of the debate which are in the Standing Orders, the general principle and merits of the financial and general administration of the Government. Perhaps I should quote the Standing Order again, some Members of the House are looking mystified. Would you kindly address the Chair if you have something to say? I am sorry, I am having a time finding this. It is the Standing Order which I quoted at the beginning of this...

HON. J. LEMUEL HURLSTON: Mr. President, I think it is Standing Order 63(2), Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: Yes, that is right. Thank you very much. I am most grateful. It says: "on the Motion for the second reading of an Appropriations Bill", which is what the House is now debating, debates should be confined to the financial and economic state of the Islands and the general principle of the Government policy and administration as indicated by the bill and its estimates."

The other Standing Order to which I am referring is 41(1). I hope the House understands that I am only intervening on the principle of the efficient dispatch of business. 41(1) reads:

"The Presiding Officer, after having called the attention of the House, or of a Committee, to the conduct of a Member who persists in irrelevance, or tedious repetition, either of his own arguments or the arguments used by the other Members, may direct the Member to discontinue his speech and to resume his

seat."

I am not approaching that point. I am simply drawing your attention to it. I would ask other Members if they have anything to say to the Chair would they stand and speak into the microphone.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Mr. President, while accepting your ruling, I am wondering whether... at page 35 it seems a policy of Government is to continue to subsidise Cayman Airways...

MR. PRESIDENT: I am not saying whether it is a matter of Government policy, but this argument was covered quite extensively by a previous speaker, the Second Elected Member for the Lesser Islands.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Mr. President, do I understand you to say, then, if one Member of the House covers an area, I cannot cover it?

MR. PRESIDENT: I am pointing out to you that the Standing Orders say that "a Member who persists in repetition, either of his own arguments or the arguments used by other Members..." I did circulate to all Members before this meeting of the Assembly on a reminder, I think it was circular number three from the Clerk to Members, the reasons for that are stated in that circular. I do not think I can make it clearer. The First Elected Member for West Bay.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Yes, Mr. President. It would seem that this Standing Order is saying the Member carried on a long time in irrelevance or tedious repetition. The Member, seems to me, is just getting into the fact of the subsidy. I find it strange that the Chair is taking this position when the Member for Health carried on such a long time in irrelevance and tedious repetition.

MR. PRESIDENT: That is the opinion of the Member. The Chair has its opinion. I have given my ruling. Would you like to continue?

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Mr. President, it is just about time. I am wondering, rather than I begin on a new Head, could I just stop there.

MR. PRESIDENT: How long do you think you would like to go on.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: I am going to be a lot longer, Sir. No more on Cayman Airways, but I will be longer on other subjects.

ADJOURNMENT

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, I move the adjournment of this House until 10:00 tomorrow morning.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that the House do now adjourn until 10:00 tomorrow morning. I shall put the question. Those in favour, please say Aye... Those against No.

AYES.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Ayes have it. The House is accordingly adjourned until Thursday morning at 10:00.

AT 4:30 P.M. THE HOUSE STOOD ADJOURNED UNTIL 10:00 A.M. THURSDAY, 30TH NOVEMBER, 1989.

**THURSDAY
30TH NOVEMBER, 1989
10:17 A.M.**

MR. PRESIDENT: I will ask the Honourable Member responsible for Communications, Works and Natural Resources to say prayers.

PRAYERS

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON:

Let us Pray.

Almighty God, from whom all wisdom and power are derived: We beseech Thee so to direct and prosper the deliberations of the Legislative Assembly now assembled, that all things may be ordered upon the best and surest foundations for the glory of Thy Name and for the safety, honour and welfare of the people of these Islands.

Bless our Sovereign Lady Queen Elizabeth, the Queen Mother, Philip Duke of Edinburgh, Charles Prince of Wales, Diana Princess of Wales and all the Royal family. Give grace to all who exercise authority in our Commonwealth that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety may be established among us. Especially we pray for the Governor of our Islands, the Members of Executive Council and Members of the Legislative Assembly that they may be enabled faithfully to perform the responsible duties of their high office.

All this we ask for Thy great Name's sake, Amen.

Our Father, who art in Heaven, Hallowed be Thy Name, Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done, in earth as it is in Heaven. Give us this day our daily bread: And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us: And lead us not into temptation; but deliver us from evil: For Thine is the Kingdom, the power and the glory, for ever and ever. Amen.

The Lord bless us and keep us: the Lord make His face shine upon us and be gracious unto us: the Lord lift up His countenance upon us and give us peace now and always. Amen.

MR. PRESIDENT: Proceedings of the House are resumed. Government Business, Bills. The Second Reading of the Appropriation (1990) Bill, 1989. The Third Elected Member for George Town to continue.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

BILLS

SECOND READING

THE APPROPRIATION (1990) BILL, 1989

(Continuation of debate thereon)

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Set out in the Estimates are the revenues and expenditure of the Cayman Islands. It has been the aim of the Government, both present and in the past, to balance the Budget. That has always been put forward, as has been done this time, in the Budget Speech. I would now like to examine the Government's policy of balancing the Budget. First, this is the Government's Budget. It is a Budget that the whole Executive Council approves, even though it is obviously one that is put forward by the Honourable Financial Secretary in his capacity as such. It is one which contains the Government's policies. Therefore, the four Elected Members of Government are very much aware and have approved that Budget, both on the Revenue and the Expenditure side.

I believe it has to be seen that the Budget has left out expenditures which must come about in the very near future. Those areas are the increase, once it is approved by the Government, to the Civil Service. That has to be a substantial sum of money, whether it is \$3 million or \$5 million or \$6 million or whatever, it, in any event, has to be a substantial sum. Further, we have had the Member for Health lay on the Table the Pension Scheme for the Government which shows some \$32 million that will be necessary to fund it. There is no substantial amount in the Budget for that either.

The civil servants, like any other employees, are entitled to their pensions. It is money they have worked for and has accrued to them and, as I have said in this House many times before, this is not something that is being given to them, they are entitled to it. I believe that this Budget should have made a provision for putting aside money towards it, in a substantial amount because we are not looking at funding this by putting aside \$1 million or \$2 million a year. I think we are looking at many millions more than that. What I would like to have seen, because I believe that the Elected Members of Government knew that it was going to be this amount, at least sometime during the time before the Budget was presented to this House, and they

should have made a substantial provision made for it. That, together with about 22 places of nominal votes in the Budget (the \$10 votes) where matters are regarded as essential but there is not sufficient funds to put in at the present time to fund them, or occasionally could be because Estimates have not been completed on projects yet, but they are regarded as important projects. The fact that a provision is made is sufficient to warrant that. If proper provisions had been made and while the specific amount for the civil servant's salaries increase may not be known, as was done the last time this arose - an estimate was put into the Budget as a sum - then what we would have, unfortunately, would be a Budget which is really not balanced.

If these were sums such as the Civil Service increase that would not have to be paid, if it were a building of a road or a building that you could put off, that is different. But the Civil Service increase is a necessary expenditure which must arise very near in the future and, in my view, the Executive Council should have put in the proper provision in the Budget for these two matters.

Once again, it is not a good idea to pay lip service to the balancing of the Budget if, in fact, we have important and crucial matters such as this left out. Quite frankly, if there is ever one time that authority should be given to put a sum in the Budget it should be the payment of civil servants' pensions and salaries.

Obviously the Budget is a lean Budget. The increase over last year is not very large and the fact that Government is tight of funds for the coming year is even more the reason why the securing of money which has to be spent should be put in there. So, looking at that aspect of it, I feel that we have to be realistic and we have to do what is right and we have to make provisions for those.

In another area, moving off that most important area, we have seen in the Budget some \$5.2 million is repayment on the present loans. This appears to be approximately one half which is dealing with repayment of interest only, and one half is principal and interest. What I am drawing attention to here is the fact that we do have loans that at present we are paying interest on that ultimately in the near future we will have to begin to repay. This has to be taken into consideration with any further borrowing that this country makes.

I would like to endorse the economic development planning that the Honourable First Official Member has put forward because I believe it is necessary to ensure that when we have the Estimates come to this House, they take in everything that needs to be added into them. He has summed this up on page 54 going onto page 55 when he said:

"An economic development plan in the context of a free-market economy represents no more than a management tool designed to give the Government more efficient and effective leverage over the allocation and use of scarce public resources. Within the framework of clearly defined and attainable set of goals and objectives, the Plan would estimate and mobilise the necessary domestic and foreign resources of money and skills, and allocating and guiding them to those priorities which seem most likely to make the greatest contributions to achieving the goals and objectives within a given time frame. The Plan would also identify, prioritise and cost those investments that comprise the public sector of the economy and programme them over a period of 3, 5 or 10 years or whatever time frame seems more reasonable..."

That, I think, is very good planning. It is something that is necessary. I would only interject this, that with it, provided that it remains as the First Official Member has defined it, we do not have the unnecessary interference into private enterprise because I am a staunch believer that free enterprise and the public sector should do as much of the work, and deal with as many of the projects, as can be done. To have a Civil Service which is expanding too rapidly, where projects can be dealt with in the private sector, I think, that is bad, and I will expand on that a bit more when I deal with the Civil Service, but I fully agree with this. Like everything else it has to be applied in small doses and not in the massive doses we have seen before this House relating matters such as roads and the hospital, which I will deal with at a latter stage. All I would say, when you are putting this together keep, as the basis of it, the free enterprise system. In the areas where you have to steer the private sector. I would ask that while that steering be stern to a certain extent, that it be done with ease and be done objectively because we must never forget that the Government and their revenue depend directly on the private enterprise and the continuity of private businesses which are generating the revenue.

The other area, while on this Government policy, is that I feel that the question of accountability is very important. The caution which has been expressed by the Public Accounts Committee, in relation to overspending on votes, should be taken seriously. Having said that about where I feel the Budget itself is in reality not balanced, in my view, is because it has left out crucial expenditure that must take place and what will happen now is that there will be very heavy supplementary expenditure in the meantime. That, to me, seems not the way to go when Government could make a provision for it, at this stage.

Let me say this, there is no dishonour on Government if the Budget does not balance. But the expenditure which is coming about is one that is controlled and is necessary. If, on occasions such as this, money has to be spent, then perhaps the exception to the rule of balancing the Budget may have to come about. Overall, what the Budget is trying to achieve is good for the country. I do not think we should kid ourselves, or the country, by not doing what is a reality.

The last aspect on this that I would like to mention and it ties in with what I will be dealing with as an Open Check Policy Plan, such as the Master Ground Transportation Plan and the new hospital, is that the Government policy on borrowing must be that it restricts itself within the 10 per cent of the recurrent revenue to service its debt. Both the principal and interest. As I mentioned earlier, in doing so it has

to take into account where there are moratoriums and loans, because you may be paying \$1 million interest, but when the principal comes on line in a year or two, that could jump to \$2 million or \$1.5 million or \$2.5 million. In when the principal comes on line in a year or two, that could jump to \$2 million or \$1.5 million or \$2.5 million. I do not think the Government should go up to the 10 per cent. I think they should leave a 1 per cent freedom fact, I do not think the Government should go up to the 10 per cent. I think they should leave a 1 per cent freedom so that when we hit 9 per cent the brake has to be put on lending and alternative sources found to fund the Budget or projects which are not so necessary should be cut.

It is a reality, unfortunately, that the country at this stage is beginning to feel the effects of a slowing down in the economy. Especially prominent, it seen with the tourist figures for the Islands. It is a fact that when you get tourism beginning to slow, you will ultimately find a slowing within the economy. At present, let me say this, the figures that have been produced in the Budget do not show any large extent of this, but, like the Honourable Financial Secretary mentioned, it takes a while before the bite of the slowing is finally felt throughout the economy. I do not personally think that we are going into a recession, let me make that clear, but we are not expanding now and we cannot be expanding at the rate we did in the good years, back two or three years ago, and the Budget has to take this into consideration.

I would now move on to another topic that has been raised. I guess it is important to Government's policy because it is how the Government works to produce its policy, and thus the impact of Government on the ultimate policy of the country. It seems to me that in a democracy a good government works by having good communication with its people and with other Members in this House. It obviously must have cooperation from Members within the House and the public. Thirdly, to achieve that, there must be some element of friendship between the two sides of the House. If not, then I believe Government's policies are bound to be affected.

What are some of the problems under these three headings? Lack of communication, be it with matters relating to immigration, or be it with the Member with his own constituents or, more specifically here, a lack of communication between the Government Elected Members and the Backbenchers. This is obviously a problem in this House, and has been a problem in this House throughout its past year or so.

We have seen that the Pension Plan, for example, was aired publicly, it went out to the organisations such as the Chamber of Commerce and its professional organisations which included people and organisations such as the Builders, Hotel Association, the Lawyers' Association, and was looked at in considerable depth and it was only about a month ago that we received a briefing on it. In my view, that is bad communications with this side of the House.

Now, another area of conflict in the House is the Health Care Plan. Where is the communication there? It seems to me that everybody in the world seemed to know what was going on with these two plans, and we have to pick what we get from the newspapers or the Chamber of Commerce's Bulletin. We are now going to be briefed on that, as I understand it, in a few weeks' time and we were to have been briefed on it back, I think it was, September the 20th at 4:00 P.M. but, unfortunately, a few hours before we were to have the meeting that was called off. But, when you get major issues such as this and you are not getting the Members of Government coming to the Backbenchers and outlining this. We see things indirectly. It cannot make for good communications and obviously, it literally wipes out cooperation.

It is impossible to drop in the lap of anyone, be it Backbenchers or the public, a major issue and then expect that you will get the extent of cooperation that you would have gotten if you had come to them properly and explained it in some detail, and then give them time to think about it because you do need time. I like to look at things from all angles and I find that sleeping on things overnight sometimes helps one to see the different views on things. It comes out of looking at things from the in-depth point of view. If there is one thing I could say Mr. Jim Bodden was good at during his lifetime in this House, it was with communicating. It is so crucial that all Members of this House sit down at times and try to trash out major issues. Regardless of what happens, it is a totally different climate when one is in the formal part of the Legislature and many of the issues that one can discuss and deal with - unfortunately, if one does not know it, or if there are no meetings to be briefed on these - then, naturally, it gets to a stage which ends up in considerable conflict.

Moving on from the heading of Communications, where I think the Government has definitely failed, and to be frank, failed badly, has been their communication with us. That is my personal view, I should say. On cooperation - once we get over the stage of where we know what is coming up, then we come to the stage where one is asked to vote for something or to support it. In my view, and I believe in the public's view, we have been very responsible Backbenchers and history has shown this. In the last meeting of this Legislature we supported 5 out of 6 Laws. The sixth one was the Music and Dancing Licence Law. So we have tried to cooperate and even at times when we have managed to get together, and this has already been out publicly on the floor, as we did with the Motorcycle Amendment Law, what we got for it was a reasonably good political pounding in here from the Member of Communications and Works introducing that Bill, in his opening. However, we were responsible and we voted for it. We did not let politics intervene. If politics had intervened, we would just not have voted for it. But we voted for it. We sat down around a table in the spirit of cooperation, as should be done on all major issues, and we agreed on it. We came into this House and we got banged for that cooperation.

The only other two very brief things I will mention on this to give some examples, because the Member for Health spent some time dealing how Government's policies towards cooperation should be working, is when the then Government Backbenchers got together and the joint statement came out relating to the vote of no-confidence and four or five hours later in a public platform at the Court steps, a similar banging took place.

Lastly, we asked this House to put the Labour Law into a Select Committee so that we could put certain amendments, rather than trying to deal with them from the floor of this House. We asked them to cooperate with us on this point and in that instance they had eight votes so.

unfortunately, it did not happen. What I am trying to show here is that it is no good for the Government to ask us to cooperate, if they are not going to cooperate as well, because we have to be naive to consistently cooperate and then get beaten for it. That is not even good common sense from our point of view. So, what I see as affecting the Government's policies, and here and we do have a very finely tuned House, if I may use those words to describe it, where there are times when the Government must seek the cooperation of one or some of the Members on this side of the House to support its issues.

How can you achieve communication and cooperation unless there is some element of friendship? It is difficult to put people around the table when, as I heard yesterday, and I was somewhat shocked, the Member for Health mention that the First Elected Member for West Bay was not his friend. I have been a lawyer for some 20 years, we argue points inside of a Court and we come out and we have to get on with each other because life extends beyond these hallowed walls. What I am pointing out is that if we are going to get to that extent of it in public, then the public needs to understand the difficulties that exist. It is something that goes both ways. I am not saying that there are not times when we may not be at fault. Everybody, I think, makes mistakes at times. But it is a hard fact in a democracy that you need a majority to run a Government. I believe that the phrase, "Politics is the art of compromise" comes about. It comes about very clearly when you have the Members of Government needing support, especially on a major issues.

I would just like to mention one thing here. Matters that we have voted against, we felt were not good for the Cayman Islands. We did that because we believe that is our duty in this House and it is the responsibility placed upon us by the Electorate of this country. What we have not been prepared to do, and unfortunately was one of the issues here, and I would like to deal with in a bit of depth further on, is the Master Ground Transportation Plan, was to vote against that aspect of it from the point of view that we were not prepared to sign a blank cheque for Government to go off and begin spending the public's funds. It comes back to accountability. We can show good cause for what we have voted against. However, other Members and I asked the Member for Communications who was bringing this to please adjourn it, to please put it off a bit, and not get into this confrontation stage. But, no, it was put to the vote and the House has recorded that it was defeated. I would just mention this. It seems to me that if you are going to have a matter of major issue in this House put to the vote when it could be adjourned or withdrawn for some element of compromise or communication to be carried out, then whatever the consequences of that be, it squarely rests on the shoulders of the Elected Government of this country.

I want there to be no doubt about this. When Motions or Laws are brought by the Government, that Member bringing it is the person who has to try to seek to adjourn it, if he does not have a majority. If they force a vote in this House they feel too big to communicate, or too big to ask Members to vote with them and support it, then all I can say is that the consequences that follow would follow because of what they have done. The public needs to understand that the Government needs a majority and that is a duty under the Constitution. The Backbenchers do not need a majority. They are a minority by nature. There has to be these elements of communication, cooperation, friendship and, most of all, if they are finding a major issue that they do not have a majority, all I would say is, for Pete's sake, have enough sense to adjourn it or not force the confrontation as arose on the Master Ground Transportation Plan.

What is a reality is that where you get eight Elected Members of this House saying the views of the people are one thing, it seems to me that it would be prudent for the minority of the one third of the four Elected Members [of Executive Council] to sit and take note of it and try to test the water themselves.

Finally, there is a West Indian Calypso that says: "10,000 Frenchmen can't be wrong." If the Government only had problems with its Backbenchers in this House it would be somewhat different. But as we saw there is obvious confrontation with the Chamber of Commerce and its professional organisations, for example, on the Pension Plan; be they the Lawyers or the Hoteliers or the Builders, so it is a problems which stems beyond this House. It stems into the fact that the general public expect to see that the Government takes steps, and they are charged with responsibility for their subjects, to get what is necessary in this House to pass their major programmes. But to do so, it has to be a two-way street. It has to be a matter of give and take, and if we are on the side of giving only, then, finally, once we have been beaten on the head for a sufficiently long time, I am afraid things become more difficult.

Moving on to deal with the two Lesser Islands. These are an integral part of the Cayman Islands. They have to be looked at from the point of view that there has been large capital expenditure to build Grand Cayman and, quite frankly, I feel they have never gotten their full share of what should be coming to them. I know we tried, and I believe that most Governments try, but sometimes I think we have to put ourselves in the position of being the two Lesser Islands, we have to realise that the infrastructure has to be built up and this is going to cost the Government. It has cost the Government a lot in the past and it is also going to do so in the future. But, we are all one people, one group of Islands and I believe we have to look very carefully at whatever the two Elected Members and the Third Official Member of this House come up with from time to time, because they will only develop as we develop the infrastructure and finally get them to a stage where they can basically be on par in some of the industries, at least, of Grand Cayman.

While it may be difficult to see a large part of the Banking or the insurance industry move there, the area of tourism is one that I believe has to be pushed by the Government in its policies. I would hope that we would see in the future those Islands moving forward and its people feeling that the time has come when many of them who had to come here for jobs, would feel secure and safe to get back and be assured that there would be continuing jobs in the two Lesser Islands. I would say this from the conservation point of view, we are really very lucky that we do have Grand Cayman which is fairly far developed, but the two Lesser Islands in a lesser degree are still preserved to a large extent and they can learn from many of the mistakes that may have been made over here. So it has its good points with development, and it has its bad points.

On to another heavy subject, that of the Civil Service. I am an ex-civil servant. I am proud of that. I am glad that the service has gotten from a stage where many years back, a decade or two, people felt that going into the service was not the best thing to do. The service is getting to a stage where it is a proud one. It is showing that the attractions within it are sufficient to keep good key people in there. I believe we will find that with the increases to Government's salaries with the stabilising of the Pension situation, and money going into the Budget now to deal with those accrued matters. If I were a civil servant I would worry me that my pension was being paid out of recurrent funds, because it could well be that what I have worked for over the last 20 years, for example, one good day there may not be sufficient funds to continue it or to pay it fully. So I believe to give the security to the Civil Service we must ensure that salaries are up to a good standard and that their pensions are secure. When I say secure, I mean secure away from politicians, all politicians, generally. So that the fund, when we finally see the pension matter from the Member for Health, it is something that is secure because this is money that has been worked for. It is not contingent money.

Having said that, I believe the civil servants must give an honest day's work for that good pay. That goes hand in hand with the security and the pay. We are seeing a very large amount of new services - new civil servants being asked for this year, what would be good, and it may be a little short of notice to give it now, is to see the justification for those posts in writing. I know that the Third Official Member is putting in place the organisation and management services, as it is now more commonly referred to, to ensure this. So with the asking for extra posts must come the proper justification after the proper studies. I will say here that if it takes four, or eight, or 10 people in that Department, the one Department where money cannot be better spent on is one which deals with the management services in a large organisation. With it, when they look at posts I believe that they should also look at adding but also of cutting posts in areas where it is not necessary. I am not saying to get out there and contract the Civil Service overnight, but I believe that organising and moving people around into other posts and cutting out that posts that become redundant would avoid us having to add people there many times.

Having said that, the rapid rate with the Civil Service has increased does worry me. I believe that the Government is not following, as rigidly as it should, the policy that if the private sector can do certain areas of business, then Government has no business in it. That is for two reasons, and they do not reflect on this Government. These reasons are universal. The first reason is that it is hard to get the public to pay the Government. They feel more reluctant to pay than they do private enterprise. Secondly, the projects that the private sector does, do not get tainted with politics. So many times it does make for better economy and better organisation. I would look forward, if it is wish of the Finance Committee, to listening carefully to representatives from the Civil Service Association and their management association on their views on matters such as the pensions or the increases, or any other areas that they feel that this House can cooperate with towards a better Government. And you know that if we have open communication, I do not necessarily mean public when I say open, but communication between ourselves in these areas, many times you can avoid any misunderstanding or confrontation that could arise in the future and could create a problem.

The one thing that still worries me is that the Civil Service is still weak between the senior, the top people, and the strata under it. There has to be a strengthening of the pyramid within the service so we see more deputies in against the Principal Secretaries and the Members of the Executive Council. So I would like to see not such a large gap between the heads and the middle management stage. I think the Government has to put in place for its continuity and its stability - to use the words which are continuously pounded out in the Election campaigns - it also needs to have people there so if for any reason one of the Principal Secretaries or the Financial Secretary or the Attorney General or the Administrative Secretary, whoever, is ill or for whatever reason is unavailable, there is a person to continue. Secondly it follows that there must be the necessary delegation of authority to those people because that is the only way that they can mature into a position to assist the person at the top. It used to be an old Civil Service policy that when someone got too near to you, then you pulled back somewhat because that way you would preserve your position if there was nobody to take over. I am happy to say that that has long gone. But, there still remains that weakness and I would like to see that filled.

On one point, and I know the Third Official Member who is in charge of this has answered on it, but I still find it difficult to understand why in the Police Force we have not been able to attract more Caymanians. There seems to be something that either we ourselves, or the Member, or someone is not getting right, because, as the Financial Secretary has shown in his Budget, areas such as Banking or in the professional areas we have managed to get people in, and I would ask him to have another good, hard look at that because I think he mentioned it was only one out of 20 applicants, or two out of 20 applicants that joined, to see what can be done to continue the overall Civil Service Caymanianisation approach. Quite frankly, I do not know what the answer is. But I am saying to him that is the one thing that has struck me, and I have thought about it a lot and I do not know where the problem is but I believe that he should look as carefully as he can to solving the problem there. In areas where the public has to rub shoulders with the Government it is more crucial that the Caymanianisation be carried out in those areas. It eases everybody's burden I think, including yours, Sir, in your other capacity being in charge of the service.

From there, I would like to deal briefly with what now is the largest Government Capital Estimate of Expenditure - the roads - and the Government's general policy there. Let me say this, I know there is a problem with traffic in this country. All of us know that. It is important that solutions be found to these. However, the solutions have to be realistic. It cannot be a situation where we forget priorities in other areas and concentrate only on this. In fairness to the Member for Communications, and to any Member, they naturally push their subjects harder than they would other subject. That is a natural human tendency. But there has to be realistic limits to what we can do.

What is most frightening (and I use the word frightening) is when we are asked to support the Government's policies when we do not get a realistic cost, when we are basically

being asked to sign an open blank check and send off someone who is going to ultimately come back and say: 'I thought it would have cost \$40 million, it could cost \$60 million or \$80 million. I do not think that would be being responsible. So it is important that when the Government presents something to this House, or to the public, that the cost is counted. There is no short cut to that. No matter how crucial a project is. If it is a substantial project, the chances are that we are going to have to borrow heavily or we are going to have to tax heavily and that, ultimately, bites the little man as well as the big man.

In summary, because this issue was tied in with the hospital issue, it was mentioned that it was difficult to put the hospital somewhere else if there was no road to it, but what has to be looked at with every major project is what does the public want and, more importantly, what can it afford. The impact of that Plan was that peoples' land and houses would have been affected, they could not have built anything further and the sum involved, because of the massiveness of this Plan, has to be an extremely large sum. What I think has to happen here is that the Member and the Government must go back and come up with a realistic Plan to deal with the road and traffic problems. But I say it has to be a realistic one, it is because the public has to be able to afford it. It has to be in line with its priority, and it has to be one which is certain, because certainty with any large plan is important. I think I saw in the Public Accounts Committee that there is a sum of some \$7 million claim on a project that was not even much to begin with. I will say no more on it, but it was in the Public Accounts Committee. So we have to be careful when we get into things to fix with certainty, how much the public may have to pay. I know Government naturally resists that claim. But that is an example there because, at the end of the day, it is the public that has to pay for (to use the word banded around by the Member for Health) the grandiose scheme.

I believe that we have shown that when projects or Laws are good for the country we do support it and we are saying here that, yes, something needs to be done on it. But go back and come up with something smaller, that is affordable. Now, we find tied in with that aspect the new hospital scheme which, once again, is very large; which, once again, we know nothing about to any extent. But when you get extremely large numbers being pushed around in the newspaper, \$20 million here and there, and you realise that that one project could probably double the country's borrowing, it must give cause for concern.

Once again, the Government's policy is that they are failing to see the little things. They are failing to find the small, practical solutions to things, and they are getting carried away with these big projects and big schemes. They only come into effect many years down the line, but in-between there is the stopgap and something has to be done in-between. There are problems with the medical services. Those problems are not going to be fully solved with a \$20 million hospital. It goes much further than that. In fact, I believe that before a person should be given the authority to do big things they should prove themselves with the little things. With only a year under the Government's belt, they just have not got on with a lot of the little things that will only be taken over to these big projects.

There are problems relating not only to the physical plants, the hospital itself with overcrowding. Let me say this, no matter what size you build a hospital, there are going to be some peak periods when it will not be capable of taking in everybody as an in-patient. That is a way of life. But what you have to do is find a realistic balance in between the Utopia and what is realistic. People will understand this if you tell them.

What people are not going to understand is when those statistics show that an extremely large amount of beds have been unnecessarily put in and they are sitting there empty and you are charging the little man fees which, once again, I will say this to the Member for Health, it would be very prudent for him to publicly expose those fees before the Executive Council brings them in to ensure that it is not only what the public wants, but what they can afford. It may well be that the public's view, as has been stated from time to time by consultants which I would like to deal with in some depth later on, that we do have a good facility. It is not the best. It has areas that are lacking, but let us try to do, in a small way, some of the things that will improve it.

The Member has put out a lot of effort on Health and drugs, I will say that, but I believe that you have to give people doses of medicine fairly slowly or you get rejection. If he feels and he pushes along the management services side of this - that certain things are lacking on the management side - let us get these in place now. A new hospital is not going to affect that very much. I think that unless you have sorted out many of the problems, be they staff problems (which really is not the Member's responsibility but the Department's).

MR. PRESIDENT: Proceedings are suspended for 15 minutes.

AT 11:30 A.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 12 NOON

MR. PRESIDENT: Proceedings are resumed.
The Third Elected Member for George Town continuing.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Mr. President, continuing to deal with the medical services, a lot has been said and in relation to the new hospital. However, with this I feel that in instances where there could be an easing of the medical services through a private hospital that every support should be given to that by Government. This is an instance where no matter what is said, I cannot see the expenditure of \$20 million and having fees raised to a stage where the public cannot afford to pay for the services in it, so Government will have to continue to subsidise it as it now does. It would be unfortunate if, not just on the hospital, which I look forward in due course to

getting the full report on, but also on the Master Ground Transportation Plan or any of the other policies that the Government has not gotten through or may not get through in the future, they take the approach that because they cannot get what they want then they are not going to try to deal with what they have. I believe, if anyone takes it, not just Government Members, it would be a very childish approach. Much the same as going into a store the parents says "I cannot afford to buy you all the lollipops", and they say "if I cannot get them all then I do not want any."

I think we have to look at this realistically. These things might well come much further down the line, but at this precise time the country can only take so much debt and the people so much taxes. One of the things that one of the Members mentioned was that the Backbenchers are concentrating on what is needed for their districts. This is only natural because the Member's functions do, to a very large extent, go towards their duty to assist their districts. It is no good trying to talk about compromise or otherwise, if we are going to get the attitude that the Backbenchers can do without a lot which has been asked for and which this House has heard Members read requests for their districts on the basis that the districts do not count, and it is only these large central projects that should take priority.

Simply, Sir, the cooperation has to flow both ways. There must be some understanding of the Backbenchers' feelings towards wanting what are extremely small things, from a cost point of view, for their districts. I think it is all a problem of attitudes, at times. Let me say this, speaking generally, I found that if the attitude at the top is wrong, it filters all the way down through the organisation. If there is a politician taking an arrogant approach, 'I must get my big project through and your little one does not matter', then the resultant attitude which is generated by that does not breed well for communications nor cooperation.

One other aspect, while on this, is the fact that a lot has been said about policies. I agree fully that policies are necessary. From what I can see, the policy-making is still not yet in an overall, comprehensive plan, but is largely still sporadic. While not harping on the past, during my eight years in the Government I did produce general but comprehensive policies in the three areas of health, education and social services, so I believe fully in the policy making decision. I also believe that one has to be realistic and approach it from the point of view of what the public can afford.

The other area, indirectly in some ways connected with this, is the area of the problem this country has with drugs. In fairness to the Member, he has put a lot of effort into that area. I am hoping that now we will see a pulling together overall of the comprehensive Plan and we will begin to see results coming forward, because this Plan is so crucial that it touches the fundamentals, the foundation, the fabric of society and it is something that must succeed at all costs. I do not often say that because I am not talking about costs in one area, but whatever is necessary, within reason, either in human resources or money to fight drugs and crime in this country, then I think, it must be put to the organisations, or the Member or whoever would be dealing with it, to see that it goes forward rapidly and fully. It is a difficult area. I understand that. But the future of our children and our country has to ride heavily on the eradication, or the lessening, of the drug problem in these islands. I am happy to see that it is being dealt with on the basis of not just drugs but alcohol problems in the work place, problems in the home, because it is an overall matter. Normally one hinges on the other - problems in the home or the work place, sometimes drives young people to drugs. The problem which causes the dependability on drugs, if that is removed, then it must go a long way in dealing with the problem.

There is only one thing I would say. I think the Honourable Member for Health, the earlier he forgets the statement about the writing off of a generation and moving forward fully with it, I think the quicker we will get on with this. I know there are problems with it, but there is not sufficient money in the world to value one life. With that approach we have to fight it and push on. I think the whole society needs to join forces, be it behind the Churches, CASA, the youth organisations, the service clubs, whatever, in the spirit of cooperation and with the single aim we should push towards solving this problem. It obviously is not going to go away by itself, it is not easily solved. But I do believe with the increasing of effort we have got to be making some impact, I would hope, at this stage.

Moving from there to deal briefly with tourism. This is obviously one of the two main strong holds of our economy. I believe that the decline of tourist arrivals by air is one problem which is serious and which I hope, and I understand, may well be coming to an end. We have had many months of decline now.

The solutions there are probably not easily found either. We are subject to a certain amount of external influence, but I do believe that we must take the approach that despite the outside factors, we must find ways on the inside to offset this. If we find that money is becoming tight and people are spending less in North America, then we should look to Europe. I think the Government itself, and especially the Member for Tourism, has to look at the impact of the European Economic Community (EEC). The impact it will have on these Islands, the impact it will have on tourism.

The one unfortunate thing about that is that with tourism and advertising, it still remains largely local despite the dropping of the barriers. The funds spent on advertising in the United Kingdom would continue to have very little effect in Germany or France or wherever, because the lowering of the barriers do not, as such, bring together or make any smaller the size of the population, the language barrier nor the size of the territory itself.

I understand that former Governor Russell spoke on this to one of the organisations here and said that we would see the Government and his office gearing up towards not just the 1992, because I think the European countries are going to be so involved with their own problems that the colonies are going to lag somewhat behind before we see what could be happening towards ourselves in reality. But it is never too early to begin.

I would hope that we would see a gearing up from the banking, insurance and the tourism side, especially from the finance side, because ultimately when we get a united Europe

in certain areas, certain ages that we may have now through the London inter-bank market, the LIBOR market could well be strengthened or weakened. It has been an important area and an important reason why banks here have used us because of its freedom into there.

What we also have to realise coming with this is the fact that we are no longer going to be able to put one country against the other, from a competitive point of view, in certain areas. Therefore, we will have a weakening, fortunately, not in a trade area, which we are fortunate not to have to deal with as the other Caribbean Islands have to do. I know within the EEC, I have seen papers relating to the developments in the insurance and the banking industries. They are now beginning to look at it and beginning to project. However, despite how early it may be, we must come to grips and we must find out where we are going with this because at some stage the Government here is going to have to put forward their views to Her Majesty's Government on how we will be affected and we need to have our case well prepared because I am sure that she does not like the open check policy either.

I would now like to turn to the district of George Town and deal with a few of the areas where I think Government policy should be directed. What is most annoying, and what I have heard many people talk about, is the state that the many roads are in. If I remember correctly, there was to have been a programme set up in the Public Works Department to deal with the repairing of roads. George Town, especially, has suffered on this. While we have had the benefits of the water and sewers, on the other hand it has suffered with a lack of road repairs after these have been cut into for the purposes of laying pipes and lines.

These are small things, perhaps, but when you run over those small things everyday they get to be big things to people. I would ask the Member and this is the first time we have had two Members from George Town in Executive Council, would they please get on the repairs? Places such as the North Sound Road and roads around here need repairing. I appreciate the West Bay Road where they have now started some repairs to that recently. The upgrading of the launch ramp at the White Hall/Bob Soto area is also important, and I would ask, while on that subject, that we have also a launch ramp put into the North Sound Area for George Town residents. There are many roads that do not just need repair but need to be paved. While I know that the Government cannot do everything, I believe there has to be a systematic programme of continuing to upgrade either with the chip and spray or the full asphalt concrete on the roads. Lights needs to go in many areas. I would like to explain that lights are one of the best deterrents for keeping crime down. I know that the two George Town Members on Executive Council are champions of the little peoples' cause, and these are the little ways that they can push to keep them.

The other area I have special interest in is the George Town Primary School. It should be kept up to its full standard and expansion continued. It is ironical (and I do not like to keep going back to the past because we are dealing with the present problems and the past does not have that much preference in it) that it came up from a school that was probably looked down upon more than any of the other primary schools to become a school which today can be the pride and joy of the education system. I am happy that a substantial part of that came about some years back. We have to keep these extensions and repairs up to date.

A small but important area, once again, I would like to see parks purchased or set up and some continuation of the housing projects that were started some time back. Cemeteries, while sometimes these are forgotten about, have to be maintained on a continuous basis. It is another area that I would like to see more money in the Budget for.

We are facing a fairly critical problem, I think, with space for the Courts and the Courts office be dealt with at an early stage. It is most important that the main bastion of democracy, that of fair judicial trials, be carried out in proper buildings with proper facilities. It would do much towards the maxim that justice should not only be done but it should be seen to be done.

The other area that does bother me, in relation to George Town, is the fact that, despite requests, the permanent moorings that would be saving such of the reefs that remain in George Town, have not been placed. Where they are, or why they have not been placed is something that needs to be answered publicly. It is all well and good for the Government to say to the private sector on conservation that 'you must do this and you must do that', 'do not remove this mangrove tree or that piece of rock', when the Government is letting 5 or 6 cruise ships drop anchors in instances where they do have both the money, I would think, and the anchors to get these put down. Quite frankly, it seems to me that the Government needs to carry its own weight when it comes to that aspect of it.

I am happy to see that there will be a review of the Shipping Department and the Registry. This is an important area but it is one which obviously has a certain amount of difficulties. I hope we find, in due course, the competitive edge which we need so that we do not become synonymous with registries either in the United Kingdom or other Commonwealth countries and that we can sell some aspect of our Islands, be it our ease of getting companies, or whatever, to get this going. But it has to be watched very closely. I believe that the Member is probably doing that, in any event.

I would also like to see the decisions coming from the Development and Planning Department expedited, in fact, from the Survey side of the Registry, especially. That aspect is a very specialised area. But the only way you can have the proper functioning of the private sector is to have the Government departments, which directly affect the private sector, give decisions quickly and get out registration, or whatever at an early stage. In fact, those two Departments touch on a very large part of Government's revenue, and it is important that they get what is necessary to ensure that they function efficiently and quickly.

I would now like to turn to a few areas that have been raised in this House, and where I think there is a considerable amount of confusion, at least the public is confused in this

area. It is the duty of the Elected Government who is charged with the responsibility of their respective Portfolios to make their decisions. That is not the duty of the Backbenchers. It is their primary duty. We can assist only up to a point, and beyond that we cannot.

On experts, which there has been a lot said about, I have found that what you get out of experts, basically, is what you give them in the beginning. If you are going to build a house you go to an architect and you say 'I have \$50 thousand or \$200 thousand to build a house, please draw me a house.' You will then get something that is within your Budget. On the other hand, if you leave the terms of reference wide and you do not put in any costs you could well get a house you cannot afford, worth \$1 million. Experts like producing ideal things. I am saying this as a professional, an expert in a certain area. They like looking towards what is the best of everything. So, while I know we need experts and, quite frankly, I will be questioning the Member for Health about the \$900 thousand for experts because a large amount has already been spent by that Portfolio for experts. They are necessary, but, with everything else, there is a certain limit. What I believe is happening is that the terms of reference to these experts is so wide that what we are getting is something that the country really cannot afford.

If we have \$5 million to spend on the hospital and we can afford that, then get the expert to go back and come up with something that is workable within the \$5 million. I believe you must start and expert with a Budget when you are starting a project which is dealing with money. So, I do not blame the experts because I would assume they are staying within their terms of reference. But, I believe it would be more practical to try to work out what is affordable first, and then get the expert to produce what is best within that limit, and what the public can afford. If you give the expert a blank check, he is going to produce something that is costly. This is what we have obviously seen of the Government's policies, in at least two areas this time, relating to. We have to be careful. For example, the sum of \$12 or \$15 million for dealing with solid waste was put out. That is well and good, but the public pays garbage fees and in that respect it does get to be somewhat frightening.

Moving off that, all I would say on what we heard from the affidavits from the Member for Health, is that I do not know if this is setting a precedent for other Elected Members of Executive Council or not, I will say no more than that. I know the Member for Health mentioned strangling the goose that lays the golden egg, but if it means that we are strangling the goose that is excessively spending the public's money, then I feel there is obviously justification in it.

I do not subscribe to the fact that one can delegate all of one's responsibility. One can delegate some but, ultimately, responsibility and accountability are peculiar to the person holding the office. On a lot of what was said in that respect, all I can say to the Elected Members of Executive Council is, that with the free trips, the prestige, the cocktail parties, goes a very heavy responsibility also. While that sometimes is difficult, it has to be shouldered. It is not, in my view, sufficient to continuously produce excuses for why something is not done. I think that it is necessary to get on with the job and to stop blaming us or blaming anyone else in areas where there has been any failure. With that I would move on to a different area that I will deal with in two broad heads.

We heard a lot back in February in the Throne Speech and Budget Speech about a new Juvenile Law. That is most important. I know there has been work done in relation to the caring homes. These are children, normally, who cannot protect themselves and society has a duty to protect them. I would hope that a revision of that Juvenile Law would be brought forward at an early stage to this House, preferably before the time set by the Standing Orders. It would be good and that will have an overall comprehensive set of provisions to deal with ensuring that in the early and tender years of a child's life that he is given the protection that society has to give. It is those years that become the formative years and while some children will have problems, I think it is accepted that if they are worked with, we can get them back into the mainstream, so to speak (to use the language of educators), where they belong.

I know a lot has been done in this area and it is unfortunate that sometimes things are taken too lightly in areas, but things such as ensuring proper immunisation, which we have continued, is very important. The dentistry side, fluoride which the Member is going look into in due course. Also seeing that the proper education is coming to these children at an early age, in relation to drugs. It seems to me that the earlier we reach the children in that area, the better off we are going to be because it seems a lot more difficult once they are hooked on drugs to deal with them as effectively as warding it off.

Hand-in-hand with that is another piece of Legislation that I hope the Government policy would see fit to bring. That is the Domestic Violence and Matrimonial Proceedings Act of the United Kingdom, 1976, which basically deals, to a large extent, with wife beaters - if you want to put in the man on the street approach. What happens now is that you have to go through the Matrimonial Causes Law and actually file under it, to deal with matrimonial violence. The United Kingdom has taken the approach that this can be dealt with without having to go that route because it is not always the party's wish to begin matrimonial proceedings towards a divorce or whatever.

It ties in with the Juveniles Law because in that area, I think, both the police and society have been to lax and have attempted to push it aside. But, I am not just championing women's rights. It is important that the protection that we need is something that can be received quickly and effectively, be it an injunction to stop a recurrence of the violence or otherwise. I believe tying those two together would do a lot towards ensuring, because there seems to be no reason in the world why a child or a woman should be beaten or brutalised, there is chastisement and I believe in that with children, let me say that. But these two Laws would deal with the extreme stages that may arise.

Also into that area, I believe that in due course it may be necessary for us to see a Family Court which is very active in these areas. I notice that one may be saying 'Ah, another sort of Department', but these are specialised areas. When you are dealing with juveniles and we have

been lucky to have, for example, people like Mrs. Ena Royal sit on these Juvenile Court panels from time to time where there is a wealth of knowledge and understanding. While one is dealing with the exercising of the Law, one also has to show care and interest and get out of the formal Court procedure where there is more of a rigid approach to the law. I believe this would assist the Member for Social Services considerably and I would ask him and the Second Official Member to look at the Legislation and this area of society.

The other area I think Government should exert more effort towards is the elderly. Many times it is not just the children who are somewhat helpless, but also the elderly. I know and I am grateful to the N.C.S.S. for what they have done. The programmes such as the 'meals-on-wheels' that was started sometime back. A lot of these could ease the impact on the elderly who are really people who have given their all to this country and then they become somewhat isolated. Unfortunately, the family unit is no longer what it used to be and they become lonely, isolated and sometimes not properly fed.

The Social Services is not an easy cup of tea. I would be the first one to admit that. The Member has my sympathy in that respect, mainly because of its' diversity and the fact that you are dealing with purely human beings spreading over a wide range both from the medical, economic, mental and all aspects of society. But I think the more that is done on this side, the more direct the impact will be on the drug problem.

I keep coming back to that because I still believe that many of the people who become hooked on drugs had their problems originating in areas other than drugs. Their frustrations, either in their early life as a juvenile, or on their job, or in their home, or through being brutalised, or whatever, that ultimately drives them to that deathly habit.

Before I move on to another topic, I am getting near the end but I could not finish before, and I would ask you to take the break, Sir, because it is just about time.

MR. PRESIDENT: Proceedings are suspended until 2:15 P.M.

AT 12:45 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 2:15 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: I thought for a moment we did not have a quorum but then the First Elected Member for Bodden Town suddenly appeared. Proceedings are resumed. The Third Elected Member for George Town continuing.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Thank you, Mr. President. I would like to add one thing to the last area that I was dealing with. I believe that the time has come for us to bring the children which are in the approved Jamaican schools back home to Cayman, and that the Government should do everything to expedite it.

The area of sports is and always has been important from the early days of civilisation. It provides the wholesome channel through which one can use one's energy. It provides an edge of competitiveness that is important in a democracy. It keeps the youth out of areas which would otherwise be open to them, such as getting in trouble either with drugs or crime, or just wasting their time. It is also important to one's physical growth and should be encouraged.

I would like to see that there be a concentrated, concerted effort in this area. I am looking forward to the next phase of the George Town Sports Project that I see in the Budget this time. I am also supportive of ensuring that when the associations do need some money and have made what efforts they can to raise it, that Government have sufficient funds to assist them. It is expensive for our athletes to go abroad and compete and it is in this area that the international exposure and competitiveness will nurture them, and their companions, into a more wholesome and better area. The sports fields in Grand Cayman and Cayman Brac have had constant upgrading. I am happy to see that funds are in the Budget to continue this. But I do believe it is one alternative to keeping our youth away from trouble and we must press on with it to the utmost.

What I would like to do in the next few minutes is merely summarise, in a very brief way, the areas that I have covered. The Budget was very ably presented and I think it a brilliant Budget. It has thrown light in areas that I think is important, not just to Government in its planning but also to the private sector and the commend the Honourable First Official Member for it.

We have to tackle the problems in education - overcrowding, lack of books, shortage of teachers - and move with full force on the Community College. Secondly, the medical services must be improved. I think we must spend more time on this problem and less time on the new hospital project and that Government should support a private hospital. In relation to experts, I think we have to give them realistic guidelines and ask for affordable projects, not just the best and most perfect project, but what the country can afford.

On the Civil Service, I believe they deserve their salaries increased and pensions in return to giving a honest day's work.

The private enterprise should be allowed to do what projects that it can and thus stop the very worrying rapid expansion of the Civil Service, which now takes a very large part of the recurrent expenditure of the Government. Further, I believe there needs to be a strengthening and underpinning of the Principal Secretaries and Heads of Department. We must get an organisation and management services programme operational brought into force.

On the Budget and the Estimates, I believe that we should have

taken account of the salary increases and the pensions in it and we have to realistic. These have to be paid, at least the salary increases. We should provide for them. This would avoid the heavy Supplementary Expenditure which is really not good Government.

On the roads, I believe we should get on with the repairs, get realistic costs for new roads, and when bringing the large projects that the Backbenchers, or this House I should say, and the public should be told the realistic costs, where the money is coming from and how it will be repaid. The policy which the Backbenchers have taken of not supporting a blank check policy should continue.

I believe that it is, in summary, realistic to say that the Cayman Islands cannot afford the Master Ground Transportation Plan, the new hospital, a Pension Plan, a cruise ship dock, all in a short period of time, because this must entail at least what the Government does with probably hundreds of millions of dollars. For George Town I have listed some of the things I would like to see. For the first time, during my time in the Legislative Assembly, I am sure that the two Elected Members for George Town who are on Executive Council will see that those are carried out.

We must intensify the fight against illegal drugs. This must come about by full community effort. We need to strengthen the Social Services Laws relating to juveniles and domestic violence.

The Elected Executive Council Members should learn to shoulder their own responsibilities and their duty is to provide solutions, not excuses. Saying that when some other Member was in Government they should have done this does not solve the current problem of the fact that something needs to be done. I do not think they can pass on their responsibility to the Backbenchers. Further, I do not think that Members can call for teamwork through one side of their mouth and then, through the other side, say that a Member of that team is not a friend.

I appreciate and reiterate that during my time in the Legislative Assembly, this is the first that we have had two George Town Members sitting on Executive Council and they are charged with the responsibility for two very important areas of Government. I wish them well in that.

Reaching near the end of this, I think we, in this House, should work together towards communication. I do not think it is good to wait until the last minute and then for the Elected Government to expect when they see trouble looming to approach the Backbench, as has happened in the past. The compromise of getting a part of a project, or a Motion, or a Law through has got to be better than getting none at all.

I think that the Executive Council Members need to consider the serious consequences of trying to operate a Government, at times, in a democracy as a minority and accept that it is their responsibility to have the support of the Backbench for their laws or motions, because whatever rises in the future as a result of a minority Government is caused by the Elected Executive Council Members and is their responsibility. The Backbench can and are willing to assist the Elected Members of the Executive Council but under the Constitution they cannot do their job for them. Here a little bit of humility sometimes can help.

Lastly, I have tried to keep the debate in this Legislative Assembly high. I think we all should try to do so, keeping personalities out of it because, as we have seen, this can hurt friendships rather than help them. We must put forward a spirit of cooperation which the Cayman Islands now so badly needs, and our people expect.

To my friends in this House, and I would say to the public, generally, that we must move forward shouldering our own responsibilities for the good of the Cayman Islands and our people.

Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: You only get one turn. The Honourable Member for Communications and Works.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President.

First, I wish to congratulate the Honourable First Official Member, the Honourable Financial Secretary, on the fine presentation of the Budget Address when he moved the Second Reading of the Appropriation (1990) Bill, 1989. The Budget Address gave a comprehensive analysis of our economic performance during the 1980s and provided projections for the new decade, the 1990s. But, before moving into the text of my debate, I am reminded of a quote which I read recently by Aristophanes describing a popular politician. He said: "You have all the characteristics of a popular politician: a horrible voice, bad breeding, and a vulgar manner." I trust that none of us in this Honourable House will gain this type of popularity either during the debate of this Budget, or at any other time. I am also reminded of George Bernard Shaw and the remarks he made on politics when he said: "He knows nothing and thinks he knows everything; that points clearly to a political career." Again, I trust I will not fall into this category.

I also wish to carry on the very high standards which we should in this Honourable House. I share the view that we should, at all times, endeavour to be on very friendly terms with our colleagues, regardless of whether they are on the Government bench or on the Backbench. Twelve Members were elected to this Honourable House and we have our duties to give our people the very best representation.

I too, am very happy with some of the happening that have occurred. With others I am very disappointed. But provided those happenings are in line with our Parliamentary and democratic process, I see nothing wrong with them. The *Hansards* of this Honourable House will show that the matters raised by me in the debate of the 1989 Budget Speech were quite relevant. These were highlighted, somewhat, in the speech which was delivered by the Honourable Financial Secretary. I think it is relevant that I should refer to an excerpt of my debate of the 1989 Budget, as recorded in the *Hansards* of this House, in order to show

that in many ways my predictions on inflation and salary increases were on target. It was on the 9th of March, 1989, after an adjournment that I made the following few remarks. It reads:

"I would clarify a point I had raised regarding the inflationary spiral in the Cayman Islands and how this is interrelated with the increased Capital Spending proposed in the 1989 Budget. In order to do this I would wish to first refer to a portion of the Budget Address which highlights the point I was referring to. This is on page 56 of the Budget Address dealing with salary increases, it reads: 'Government has over the past eight years operated on a Consumer Price Index formula which triggers a salary award to civil servants, i.e., whenever the index reaches five per cent in any single year, the award to civil servants will be four per cent.

The Index at December 1988 shows an increase of 6.2 per cent, and therefore an award of four per cent totalling \$1,275,000 is inserted in the 1989 Budget.'

While I do not intend to project myself as a Milton Freedman or an authority on economics, I would nonetheless wish to clarify, in my opinion, the situation that can occur in circumstances such as this. An award of 4 per cent in actual fact suggests that civil servants are being compensated for the erosion in their salaries caused by inflation and, in fact, they are worse off now by approximately 2 per cent this year than they were at the beginning of last year."

That was point out that we may agree on a salary increase to recompense civil servants with, due to inflation, this is only filling in the gaps and the erosion caused through inflation and in real terms it does not, in fact, make the position or the situation of the civil servant that much better off. I continued to say: "In this connection, while I have not seen specific mention in this Budget Address, I hope that some consideration will also be made toward pensioners..." This was indeed the case. Consideration was made toward pensioners. I stated:

"Continuing on the question of inflation, which was recorded at 6.2 per cent in 1988, my prediction is that this trend may continue into next year... [This, indeed, has occurred]. My opinion is based on the situation we have before us - we may be looking at 10 per cent at this time next year."

I gave the basis for my opinion. I stated:

"This opinion is based on not only the increased cost of living generated by the private sector, but it is a basic economic fact that heavy Government spending can have the effect of increasing the cost of living..."

This point was also reiterated by the Financial Secretary in his Budget Address that maybe when the private sector is overheating, it is time that Government put on the brakes. I have read that to show my consistency in my debates and that my predictions, in debating the 1989, Budget were right on target. I continued:

"We have heard talk of the heating of the economy. The point is that Government is as much to blame for the heating of the economy as the private sector."

The reason I am reading this is that some Members have criticised the Budget as a lean Budget, but at the same time they have given much credit to the Budget Speech, not of course realising, that the Budget Speech is a reflection of the Budget itself. It is a fact that our economy is directly influenced by the economic vagaries of the industrialised countries. A recession in the United States of America, for instance, carries with it a direct negative impact on our small country. This being the case, because of our economy, and because of the fact that it is directly influenced from the changing conditions in the United States of America, we have to do our best to make it as solid and to become as self-sufficient in areas where this is possible.

It is against this type of background that I must reiterate that much care must be taken in any policy of this Government for slowing down our economic growth, in view of the possible negative impacts this could have on our very fragile economy and on the standard of living on our people, generally. However, the Financial Secretary has given us the choice. He has shown us the possible negative impacts of overheating our economy and, at the same time, he has brought to our attention the danger of allowing our population balance to drop, that is indigenous Caymanians as opposed to non-Caymanians.

What he did in his Budget Address is to point this out to us and it is up to us as a Parliament, and as representatives of our people, to consider very wisely what course of action we will take. The First Official Member, the Honourable Financial Secretary alluded to these negative impacts and also to the impacts of slowing down the economy, and the negative impact it would have on the lives of our people.

I agree that the employment rate of any country, including the Cayman Islands, is indicative of the relevant measure of the overall economic performance of a country. Whilst we

are, as a people, concerned with the shifting of the population balance - that is, Caymanians against non-Caymanians - we must also recognise that as a growing country we are not yet able to provide all the professional and technical services which are required in order for us to maintain our position as a leading off-shore financial centre, and a leading tourist destination. It was because of this fact that in 1984 I included in my Manifesto that it was important we consider integration with Caymanians with non-Caymanians where possible. Again in 1988, the Honourable Member for Tourism and I included that in our Manifesto because we were well aware that as a young nation or country we need to work together for the prosperity of these Islands.

On the question of public finance. It is because of the high level of service provided by these Islands that we are able to maintain a highly respected position as an off-shore financial centre. But to gain such a prestigious position meant much fiscal and economic planning. It did not just come about. Therefore, we need to ensure that our infrastructure facilities are in place to maintain this high, respected and enviable position which we now hold in the world of high finance. This will mean infrastructure facilities such as good communications.

Good communications means not only taking the plane from here to Miami, but our telephone system from Cable and Wireless; the utilities that we give to the people of this country and those that visit here; our roads. There are many areas that we need to consider. Our professional services, our country is known to have one of the highest per capita level of professionalism in the legal, accounting, banking and insurance side that we can find anywhere in the world; good hotel accommodation, this is also very important, a reliable water supply; a good sewage system, etcetera.

It would do us all well, Backbenchers included, if we realised that cooperation means exactly what it says - we must work together. There is no use of getting up in this House and playing with words. Rhetoric is not going to help us unless we are into an election, but our election was last November, so let us put it behind us and work toward the betterment of our people.

I agree that the Government's ability to finance this Budget largely from domestic revenues, freed from unduly relying on debt financing is good management. But I also support the view that was expressed by the Financial Secretary, and in credit to the Third Member for George Town, he also stated words to the effect that an accumulation of debt under our public debt is not necessarily always a bad thing, that is, deficit financing. I am sure that neither Member is advocating such a position, but if this is necessary it is not unusual in a developing country, but thank goodness this Government has not yet had to go into deficit financing. I hope this will never be necessary.

What is more important is our credit worthiness and our ability to service the public debt without putting pressure on our economy. Of relevance, therefore, it is noteworthy that while our public debt did grow from \$13.1 million to \$22.5 million between 1983 and 1987, that, as a percentage of gross domestic product, the percentage dropped from 7.5 per cent to 7.2 per cent, bearing in mind that 10 per cent is usually used as a maximum standard or lever for the measurement against revenue.

I now move on to the subject of the transportation Infrastructure. I was surprised to hear very little, or no mention, of this section of the Honourable Financial Secretary's Budget Address. Whether this was by oversight or by intention, I am not sure. This is a very important section of the Budget Address and I feel it is important that we should refer to this. I refer to paragraph 7(2) on page 49 of the Budget Address, and it reads:

"Transportation Infrastructure.

The second major structural weakness that the growth expansion of the 1980s has brought forcefully to the forefront is the deficiency in the capacity of road networks and port facilities. The major road networks leading into and out of George Town are clogged..." [These are words from the Budget Address, from the Honourable Financial Secretary] "...particularly at peak hours. There were 33 per cent more registered vehicles on the roads in 1987 than in 1984 and there were 28.3 per cent more vehicular accidents in 1988 than in 1984 involving fatalities, personal injury and damage to property. Increased road traffic growth has not only increased the demand for driving space, it has also seriously increased the demand for parking facilities, particularly in George Town business and administrative center, as well as in the adjacent business areas. Mr. President, the demand for increased road capacity is already critical."

The Honourable Financial Secretary continued:

"The 1987 Master Ground Transportation Study predicted that by 1993 capacity demand may assume crisis proportions unless the necessary road capacity expansion plans are developed and implemented by 1993."

It is against this type of background why Government felt that a plan was a necessity for this country. Hitherto past Governments did not provide such a Plan. Things were done in an *ad hoc* manner. But, this Government prepared a proper Master Ground Transportation Plan, and we are not suggesting that there are not certain areas of this that may need to be revised. We are prepared to have these revised. I would like to state, as a matter of fact, that I have already told the Master Ground Transportation Steering Committee that I would like for them to have another look at the three composite maps that were just defeated in this House. This is to show that the Government wants to work with the Backbench. There is no truth in the

rhetoric that we heard here that we are a bunch of arrogant people that do not want to work with them. The opposite is true.

We have, on many occasions, made overtures to work with the Backbench. So for them to refer to us as not wanting to work with them is not correct. Cooperation is as it states, and anybody can look up the meaning in the dictionary. You cannot cooperate with just ones' self. It has to be a mutual situation. We have to work together. That is the key word. Let us put aside the political differences, and let us work for the benefit of this country. Let us forget about party politics. Let us forget about our own district needs, and think more seriously of the needs of the people of the Cayman Islands. What is best for the Cayman Islands. Of course we have to look at our districts, but the key factor is that the interest of this country as a whole is the most important factor.

As long as some Members get a road or a street light in their district they are happy. They could not care whether the George Town district is clogged with traffic. We bring in professionals to try and help us solve these problems, but they reject the Reports from professionals. If we are to work together in this growing sophisticated country of ours, we have got to depend on expert advice. We, the Members of this House, do not have the technical expertise to answer all the questions, even though many times we seem to have, or some of us at least. Let us work together in this House. This is the only way we can succeed.

We hear a lot about minority and majority Government. It appears to me that the Third Elected Member for George Town is obsessed with that. Maybe this is the reason why we cannot get cooperation in this House because he is so obsessed with the idea that he feels he is in the majority that he does not need to cooperate with the Elected Members of Government. May I suggest to the Third Elected Member for George Town that this Budget is not just a Budget for the Elected Members of Executive Council, it was a Budget presented by the Financial Secretary on behalf of this Government. That must be understood.

I do not really believe that all Members of this House allowed sufficient time to absorb the information available to them under the Master Ground Transportation Plan. As I said, it is my intention to go back to the Planning Board. It is my intention to look at various alternatives in the interests of this country. Not because the First Elected Member for Bodden Town said he will not support it, or the Second Elected Member for Bodden, or anybody else, but because I am put here to represent the interests of my people and whatever is best for them is what I intend to do. If it means that we have to revise the Plan because our people want that, we will do so. The fact that this might have been rejected in this House is no reflection on us. It is no reflection. What would be a bad reflection is if I allow them to also win the war. What they have won is the battle but as a good politician, which I think I am, I have the interest of my people at heart. I will go back to the drawing board and then take it to the people, and if our people said to me, after we have given them the alternatives, that they are not interested in that Plan, then I will be the person to suggest to my colleagues that we drop it.

I would again remind Members of this Honourable House of the remarks made in the Budget Address by the Honourable Financial Secretary, that by 1993 we could be reaching a crisis situation in this country.

I realise that there are a number of influential people in this town, and otherwise, that may be affected by roads going through their properties. No one on the Executive Council, that I am aware of, would want to bring hardship to those people. We would also not want to bring hardship to the little people in this country, and may I remind the Third Elected Member for George Town and others that even as a Member of the Executive Council, I have not forgotten that there are some little people in our country. I have not forgotten that, and I hope that other Members of this House equally remember that, because it was the little people and others in this country that have helped me to be in a position where I can represent them today. Anything that I can do to help them, I will do. Therefore, I was surprised that some Members of this House, rather than looking after their own constituent's needs, found time to go into Rock Hole and other areas to try and spread misinformation to the people in this town. If they are so concerned about representing their constituents, why is it that all they have in mind is getting an abattoir built in Bodden Town. What is this abattoir for? At the same time they want to declare the 1990s the decade of youth. Is there any correlation between an abattoir and a declaration of the decade of youth for 1990?

We have to deal with the matters brought before us in this debate. I will not lower myself to the stage of being personal with any Member, but I will deal with the matters that have been brought before this House during this debate. We have to deal with these issues. You heard the First Elected Member for Bodden Town get up in this House. He kept pointing across here, telling us that he is a school teacher. I believe that Member forgot that he is not now in the classroom. What he must realise is that he is a Member of this Honourable House and that he is dealing with colleagues, that he must show due respect to. As a rookie politician, like myself, I cannot understand how he could point across to a man of the integrity and long service of the Honourable Member for Education, and try to tell him how the country should be run. I should be, if I was in his position, trying to learn a few things. But in his one year in the House he has all the answers.

Even at this point in time with my background in the Civil Service, with my fifth year in this House, I still ask the opinion of the Honourable Member for Education and other colleagues on Executive Council, and other Members of this House. Nobody is that big. And I do not know why that Member feels that he is on Cloud Nine. He needs to be pulled down to earth.

If we are going to talk about respect, we must show respect for our colleagues and stop trying to pull them down. In one breath they are asking for friendship in this House, and in another breath we hear Members in this House trying to pass derogatory and demeaning remarks about other Members. How can we foster a spirit of friendship if we are going to do that sort of thing? We cannot. Some of them ask me if I am turning a Christian, why I am not saying certain things. That is not the point. Common decency dictates that we treat each other with due respect. This is what we need to do and this is the only way that we are going to have a successful 1988-1992, or any period this House may have to go through. Sorry, 1992. But,

we need, as a group of politicians, and I hate to be called a politician sometimes. I think I am a little more than just an ordinary cut politician. I do not want to be called a statesman either, because I saw a definition of a statesman which says that a statesman is only a politician that has been dead 10 years. So I am always careful about that also.

The main thing I want to get across today, and I am not pointing any fingers, it is for all of us, including myself, that we try to work together. Unless we do that, we cannot succeed, because a house divided against itself cannot succeed.

What has occurred during this sitting of the House has not perturbed me a lot because it has gone through the democratic process. The rejection of the three prescribed composite maps went through democratic process. The refusal to accept the West Bay Landing Feasibility Study went through the democratic process. But what perturbs me is when I hear personal attacks on any Member of this House, or on any member of the Civil Service.

I now wish to deal with the financial position of these Islands. In the Accountant General's Report for the year ended the 31st of December, 1988, he showed where the Government's revenue was buoyant during the year to the extent that the total actual revenue for that year exceeded the Budgeted Revenue by approximately \$14 million. An improvement of some 19 per cent. A similar trend is also expected for the year 1989.

May I take this opportunity to congratulate the Accountant General for his Report, which highlights that for the first time the Government's accounts are supported by a Report by the Accountant General to facilitate a clearer understanding of the most significant features of the Financial Statements, and the standard of financial controls which have been achieved.

The structure for the control of the Government's finances is set out in the Public Finance and Audit Law, 1985. This Law is supplemented by Financial and Stores Regulations which were introduced in 1987. I am also pleased to note that the standards set by this Government in 1984 in the establishment of a functional Public Accounts Committee has been continued. My only disappointment is in respect to the Public Accounts Committee's Report in that they did not submit their Report in a timely manner, as had been done in previous periods between 1984 and 1988. I may say that this was during the time that I was the Chairman of that Committee, a Member that believes in double entry book-keeping.

It is noted from the Auditor General's Report on the Financial Statements of the Cayman Islands for the year ended the 31st of December, 1988, that he transmitted the certified statement to the Clerk of this Assembly on the 27th of July, 1988. This Report, together with the Public Accounts Committee's Report should therefore have been tabled in accordance with Standing Order 74(5), in September 1989, and should not have been delayed to this meeting of the House. I, therefore, trust that in the future these most important Reports will be tabled in a timely manner, in accordance with the Public Finance and Audit Law, the Finance Stores Regulation and, of course, in accordance with Standing Orders.

It is important that we have these supported...

MR. W. MCKEEVA BUSH:

Would the Member give way, Mr. President?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON:
come to speak.

No, Mr. President, unless he has a Point of Order, his turn will

Also, it is my opinion that certain areas of the Public Accounts Committee Report were unfortunate. Especially the remarks in relation to his Report on the Water Authority, and I quote:

"The Committee notes that the Authority strongly resists that the claim is fair and allowable and the Committee suggests that in light of this, that the contractor not be allowed to tender for future Government contracts."

That was most unfortunate. Especially in view of the fact that this matter is still being negotiated. Therefore, I would suggest to the Chairman and the Members that care must be given not to project the wrong impression of the Government's position in this, or similar cases, especially where those cases are still under negotiations in a spirit of mutual respect and cooperation.

Having covered the areas that the Financial Secretary's Budget Speech, dealing with the economy and our financial position, I now wish to deal with my Portfolio and the Departments under my responsibility.

Mr. President, 1989 saw my Portfolio almost double in size with the combination of the Portfolios for Communication and Works and development and Natural Resources. Associated with this was the complete change-over of staff and the creation of additional posts to put up with the increased work load. A number of Committees were appointed to study and make recommendations on such matters as the National Water Policy, the proposed new Post Office, Marl Mining, the Building Code, Marine Conservation, telecommunications, street naming and numbering and the West Bay Tourist Landing and other matters.

Of particular importance was the Committee which was appointed to study George Town in a comprehensive manner and make recommendations for a concert plan with particular emphasis on the Government's facilities. This Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) prepared a Report which was tabled in this sitting of the Legislative Assembly. Again, I wish to congratulate the Chairman and the members of this Committee for a very fine job and I would reiterate that this was done at no expense to Government - a study or Report, which I understand would normally have cost in the region of \$300,000 or more.

In order to make some Statutory Boards more functional in my Portfolio, it was necessary to increase membership. These included the Central Planning Authority and the Electricity Licensing Board.

Marine Parks continue to remain a high priority area to further promote public awareness. Especially we want it known that the Marine Conservation Week has been introduced. I will speak in a little more detail on this later. This event involves three Portfolios with contributions being made by each; namely, the Portfolio of Tourism, Aviation and Trade and the Portfolio for Education, Recreation and Culture, together with my Portfolio, Communications, Works and Natural Resources. The Watersports industry is also playing a major role in this event.

A moratorium has been placed on on-shore mining of marl until a scientific study can be undertaken of both off-shore and terrestrial marl resources. A major environmental engineering consultancy firm - Sage Two M. Hill - has been commissioned to carry out this study, which is scheduled to commence in early 1990, if we can get the financial approval from the Finance Committee.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Would this be a convenient moment to take the break?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON:

Thank you, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Proceedings suspended for 15 minutes.

AT 3:15 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 4:04 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Communications and Works continuing.

Proceedings are resumed. The Honourable Member for

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Earlier in my debate on the Budget Address I mentioned that certain representatives seemed to have more interest in their constituencies than the country as a whole. I did not want this to be misunderstood because I congratulate Members of the constituencies for showing a keen interest in their own constituencies, as I do in George Town.

But, the point I was trying to make is that if we have, for instance, \$120,000 to split up between six constituencies, that no one constituency for example can expect \$100,000 out of it. We all have to be reasonable and we have to consider the interests of the country, as a whole.

During the debate by previous speakers, reference was made to the Government not projecting its policies. As the Executive Council that has to show our policies - what we have accomplished and what we plan to do - with your permission, Sir, I wish to refer to some of the policies that are being planned for our various Departments so that Members can be informed of exactly what we plan to do. This will not be protracted, it will be just in line with information which has already been provided to the Secretary for inclusion in the Budget Speech. The saying that politics is the art of compromise is one which I totally agree with. It derives in part from a speech by Edmund Burke in *Conciliation with America* made on March 22nd, 1775. The relevant passage is: "All government - indeed every human benefit and enjoyment, every virtue and every prudent act - is founded on compromise and barter.". Let us, therefore, rid ourselves of the problems that we are now experiencing in this Honourable House.

I would now wish to draw the attention of the Honourable Members to some of the activities within the Agricultural Department as it relates to the Budget, without going into too much detail. I was, however, pleased to see the emphasis which this Government has given to agriculture. This was clearly spelled out in the Budget Address, that Government intends to place a lot of emphasis on agriculture.

I agree that there are certain constraints which must be taken into account in the development of our agricultural potentials. These may be placed in three broad categories, namely:

1. Productive capacity development constraints, such as the availability of farm resource inputs;
2. Productive efficiency improvement constraints, relating to the way in which farmers allocate and utilise available resource inputs; and
3. Land economising constraints, which relates to the farmers ability to use the limited amount of farmlands to a greater advantage by avoiding crops whose commercial viability requires large acreage of arable land and costly labour and raw material input.

Until recently, agricultural development was not treated with the policy commitments as in the case of other sectors of our economy. However, I am pleased to say that since I assumed responsibility for agriculture, that I have commissioned an Agricultural Development Plan which should be completed by the end of this year.

Basically, the Draft Agricultural Development Plan should cover the five year period from 1990 to 1995, with provisions for annual review, and should operate as a rolling five year Plan so that changes which may occur in the economic, technological and planning environments can be taken into account. The Plan should outline problems, issues and tasks facing the agricultural sector and indicate priority considerations underpinning the sector's development, as well as the development strategies to be pursued during the Plan period.

Thirdly, the Plan should contain details of the sectorial development programmes and should include analysis of the institutional arrangements that would need to be put in place to facilitate the achievement of the sectorial development objectives. Fourth, the Plan should indicate the minimum investment effort required and should explore desirable new agricultural initiatives.

During 1988 the crop sector showed moderate recovery. But, on the question of the Farmer's Market, I must admit here that, even though it provides a very useful facility, we are very concerned at the Portfolio level at the level of its profitability or non-profitability. I intend to consult with the Chairman of the Farmers Co-op in an effort to try and improve the operation and management of this sector of this facility.

I am very pleased that the Second Elected Member for Bodden Town has been so active in assisting at the Portfolio level with the subject of agriculture. Yes, I give credit where it is due. Also in attending as the delegate to the Agricultural Show that was held in England, the Royal Agricultural Show, this year. I was very pleased with the Report that we received from his visit.

As was appropriate, much emphasis was placed on agriculture in the Budget Speech. It is partly against this background why I will be seeking (and I wish to make this point), and I hope to receive the support of Honourable Members of this House, all Members of Finance Committee, to have the provision of the \$280,000 that was originally expected to have been placed in the Budget, placed there for the abattoir. Unfortunately, due to Budget constraints certain items had to be cut drastically, as is done in any Budget. If possible, I would like to see that item put back in the Budget.

It is not an easy job to prepare a Government Budget. I had that responsibility for about three years, together with the Financial Secretary when I was the Deputy Financial Secretary, so it is not a very easy job. It was because of this that the Financial Secretary, and rightly so, had to agree on a policy to be followed in preparing the 1990 Budget.

The policy was basically in three basic parts - those projects which were sufficiently advanced, with regards to site acquisition; planning permission and working drawings that could be put out to tender were regarded to have the first priority for the Budget. The second priority items were those projects which either had no site acquisition, or with incomplete project briefs or costings, so that construction was unlikely to begin before the third or fourth quarter of 1990. Those that fell in the third place were those projects which Government may wish to consider deferring one year, that on the surface would appear not to cause excessive inconvenience to the service or the public.

These are sound economic and financial policies. I support them 100 per cent and I trust that when we meet in Finance Committee that we will bear in mind these policies and be guided by them.

I also agree with the Honourable Financial Secretary, the First Official Member, that in view of the situation developing in the G7 economies - that is, the United States of America, the United Kingdom, Japan, West Germany, France and Italy - that it behooves us to develop our agriculture sector as far as possible and practical. I also agree that the creation of a single European market in 1992 will mean that the world's single largest and wealthiest consumer market will no longer be the United States of America, but will indeed be the united states of Europe. The balance of world income will be highly concentrated in Europe. It is against this background, and with this information in mind, that it is hoped that when the Agricultural Development Plan is tabled in this Honourable House that it will receive the full support of all the Members in this House and that we will not have a suspension of the Standing Orders to defeat it.

I now wish to give a brief outline of our Lands and Survey Department. In doing so I wish to refer to paragraph 65 to 67 of the Auditor General's Reports. It is entitled Land Exchanges. It reads:

"The Development and Planning Regulations, 1977 (Regulation 25) established that in sub-divisions a provision for the schools shall be made at the rate of:

- (a) one primary school for every 400 families (the site reserved for a primary school being approximately 3 acres); and
- (b) one secondary school for every 2000 families (the site reserved for a secondary school being approximately 7 acres).

The Regulations [23] also provide, according to the size of the sub-division, that the Central Planning Authority may require a developer to set aside land for public purposes including children's playgrounds, sports fields, parks, churches and public rights-of-way and to reserve without charge adequate lots, not exceeding 5 per cent of the land being developed, for public use."

The reason I am dealing with this matter is that I wish to refer to the way in which such matters are dealt with within the Lands and Survey Department and the Planning Department.

"The Development and Planning Law, 1977, not its Regulations state specifically that the land set aside in developments for educational purposes under Regulation 25, and any under Regulation 23 for other public purposes, shall be filled or developed. However, the Central Planning Authority may impose such conditions as it thinks fit upon the grant of a planning permission including the requirement for the set aside land to be appropriately filled."

The Auditor General's Report continues:

"My officers examined two large recent developments where developers were liable to set aside land for educational facilities under Regulation 25. Neither of these developments were required by Government to set aside land for other public purposes as may be required under Regulation 23. The results of their examination are set out below.

This project is located on the West Bay peninsula area and to reclaim and develop approximately 120 acres of wetlands into a marina and condominiums. My officers estimated that a site of about 6 acres would be required, under Regulation 25, to be set aside for educational purposes."

I will not read any more details than that, but I will just move on to the next development:

"This project involves the reclaiming and development of some 245 acres of wetlands, also in the West Bay peninsular area. My officers estimated that about 12 acres of this project would be required, under Regulation 25...."

The Auditor General's Report is quite straight forward. I was surprised, on the basis of this Report, that the Public Accounts Committee was able to report in the manner in which they did. I refer to pages 9 and 10 of the Public Accounts Committee Report. They stated that Government did not receive good value for money. In fact, this is not consistent with the Report of the Auditor General. The Standing Orders state that the Public Accounts Committee's Report should be a Report on that of that of the Auditor General. The Public Accounts Committee stated:

"This subject was a sensitive, complex and difficult one for the Committee to consider. We are deeply concerned to find that large real estate developments are placing a burden on the infrastructure of these Islands. The Committee was disturbed to hear that present Laws and Regulations appear inadequate to control and regulate these developments. The Committee examined 2 cases," (which are the 2 cases I just referred to), "where developers exchanged liabilities in respect of their provisions of land to Government for recreational and educational purposes for cash or lands elsewhere. The Committee wishes to state emphatically that it was not convinced that Government received good value in these exchanges. Every effort must be made to obtain good value in such exchanges and the Committee expects in future that this will be clearly seen in such cases...."

There is no basis or justification for this statement. In view of this I would suggest to the Chairman, the First Elected Member for Bodden Town, that he should get his facts correct in the future.

I am now moving on to the Department of MRCU...

MR. ROY BODDEN: Mr. President, if the Member would give way, Sir, on a Point of Clarification.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: No, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Excuse me, this is not an easy one. The Report of the Public Accounts Committee is, of course, now tabled and therefore part of the property of the House. Unless I am wrong, I think that normally that Report is debated when the Government Minute is Tabled and I think it would be better to debate it then. I see no objection to your covering the matters of principle in regard to land purchases and development and so on, that is another matter.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Thank you, Mr. President. It was only in reference to my Department of Lands and Survey that I raised that.

The single most important accomplishment, in my opinion, that was ever undertaken by this Government was the expenditure allocated to the late Dr. Giglioli to eradicate mosquitoes in these Islands. Had it not been for his efforts we would not today be enjoying the results of a virtually mosquito-free Cayman.

The record low numbers of mosquitoes in 1988 continued into 1989. Even though this year's rains began early (from the end of April), it was possible to keep mosquito densities low by larviciding to prevent emergence or, when this was impossible, by early spraying of broods as they

emerged. Low tide levels and the distribution of much rain outside swamp areas helped to keep mosquito numbers low, up to the middle of the year.

Most spraying was done with Dibrom, an insecticide used by the MRCU since 1973, with no evidence of the resistance feared a few years ago. However, the synthetic Pyrethroid insecticides have been used very little this year due to resistance problems. Experimental work has continued with residual larvicides, two safe and effective ones now having been identified. There are still problems with the even applications of these compounds but a rotary metering device and a large spreader have recently been acquired for the thrust aircraft to help over come these problems.

Upgrading of the dike and canal systems continues with work in the Barkers area. Disinfection of aircraft and boats also continues and surveys show that all three Islands are still free of Yellow Fever and Dengue mosquitoes. The Natural Resources Lab has also made a number of strides during the past year.

Mr. President, I am moving on to another subject, I do not know if this would be a convenient time to adjourn.

Does the House wish to continue past 4:30?

MR. PRESIDENT:

ADJOURNMENT

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: I was going to rise to suggest no, Sir. I move the adjournment of this Honourable House until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that the House do now adjourn until tomorrow morning at 10:00. I shall put the question. Those in favour please say Aye...Those against No.

AYES.

The Ayes have it. The House is accordingly adjourned.

MR. PRESIDENT:

AT 4:29 P.M. THE HOUSE STOOD ADJOURNED UNTIL 10:00 A.M., FRIDAY, 1ST DECEMBER, 1989.

FRIDAY
1ST DECEMBER, 1989
10:05 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT:
prayers.

I will ask the Third Elected Member for George Town to say

PRAYERS

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN:

Let us Pray,
Almighty God, from whom all wisdom and power are derived:
We beseech Thee so to direct and prosper the deliberations of the Legislative Assembly now assembled, that all things may be ordered upon the best and surest foundations for the glory of Thy Name and for the safety, honour and welfare of the people of these Islands.

Bless our Sovereign Lady Queen Elizabeth, the Queen Mother, Philip Duke of Edinburgh, Charles Prince of Wales, Diana Princess of Wales and all the Royal family. Give grace to all who exercise authority in our Commonwealth that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety may be established among us. Especially we pray for the Governor of our Islands, the Members of Executive Council and Members of the Legislative Assembly that they may be enabled faithfully to perform the responsible duties of their high office.

All this we ask for Thy great Name's sake, Amen.
Our Father, who art in Heaven, Hallowed be Thy Name, Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done, in earth as it is in Heaven. Give us this day our daily bread: And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us: And lead us not into temptation; but deliver us from evil: For Thine is the Kingdom, the power and the glory, for ever and ever. Amen.

The Lord bless us and keep us: the Lord make His face shine upon us and be gracious unto us: the Lord lift up His countenance upon us and give us peace now and always. Amen.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Proceedings of the Assembly are resumed. Continuing the Second Reading debate on the Appropriation Bill. The Honourable Member for Communication and Works, continuing.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

BILLS

SECOND READING

THE APPROPRIATION (1990) BILL, 1989

(Continuation of debate thereon)

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President.
At the adjournment yesterday I had reached the point in my debate commenting on the Department of Natural Resources. However, before touching on this subject I would clarify one or two matters which I raised during my debate. Regarding the comments I made in connection with Public Finance and Audit Law, I did, in fact, check the relevant provisions of the Law and for the sake of the Hansards I wanted to clarify the point I had made. In so doing, I will not be dealing with any matters outside of what I spoke about yesterday. I refer to section 41 and 42 of the Public Finance and Audit Law, 1985 - Law 23 of 1985, which reads as follows:

"The Accountant General shall, within the period of four months, or such longer period as the Governor may determine, after the close of each financial year, transmit to the Auditor General -

- (a) a statement of the assets and liabilities of the Government;
- (b) an annual statement of the receipts and payments by the Government; and
- (c) such other statements as the Governor may specify from time to time.

42 (1) - On receipt of the statements referred to in Section 41 the Auditor General -

- (a) shall examine and audit the statements; and
- (b) shall, within the period of seven months after the close of the financial year, or such longer period as the Governor may determine, prepare and submit to the person presiding at a sitting of the Legislative Assembly a report in respect of his examination and audit of the statements and on any matter relating to the performance of his duties and the exercise of his powers under this Law, together with -
 - (i) a copy of the statement of assets and liabilities of the Government, duly certified by him; and
 - (ii) a copy of the annual statement of the receipts and payments by the Government, duly certified by him.

42 (2) Within the period of three months, or such longer period as the Governor may determine, after the receipt of the report and certified statements from the Auditor General under subsection (1), a copy of the report and certified statements, together with a copy of the report of the Public Accounts Committee of the Legislative Assembly shall -

- (a) be laid before the Legislative Assembly; and
- (b) be submitted to the Secretary of State."

My reference for Standing Order 74(5) is that Standing Order states that both the Auditor General's Report and the Public Accounts Committee Report shall be laid at the same time.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN:
time.

Mr. President, on a Point of Order. They were laid at the same

MR. PRESIDENT:

Sorry, I could not hear you.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN:

They were laid at the same time, as far as I know.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON:

Mr. President, I think the point that the Member missed is that the period for the presentation of the Accountant General's Report is within four months after the end of the year, which would be the end of April, and then for the Auditor General's Report is within seven months after the end of the year which would be the end of July, and three months after that, it should be brought within the period of three months after that it should be brought to the House.

The point I was making yesterday was that to bring it to the House, technically, in November is a late presentation in accordance with the Law. Of course the Governor has the right to extend the period at any time. That was the point I was making. Standing Orders 74(5) states that the Auditor General's Report, together with the Public Accounts Committee Report, shall be laid together. So, technically, both of those should be laid in September of each year.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. ROY BODDEN:

Mr. President, on a Point of Order. As Chairman of the Committee I had hoped to avoid bringing this to the attention of the House...

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON:

Mr. President, could the Member state the Point of Order?

MR. PRESIDENT:

I am prepared to let him speak, partly because this is now getting completely irrelevant to the matter at hand and, as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, I think he should speak.

MR. ROY BODDEN:

The lateness, Mr. President, was due in large part to the illness of the Committee Clerk. As I had said, I considered that this was a trivial matter, and I did not wish to bring it to the attention of this Honourable House as I wanted to spare the Honourable Clerk any potential embarrassment, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT:

I think we should now go on with the substance of the debate. If you wish to raise this as a matter affecting the rights of the House, that is fine, but do it in a separate context.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON:
ruling.

Mr. President, I am very happy to go in accordance with your

On the question of the Agricultural Department, just as in the case of this one just raised, I wish to add to a comment that I had made. That is to mention that progress is being made toward the building of the Agricultural Society pavilion and hopefully the Agricultural Society, which is the body responsible for its construction, will have it ready for the 1990 Agricultural Show. Arrangements are being made with the cooperation of the President of the Agricultural Society to have a release of Government funds as soon as the Agricultural Society provides the necessary information to the Portfolio to support the release. This project promises to be quite impressive. There have been a number of objections to the proposed location and the Portfolio, together with the Agricultural Society, is trying to resolve this matter.

Also in the debate yesterday the Third Elected Member for George Town had extolled the virtues of friendship, a position which I wholeheartedly support, and at all times endeavour to live by, because I think I can truly say that there is not one Member in this Honourable House that I am not on speaking terms with. He was specifically referring to a remark made by the Honourable Member for Health and Social Services in reply to a remark which, in my understanding, had been previously made by the First Elected Member for West Bay indicating his friendship with the Honourable Member. I, too, am saddened to see a good friendship tarnished, and I hope that politics and the good representation in this House will continue regardless.

Much had been said on this yesterday, and it is only right that comments be made. Many times I find that in debating, Members make certain comments but they get very upset if those remarks are replied to. But in a democracy I feel that each person should have a right, within certain decent parameters, to express his opinion.

Just before I move off this point, I would like to impress that it does not help to foster good will and better friendships when one is continually being lambasted, or one's name is continually being demeaned. Each individual, regardless of his position in this House likes to feel that his integrity is in tact. If we are seriously committed to fostering good friendships let us refrain from personality assassinations, and getting involved in bad politics. To be friendly, one must act in a friendly manner. We must agree to disagree. We must keep gutter politics out of these hallowed Chambers. Let us deal with the national issues before us, however painful this may be. I have sat here in these Chambers and I have received a number of attacks - some of them justified, probably, some of them, in my opinion, not justified. But, it was done within our Parliamentary and democratic process. It should be kept at that level and when we go into that Common Room we should be able to sit and talk to each other on fairly friendly terms.

I now wish to turn to a letter I received yesterday from the Genesis Strata Corporation. I did not have the time to read it yesterday while I was speaking, but last night when I read it I felt that it was of such importance that I should bring it to the attention of this Honourable House. It is directly relevant to a provision that is made in the Budget for the Jennett 'T' road in George Town. I wish to make it quite clear that this road is not a Linford Pierson Road. It is a road that is hoped will improve the general congestion and the situation within George Town and within that particular area. This was written by the Secretary and it reads:

"Dear Mr. Pierson:

As you will be aware, construction of the new Citco building, opposite the Genesis building and adjacent to Jennett Street, is now well under way. Our concern is that occupation of this new office building will compound the prevailing traffic problems caused because there exists only a single narrow exit along Jennett Street into George Town for the growing number of offices and commercial entities in this area.

Our understanding is that some Government funds have been allocated in the current Budget for the construction of the Jennett 'T' which will permit an alternative exit at the eastern end of Jennett Street leading into Mary Street and Shedden Road. This would alleviate this frustrating traffic bottle neck and also channel traffic away from the centre of George Town.

In view of the general concern of businesses in this area and the recent discussions in the House regarding the Master Ground Transportation Plan we shall be most grateful if you will let us know of Government's current plans for this project. We would hope that Government would give this scheme top priority."

This was copied to "the Honourable Norman Bodden, Honourable Benson Ebanks, Honourable Ezzard Miller, Honourable McKeever Bush", I am just reading like it is here, Sir, "Honourable John Jefferson, Honourable Mabry Kirkconnell, Honourable Gilbert McLean, Honourable Roy Bodden, Honourable Franklin Smith, Honourable John McLean and Honourable Truman Bodden". That was how it was written here. Then to "Mr. Harvey Stephenson [who is directly involved]; Mr. Leonard Ebanks, Mr. Brian Bothwell, Mr. Richard Harris, Mr. Lawrence Thompson, the Manager of Administration of CIBC Bank and Trust; Mr. David Arch, Mr. Arek Joseph, Mr. Donovan Ebanks, the Bank of Credit and Commerce, Mr. R. Rodgers and Mr. E. Deidrick." There is no question at all that the public sees this as a major problem that needs to be remedied. I cannot do it alone. I am glad that each Member of this House was copied with this letter. I say this so that the listening public will know that I will try my endeavours to get the appropriate funds allocated for this road. I hope

that Members will support this in Finance Committee.

On the 24th of May, 1989, I also received a letter from Casey Gill and Company. It was sent to the Principal Secretary of my Portfolio. It reads:

"Dear Sir:

I represent the strata Corporation of the Genesis Building. We shall be grateful if Government can update us on the plan, and date for the completion of the proposed outlet from Jennett Street to Shedden Road and Mary Street. We understand that this project was scheduled for commencement shortly and is, in fact, recommended in the Master Ground Transportation Study."

That was in error. It was not recommended in the Master Ground Transportation Plan Study (MGTP) but rather in the Technical Advisory Committee Report for George Town. So it is not a part of this study carried out for the MGTP, but the detailed study carried out for the conceptual plan for George Town.

"With the increase of office construction, occupancy and general commercial activity in the area, Jennett Street now becomes extremely busy and congested during peak hours.

The exits planned into Shedden Road and Mary Street will be extremely advantageous to George Town. The reason for that is that under the existing arrangements Jennett Street traffic exits right into the centre of town, adding to the main congestion. Whereas exits from Jennett Street in the opposite direction will divert traffic away from the centre, and thereby relieve George Town congestion.

Quite apart from the above it goes without saying that land owners, office tenants and shoppers using Jennett Street will be relieved of the frustrating delays suffered during peak hours because of this bottleneck which can so simply be remedied. We have made initial approaches to all concerned parties and their views and support of this request will be forthcoming, should that course be necessary.

We look forward to hearing from you."

I replied to this letter and advised Mr. Gill that the Government would be looking into this. We have, in fact, looked into this matter. The system has been designed by Public Works and some provision has been made in the Estimates, but because of the cuts having to be made in order to balance the Budget we were not able to put the full allocation at the time. I will deal with that in one minute. But before I go to that, I wish to further point out and to give the practical position to highlight the crisis in this particular area. There are a number of offices in that area. Just to give an indication of the number of people going in that street:

The Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce	40 parking spaces
Butterfield Bank	25 parking spaces
Coe Building and Comart Supermarket	10 parking spaces
The Village	34 parking spaces
Jennett Building	30 parking spaces
The Genesis Building	50 parking spaces
British American Centre	96 parking spaces
Total parking spaces (approx)	300 spaces

That is separate and apart from all the traffic that goes in there to the bank and to the offices located in that area, in addition to the business places there, because in the Village alone you have Video Max, which is a very busy area, a lot of people go in there; H & L Duty Free Shop; Nemhard's Pets; Nature's Best Foliage; Sharper Image; Cayman Tours and Travel, and a number of others. There is no question at all that this facility is badly needed. I can only attempt to impress on the Members of this Honourable House (and in particular the Elected Members) that they give this very urgent matter their full support in the Finance Committee.

The next question that could be asked is where do we get the funds from? Members will recall that there were funds allocated under Head 41-006 under the Capital Estimates in the amount of \$4,100,000. Of this amount, \$400,000 is provided for the roads in Cayman Brac, the balance of \$3,700,000 is split up as follows:

- The West Bay road sidewalk	\$370,000.00
- District maintenance work	\$630,000.00

That is \$1 million, with a balance of \$2,700,000. This amount was allocated as follows:

- MGTP immediate action

\$680,000.00

We saw the defeat of the Motion that would have made this possible. So these funds should now be available for other construction. I am proposing that some of these funds be used for the Jennett 'T'.

- Phase one preparation	\$660,000.00
- Amount provided for Jennett 'T'	\$360,000.00
- Land acquisition	\$1,000,000.00

As I said, since the MGTP has been defeated by the House - hopefully, a temporary set-back - I am taking this opportunity to advise the Elected Members who form the Finance Committee that I will need sufficient funds for this project. The estimated cost of the Jennett 'T' is something like \$2.5 million. It is a very urgently needed facility. I cannot impress too strongly on the Members the need for this.

I also wish to comment on an Editorial in today's newspaper, because I feel this editorial is a very timely and good one, well written. I have been known to get up in this Honourable House and lash out at the *Caymanian Compass*, but this is one time that this is not the case. I feel that they have noted the main problem that is facing this country and an issue that very few of the Members that have previously debated this Budget Address, place very little attention on. It reads:

"The debate in the current meeting of the Legislative Assembly so far has concerned a number of controversial issues - The roads plan, the Hospital project, the request for a cruise ship landing in West Bay - to name a few. Large projects such as these must be based upon some form of projection of the future economic growth in order to be planned in a rational manner.

However, the question that looms over everything has not yet been answered. Should efforts be made..."

And this was the main area of the Budget Address;

"Should efforts be made to slow down Cayman's phenomenal economic growth or should the economy be allowed to go ahead full steam, until it runs out of momentum?"

Before I continue, I wish to point out again that this particular issue was raised very strongly in my debate of the 1989 Budget. I made the point, at that time, that the economic activities in Grand Cayman was mainly, I said 80 per cent of it, concentrated in George Town and on the West Bay Road, and that it was my feeling that we need to be looking at ways and means of encouraging future, potential developers to go into the outlying districts, such as Bodden Town, North Side, East End and, indeed, in Cayman Brac. I said at that time, 'My question today is', and I am reading this from the Hansards of my debate on the 1989 Budget Address.

"My question today is, what are we doing to encourage development outside George Town and the West Bay peninsula area into areas like Bodden Town, East End, Northside and in other areas of Grand Cayman?"

Are we prepared to offer sufficient incentives to investors or are we prepared to implement the necessary policies that would in some way discourage further development on the West Bay beach area and encourage the development into the suburban or outlying areas of the Islands? Are we prepared to offer sufficient incentives to encourage development to go to the Lesser Islands?"

I went on to say:

"I have often said that perhaps we should consider a reduced cost to banks, 'B' Banks, insurance companies, the ordinary companies forming there. We should consider a reduced cost to those people to establish themselves in the Lesser Islands. Particularly in Cayman Brac. Of course this would have to be very closely monitored to ensure no companies or banks are transferred from Grand Cayman just to take advantage of this reduced cost.

If we have 5,000 companies in Cayman Brac and a number of 'B' banks there, it would have the effect of generating more business in Cayman Brac, thus improving the economic standards of that Island."

I went on to say:

"At present we are still subsidising the Lesser Islands. This is one of the reasons

why we have to be extremely careful not to stop our development in Grand Cayman. As I said yesterday..."

And this is reading from this page of my speech on the 1989 Budget;

"...planned development is desirable but in the situation where we are subsidising the Lesser Islands, it would be a mistake for us to move too rashly in this respect."
(Hansard, 9th March 1989)

I reaffirm this, not only on the basis of our economic situation, but what I am putting forward on the Lesser Islands can be substantiated by the fact that a number of companies are now establishing themselves in Tortola, the British Virgin Islands, perhaps to a lesser extent than at Turks and Caicos, but they were also establishing there.

Those of us who have had the opportunity to visit the British Virgin Islands will agree with me that Cayman Brac has as much to offer as that Island. The main reason why they are establishing in Tortola is because of the cost considerations. There is no reason at all why we could not attract some of those businesses to Cayman Brac.

The Editorial in today's *Caymanian Compass* continued to say:

"Much has been said in recent months about the stress placed on the community by the rapid growth. Particularly the ratio between Caymanians and expatriates and the chronic shortage of labour.

Sections of the Budget Address provide background information on the rate of growth and on possible effects of dampening efforts are of continued unbridled growth."

The Editorial continued:

"Government revenues will be affected if the economy were to be slowed down and spending would have to be adjusted accordingly. Similarly, if the current growth rates were to continue, new demands on the infrastructure would have to be satisfied."

The closing paragraph of the Editorial stated: "During the Budget Debate..." And I would like to stress this because I fully agree with this: "...Members of the Assembly should address themselves first and foremost to the matter of growth since it is the underlying issue on which the shape, size and urgency of most other projects will depend in one way or another."

This is well put and I would hope that all of us will address ourselves to this very pressing issue.

I would again stress that my position on this question is that we need to be very careful when we talk about slowing down the growth in Grand Cayman because, right now, the development is mainly on the West Bay Road area and in George Town. If we do this and it is not properly done it is going to affect not only the residents of Grand Cayman but it will severely and directly affect the Lesser Islands because they are subsidised, to a large extent, by Grand Cayman.

What we see area lot of businesses on the West Bay Road and in George Town. There is no reason why we cannot, even if we have to legislate, try to get those people into other areas. This is one of the reasons why I again submit that, even though the Motion on the Report was defeated in this House, efforts should be made to develop a development strategy for West Bay and other outlying districts and the Lesser Islands.

Having dealt with those issues, I now wish to move on to a department of my Portfolio, namely, the Natural Resources section. During the past year the Natural Resources Lab continued basic monitoring of the Marine environment. In addition, another year's worth of data was collected for the Nassau Grouper study. The first annual shallow water fish survey was conducted in June with the assistance of the local diving community. Data from the first conch population survey, which consisted of 840. Twenty-four square meter sample areas were collated and analysed. Thirty new marine park moorings were installed in Cayman Brac and Little Cayman in April of this year and it is planned to instal 30 additional moorings on Grand Cayman by the end of 1989. Also, a point raised by the Third Elected Member for George Town, and that has also been raised by other Members, we are seriously looking into the possibility of installing permanent moorings in the George Town Harbour.

The Natural Resources staff recently attended training work shops and seminars on Marine Parks, protected coastal areas, and coastal zone management. A long-term Comprehensive Environmental Monitoring and Management Strategy is currently being developed. Parts of this will be implemented in the coming year.

It would be remiss of me if I did not make some mention of a very important event that is taking place this week which started on Sunday and ends tomorrow. This is our Marine Conservation Week. Marine Conservation Week was designated to raise public awareness of our existing Marine Conservation Laws and to educate the general public about the need for marine conservation. Accordingly a

programme of activities aimed at enhancing everyone's appreciation of Cayman's rich marine environment was developed. I would at this point wish to acknowledge the very hard work that was put into this by its Chairman, Miss Gina Ebanks, the Assistant Scientific Officer at the Lab, and the very hard working members of her Committee.

The week began with an Interfaith Service held at the Eimslie Memorial Church. Again, this was a very inspiring and most enlightening service. It is a pity, I think it was, perhaps, because of the inclement weather, that more of our people and, in particular, more of the Members of this Legislative Assembly could not have been present at that meeting. Other activities during the week include special lectures on coral reef ecology, a slide presentation by the National Trust on Cayman's marine heritage, an Art Show at the Pure Art Gallery featuring works of local artists on marine themes. Special evening entertainment, specials at local restaurants, a series of articles on conservation themes in the press and on Radio Cayman, an underwater photo competition and an underwater treasure hunt.

Special activities for children include after school snorkeling offered by the Fitness Connection and the Cayman Islands Watersport Operators Association. Sting Ray City trips were organised by the Cayman Marine Lab and a special childrens' school radio programme.

The week culminates in conservation celebration day on Saturday, December the 2nd, which is tomorrow. This day was especially designed for children and there will be a variety of organised activities which will include free glass bottom boat rides, snorkel boat rides, art classes taught by the Visual Art Society, snorkelling classes taught by qualified instructors from the Cayman Islands Watersport Operators Association, a sand sculpturing contest and childrens' entertainment. A monument which will be dedicated to Marine Conservation will be finalised by the children on that day, under the supervision of Lesley Bigelman. At the end of the day three yearling turtles will be released as a symbol of these Island's commitment to Marine Conservation. Unfortunately there seems to be some bad weather coming down and I hope that this will not affect tomorrows activities on the beach.

Also, the Natural Resources Lab has been very much involved with the Marl Mining Consultancy. For the last several months, a technical committee set up by my Portfolio has been negotiating with the Environmental Engineering Consultants - CH2M Hill - on the specifics on the proposed study which will address the problems associated with obtaining fill material on and off shore. It is anticipated that the details of the study will be finalised during the week of December 4th to 5th. It is hoped that all these necessary consultancies will receive the necessary financing. This matter, the consultancy on marl mining is a very, very necessary and important one.

Also, the Natural Resources Lab has been very much involved with the maintenance of the Marine Parks. This is indeed a full time job now with 164 permanent dive moorings, 58 spar buoys marking parks boundaries as well as numerous range markers and navigation lights. The unit is also very much involved with Marine Parks enforcement. I am happy to say that we have some very dedicated officers in that section of the Natural Resources Unit. The Natural Resources Lab is currently expanding their programme of monitoring to include continuous data collection within important areas of threatened marine habitats.

In summary, with regards to the Natural Resources Unit, the staff is stretched to the limits of its capabilities in trying to maintain the vital marine park systems as well as monitor and protect the natural environment. Although this section has taken on two technical and one secretarial members of staff in the last six months, it still only has an effective complement of three scientists and two field officers. The Natural Resources Lab is urging the Government to upgrade and expand the section to a full department of the environment. That matter is now under consideration.

I now wish to turn to another Department of my Portfolio, which is the Planning Department. The year of 1988 set a new record for the value of development applications approved, with the figure being \$131 million. Approvals for 1989 promises to exceed that amount with \$71,155,641 approved in the first six months of the year. Categories which are leading the approvals are residential and apartment/condominium projects.

In 1989 the Planning Department strove to give the Cayman Islands the first official Building Code but we had some setbacks with this and it appears that this goal will probably be achieved in 1990, and not 1989. With the Building Code we have involved the Members for the Lesser Islands, the First and Second Elected Members for the Lesser Islands, and also we have representation on the Committee from members of that constituency. In addition, the Planning Department began a review of the current regulations with the goal of improving the effectiveness and efficiency of that Department.

In 1990 the Department will continue its efforts to ensure the adoption of a Cayman Islands Building Code, as mentioned earlier. Improvement in the code enforcement areas will be a priority for the Planning Department in 1990. Such enforcement has not been adequate in the past, yet the very ability to implement the development plan depends on it. Hopefully, appropriate amendments will be passed during this meeting to assist the Planning Department with enforcing their regulations. I will not comment on the prescribed composite maps that were also submitted through the Planning Department as that matter has already received considerable attention in this House during this sitting.

I now move to the Postal Department. Provisions are made on the loan funds in this Budget for the building of a new General Post Office. I have a special Committee. A part of the Technical Advisory Committee, together with the Post Master General, are now deciding on the most appropriate location to recommend to the Government for this Post Office. Also, in line with the recommendations, also made in the Technical Advisory Report and from a Portfolio policy point-of-view, something has to be done to alleviate the pressures on the sub-Post Offices. Right now there is a very long waiting list for post boxes in the various districts, but, in particular, in the George Town/West Bay Road area. So it is hoped that some type of facility will be possible along the West Bay Road area. My Portfolio and I are looking into various ways and means of dealing with this very pressing problem. There have been many years now since there has been any increase in

rental of our post boxes. Some post boxes cost only \$6 per year which is ridiculous in this day and time. The Portfolio is also looking at ways and means of revising those rates.

I now wish to deal with another Department falling under my Portfolio, the Public Works Department (PWD). We have heard a great deal of criticism from some Members of the House regarding the Public Works Department, as I said earlier, some, no doubt, justified. But, I dare say that most are not fair and some are without foundation. The following will provide an overview of some of the projects with which the Public Works Department is now involved and has been involved with during the past year. Sometimes remarks are made without having all the facts. While I, too, would like to see more efficiency in a number of Government Departments, sometimes we need to understand the true situation and be a little bit more tolerant.

The Public Works Department continues to invest in training young Caymanians. Those currently overseas studying include Omar McLean, Jonathan Jackson and Sean Evans, who are studying architecture, and Findlay Joseph, who is studying Civil Engineering. Mark Scotland has received a degree in Civil Engineering and has joined the Department on a full time basis. The Department was fortunate in having 14 Members of the executive and supervisory staff participate in the Management Development Programme. Mission statements for the Department and unit sections have been prepared, along with unit goals and objectives. Action plans are now being prepared. With the approval in principle, and this was hoped that this would have been the case, but unfortunately it was not, but I still would like to let you know our intentions, with the approval in principle of the Master Ground Transportation Plan, in its phase one project, there has been an increase in the roads section support. That is, staff were put in place to look into land evaluations, etcetera. The Firm of David Lashley and Partners were awarded the contract for the design of phase one of the Master Ground Transportation Plan projects. In addition, Mr. Murray Blanchard joined the local staff as Project Manager for the MGTP study, and Irene Carlos has been contracted to implement land acquisition for the MGTP projects. The position of Executive Engineer of roads has been filled by Ron Kane of Texas. There have been other areas that were filled in.

As I mentioned earlier having received the assurance from the First Elected Member for Bodden Town that, had this matter been deferred, he swore on his honour that he would support it, I trust this is still the situation when it comes back to this Honourable House. It is hoped that we will have a complete revision of this and several alternatives that I will be able to present to all Members of Government, so we can get the full support or otherwise on this issue, and that also, it will also be given total publicity before being brought back to this House. This is not to say that the Study that was brought here did not, in fact, get such publicity, but in the interest of cooperation we will again give this document as much publicity as possible.

On the 1989 maintenance Budget, the spending for roads will total approximately \$319,000. This includes maintenance for drainage wells, signs, sweeping, bush cutting and surface patching. In the 1989 Capital Budget, major accomplishments of 1989 include completion of five immediate action projects that were recommended by the Master Ground Transportation Plan. This Plan has, in fact, already been initiated in this country, the immediate section of the Plan, so it is not breaking new ground.

These five immediate action projects include major construction at the intersection of Eastern Avenue/Crews Road and Eastern Avenue/West Bay Road. New traffic signal control equipment was installed at these and three other locations which greatly improved traffic flow through these junctions. Other major road works included the construction of a reservoir road in East End and Linhurst Avenue in George Town.

Other Capital work completed, or under way in 1989, was the West Bay Road shoulder improvement between Cayman Falls and Merren's, West Bay Road sidewalks on the east side between the Hyatt and the Governor's Residence and new streets in Frank Sound, Bodden Town, East End, West Bay and George Town Districts. The roads section also completed car parks at the Tower and the Government Administration Buildings. East End and Northside; boat ramps. Playing fields in Northside and West Bay. Shoulder improvements in Bodden Town and reconstruction of a section of Frank Sound Road. Second application work was done, or is currently underway, on 24 roads Island wide.

I do not think it would even be necessary for me to continue on this because it is quite clear that much work has been done through the Public Works Department in each district of this Island, and even in Cayman Brac during 1989. However, as it is known, Cayman Brac is separated from us by almost 80 miles of water and that Island has its own Superintendent of Works in charge of the works in that particular area. Those projects that I have mentioned, the capital expenditure on them will amount to some 70 per cent of the approved Budget. The delay in land acquisition for the Master Ground Transportation Plan and late letting of the West Bay sidewalk contract are major reasons for that 30 per cent under-run, because the work being done on the sidewalks was contracted out and not done by PWD.

Overall the Capital Budget was approved at \$4.28 million dollars for the Grand Cayman road section, of which \$1.7 million was for the commencement of the Master Ground Transportation Plan, and \$6 million was for the immediate action projects. The amount of \$.65 million was for the West Bay Road sidewalks and \$1.17 million for the other road improvements.

The actual expenditure will be \$1.2 million for the MGTP, and this has already been spent, \$5 million for the immediate action projects recommended by the MGTP, \$3 million for sidewalks and \$1 million for other road improvements, for a total of \$3 million in actual expenditures. That is quite a lot of public works being done in one year.

Work was also done on the Airport Development Project. In Cayman Brac, the new terminal building, fire station, apron taxiways, and associated infrastructure, were completed in 1989 and went into operation in February of 1989. This project was jointly funded by the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB), the European Development Fund (EDF), and the Cayman Islands Government at an estimated final cost of \$3.36 million.

We have also heard it said in this Honourable House that no

substantial work was done on the Community College. The true facts are that the land acquisition for this project was finalised in September 1989. Tenders are to be invited in October 1989 and construction estimated to commence in January 1990 with completion in January 1991. Funding for this project is being provided jointly by the European Development Fund and the Cayman Islands Government.

On the question of school buildings, work commenced in September on the new George Town Primary School Assembly Hall, which will double as a hurricane shelter. Also valued at \$373,000, this project is anticipated to be completed in May 1990. At the Cayman Islands High School two buildings were renovated to provide a new home economics block and a new science laboratory. A project completed was the new therapy wing at the Lighthouse School. A project funded by the Kiwanis and the Government at a total cost of \$57,400. Projects currently in the design stage include a new science block at the High School and a new library resources centre at the Middle School. These projects are projected to commence on site early in 1990. I think this speaks highly, not only of the Public Works Department but also the Portfolio of Education.

On the medical buildings, work on the new recompression chamber situated at the hospital was completed in May of this year, at a cost of \$86,500. Also something that an Honourable Member for Health can be very proud of. On the question of Government offices, conversion of an existing Government owned house to the new Protection Board Offices is underway with completion anticipated in October, 1989. Work on the new Immigration Offices is anticipated to commence in early 1990. The project costs for these works is estimated at \$702,000. At the Sports Centre complex the public toilet facility is well underway with completion estimated early this month, at a cost of \$80,000. On the Central Funding Scheme Paint Shop, this facility was completed in September 1989 at an estimated cost of \$72,000. The question of harbours and docks, a new launching ramp, jetty, access road and parking at a cost of \$62,300 were constructed at East End in July 1989. Yet, we are told that we are doing nothing.

On the maintenance section, during 1989 a total of \$1,297,051 will be spent on the maintenance and repairs of Government buildings, staff housing and school buildings. This work is being carried out by the Public Works Department, or at least being carried out through that Department. On the renovation and repairs to medical buildings, miscellaneous general repairs to medical facilities by December 1989, will account for an estimated \$113,000. The main projects carried out were: renovations and re-roofing of the Hospital Administration Building after the hurricane, \$25,000; electrical repairs to the sterilising unit, \$8,000; a new door to the Pharmacy, \$500; an overhead covering for the ambulance, \$2,000; alterations to the existing laundry unit, \$5,000. Again, we are being told that the Honourable Member for Health is not doing anything.

Renovations were also carried out to the Police building. A total of \$64,000 will be spent on Police buildings in 1989. This includes the front desk repairs and renovations, new sliding gates, repairs and renovations to the control room, re-carpeting of offices, repairs to the barracks, the remodeling of the entrance hall and the canopy extension, the removal of the existing fence and construction of a new walk plus a nine foot security fence in George Town. While in the districts, \$9,000 of repairs will be carried out to the Bodden Town and West Bay stations.

In the districts, renovations were carried out to Town Halls also. The amount of \$45,000 will be spent on renovations and repairs to the Town Halls in Bodden Town, Northside and East End. Also, on the re-roofing programme, a total of \$44,000 was spent on re-roofing Government houses during the year. The sum of \$24,000 on the Governor's Residence staff quarters and garage, and \$20,000 on other Government staff housing.

Re-roofing the Mosquito Research Control Unit, garages, the Legislative Assembly and the Medical Centre, the technical and Social Studies block at the high school came to a total of \$97,350.

The Public Works Department was also involved in the installation of hurricane shutters. In line with the Department's efforts to upgrade the hurricane preparedness, hurricane shutters were fitted to 16 Government staff quarters with a total cost of \$47,000, while the installation of shutters to the Lighthouse School and the Sunrise Training Centre came to \$16,000. On the Electrical Section of the Public Works Department, to enhance the safety for jet aircraft flying into Cayman Brac at night, a system of approach lighting was added to runway 08, to identify ground levels. In addition, a series of identifier strobe lights are being added to mark the runway edge, as an additional safety factor. The cost to date of this project is \$13,740. On the very topical question of street lighting, Government is continuing to upgrade the street safety as rapidly as possible. Eastern Avenue has been lit to recommended road lighting standards by replacing existing 175 watt lights with 26 400 watt, high pressure, sodium light fixtures. The cost of the purchase and installation of this project is some \$7,942. With regards to the other districts, the Government will continue to upgrade the lighting in those districts, within the Government's Budget.

Proceedings are suspended for 15 minutes.

MR. PRESIDENT:

AT 11:20 A.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 11:53 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Proceedings are resumed.
The Honourable Member for Communications and Works,

continuing.

Thank you, Mr. President.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON:

As the Financial Statement is an integral part, perhaps the most important part, of the Budget, and the Budget Address is directly related to this, and since previous speakers did not look into this in detail, I felt that it was most important for the listening public to have an appreciation of the financial position of this country, and the position since 1984 when this Government first took office. Just to say that at the end of 1983 figures will show that this country was near bankruptcy. There were a lot of our bills we could not pay. It is very heartening to see the information which has been provided by the Financial Secretary, the Honourable First Official Member, in his presentation of the Budget Address.

It was interesting to see that the Gross Domestic Savings increased from \$16.9 million in 1983 to some \$38.5 million in 1988. This all happened since 1984 until 1988. This is an increase of approximately 128 per cent. The average annual rate of growth was 18.3 per cent. As the proportion of Gross Domestic Product, the Domestic Savings Rate increased from 7.2 per cent in 1983, to approximately 10 per cent in 1987. The largest component of domestic savings was in the private savings. The public savings was nil between 1983 and 1984, but grew from about \$4 million in 1986 to \$17 million in 1988. Private savings increased at an average annual rate of 17.8 per cent and this was during the period of 1984 to 1988. The overall growth was 117.8 per cent from \$16.9 million in 1983 to \$38.5 million in 1988. As the proportion of Gross Domestic Product, the private savings rate increased in real terms from 7.2 per cent in 1983, to 9 per cent in 1987. At the same time, private consumption, as a proportion of Gross Domestic Product, declined in real terms from 66.4 per cent in 1983, to 63.1 per cent in 1987.

I totally agree with the Honourable First Official Member, the Financial Secretary, that what these estimates suggest is that in the 1980s, in particular from 1984 to 1988, the economy grew from a 7 per cent saver to a 10 per cent saver. I have read that section of the Budget Speech to highlight the very good stewardship of the Government since 1984. The country is in good hands. The people out there know that, and this is the reason why they are fully behind this Government.

On the Statement of Estimated Receipts and Expenditure for the financial year ending the 31st of December, 1990. Next year is starting out, and this was the balance, with a surplus of \$9,152,342. Even though we have a total expenditure of \$107,610,498 we were able to cover all our expenses from our own resources, without having to increase any revenues or taxes on our people to do so. The revised position shows that at the end of 1990, and I would give a guess now that this will be much increased, but on the figures we have before us, the revised position is that at the end of the 31st of December, 1990, we will still be in a surplus position and much better off than we were when this Government took over in 1984. In addition, we have reserves (I am not sure of the exact figure), but I would venture to say that it is well over \$15 million. This country is in good shape. There is no question about it. I have yet to hear any Member get up in this Honourable House that has been able to successfully contradict that statement.

Under our summary of Capital Expenditure, the approved 1989 Budget was something like \$19 million. In the interests of being frugal and in the interest of implementing good fiscal measures, this amount was reduced by some \$1.3 million bringing the Estimates for 1990 to some \$18.2 million. Again a sign of good stewardship. The Third Elected Member for George Town queried the Government's policy in balancing the Budget. He also suggested that the Budget was poorly organised because it did not include the salary review which we have yet to receive. It seems strange that this Member would criticise this Government for omitting a figure that we do not yet have. How could we have included the figures for the salary review when that review has not yet been concluded? Perhaps the Member can explain to us how this is possible. He also suggested, and to a certain extent I agree with this, that there is nothing too wrong in a developing country sometimes going into deficit financing. But I would hate to see this happen to the Cayman Islands. We do not need to do so and I feel that we should still continue to strive for a balanced Budget.

He suggested that the omission of an amount in the Budget for the civil servants was an indication that we did not care about them. Nothing could be further from the truth. It was this Government that commissioned the salary review in the first place. We have shown our interest in our civil servants and we will find ways of paying them, even if it has to come out of our Reserves. We will never neglect our civil servants because we respect them. They are the hub around which our economy spins. The Third Elected Member for George Town also mentioned that the Civil Service is expanding too fast. I never heard the Member state any suggestions on how he would cope with such a situation. With the phenomenal growth we have had in this country, the Civil Service has to be well equipped to cope with this and to cope with the growth in the private sector. This is most important. I would hate to see any Member of this Government, be they on the Government bench or on the Backbench try to erode the efficiency of our service.

I now wish to move to another subject under my Portfolio, namely, the Water Authority. But before doing so, I wish to state, in respect to the Lesser Islands, that I have received full support, in particular from the First Elected Member from that district, in trying to have work done, not only in the canal near the Tiara Beach area, but also with regards to taking water to Cayman Brac and also with the installation of terminals. This is not to say that I have not also received some support from the Second Elected Member for the Lesser Islands, but I thought it was only fair that I should make special mention of the amount of support that I have received from the First Elected Member in these respects.

We hope that by the middle of next year we will have piped drinking water in Cayman Brac because it is our intention, from the Water Authority's point of view, to take a 60,000 gallon a day reverse osmosis reservoir or machine to Cayman Brac and supply that area with water. We also hope that we will be able to build a half million gallon reservoir so that those people that are not able to get water piped to them, will be able to get fresh water delivered by truck to their homes and businesses.

A major development occurring with the Water Authority in 1990 will be its move on the 1st of January to a full Statutory Board status. Consequently, it is not included, as can be seen, in the 1990 Budget. The year 1989 saw the Water Authority continue with its growth of Capital Works,

particularly with respect to the George Town water supply. Additional expenditure of C\$2.5 million has been obtained to extend distribution to Spotts/Newlands and extend the reservoir capacity by one million imperial gallons. The extension commenced in September of this year and completion of this extension is anticipated in March of 1990. In parallel with the extension of distribution, the Authority also took measures to increase the amount of water it has available by entering into an agreement to have an additional 350,000 US gallons available per day, by the end of 1989. To meet the anticipated shortfall in supply, whilst the new plant is being installed, the Authority has taken delivery of a US 60,000 per day desalination plant, which is now installed and will be producing water until the larger plant is on stream.

The provision of the additional water making capacity will ensure that as from the first part of 1990, the amount of desalinated water available to the Water Authority will be between US 800,000 and US 900,000 gallons per day, depending on the availability of the plant operated by the Central Desal. The Authority is, at present, actively investigating the possibility of moving the 60,000 gallon per day plant to Cayman Brac, as I said earlier. If agreement is reached with the Government, and this is through the Water Authority, it is anticipated that the plant will be operational in Cayman Brac by the middle of 1990. A limited distribution to the southern end of the Island is proposed, as is a 500,000 gallon reservoir to supply water for distribution and to be trucked to the other districts. In addition, a piped water supply to the district of West Bay is being given much consideration and top priority. The water Authority has favourably considered a proposal from the Water Company to extend their distribution to include West Bay, provided that it meets the approval of Government and certain matters with respect to the concession can be agreed. Of particular importance is the matter of price control as the Authority and Government feel strongly that the residents of West Bay should not be subject to a price any higher than those residents of George Town.

The overall water development of the Islands is presently being considered by a Committee made up of various interested parties and Chaired by Mr. Joel Walton of the Economic Development Unit. It is anticipated that the Report of this Committee will be available in early 1990, and it will be recommended in strategies that will enable the whole of the Islands to have a safe and secure water supply, in an economic and affordable manner.

On the sewage side, the West Bay Beach sewage project has passed through one year of mainly trouble free operation. The problems with the sewage treatment works were resolved in late 1989, and in 1990 steps are to be taken to ensure that the salinity of the effluents from the sewage treatment works is brought up to a sufficiently high standard to be used for irrigation. In addition, in 1990 it is anticipated that the sewage system will be incorporating many more new connections as the drainage area develops further. The Water Authority is to investigate the possibility of sewerage the centre of George Town and North Church Street, which is considered a priority area of concern.

From 1986 to date, a total of \$16 million has been invested by the Water Authority in Capital Development of water supply and sanitation sector. By the end of 1990, this expenditure will have increased to \$17 million, assuming that no further extensions are made on the water supply and the sewage projects. Earlier in this meeting the question was raised by the Third Elected Member for George Town regarding fluoridation. As promised to this Honourable House, we have investigated this and we are continuing to do so. It is the feeling, pending further distribution of our piped water, that urgent efforts will be given to putting appropriate levels of fluoride in the existing piped water supply. With the understanding that, as said in the answer to a question in this House, we have to be very careful that we remain within the recommended limits.

I now wish to move onto another area relating to the Budget, an authority that falls under my Portfolio. That is the Port Authority. I will briefly outline the policy in regards, as I have done with the other departments, as relates to this Budget Address. The following projects have either been commenced or will be completed during this calendar year. The Port Authority introduced a contributory pension scheme for daily paid workers and made retroactive payments for past service. It started a pension fund for workers who are too advanced in years to benefit from the Pension Plan. It buoyed the Eden Rock area in order to make this area more safe for divers. The Port Authority Administration building has been completed and is now occupied. Work has commenced on a building to provide offices, a luncheon area, showers and rest room facility for the daily paid workers.

The Port Authority also completed two cabanas at the Tourist Landing for the shelter and convenience of cruise ship passengers. Eight benches are to be installed within the next month. Work is due to commence in December on a Tourist Booth and restroom facilities. Additional shelter will be added when the present rotunda is covered. Also, work has started on the new cargo distribution centre in the Industrial Park. This project will be completed in stages and, when completed, this area will serve as a distribution point for 90 per cent of the landed cargo and will provide a sufficient covered cargo area and container storage to serve the Port into the 21st century. Preliminary studies are being undertaken for the expansion of the present docking area and for the construction of a cruise berthing facility. These Plans will be presented to the Executive Council in 1990.

I have taken time to relate these activities so that this Honourable House and the listening public can assess the amount of work and the policy as relates to the statement of the Budget Address. They will then be able to judge for themselves the tremendous amount of work that is being undertaken by the Members of Executive Council.

The Port Authority is being operated at a very good profit level. The Port Authority will most likely generate a record breaking profit again this year, in spite of the George Town facility having to subsidise Cayman Brac to the tune of over \$200,000. It was against this background that I warned that in any policy to slow our economy we should bear in mind that Grand Cayman is still subsidising the Lesser Islands. Perhaps, moves should be made to see what economic developments can be generated in that Island.

I also think it is important to mention that although the Port is

doing quite well financially, the profits being generated are down from the 1977 Tariffs and, therefore, the proceeds are only half the spending power of that period. I will say this, wearing the hat of the Chairman of the Port Authority, that taking the above argument into account, I think the Authority should now be looking at revising its tariffs to allow for inflation and, therefore, have the ability to finance the future expansion to its facilities that is so desperately needed if the Port is expected to operate at the level of efficiency that it has achieved in the past years. At our level of profitability and efficiency, there is no question at all that we are in a position, if we need to enter into any capital expenditure, that we are able to service our loans.

Moving on I would briefly like to give a synopsis of the Central Funding Scheme as this plays a major role in our country's development. Before doing so, at present I have my Officers in the Portfolio looking into the feasibility as to whether Government should now be looking at the rental of small vehicles as opposed to purchasing them, and to look at the cost benefit analysis of this exercise because there are firms in this country that are in this type of business. Our initial investigation proves that it could be much more profitable and beneficial to this Government if we investigated that avenue.

The main function of the funding scheme is to advise Government of the suitability of vehicles and mechanical equipment for its fleet, and to assist in the purchase and the commissioning of such equipment and to provide maintenance services for the fleet. They also dispose of vehicle and equipment at the end of their economic lives. During the year the organisation took delivery of 60 vehicles and equipment for various Government departments. The most notable of these were nine police patrol cars for the Royal Cayman Islands Police Force, and a large tractor for the Environmental Health. The cost of the additional units amounted to some \$1.4 million. During 1989 the overall fleet image and appearance has been enhanced. To keep pace with advances in technology, five mechanics have attended short mechanical training courses focused mainly on emergency and security vehicles. Four officers have also attended management and supervisory training courses provided by the Personnel Training Unit. As can be seen there is not one section of my Portfolio that is not actively involved.

Also, we have recently set up a Traffic Law Committee, as this subject also falls under my Portfolio. The Traffic Law Committee, comprising of representatives from the Royal Cayman Islands Police Force, the Public Works Department, the Planning Department, the Department of Lands and Survey and the Central Funding Scheme, was established in March of 1989, under the auspices of my Portfolio with the objective of undertaking a thorough and wide ranging review of the Traffic Law. The need for such a review has long been apparent and was one of the specific recommendations of the Master Ground Transportation Plan.

At the first few meetings the Committee discussed and formulated proposals upon certain basic changes it would wish to see introduced into the Law. The fundamental nature of these changes involved the reassignment of certain responsibilities and functions under the Law. Some of these are to be transferred to the Central Funding Scheme. The Committee has embarked on a detailed, section by section review of the Law and has so far covered vehicle and driver licensing, driver testing, regulations of taxis and omnibuses and traffic engineering. It is the intention of the Committee to do a complete rewrite of the Traffic Law.

Just to briefly comment on some of the remarks made in regards to my Portfolio in previous debates before closing, I wish to make it abundantly clear that the Portfolio is committed to servicing the country as a whole to the best of our ability and within the constraints of our financial resources. Lights have been requested, not only from the Bodden Town Members, but other areas, and the Portfolio has been instructed to comply with each request as far as is possible. Also, roads were requested that we have endeavoured to comply with. But, I feel Members can appreciate that we can only do so much within the Budget which has been approved. Six new roads were built or repaired in Bodden Town during 1989 out of a number of 12 which were requested.

POINT OF CLARIFICATION

MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH: Mr. President, On a Point of Clarification, Sir. I asked the Member during Question Time to give me the names of those six new roads which were built. I have not received it yet. I am disagreeing with him, Sir. No six new roads...

MR. PRESIDENT: Sorry, sorry. No, you are entitled to the first part, you are absolutely correct, please do not go further. You are inviting him to clarify that point.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, from the information which I have been provided with from the Public Works Department, I would be happy to give this Member that information. Whether or not he agrees with it is another point. I had, in fact, already shown the Member the same information which he is now requesting. Perhaps it has escaped his memory. The roads are:

- General Ebanks Road
- North Sound Estates Road
- Northward - Towbis/Lemon Road Construction
- West Lane - to Long Residence Construction
- Taxi Road - Block 56 E 28

Second Application Surface Treatment was also given to Savannah Heights Road and Savannah Acres Road.

Mr. President, I hope that answer is satisfactory, if not I will be happy to meet the Member to further clarify this later on today.

MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH: Mr. President, for the Member's information, Sir, none of those roads he mentioned are new roads. Many of those roads he mentioned as being new roads have not even been resurfaced, Sir.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, that is not my understanding from my Public Works Department, my technical advisors, and I must be led by the information they have given me. But, as I said, I am not prepared to be interrupted anymore unless it is on a Point of Order, and if I can meet with the Member after this to clarify this point, I will be very happy to do so.

The point that I was trying to make, before I was interrupted is that it is our policy, and the policy of this Government, to do whatever is humanly possible, not only within the constraints of our finance, but within the capability of, and through, the Public Works Department. But what Members have to understand is that there are five districts in Grand Cayman, each one requiring work done on roads and other works carried out by the Public Works Department.

In an effort to try and address all these problems I made it quite clear to the Public Works Department, at our meetings at the beginning of the year, that we wanted them to start at East End, which they did, and then move into Northside, then Bodden Town. They then went to West Bay, back to the West Bay Road and did some shoulder work on the road and now the last one is in George Town. So nobody can accuse me of being selfish in my handling of this. George Town was left until the last.

I want to give the assurance to this Honourable House that in any area of my Portfolio's activities we will continue to work very closely with the Members on the opposite side of the House because we realise that the only way we can be successful with our programmes is in a spirit of cooperation.

One area of cooperation which we will see demonstrated in one way or the other has been my recent request to Members of the Backbench to seriously consider the need for the Jennett 'T' Road. This is not a Linford Pierson Road, this is not a road for any Member of Executive Council. This is a road that is badly, badly needed, and refusing to support that is going to be a refusal to provide a needed facility and amenity in the country. We need this road, like a lot of other high priority projects. I am again asking the Members on the Backbench to demonstrate what they have been saying in their debates, that they are willing and anxious to support the Government with their projects. I would like to see this demonstrated. This is one area that I feel that they are able to do this. There is no use of any of use getting up in this Honourable House and paying lip service. If we say we are going to do something, we want to extend the hand of friendship, let us do so. Let us work together. Cooperation means working together. I want to sit with any Member of the Backbench to discuss the Capital Programme that we have for 1990.

The Third Elected Member for George Town can attest to the fact that on my first tour of George Town to examine the roads, he was one of the first people that I invited. I have no problem in dealing with our Backbenchers. As I said earlier, there is no question at all, I get on well with any Member of the Backbench. But we, on this side of the House, must reply to matters brought up in any debate in this House. It cannot be a one sided situation.

I commend this Budget to this Honourable House and I trust that when we get into the Finance Committee, that we will conduct ourselves in a proper manner. I realise that, as in other cases of my experience in Finance Committee, there has been horse trading, as we call it - Members in requesting that funds be shifted from side to side, or from vote to vote. But let us understand that if we are to operate within a spirit of cooperation that we need to be tolerant. We need to understand that politics is the art of compromise.

I thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Does any Member wish to speak? [pause] We do [pause] Time does seem to go so slowly when you are waiting. Does any Member wish to speak? [pause] We do not seem to have sat very long this morning already. I feel worried about the breaks we have been having. Would you like to start? We have nearly 10 minutes. [pause] As I said a little earlier (I cannot remember whether it was this meeting or the last meeting) the Chair normally tries to get an alternate balance in the order of speakers. [pause]

I am grateful. The Third Elected Member for West Bay.

MR. JOHN D. JEFFERSON, JR.: Thank you, Mr. President. First of all, I want to thank the Honourable Financial Secretary for his most challenging and thought provoking Budget Address, and for the eloquent manner in which it was presented. His Address was also academically stimulating and gave me the feeling that I was in a combined class of economics, statistics and accounting at my old Alma mater, Morgan State University in Baltimore, Maryland.

The issues which were raised are ones, I feel, that we as legislators must address in this country if we are to survive as a people. The alternative is to be prepared to run the risk of being outnumbered and becoming second class citizens in our own country. The theme of my address is going to be control. Some of the issues raised were:

1. A falling birthrate within native Caymanians;

2. The rapid pace at which our economy continues to expand;
3. The alarming increase in the rate of expatriate immigrants into this economy to fill positions which are created;
4. The alarming shortage of qualified native Caymanians to meet the local demand for persons to fill positions which have been created by the rapid rate of expansion;
5. The questionable quality of education that our Caymanians are getting overseas;
6. The necessity for diversity in the economy to reduce dependency in the economy on tourism and banking;
7. The necessity to invest sufficient money in human resources so that we can prepare Caymanians to meet the demand for qualified persons to fill the jobs which have been created because of the rapid expansion; and, last but not least,
8. The fact that the prudent fiscal management we have pursued over the years, in that our Budget has been financed through local revenue rather than through debt financing.

Let me now deal with some of these issues. Population: The birth rate among native Caymanians grew from 14,700 in 1983, to 16,400 in 1988. An annual increase of approximately 2 per cent. The Financial Secretary did throw out some of the facts for this. As Caymanian women are now in the work force they have less time to deal with the idea of raising a family. Also, another very important factor is that we in the Cayman Islands are so conscious now of the high cost of living. It is very expensive today to have and to raise children in this economy. Non-Caymanian residents grew from 4,600 in 1983, to 9,500 in 1988, an overall increase for the period of 106.5 per cent, reflecting an annual increase in growth of 16.1 per cent. On the one hand our birthrate is only two per cent. On the other hand the non-resident portion of our population is growing at a clip of 16 per cent. So all of a sudden over the years there has been a significant gap created.

The ratio of Caymanians to non-Caymanians fell from eight to two in 1983, and six to four in 1988. I think we are going to be much more surprised over what the new census figures will reveal. I think it is worse than this. The scenario of the future because of the continued decline in the native Caymanian birthrate in 15 years, it is projected that over 43 per cent of our indigenous population will be over 55 years of age. In other words, reaching or approaching retirement age. By the year 2010, 52 per cent will be 55 years and older. This means that this will cause major implications to the health system, Social Services and the labour force in these Islands. The five areas of main activity in our expansion are as follows: (a) Professional business services grew at an annual clip of 16.2 per cent; (b) Wholesale and retail; (c) Tourism; (d) Financial services; and (e) Building construction.

The Tourism and Financial Services grew at an annual clip of approximately 8.8 per cent. Building was close to 20 per cent. Together these five areas of activity accounted for approximately 70 per cent of the growth in our local Gross Domestic Product between 1983 and 1987. There has been no sign that there is any slow down or decline projected in this area. The labour force grew from 10,300 in 1983, to 12,800 in 1987, representing an annual average increase of approximately 6 per cent. The percentage of Caymanians in the total labour force fell from 73 per cent in 1983, to 62 per cent in 1987. That represents approximately an 11 per cent decline in five years. It continues to slide.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Proceedings are suspended then until 2:15.

Could I interrupt you for a moment? Is it convenient to break?

AT 12:49 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 2:18 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Proceedings are resumed.

The Third Elected Member for West Bay, continuing.

MR. JOHN D. JEFFERSON, JR.:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Just before the break I was dealing with the statistics relating to the local labour force. I mentioned that the labour force grew from 10,300 in 1983, to 12,800 in 1987, representing an average annual increase of 6 per cent. The number of Caymanians employed in the labour force declined at the rate of 73 per cent in 1983, to 62 per cent in 1987, or an 11 per cent decline over the period. What it really reflects is that the number of Caymanians employed as part of the labour force grew by an average of only 1.3 per cent per annum, whereas the percentage of employed non-Caymanians grew from 31 per cent in 1983, to 40 per cent in 1987, or at an average annual increase of 13.5 per cent.

What this represents is a decline in the number of Caymanians

as a percentage of the total labour force. The ratio of Caymanians to non-Caymanians fell from 7 per cent to 3 per cent in 1983, to 6 per cent to 4 per cent in 1987. In other words, while 24 per cent more new jobs were created in the economy between 1983 and 1987, only 5.1 per cent more Caymanians were available to fill them. In short, the rate of new job creation in the economy during the 1980s far outpaced the rate at which Caymanians were available to fill them. This has had some very negative effects on our society. This is voiced by a majority of native Caymanians - that we are growing too fast - and if you have your ear to the ground, what most people are saying is that the Government has to take measures to correct, or at least slow down, the rate at which we are growing on an annual basis. One of the major fears among native Caymanians is that we are fast becoming an endangered species in our own country. Caymanians are genuinely concerned about the fact that if we continue at the pace that we are growing, pretty soon we will be outnumbered as a percentage of the resident population.

What has caused the present situation? Well, political stability. In other words, the Cayman Islands are an attractive destination for the foreign investor. We do not have any foreign exchange controls in place, which allows the free movement of funds in and out of the Cayman Islands. We basically operate as a tax free environment. We really do not have any real estate, corporate or personal income taxes, etcetera. This has made the Cayman Islands a very attractive jurisdiction.

Another attraction we also have is the fact that there is very little Government intervention or restrictions in place. In other words we operate under the free market concept. The other very important advantage, as of this date, is that we continue to enjoy a relatively harmonious relationship between employer and employee. There is an absence of labour unions. I encourage this because I think it is much better if employers and employees can get along together and work out harmonious relationships that are mutually beneficial rather than being in a position where they have to sit down with a union and negotiate salaries and other employee benefits.

Tourism and banking continue to be the main economic fillers of our economy. The category 'B' banks grew in total numbers from 420 to 492, or 17.1 per cent from 1983 to 1988. The category 'A' banks grew by 9.4 per cent, that is, from 34 in 1983 to 35 in 1988, bringing a total number of banks licensed in the Cayman Islands at the end of 1988 to a total of 527, which represents numerical growth of 16.6 per cent.

The banks here have done a good job, as far as financing activities in the local economy, but I think that some efforts should be made to see if they cannot do more. The cost of financing here in the Cayman Islands is very expensive. This is caused by the banks, basically, arriving at exorbitant interest rates that they charge consumers, as opposed to what funds cost them. In other words, the spread between what funds cost the bank and what they loan those funds to the consumer for is very large indeed. I think that some efforts should be made in order to see if this spread could be decreased somewhat, so it would make it less expensive in the long run for consumers to borrow for essential needs in this country.

The banks have made a real effort recently to make available more long term mortgages, and housing is becoming a very critical issue in our society because of the price of homes today. I remember back in 1974 or 1975 when I was thinking about building. At that time I was looking for C\$30,000 to build a three bedroom home, consisting of approximately 2,600 square feet. At that stage, I was required to come up with one third of the appraised value of the house and property.

Now, if you are talking about finding one-third of \$30,000 or \$45,000, that is bad enough. But today, when you are talking about your average home, you cannot build a house in the Cayman Islands, at the present time, for anything less than \$100,000. That one third requirement becomes very expensive indeed. To a lot of local Caymanians who are interested in owning a home, that figure becomes prohibitive.

Recently, Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce, The Bank of Nova Scotia and the Cayman National Bank did establish a policy of putting more funds into their mortgage portfolio with the idea of making more funds available for this purpose. They are making efforts to relax the requirements a little bit. That is good. But I think there is still room for more improvement in this area. Interest rates charged to consumers are normally associated with risk and there are two things that you do not touch belonging to a Caymanian; the land they own and their homes. So, if funds are made available to young Caymanians at more relaxed rates, I think the banks can be confident that those funds will be repaid.

Tourism continues to be the other mainstay in our economy. From all indications it appears that we are going to have a good tourist season. The local hotels and the Caymanians employed in that area welcome this because 1989 was not a very good year. But, I am still concerned that the Cayman Islands, as a destination, may be pricing itself out of the market. From December 15th to April 30th, if a person can get a room along Seven Mile Beach for less than \$100 to \$120 a night, then they are very lucky. There is nothing abnormal about paying as much as \$200 to \$250 a night at some condominiums. That is very expensive, indeed.

Most of our visitors are ordinary people like the rest of us. They work all year and save and pay off their credit card balances so at least once a year they can take a week or two week vacation, and the Cayman Islands have become a very famous and popular tourist destination. I think we should make every effort to ensure that continues. Because of the amount of the tourist dollar today, there are many destinations vying for that business, Jamaica, Puerto Rico, St. Thomas, St. Martin and Aruba are some of those destinations. We must always be conscious that competition exists. We should also ensure that we retain our percentage of that market by offering attractive prices, as far as rooms and service is concerned, good service and a continued friendly environment.

In 1988 the latest statistics relate to hotel occupancy which stood at just over 68 per cent on an average for the year. Apartments or condominiums stood a 53.7 per cent. Now, when you talk about the significant investments in these projects, I was fortunate enough to attend the

opening of the new Kirk Supermarket yesterday and it was revealed that they had spent in excess of \$10 million on their new shopping centre. I imagine the investment by the Radisson or the Hyatt is probably substantially more than that.

So it is important for these hotels to maintain a high enough occupancy rate in order for them to survive as economic entities. The question and concern I have is what impact will the new Radisson hotel, which I think is scheduled to open in March, have on occupancy rates in this country? I trust that efforts are being made to advertise the Cayman Islands and their properties here, because if you get the situation where the number of tourists are not increasing, but the properties which offer services to these visitors increase, then all you have is more people in the pie sharing up a certain amount of dollars.

A significant percentage of our people are employed in the tourist industry. According to the latest statistics 1,152 were employed in the hotels, and 245 in apartments or condominiums. So, these hotels and condominiums are very important contributors to the employment of our people. We, as leaders, have to ensure that our people continue to enjoy good salaries, good working conditions, the opportunity for promotion and, last but not least, we must see that they get their gratuities. I would urge property owners, as I said before, to be conscious of the competition around us and plan for the long term, as far as the pricing of their rooms and services, rather than trying to make a quick buck, at the expense of continued tourism buoyancy. This is a two-way street, and I would also like to encourage our people who are employed in this industry to continue to carry out their responsibilities in a very effective, efficient and pleasant manner to ensure that visitors enjoy their stay here and make plans to return.

I would like to go on to address the subject of the Civil Service, also in keeping with employment. I am becoming increasingly alarmed and concerned at the rate at which our Civil Service is growing. In 1989's Budget, I think salaries and benefits for civil servants amounted to something like 57 per cent of the total amount of recurrent Budget. That is a significant figure. This year those salaries and benefits (this does not take into consideration the salaries review which is now underway) amount to approximately 59 per cent of the Recurrent Expenditure.

I personally believe that the Civil Service has grown too large, and I was a civil servant for seven or eight years. It appears, because the policy was in place when I was there and I do not think it has changed since, the service has become a dumping ground for all nationalities who desire to remain in the country but cannot get a work permit. So rather than leaving them go and smile and contact the right people and they become a permanent part of the Civil Service establishment.

For the dollars we have invested in our service, we must ensure that our service is well trained. I do not think we have invested enough effort and funds in this area and I would encourage the Government to pay closer attention to the level of investment in these areas. We must have a Civil Service that is highly professional and efficient. We must ensure that there are incentives and opportunities available in the service, especially for our young native Caymanians, to move up.

A previous speaker mentioned the weakness in the service, especially in middle management which is just below the Principle Secretary level, and in some areas this is very acute. There is no reason for this. I think the salaries in the Civil Service now, to a great extent, especially at that level, are very attractive. There is no other entity on the Islands that has better vacation benefits. I am not sure if they have cut out the benefit with regards to leave passages, but when I was there, after five years at my level, I was entitled to a round trip passage for myself and my family to the equivalent of New York. This is attractive. So as far as the salaries and benefits that are available to the civil servants, I am not saying they cannot be improved, I think, generally speaking, they have become much more attractive.

The other thing, and this is a very important factor, the service does lend some sense of stability. In the private sector, yes, you might be making a little bit more money, but you can be told after months and months, "Sorry boys, we are not making any money so we are going to have to cut staff." This is not necessarily the case in the Civil Service. As long as you continue to pull your weight, you do what you are responsible for, the chances are that you will have a job until you are 55 or 60 or 65. If you are so inclined to make the Service a career, then you can retire and draw an attractive benefit. So I think greater effort must be expended to ensure that our human resources employed in the service are more efficiently utilised. I can assure the civil servants that they do have our support, and I can speak for myself, I think my colleagues on this side of the House concur, that we are going to ensure that they get what they are entitled to.

We have reached a very critical and crucial crossroad in our development. First of all, the fact is that we are experiencing a declining birthrate. Then there are questions in regard to the quality of qualifications that many of our young Caymanians who go overseas for higher education are getting. This really concerns me because if we are not in a position to properly train our own people to the level where they are qualified to assume some of the senior positions that are available in this country, then we have a very serious problem.

What is also very disturbing is that statistics reflect that we are growing at a clip of about 16 per cent per annum. We are not producing enough qualified Caymanians to take those positions and approximately two per cent of our resident population, that is native Caymanians, are presently pursuing some form of higher education. In other words a total of approximately 300 persons. We pay a lot of lip service to the training of Caymanians - scholarships being available and the whole bit - but the statistics do not lie. The statistics reflect that much more emphasis has to be placed on this area of training our people. I am the first to admit that funding today, by the way of scholarships, student loans, and even by way of commercial loans, are much less difficult to come by. But, in spite of this, only 2 per cent of our people are now pursuing higher qualifications.

I have been thinking about this. One reason, I think, is the fact that, first of all, our public education system has not returned to the level of profit, I would say, the kind of returns

that are in keeping with the quality and amount of investment in education, especially our Government, Cayman Islands, High School. And we hear great propaganda about how many passes are coming out of the high school. I daresay that if you were to exclude those students who are non-Caymanian, who are a part of that system, from those passes on an annual basis, the percentage probably has not increased from what it was when I graduated in 1969, and our education budget has quadrupled many times over.

We also have problems at the primary school level. From questions asked in this House we have been made aware that there is overcrowding at the West Bay Primary. There is an overcrowded situation at the George Town Primary, there is an overcrowded situation at Savannah and, to make things worse, those classrooms which were planned and projected for those schools have not yet been built. The call is that the emphasis is education and youth.

I am still concerned that we as a country still have to have wardens riding on buses to keep order. I think this is totally unacceptable. I think if some type of investigation were made it would reflect that there are a small number of culprits who are causing the problems. My attitude is, rather than spending a fortune trying to keep discipline, maybe we should deal with those individuals on an individual basis. When I was going to school I went through the public system. There was no such thing. Sure we danced and sang and made noise on the buses, but it was orderly. Nobody minded that, and wardens were not required.

I think one area where we have gone wrong is the level of contribution that this Government has made to private schools has been too small. And I do not necessarily mean the Government since 1988. When you consider that the average annual contribution to the schools is probably \$5,000 or \$6,000 and the calibre of students that they are turning out, compared to what is coming out of our Cayman Islands High School, then it indicates that they are getting a better return on their investment.

If we are to ever be in a position where we will have a sufficient number of Caymanians that are required to go on for higher education, this has to come, to a large extent, from the private schools. I do not distinguish between a public school and a private school. None of those schools are making any money anyway, and the end results are the same. They are training young Caymanians to take up responsible positions in this country. So if it means that we have to contribute a little more of Government's Budget to support the private schools, I say let us do it.

We always hear of the amount of money that is made available for scholarships. As I mentioned before, the amount and the availability of funds has become much greater than it was when I was going to school. Then, if you did not have the right connections, and you did not have the right surname, you could forget it. But, there are still young Caymanians who have a desire to further their education who cannot get the necessary finances. I am aware of one such individual from my constituency and I think this is a shame. I think, especially in light of the acute shortage of qualified Caymanians in our society, that we should be encouraging and be trying to attract young Caymanians to take advantage of funds made available because that is an investment in the future of this country.

In my opinion, the most challenging issue that we are faced with today is the pace of economic development. I know some of the Honourable Members spoke - the Member for Health and the Member for Communications stressed the priorities as being the hospital and roads - but I think the main issue that we are faced with in this country is the pace at which are growing and developing, especially in light of the acute shortage of a sufficient number of our people to take their rightful places in positions created by this expansion. I think the pace has been too quick and this is one reason why we are in the situation we are in today, it has happened too fast. We cannot train our people fast enough to keep pace with the level of growth. If we had established sensible policies that ensured that we grew at an acceptable rate on an annual basis, then I think the situation today would have been much more manageable.

What are the solutions? I think the solutions are going to be painful, but very necessary. Statistics reflect that we have a situation of over employment in this country. Every able Caymanian who wants a job can find one. Some can find two. I know many, especially among the women, who hold two jobs. Why? Well, because of the high cost of living, and also because the jobs are available. If we are to address the present situation we must embark upon a policy or programme of intensive training of our people to ensure that they will gradually be in a position to take advantage of some of the positions that are available in this country.

When I am talking about policies, I am talking about policies like the one which was taken some years ago to establish a local Law School. There were many critics who said it could not work, but I am proud of the calibre of Caymanian lawyers that are coming through that school. Those young men and women take second place to no one. I think the Directors of the School must be congratulated for their interest and efforts, that enabled the young lawyers studying locally to receive recognised degrees from the highly reputable British institutions.

I cannot remember what year the Law School was established, but I think it was during one of the previous administrations, not the one now in place. It has worked so well that we are in the position today that pretty soon we will have an overabundance of locally qualified lawyers. Why can we not take the same efforts to establish a business school here? Accounting, banking, which is a very specialised area in itself, one does not go to a classroom to learn banking. A lot of employees of banks are now working towards overseas qualifications through correspondence. I see no reason why we could not have a local institution that offers local banking courses as well, that would prepare and qualify our employees in that area to get the necessary diplomas. It is a fact that even though funds may be available, the mere fact that if one wants to further their education they have to go overseas is a significant consideration. I went overseas when I was 20 years old and many nights I cried myself to sleep - homesickness. But if we had a local institution offering courses of study of that calibre, then a lot more people would be taking advantage of that institution. I am talking about people who are presently married and have a family that still have a desire to further their education and qualifications.

It made me proud that about two years ago I attended a graduation ceremony of teachers who had gone through a local course of study over a two or three year period, and they were eventually awarded degrees from the University of Miami. These are the types of things I think we are in serious lack of in this country.

The training must be a joint effort between the private sector and Government. We just passed a Motion about establishing the Public Legal Defenders Office. This is one of the recommendations that I made that the cost of the office should be borne jointly by Government and the people employed in the profession - the same principle I am recommending here on other areas of training of Caymanians.

We must begin to pay more than lip service to training. To a large extent, so far that is all that it has amounted to. When a local bank gives a scholarship, it is all over the back page. We are not in this business for publicity. We are in this business because we recognise the benefits of training young people locally to take up these positions.

Immigration: I think (and the statistics reflect) that the areas of greatest growth have been in the area of professional and skilled persons, and not domestic maids. I do not support the idea that if we start tightening our immigration policies it should start at the domestic helper level. Why? Presently it is necessary, in the case of a young couple starting out for both parties to be working just in order to make ends meet. If you are going to penalise that couple by saying that you cannot have a domestic maid because we have Caymanians who can do that job, then we are not any further ahead. We are worse off because what happens is that you are in a position then, where Caymanians can no longer be in a position to take advantage of the opportunities that are available in this country.

Let us look at the domestic maids. They are doing a job which most Caymanians do not want to do. How many Caymanians are you going to find in this country who are prepared to work for \$55 or \$60 a week? Not many. I cannot blame them, because at that level of pay they would not be a position to ever make ends meet. The other factor is that most of these people are on a short term basis. There is never any possibility, and statistics bear me out on this, of them ever qualifying for Caymanian Status, so those are not the people I am concerned about in this country. Let us continue to ensure that a sufficient number of personnel of this calibre are available in this country in order to allow Caymanians, especially the working women, to be in a position to take advantage of some of the opportunities that are available.

I agree that some policies have to be established in the area of immigration. I think those policies have to be geared towards the professional and skilled labour that is coming into this country. I think this should be gradual and it should go hand-in-hand with a serious training programme that should be implemented at the same time, to ensure that Caymanians are gradually being trained to take these positions. The kind of programme I am talking about is where somebody coming in knows they have three or five years and young Caymanians who have the capacity to be trained are identified, and it is understood by the employers that they have a three to five year period in order to identify and train a young Caymanian to take that position. Otherwise, after five years, then its tough.

What is happening, and statistics bear me out on this also, is that you are getting the professional coming in and, because they are not training our Caymanians, these people are here for 10 or 15 years at a time. After a while they qualify for Caymanian Status, and once they are granted Caymanian Status you cannot move them. So that is why I am concerned that any restrictions in the area of immigration must start in this area.

I recall that my colleague, The First Elected Member for West Bay, moved a Motion calling for an apprenticeship programme for this country, that is, finding or identifying a young Caymanian who has the capacity to be trained, identify him with a particular job and seeing to it that he is trained first hand in the responsibilities of that job, so that some day he will be in a position to take over that position.

My remarks are not only geared towards the private sector. I think the Government is as guilty as anyone of not training Caymanians to take positions. As a matter of fact, they are worse. I walk through the Glass House now and I do not know who half the people are - strange faces, they are not Caymanians. The Government must establish policies that encourage more self-sufficiency. If we ever have a Northwester and it lasts for a week, or two weeks, we are in trouble. You go into Foster's and the shelves will be empty. We have, and I think it has been a proven fact, that we can make great strides in this country in the area of agriculture.

[an Hon. Member: Hear, hear!]

MR. PRESIDENT: Would it be convenient to break there? Are you just changing subjects? Proceedings are suspended for 15 minutes.

AT 3:20 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 3:57 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Proceedings are resumed. The Third Elected Member for West Bay, continuing.

MR. JOHN D. JEFFERSON, JR.: Mr. President, before we took the break I had started on the topic of the Government encouraging more self-sufficiency, and less dependance on the outside for goods and services. I had also started on the subject of agriculture.

It is a fact that great strides have been made in the area of agriculture in this country. It has been proven that we are capable of producing sufficient amounts of certain fruits and vegetables to take care of our local needs. I must add that the quality of the products that I have seen produced locally is second to none, and if farming is encouraged at the level it should, and the supermarkets were to cooperate and take these products, then I do not think the farmers have to have any concern about Caymanians not supporting the purchase of locally produced products. I would also like to add that a sample of these products has been made available to the Members here, in the Common Room, in the form of mangoes, guavas and other fruits, and they were of a very high calibre.

But, I think this is another area where we are only paying lip service because, looking through the Budget, there are no real provisions for assistance to farmers. The only thing I recall is the provision for \$43,000 for consultancy fees. Mr. President, we have consultants coming out our ears and it appears that this Government is a Government of consultants. I think this area has been explored. The possibilities have been realised, and all we need to do is to ensure that sufficient funds are made available to farmers for the purchase of land, equipment, seeds and other necessary plants in order for them to get on with the job. I am confident that if a decision is made to subsidise agriculture to the level that is necessary, we will be very pleased with the results.

I think we have to take the same approach with Agriculture that we took with Tourism, we need to be prepared to invest a sufficient amount, and also be prepared to wait for a couple of years before we see the real fruits of our investment. But I think it is necessary to encourage a larger proportion of local farming.

I think that the Government has to arrive at a policy, or position, where they are prepared to control or, I would say, even place a moratorium on the building of any more major hotels or other projects which are labour intensive. I think we have sufficient facilities here, especially in light of the low birthrate that we have, in other words, the rate that we are producing Caymanians to keep our people employed in that area for a very long time.

Going back to the subject of training and some of my suggestions for establishing a local institution for that purpose in areas such as banking, accounting, and other areas of commerce, I think the establishment of the Community College can go a long way in helping us realise these objectives. I think we have to face reality. We cannot continue at the pace that we are going. I do not necessarily buy the argument that, if we all of a sudden decide to stop or slow down the development, that is going to have a tremendous impact on the standard of living that our people enjoy. What would happen is, rather than us going out now and spending \$40 million or \$50 million on roads, or \$20 million on health services, there will be a gradual contraction of the number of persons that are resident on these Islands so that the position we will be in is that the present facilities will not be stretched to the level they are at right now, because there will be less people around for which those services must be provided.

Our people enjoy full employment. As a matter of fact, I understand that there is something in the region of 60 per cent over-employment. So the economy here would have to contract considerably before the standard of living which our people now enjoy is seriously affected. I am not recommending, or promoting, the idea that the contractions should be to that level. I do not think it is necessary. But, we must be prepared to say, "Hey, enough is enough. We are only so large and have limited human resources and thank you, but we are going to have a very serious look at where we are going, and we are going to develop at a pace which we can accommodate."

The question must be asked: Who are we developing for? The adding of an additional hotel, for example, sounds good. But at the end of the day, if we have to bring in another 300 people to staff that hotel because our people are not in a position to take advantage of it because they are already fully employed, then all that additional investment does to our economy, our society, is to continue to put stress on our infrastructure - our roads, health services, the education system, etcetera, etcetera.

As I mentioned before, these are the kinds of issues that this Government should consider as a priority. I think we as leaders must be prepared to make those decisions that are necessary to ensure that we, as a Caymanian community, continue to enjoy the harmony that we accustomed to.

What I am concerned about is that there is such pressure right now, and such concern among our people about the level at which we are expanding, that attitudes are changing. First of all, our people are saying, "Yes, sure, new jobs are being created, but who are they being created for?" In the hotel industry this is very evident. In the banks, the accounting firms and the insurance companies the situation is the same. I am concerned that if we do not address the situation soon, we will not have to worry about slowing it down because our people, because of the strain that they are under, their attitudes will change and we will no longer be able to boast of the pleasant environment that we now enjoy.

I always make it a point when talking to visitors of getting their opinion on the Cayman Islands and their visit here. The key statements that are always made is that the people are so friendly, efficient, warm, and this is a tremendous asset. I think we should take whatever measures are necessary to ensure that we continue to enjoy this reputation. We have a good thing going.

The fact that I am always conscious of is that I went to school in the United States, but I never had any real desire to be a part of that society. But if I had, I would have had to have been conscious of the fact, and prepared to accept, that they were going to put their people first. I do not know why we are so concerned that we have to provide employment for the rest of the world. I think our only responsibility is to ensure that our people here enjoy the benefits that they are entitled to.

The question must be asked: Is the Government prepared to address the present situation? It takes guts. It takes putting one's political career on the line when decisions of this nature are taken. I always contend that I am not a politician. The only reason I came here was because I am

concerned about what I see going on. I hope that I will be in position where I can make a positive contribution towards correcting that situation. Gentlemen, we must be prepared, as leaders, to take the necessary steps in order to slow down the rapid pace at which we are going.

We get so caught up in the idea of confrontation. A lot of time has been wasted in this sitting of the House dealing with that. I think the Government can be assured, and our track record of voting demonstrates that. We still contend that as long as the Government is bringing issues and measures that we feel are in the best interest of our country and our people, they do not have to worry about our support. But, their priorities must coincide with the priorities that we feel must be established, and the priorities that we are being told by the people that we should be addressing.

I would like to reply to some of the remarks that I have heard by the Members of the Government who have spoken. I refer specifically to the remarks made by the Honourable Member for Health, and the Honourable Member for Communications. Considerable time was spent by the Member for Health accusing the Backbench on this side of the House of attempting to bring down the Government. I have never been a part of any measure of that nature.

I think what they as a Government have recognised is that under the democratic form of Government you cannot rule with a minority. I was always told that politics is the art of compromise. By that I mean that when you see the odds against you, what do you do? You get together and say, "Gentlemen, this is what we have in mind, now what do you want? Are you prepared to support it, or not?"

On issues where they have taken that approach, if they made sense, and if we felt it was in the best interests of the country, we supported those issues. I recognise, and I want to be a part of Executive Council as badly as anyone, but the democratic process took place. They had their seven men who had the votes to put them in Executive Council. I accept that as fact. I am prepared to accept that as a fact until the next Election. And I am hoping that is not before 1992.

I am not a part with any power-hungry individuals. But what has to be recognised, and I think for the first time in the history of this House the opposition is of the calibre of professionals, the days of extension cords are over. We are all responsible gentlemen elected by our own districts, and we are concerned and responsible for carrying out the wishes of our people and supporting the measures that we feel are in the best interests of this country.

On the issue of the new hospital, I am still not convinced that we need it. I think it would be more beneficial at this stage for the Member to put in place a management system that he referred to. I think that is where the emphasis has to be placed, on services. I have been one of those who has been pushing, since the days of my political campaign, for a drug rehab centre to be established locally. He referred to that as a 'white elephant'. Now what I am saying is that the Member should take the same approach regarding the hospital. Spend money on services, and anything that we cannot accommodate locally, send them overseas. It probably works out cheaper than building a new hospital, because for us to put a new hospital in place, at the cost that has been mentioned in order for it to be in a position to be self-sufficient, fees are going to have to be raised dramatically and substantially.

What is going to happen if you raise the fees too high? Our people are not going to be able to afford it. You have that same situation where they now apply through Social Services for exemption, and you are right back to square one. What you have in the end is the same problem on a much larger scale.

I am aware of the fact that there are a number of parties who have expressed an interest in building a private hospital. I think one of those institutions is now in the process of being built by Dr. Steve Tomlinson. One group that I am aware of was out of Tennessee, I think, and they were prepared to ensure that our people would be offered the services they required. Those who could afford it would pay their way, and those who could not were assured that the services would still be available to them.

My attitude is anything that can be done by the private sector, in most instances the Government should not get into. Government has never been known, and this is world wide, to promote efficiency. They do not look at the idea of making a profit. So the level of services that are normally offered by the Government are not competitive with those that are offered by the private sector.

In all fairness to the Honourable Member for Health, I think the gentleman has done a good job. He is young and energetic. He is qualified, and he is Caymanian. I can assure the Member that as long as he is bringing measures that I feel are in the best interests of our people, and that we can afford, he has my support. But, I am not prepared at this stage to give him any blank check for a new hospital.

I did not like the remarks he made on taxis in relationship to transportation. He mentioned something like taxis overtaking 25 or 30 cars at a time. I was once employed in that area - I am proud of it - and I can assure you that the majority of people who run taxis are decent, responsible citizens. The only question I have to ask the Member in that respect is, how many taxi drivers he is aware of who have been involved with fatalities in this country?

I consider the Honourable Member for Communications a friend of mine. I have no personal feelings against any Member of this House, and regardless of whether or not I am involved in politics or any other occupation, I will continue to maintain that position. You can disagree with someone but you do not have to let that bother you, as far as your personal relationship with that individual goes. I think we, as Legislators, have to arrive at that level of professionalism where you can disagree. This is a part of the democratic process. You must be able to agree to disagree.

MOMENT OF INTERRUPTION

MR. PRESIDENT: Could I interrupt for one moment? It is just nearly 4:30, do you

think you are within striking distance of completing and, if so, would you wish to sit on, if the House wishes?

MR. JOHN D. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, I probably have another half hour. I would not want to be gyped of my air time.

MR. PRESIDENT: I am sure no one would wish to do that. I do not think the people want to go on to 5:00. In that case would you move the adjournment, please?

ADJOURNMENT

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, I move the adjournment of this House until 10:00 on Monday morning.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that the House do now adjourn until 10:00 Monday morning. I shall put the question. Those in favour please say Aye...Those against No.

AYES. The Ayes have it. The House is accordingly adjourned until

MR. PRESIDENT: Monday morning at 10 o'clock.

AT 4:30 P.M. THE HOUSE STOOD ADJOURNED UNTIL 10:00 A.M., MONDAY, 4TH DECEMBER, 1989.

**MONDAY
4TH DECEMBER, 1989
10:05 A.M.**

MR. PRESIDENT:

I will ask the Honourable Second Official Member to say prayers.

PRAYERS

HON. RICHARD W. GROUND:

Let us Pray.

Almighty God, from whom all wisdom and power are derived: We beseech Thee so to direct and prosper the deliberations of the Legislative Assembly now assembled, that all things may be ordered upon the best and surest foundations for the glory of Thy Name and for the safety, honour and welfare of the people of these Islands.

Bless our Sovereign Lady Queen Elizabeth, the Queen Mother, Philip Duke of Edinburgh, Charles Prince of Wales, Diana Princess of Wales and all the Royal family. Give grace to all who exercise authority in our Commonwealth that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety may be established among us. Especially we pray for the Governor of our Islands, the Members of Executive Council and Members of the Legislative Assembly that they may be enabled faithfully to perform the responsible duties of their high office.

All this we ask for Thy great Name's sake, Amen.

Our Father, who art in Heaven, Hallowed be Thy Name, Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done, in earth as it is in Heaven. Give us this day our daily bread: And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us: And lead us not into temptation; but deliver us from evil: For Thine is the Kingdom, the power and the glory, for ever and ever. Amen.

The Lord bless us and keep us: the Lord make His face shine upon us and be gracious unto us: the Lord lift up His countenance upon us and give us peace now and always. Amen.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Proceedings of the Assembly are resumed. Papers - the

Honourable First Official Member.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS AND OF REPORTS

INTERIM REPORT OF THE STANDING SELECT COMMITTEE ON STANDING ORDERS

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON:

Mr. President, I beg to lay on the Table of this Honourable House the Interim Report of the Standing Orders Select Committee of the Cayman Islands Legislative Assembly.

MR. PRESIDENT:

So ordered.

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON:

Mr. President, on the 13th of September Private Member's Motion number 14/89 was passed, and the Motion reads:

"WHEREAS section 46(1) of the Standing Orders of the Cayman Islands' Legislative Assembly provides that a Bill coming before the Legislature shall be gazetted as soon as possible before it is proposed to be read a first time;

AND WHEREAS this same section provides that every Member of the Legislature shall receive the text of a Bill fourteen (14) days before it is proposed to be read a first time;

AND WHEREAS it is considered that the intent of this said section of the Standing Orders was to provide that Bills be gazetted fourteen (14) days before they are proposed to be read a first time in order to provide both Legislators and the public alike due notice to consider same;

BE IT NOW THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT section 46(1) of the Standing Orders be amended by deleting this existing section 46(1) which states:

"46 (1) If a bill complies with the requirements of Standing Order 45 (Examination of bills) the Clerk shall cause the text thereof and the explanatory memorandum to be gazetted as soon as possible and shall also send copies of it to reach every Member not less than fourteen days before it is proposed to be read a first time.";

and by substituting the following therefor:

"46 (1) If a bill complies with the requirements of Standing Order 45 (Examination of bills) the Clerk shall cause the text thereof and the explanatory memorandum to be gazetted fourteen clear days before it is proposed to be read a first time, and shall also send white copies of each Bill to every Member as soon as possible after it has been tabled in the Clerk's Office."

AND BE IT NOW FURTHER RESOLVED THAT Standing Orders 46(3) and 48, and any other consequential Orders, be amended to provide that upon a Bill having been deemed to have been read a first time that it shall stand deferred to the next Meeting of the Legislature for its Second Reading."

The President of the Legislature appointed the Chairman of the Committee to be the First Official Member and, in accordance with the Motion, all Members of the House are Members of that said Committee. The quorum of the Committee is seven, including the Chairman. This is the Report of the Committee.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Papers continued. The Honourable Second Official Member.

INTERIM REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE ELECTIONS LAW

HON. RICHARD W. GROUND:

Mr. President, I beg to lay on the Table of this Honourable House the Interim Report of the Select Committee to Review the Elections Law.

MR. PRESIDENT:

So ordered.

HON. RICHARD W. GROUND:

Mr. President, this Select Committee was established by Private Member's Motion number 4/89, moved by the Second Elected Member for the Lesser Islands and is seconded by the Elected Member for East End. The remit of the Committee was to review the Elections Law and to consider the establishment of a permanent Elections Office of Government to administer the Elections. The composition is the whole House, and I was nominated as the Chairman of the Committee.

The Committee has not really commenced their business yet. It held one meeting on the 29th of November to simply approve this Report to the House. This Report is made in accordance with Standing Order 72(1), which requires Committees to Report to the House if they are unable to conclude their business before the end of the Session which they are appointed. The essence of the Report is that the Committee has not concluded its business.

As I explained to the Members when we met, and as appears in the Minutes, the Committee has not yet been called, in anticipation, first of all, of a report from the Supervisor of Elections, and also to enable the Select Committee on the Immigration Law to get underway and commence its business.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Papers continuing, the Honourable Second Official Member.

INTERIM REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LEGAL DEFENDER'S OFFICE

HON. RICHARD W. GROUND:

Mr. President, I again beg to lay on the Table of this Honourable House the Interim Report of the Select Committee on a Public Legal Defender's Office.

MR. PRESIDENT:

So ordered.

HON. RICHARD GROUND:

Mr. President, the Select Committee on the Establishment of a Public Legal Defender's Office was appointed pursuant to Private Member's Motion number 17/89, moved by the Third Elected Member for West Bay and seconded by the Elected Member for East End. The remit of the Committee is to determine the need for the establishment of an office of Public Legal Defender to defend the poor persons certified under the Poor Persons Legal Aid Law, for defense by a legal practitioner. The composition of the Committee is all the Elected Members of the Assembly and with the Attorney General. I was appointed to Chair the Committee.

Again, the Committee has not held a substantive meeting, although it held a formal meeting on the 29th of November 1989, to approve this Report and the essence of this Report is that a Committee has not yet entered on to its business. Nevertheless, as I told the Members when we met, I will be circulating to them shortly a discussion paper to structure the discussions of the Committee and also copies of representations received from the legal profession. In fact, that discussion paper and those copies are now with the Clerk's office, though we are not going to circulate them to Members until the end of this meeting as they probably have enough papers before them already. But they are with the Clerk if Members would like to do otherwise.

Perhaps, I might just take this opportunity to say that representations were solicited from the legal profession. That had some helpful responses but not everybody has

responded as yet and if there are any practitioners who have not yet responded and who wish to say something, I would be grateful if they could get a letter to me or to the Clerk by the end of the year.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT:

The second item on today's Order Paper - Bills. We continue the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill. The Third Elected Member for West Bay continuing.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

BILLS

SECOND READING

THE APPROPRIATION (1990) BILL, 1989

(Debate continues thereon)

MR. JOHN D. JEFFERSON, JR:

Thank you, Mr. President. Before we adjourned on Friday, I had come to the position where I was replying to remarks made by the Honourable Members, namely, the Member for Health and the Member for Communications. I had stopped with the Honourable Member for Communications. The Member called for the Backbench to work with the Executive Council on matters. I think the track record reflects that we as the Backbench have been very cooperative in supporting issues which we felt were in the best interest of our people. I cannot see that position ever changing because we are responsible individuals and we will continue to put forward or support matters and issues that we feel our people want and need.

This Member has a very strange way of calling for cooperation. It reminds me of the photograph I saw entitled 'Out of Court Settlements', where the lawyers arrive at a court settlement and one is licking the other over the head with a big briefcase. It appears that this is the approach that the Member has in mind. He asks for cooperation, but then he comes right behind and licks you for six. That does not go over very well with any of us. I think one of the problems that this present Government finds itself faced with is the calibre of the opposition they have to deal with. The Backbench consists of all qualified responsible men, and there are no extension cords on this side. I think it has been very difficult for them to deal with this matter. I think this is good, as far as our country is concerned. I think the public views us as the watchdogs for Government. They expect us to hold them in check on issues which the public does not want. I think our track record has reflected that we have done this in the past year and we will continue to do so.

But, the priority of the present Government seems to be the Master Ground Transportation Plan, at the expense of other issues that must be addressed in this country. It was not supported by the opposition because, first of all, we were not told how much it would cost in total. We were not told where the funds were going to come from to finance the project. We felt that the social effects of the plan. By that I mean where the plan is calling for the road to go through people's homes - and I must mention poor people's homes. I understand that the road was misdirected from its original plan because of opposition and it appears that the only people who will be definitely affected are the poor people of this country who cannot afford to stand up against the Government.

It was also not supported because we recognised that we have limited resources in this country and we did not feel that we could afford to allocate such a large percentage of those resources to any one particular project, especially when we feel that there are acceptable and practical alternatives. I must add that we will continue to support a road programme that is practical and reasonable.

The Member mentioned that he will be taking the Plan back to the drawing board to have it revised. That is good. All I can say is that I trust that the revisions take into consideration our suggestions with regard to the Seven Mile Beach Road, otherwise, I do not care what form it comes in, it will not get my support because I do not intend to ever support any issues or programmes in this country which, first of all, I do not think we need and least of all we cannot afford.

Over the past week we have heard a lot about the Jennett 'T' road. That is the road that runs back by the British American Buildings. We even got some representations or support for that road from people who are building in that area, namely the Citco people. They are concerned that they need an outlet for traffic that will be caused by their new building going in that area. They supported the idea of the road, but I did not see any suggestion on their part, or even an offer on their part to help finance it. They want the roads, they know what it costs. In the Budget the land alone will cost \$1 million. Let them come to Government and say, "Yes, we will do it, get the permission to have it done", and go ahead and get it done because out of just over \$4 million in the Budget for roads, and that is for roads - period. This one road in Town is probably going to take in excess of \$2 million of that provision at the expense of our districts. I know our colleagues from Bodden Town were pushing for roads for their districts which have not been done. We have some in West Bay that have not been done, in East End the same thing. We feel that priorities on roads have to be changed. I do not intend to support measures or issues of that nature.

We just celebrated one year of our new Government being in office. I think there were some articles in the newspaper with regard to what has happened over the year as to what we have been able to accomplish. I would like to offer my rating of the Government over the past year, based strictly on performance and based on the idea of not addressing the issues which we felt should have been addressed.

I would like to start with Education. I think our public education system has reached a crisis situation. Basically it is as a result of nonperformance on the part of the Member in charge. When I say the Member, I mean the Member responsible for Education who is also the Second Elected Member for West Bay. What are the issues? Overcrowding of the primary schools because the classrooms were not built. Questionable quality of students being produced by the Cayman Islands High School, when you take into consideration the investment the Government has in education, it is totally unsatisfactory. We should be producing a better calibre of students.

It still concerns me that there are young people in this country who have a genuine interest in furthering their education and they cannot find the money. There is no reason or excuse for that in this day and age in this country. We boast of \$109 million Budgets. We boast of one of the highest per capita incomes in the world and, as I said, there are still young people who are desirous of furthering their education and they cannot find the money. I am aware that since we have been here there have been certain recommendations that were put forward. I think the first was from the First Elected Member for Bodden Town about extending the school age. I am not an educator, but I do not see this as being any real difficult thing to do. This was brought in May, and until September, when the question was asked, it had not been done yet. It is not going to be done until a team of experts come in to tell you all that you need to do with that, an extra year at the high school or the primary school, for the cost of probably \$300,000. Discipline in the Middle School and the High School is still a serious problem and has not been addressed. So the Member, like Belshazzar in the days of old when he was judged, it was said that he had been weighed in the balance and found wanting.

Health and Social Services: I am still concerned that more is being done in addressing the serious drug abuse problem we have in this country. From information that has been passed on, only a total of seven people had applied to, or were referred to the Government for overseas assistance. Take into consideration the alarming amount of young people who are now indulging in drug abuse.

Communications and Works: I cannot fault the Member for his efforts. But, unfortunately, in my opinion the majority of those efforts have been focused in the wrong direction. Tourism took a beating in 1989, and all I would like to say on that is that I trust that we do not have a repeat of that performance in 1990. From all indications we will not and I am very happy to see that. Overall, according to the old School Master, the First Elected Member for Bodden Town, I think I would have to award the Government a failing grade on their performance over the past year. I do not think they have addressed the issues that need to be seriously addressed in this country. They keep accusing us of not telling them what to do or assisting them. I do not think our track record reflects that. Many Private Member's Motions were brought and passed, and they came from this side of the House, and they all dealt with issues that we felt should be addressed in this country.

The District Needs: The Budget does not address the needs of our districts. The majority of the Capital portion of the Budget is for the MGP, the new Post Office, and other similar projects. There is no provision in the Budget, that I can see, for upgrading our district clinic facilities, our roads programmes in the districts and other matters that we are faced with as representatives on the district level.

On the matter of Cayman Airways, I would just like to say that I am very pleased to see that for the first time in the airline's history they were able to make a profit, and that profit amounted to approximately \$1 million. But I think we have to take into consideration the circumstances which allowed that to be possible. Eastern stopped their service to the Cayman Islands which left a big hole that Cayman Airways was able to take advantage of. I think they doubled their flights from here to Miami just to be in a position to take advantage of the extra traffic load that was created by the void from Eastern. There was minimum competition as they were only competing at that time with one other airline on the route, which is Northwest, and that was a significant factor.

Their cost for equipment was also the reason. All I can say with regard to Cayman Airways is that I hope the trend continues, but I doubt that it will. The factors have changed. The competition has tripled. By changing their equipment, their costs have tripled. So they are going to have much more difficulty achieving the same results.

In conclusion, I have supported the priorities as put forward by the Honourable Financial Secretary. I support the idea that the key issue that we are faced with at the present time in this country is the issue of the rate at which our economy has been allowed to expand. I personally do not feel that we can continue to allow the development to run away because it has a direct effect on our society and the economy in which we operate. The continued expansion has a direct effect on the need for roads, health services, educational facilities, our immigration policies and the social conditions that we are faced with in this country.

To the Government I would just like to say, "Gentlemen, in my opinion, this is the key issue that must be addressed. Now that we have identified what the issue is, let us see if you have the political will and determination to get the job done." I must also remind all Elected Members, especially the Government because they are in a position where they can formulate policies that can affect the country, that our first priority is to address the needs of our Caymanian people and to ensure that they get their fair share of what is going on in this country. We must also ensure that our people do not become an endangered species.

I can assure the Government that when they bring measures or issues that we feel are priorities, are affordable, and in the best interests of our people, they have no reason to doubt that they will not get the support that they need from this side of the House, because we are concerned and we also recognise that as Elected Members our first priority has to be in dealing with the issues, needs and desires of our people.

I trust that the situation as has been outlined will receive the Government's attention and that the matter will not be allowed to continue and that it will be addressed. I would just like to say that, as far as I am concerned, I think we as Elected Members really do not have to fear receiving the

support of our people if we are doing the things they feel we should be dealing with. I would just like to say that I believe that our track record on this side of the House, over the past year, has been excellent. We have stood and supported those things that the people feel are in the best interest of this country and our people.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT:

The Honourable Member for Tourism.

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN:

Mr. President, I rise to support the Appropriation (1990) 1989, Bill, proposing a total expenditure of \$110.8 million in 1990. This amount represents approximately a 13 per cent increase over 1989. I agree with those who said it is a lean Budget. It was arrived at after weeks of study, hard work, and discussions involving the Honourable Financial Secretary and all the Members of Government, both Elected and Official, for each have had to put up their case for expenses included therein. It involved the process where cuts in proposed expenditure had to be taken. I know the Tourism Budget was cut by some \$2 million in the final analysis. It involved the reduction of Capital Projects and the denial of requests from many different departments of the Government for new services.

This Budget is the product of compromise, fair consideration, and the acceptance of what the country could reasonably afford without resorting to revenue earning measures. Questions have been raised and claims have been made that the Budget is not really balanced because of Supplementary Expenditure that will be needed during the coming year. Well, if that argument stands true the country has never ever produced a balanced Budget because this has always been the process and system used by all the Governments in dealing with the annual Budget. I do not ever recall, in the nine years that I have been here, that Supplementary Expenditure was not necessary. But I have to think that if there are no balanced Budgets, how, then, at least for the past 5 years, has Government always shown a surplus of Revenue over Expenditure at the end of the year and built up a General Reserve of some \$17 million (I believe is the figure)? Anyone following that line of argument can only conclude, as I have, that the opposition's claim of an unbalanced Budget is pure political propaganda.

One area of the Budget that stands out, and stands out in every Budget that I have been familiar with, is the large amount that is always needed from the Government's local Revenue Earnings, to cover the Recurrent Expenditure. The Government's cost of conducting business in this country, the same as the private sector, is increasing annually. In this Budget, the Government estimates that it will earn from local revenue sources in 1990 a total of \$98,458,156. At the same time it will spend on recurrent expenditure a total of \$83,751,379, or 85 per cent of all of its local sources of earnings - that is, from import duty collection, taxes, property sales and transfers, the sale of stamps, the tourist accommodation tax and other sources. So when one speaks of slowing down the economy, Government's financial needs must figure prominently in any consideration that is given to this very serious matter.

In supporting this Bill I, too, would take this opportunity to congratulate the Honourable Financial Secretary who is also the First Official Member of this House on a highly refined and thoroughly analytical Budget Address. An Address which has placed quite before this Honourable House, and the entire country, the factual position of the economy and the real issues facing the Cayman Islands as we enter the decade of the 90s. The message that I gleaned from his Speech is this: it is time to stop straining out a gnat and swallowing a camel. Anyone who believes or tries to convey the impression that this applies to only the Elected Government of this country, to the developing country of ours. Neither do I read it as merely This is all inclusive and embodies the people in this small developing country of ours. Neither do I read it as merely a call to put our priorities in order, which is, of course, important. But I believe there is a message in that Budget Address for us to rethink, or reassess, our sense of values. I believe the Budget Address is also saying that it is time to stop wasting energy on pettiness and minor differences of opinions. But the time has come to deal with the major, pressing and important issues that will affect the fate and future of this country of which we are all so rightly proud of. The bottom line is, the choice is ours.

Several searching and sobering questions have been asked. Important issues have been highlighted which must be addressed, but which, I daresay, cannot be resolved overnight. Nor will the solutions be perfect or painless, especially to a people who have become accustomed to a high life-style and who naturally expect it to continue uninterrupted. The development and the growth of the economy during the 80s has been carefully traced and ably explained. It has been repeated and re-emphasised throughout the address that Cayman's economy is almost, if not totally, dependent on world economic conditions. This is an acknowledged and accepted fact. Be it an upswing or a downturn, a recession or a boom, all these conditions, like the evil of inflation, are imported forces at work here in the Cayman Islands. We cannot approve or reject their work permits - they do not need one.

These can all be traced, primarily, to outside influences simply because the world economy produces a direct bearing on the two main and vital industries of tourism and finance on which we have become almost totally dependent for economic survival. Just let me add here that these two industries were very wisely and carefully selected years ago by smart people before us who decided that these were the two industries on which Cayman had to hang its hat. Those were wise decisions which have paid good dividends to this country. Sure, in the process problems and undesirable developments have been produced, but whoever heard of having your cake and eating it too? This can only happen if you have two cakes - but we happen to have only one country and one people. Therefore, it is left to us to strike a balance.

But I believe that we must use caution and care in our forward planning. I also believe that without being over optimistic that the situation with which we are faced can be competently handled in the long term interests of our country, once a good dose of Caymanian common sense is applied and, of course, it is left to all of us to apply it, and that includes me too. While I am all supportive of the

Government encouraging and assisting financially, or in any other possible way, with the further development of agriculture, and while I believe the diversification of the economy to the extent possible is desirable, it is my honest opinion that our country will continue to be predominately dependent of tourism and finance for the foreseeable future, for very obvious reasons. We must continue to seriously nurture and strengthen these industries to our mutual benefit.

It is true that pursuing and developing these industries has led us to become heavily dependent on outside sources of labour to help provide and maintain the quality of service at international standards, which are demanded but unbalanced. This process has nevertheless provided the very foundation for our growth and development. When we moved from the stage where our economy was totally based on Caymanian seamen sending their earnings home to their families, the Government of the day introduced laws and programmes to attract and encourage outside investors who came at our invitation. They set up businesses here. Naturally, they had to bring in some professional help and an extra labour force. But in the process new jobs and business opportunities have been created and provided for Caymanians, and rightly so. This is what Cayman is all about today.

This is why we have gained economic success. Of course, I, like many others recognise that it must remain a two-way street. Caymanians must continue to benefit and prosper from their own land. Of course, Caymanians must be trained and qualified to fill responsible positions in our business community. Quite a bit of this is, in fact, taking place. We have Caymanian professionals who each year are taking their rightful place filling jobs in our country. Of course, a small country such as ours produces professionals at a rather slow pace. I, like others, would like to see this move along faster too. The Caymanian Protection Board's Policies have helped to force some businesses to train Caymanians, but, undoubtedly, there is room for improvement there. I think this is a matter that must be worked on continuously because I also believe that there are some short-sighted business people here who do not provide promotion opportunities for Caymanians as often as they should, while there are other companies that seem to do a very good job of this.

The point I wish to make here is whether we accelerate, stop, or slowdown in the process of applying whatever measures that are considered necessary to achieve any of these, we must preserve these policies which have served us well in the past if we are to protect the future, those qualities which are truly our assets. I borrow from the Honourable Financial Secretary's words when he said and I quote: "A policy in Government that stresses reliance on the free enterprise system with limited Government intervention as the best solution to the problems of economic growth." He went on to list the following: "Prudence and stable public policies of a political culture; fixed exchange system; liberal tax policies and stable employer/worker relations." As a Caymanian I, too, am concerned about an imbalance of our population mix. I, too, am concerned about being outnumbered one of these days. But let us not allow our concerns to run away with us and force us to take drastic measures that can perhaps create other evils.

In our search for solutions we cannot afford to overlook the fact that the majority of successful Caymanian-owned businesses, small and large, are also dependent on outside sources of labour, and will continue to be so for yet some time to come. Neither can we afford to ignore the fact that many non-Caymanians are genuinely contributing to the economic success of the country. In the past 10 to 15 years we have been transformed from a people who experienced and accepted hardships and sacrifice, to a demanding and materialistic society and it is only human nature, I suppose, to expect and accept more, while any measure that would tend to reduce those expectations will be met with resistance.

To put it frankly the truth is we are caught in the dilemma of dealing with economic success. A situation which must be the envy of most countries in the region and, indeed, the world. Many countries are still struggling to reach where we are today. For us, it is no longer a matter of growth. It boils down to how much do we want, and within which time frame. But, there is no magic formula.

I have noted that there is one thread which runs through the Budget Address, and that is the hard and simple fact that every situation carries with it a price tag. There is a price to be paid for rapid development, some of which we are experiencing today and expressing concern about. But we must not forget either, that it was only in 1984 and 1985, a short while ago, when, due to world economic conditions, we became extremely concerned about our own economy and the critics were running around asking, "What is the Government going to do now?" There is also a price to be paid for calling a halt, a reduction or acceleration - that is to the extent that we can - bearing in mind the influence exerted by outside sources for which we have little or no control. It seems to me that most people will willingly and freely express concern and admit that something should be done. Many theories are offered, but agreement is never reached, nor clearly defined, as to exactly what should be done.

I suspect that perhaps this is due to a fear of the results, of the inherent risks coupled with the reluctance to accept less. This comes from those standing on both sides of the argument. Nevertheless, in spite of all these considerations which must be made, armed with the facts we have and the experience gained in the past, our first priority must be to preserve the quality of life for the people of these Islands. I, too, believe that this can be achieved by ensuring that our rate of growth does not exceed the infrastructure's ability to cope, and our ability to maintain a high standard of service to those industries on which we depend. However, by all accounts, and by some obvious signs too, we are fast reaching that stage. I therefore believe that we must tailor our rate of growth to suit Cayman's own specific needs.

Let us consider for a moment what we have. Here we have a small country with a relatively small population. We are not overpopulated; we have no unemployment, so we are not forced to follow the paths of some other countries which are plagued with unemployment and overpopulation. Caymanians enjoy a high standard of living. Each year the Government presents a balanced Budget. There are healthy reserves and the national debt that is no burden to service. It would therefore seem to me that, at this time and place we are, in fact, in a unique and ideal position which allows us to step back and take stock. A stage

where we can well afford to reassess our positions, to be selective and do whatever it takes to provide the best protection and utmost security for the future of these Islands. But these brakes must be applied with care and caution. Being a very conservative person myself, I am more inclined to support a gradual slowdown in specific areas for a start. As I recently stated in an interview with the *Newstar* magazine, I am of the opinion that this should be started with new hotels. In fact, I can tell the House that it is my intention to bring back to this Honourable House in the February meeting an Amending Bill to the Tourism Law which will strengthen the Member's authority to the maximum possible under that Law, in dealing effectively with any proposed hotel development in the future.

I believe that during this time - call it a five year moratorium on new hotel construction, or what have you - we will have the needed opportunity to strengthen and improve services and consolidate what we already have in hand before holding out our hands for more and more. I would not recommend that we go beyond this now. I would suggest that we try this one on for size first because it must also be remembered that we have the needs of a large construction industry that must also be met. I trust that this will receive the support of all Members whenever this measure is brought to the House. But having said that, I still have to wonder what the position of each Member of this Assembly would be if a new hotel project for their district were, in fact, postponed or turned down, a project that would provide jobs for their constituents so they could remain close to their homes and work without having to travel to Seven Mile Beach. With respect, this is left to be seen and I await that day with considerable interest.

MR. PRESIDENT: Would you care to break here?

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN: Yes, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: Proceedings are suspended for 15 minutes.

AT 11:16 A.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 11:46 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Proceedings are resumed. The Honourable Member for Tourism continuing.

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN: Thank you, Mr. President.

I will now turn to the subjects of my Portfolio of Tourism, Aviation and Trade. Regardless of who chooses to call what I have to say, excuses, this is left to them. I will deal with truth and facts, for the truth cannot be blamed nor facts faulted. Mention was made by one Member, the Second Elected Member for the Lesser Islands, of Bermuda's policy on hotels. I do not believe that we need to follow everything another country does, because our country is different in many respects. For example, we still have lots of undeveloped land in these Islands. But I do believe that Bermuda's policy on the phasing of hotels, based on occupancy levels, is a good one which I would plan to include in the Legislation I referred to earlier.

He went on further to speak on Bermuda not having any new hotels (and quite often Bermuda is used for comparative purposes with our tourism, so I only mention Bermuda here because of this), but Bermuda has not had any new hotels recently. In fact, the truth is that they have had a very difficult year with tourism themselves. Two of their hotels have been closed. So, in making comparisons, we have to analyse all the facts that are available to us. They have some good policies we can follow. But, as I said, they have had their difficulties and their rough times during 1989, like all of us.

I may mention here too, that there is a recent case of another Caribbean country where an over building of hotels was allowed to occur which has forced many hotels into offering cheap package-tours in order to fill their rooms. These properties have actually ended up losing money to the extent that they are now in serious financial difficulties. However, earlier this year one of our local organisations was holding this particular country up to me as an example, to show me how much better off they were than the Cayman Islands in total air arrivals. I mention this to make the point that what works for one, does not necessarily work for all. Quality is still preferable to quantity and many self-proclaimed experts have their view, I have mine.

Tourism is a complex and increasingly competitive business. One thing for sure is its success. The contribution it makes to our country's economy cannot always be judged simply from the total number of air arrivals. The customary practice of making statistical comparisons with one year to another cannot always be the yard stick by which success is measured. The calibre and quality of the visitor must be taken into consideration and while no claim is being made that all our visitors are rich, which would be foolish, we are continuing to attract the upscale market. Research tells me that 25 per cent of our visitors earn over \$100,000 per year. The divers, the largest market segment, have a higher income than divers visiting any other destination in the Caribbean. We know that the average length of stay has increased from 3.8 days in 1984, to 4.9 days in 1988, and the trend is continuing this year.

Surveys conducted by our Department of Tourism also show that the amount spent in Cayman by each stay-over visitor is US\$650, compared with \$400 two years ago. Tourism's great importance to our country's economy is an established fact and is one item on which I believe we all agree. So I need not dwell on that any further.

I will now turn to the famous refrain that has rung in my ears from January to the present, "Tourism is down"; and, "this is what you should do", or "that is what you should do". I am one who will gratefully accept good advice and I can cope with constructive criticism too, but I do not intend to

sit idly by and allow any Member of this House or anywhere else, have the public believe that I am shirking my responsibility or that any of them could do a better job, if they held this seat. Their day will come in the not-too-distant future, and an accurate account of their performance will be the judge of their ability. So, as they say, time will tell. The downturn in tourism during this year has been a constant source of serious concern to me, to the Portfolio, to the Department of Tourism and the private sector. It has occupied the majority of our time with meetings and plans during this year. But I am pleased to say that progress is being made. A year which started out with a 17.5 per cent decline in January, now stands, up to the end of October, at 8 per cent down here to date. November, I understand, is projected to be some 15 per cent up on the November 1988 figures, which would bring our year to date approximately 4 per cent down. We will probably end up with 1989 near to equal to 1988 in total air arrivals.

Yes, reasons have been established and, as may be expected, the decline is attributable to a combination of several factors which have been determined by experts in the business. Speaking of experts, with all due respect, the experts that have emerged in Cayman in the past couple of years, especially in Tourism and Aviation, at the rate we are producing them, we should soon be able to export some instead of importing any. While the reasons have been stated here, and at other forums so I will not repeat them, because in any event some people will believe what they want and that is actually of no importance to me. What is important is regaining, holding and improving our position in Tourism. Like many others in the business, I only can sincerely trust that this experience in 1989, though unwelcome and unfortunate, has served to bring home the often repeated caution that this business of tourism must never be taken for granted.

The quality of service and attitudes displayed by our people can make the difference between success or failure regardless of how much the Government and the private sector cooperate and spend on advertising, regardless of how hard the Portfolio and the Department of Tourism work to convince travellers that Cayman is the place to choose for a vacation, regardless of the political flak. I take my responsibilities seriously and I can truthfully state without fear of successful contradiction that no stone has been left unturned, that is, within our financial resources in our efforts to turn tourism around.

There has been close and constant teamwork between the Government, Cayman Airways, the Cayman Islands Hotel and Condominium Association, the Cayman Brac and Little Cayman Hotel and Tourism Association, the Cayman Islands Watersports Operators Association, as well as individual hotels and condominiums which joined in joint overseas promotions. Advertising and public relations have been reviewed. Sales blitzes have been conducted. The magazine advertising was reviewed and 800 numbers were added to our ads in order to improve the response mechanism. A new advertising campaign was introduced showing the Cayman Islands as a safe destination and using shots of local people interacting with tourists.

There has also been increased emphasis in the New York area in preparation for Cayman Airways' opening of this route next month. Efforts in the United Kingdom and our presence in Europe and Japan has been improved through the appointment of sales representatives in Belgium, Germany and Japan, which was done this past summer. This is in keeping with our plan to reduce to the extent possible of our almost total dependence on U.S. tourism. Although I must interject here that in spite of predictions on the importance of the EEC in 1992, the united states of Europe, in spite of those predictions, I believe that North America will continue to be our main source of supply, if for no other reason than the difference in transportation costs and disposable income available to its citizens.

We have increased the quality control of licensed properties. The number of hotel inspectors has been increased from one to three. We have stepped up the frequency of inspections. It is common knowledge that the Hotel Licensing Board has closed properties this year and last year, as well as individual units which did not meet the minimum required standards laid down in the Tourism Law. I have a strong Board and the Law is rigidly applied without fear or favour. No political cronies get any special treatment here. We have supported and participated in training programmes for hotels, condominiums and restaurant workers, as well as taxi drivers. The Portfolio has supported and encouraged the Radisson project, which I believe will be an asset to this country and a boost to tourism.

Lastly, but also of great importance, with the help of the Honourable Financial Secretary I have started plans for the production of a 10-year Tourism Development Plan which I consider is necessary. I trust that once produced and applied it will put some of these experts to rest or temporarily out of business.

Many times Members will compare Cayman's tourism with that of other countries, but what is never said is what the other country is spending in advertising dollars. It might be of interest to state here that the key Islands that we compete with have increased their advertisement spending by over 22 per cent this year, while Cayman has been 6 per cent. The island of Cancun alone, spent \$7.5 million for advertising during the fall of 1989. A 10 per cent increase in air arrivals in being projected for 1990. The future looks good, based on the usual assumptions, the prime one being world economic conditions. Especially the North American market. If we reach our target and there is no reason now to believe that we will not, looking then towards the year 1991, once we hold our market share I would not be unduly worried, nor either should the country be, because we cannot expect to keep producing large percentage increases on an annual basis and then turn around and complain about rapid growth and the problems that this produces.

So, without being boastful and without being over optimistic, tourism is recovering. It will be in good shape with the help of all concerned and, even if I must say so, it remains in good hands. All the critics combined could do no better than has been done under the circumstances.

Now, I come to Cayman Airways. It seems to me that no debate in this House would be complete without this subject. Let me first of all start off by recording my profound disappointment with the unwarranted and antagonistic attitudes that have been adopted by some Members of this

House towards the national airline. It appears to me that every conceivable means has been used to discredit the airline and to poison the minds of the local people and the travelling public against the company. This is most unfortunate as the airline now, as it always has, needs all the support and help it can get if it is to survive and remain in business. I would surely hope that the extent to which Cayman Airways has been maligned and ridiculed is not due to any political spite or vindictiveness. I do not own Cayman Airways, I just do my best in shouldering my responsibility for the subject.

In 1978 the Government made the decision to take over the full ownership and there and then they assumed the full responsibility for the airline, full financial responsibility for the airline. The company has always needed and received Government financial assistance in one form or another in order for it to continue to operate. However, if and when the time comes that Members no longer want to support the airline, then let them close it down and find jobs for the 300 Caymanian families who depend on Cayman Airways for a living. Also find an airline to provide an inter-Island service for Cayman Brac and Little Cayman. I have always held the view, and I still do, that Cayman Airways is an essential service which has proven its worth to the country on many, many occasions. I maintain that if all the Government is ever called upon to do is to pay the annual subsidy that it is presently paying, it is a small price to pay for the independence that it provides as far as air services are concerned and the quality of service and the contribution to the economy that the airline makes.

I have always maintained that never again in our history should we be totally dependent on foreign airlines to provide a service to these Islands. The Records of this Legislative Assembly will bear out that I have always supported and defended Cayman Airways from both sides of this House and I will continue to do so whether I am a Member of this Legislative Assembly or not, simply because I believe in Cayman Airways. I happen to believe that it has a rightful role to continue to play in providing air services to, from and within the Cayman Islands and its importance to our tourism industry cannot be ignored. Not just because the company, Cayman Airways, and the Portfolio of Tourism, Aviation and Trade have taken a decision that might not have been politically popular with some people, but it, nevertheless, is economically sound, there is no reason to attempt to discredit and destroy the airline. I would hope and expect that Members would recognise the need and see the justification in assisting and supporting the airline, rather than degrading it at every opportunity. This must be a constant source of discouragement to the management and staff of the airline.

The company has managed to show a modest profit for the financial year ended June 1989. It is the first since its break with LACSA airlines. As I said when tabling the airlines accounts, much credit goes to the Chairman, Mr. Neil Cruickshank, the Board of Directors, the Managing Director and management, and I repeat, once again, those staff members who are loyal to the company, because we certainly have some that are not loyal and dedicated.

I also explained, when the accounts were tabled, that high load factors during the Eastern strike and the savings made in maintenance costs through the transfer of much of the maintenance services from Miami to Grand Cayman accounted for that improvement in the company's financial performance. However, the Second Elected Member for the Lesser Islands, the Third Elected Member for George Town and a few others seemed to disregard this and claim that the 727 aircraft, which they referred to as an asset, was responsible for making the profit. They questioned the wisdom of changing the 727 aircraft. Let me ask, since Cayman Airways had been operating the 727s for seven years, since 1982, what happened in all the other years that the 727s did not make a profit?

There has to be many contributing factors which I believe the Members well know. Let me put it this way. Had the 737-400 aircraft been in service with the kind of load factors experienced during the time that Eastern Airlines was on strike, the profit would have been at least 50 per cent more than it was. This is the wisdom of replacing the 727s; economics not politics.

The Third Elected Member for George Town also argued that because the company showed a profit this year that it would be easy to make one next year seemingly - if they had kept the 727s. I only wish that a profit could be guaranteed. But that sort of argument is not sound to me, at least not in the airline world, because we only need to have increased maintenance costs, an increase in the fuel in the world market and any profit that airlines might have projected will go out the window. So I am sure he knows that it is not that simple and that theory that because you make a profit one year, you can expect to make one the next year, does not stand.

Let me make another point clear, and that is the liability of the \$111 million which is repayable over 15 years, that has been referred to by some Members. It should be fully understood that this is not Government liability. The Government has provided no guarantees for the lease of the 737s. In fact, for the first time since 1982, the Government has been relieved of its commitment of \$16.8 million in guarantees which it had to provide before the company could lease the 727 aircraft. I trust the record will reflect the facts in this case. I must also make it clear that in no public meeting, or anywhere else, did I ever state or indicate, either directly or indirectly, that Cayman Airways would not continue to need Government financial support in the form of an annual subsidy. I know better than that. I, like many others, know the struggle of the airline and just how vital the Government's continued support is to the company in enabling it to operate and meet its financial obligations on a timely basis.

The subsidy which is being paid is normally related to the losses on the inter-Islands service. Recently the external auditors for Cayman Airways, Price Waterhouse, prepared a report on the inter-Islands service, which I will in due course distribute to Members of this House, establishes very clearly that the direct losses, if you take direct income and direct expenditure, the total losses are equal or slightly higher than the subsidy. If a proportion of administrative costs were to be added to the inter-Islands service, the loss would be in the area of \$2 million. In the future, whenever accounts are tabled in this House, the inter-Islands service will be shown separately and form a part of those accounts.

Improvements in the inter-Islands service has been called for by

the Member, and I know this is also a concern for the First Elected Member for the Lesser Islands as well. Replacement of the Shorts aircraft has also been called for. The inter-Islands service, like an other operation, I am sure can stand improvements and I differ with the Members very little on that. I am most supportive of keeping this service under constant review and as the House knows, and has been informed, a study is, in fact, underway to determine what other commuter type aircraft is available which can adequately serve both Cayman Brac and Little Cayman. I am confident that this will be resolved so that some improvement is realised before too long. Nevertheless, tourism to the Lesser Islands and the high rate of hotel occupancy bear out the indisputable fact that generally speaking a good air service supplemented by a dependable jet operation to Cayman Brac is being provided by Cayman Airways. Quite obviously tourism cannot continue to thrive and prosper without a good service, they go hand in hand.

In the past, a study of the airline has been called for. I think at one time it was termed an investigation. But I would like to take this opportunity to also inform the House that I have started negotiations with a firm of airline consultants to have an independent study of the organisation and management of the company carried out. When this is complete all Members will receive a copy and I undertake, at this time, to keep the two Members for the Lesser Islands fully informed as the study progresses.

Remarks were also made by the Second Elected Member for the Lesser Islands regarding the air terminals in Cayman Brac and Grand Cayman. Since Cayman Brac's terminal improvements which related mainly to the replacement of the door where the baggage is collected was dealt with during Question Time, and we all know what is suppose to take place there, I will only deal with the terminal at the Owen Roberts International Airport. He listed a few items which he claimed no one was paying any attention to. I strongly refute that claim. Regardless of the Member's opinion and the source of his information, no item is ignored or neglected at the Owen Roberts International Airport or its terminal.

We have an effective airport authority, the Civil Aviation Authority, chaired by myself, and a capable and experienced Director of Civil Aviation who oversees the safe and efficient operation of our airports. If someone finds a light missing it is not because anyone is neglecting their job, either it is a type that is not available locally and had to be ordered or a decision has been taken that it was not necessary and it will not be replaced. I only use this particular item as an example. But this applies to the other items the Member mentioned.

Let me deal with the question raised regarding an extension of the terminal building in Grand Cayman and the congestion there. The mid-day schedules are naturally dictated by connecting times in Miami. While all the new airlines wanted to arrive and depart around the same time, the Civil Aviation Authority did force two of the carriers to separate their flights from the other three airlines by at least one hour. A further change was made the first of this month, which will improve the situation somewhat. But let me state that there are no immediate plans to extend the terminal building at Owen Roberts International Airport to suit any particular airline.

First of all, the new airlines which started operating here a few months ago originally sent their company officials here before inaugurating services. They met with our Director of Civil Aviation and they inspected and accepted the facilities that were available at our terminal in Grand Cayman. Furthermore, and with all due respect to the carriers concerned, some U.S. airlines have a habit of appearing and disappearing from the scene. Plus, the matter of excess capacity, the matter of too many U.S. carriers serving Cayman from Miami has not yet been settled. But more important than these conditions and uncertainties, how can Members express so much concern about the problems of growth and development and yet in the same breath attempt to promote expansions that would encourage more flights into an already saturated market?

At the present time we only have 5,000 beds to fill. We already have more flights than we need. I want it to be known, and will state clearly here that any extension of the air terminal in Grand Cayman will have to be a part of a long term Airport Development Plan which is in keeping with other development policies, not just to accommodate or suit a last minute request from any airline. The terminal at the Owen Roberts Airport will have to be busy for more than just a few peak period hours a day to justify such expenditure. Furthermore, I do not believe in allowing other people to build on Government property. Apart from what I believe, I do not believe that that has been our Government's policy in the past.

Mention has been made about the Labour Law and its application. I will only say that it has worked well. We will continue to apply it and I think we have a good Director of Labour who is doing a good job in resolving many, many problems out there in the work place. I believe that the amendments that have recently been passed will be an improvement and, of course, when the time comes, and if other amendments are necessary, they will be brought back when possible.

In connection with the labour situation though, I was very pleased to hear the Third Elected Member for West Bay when he advised the House of his stand with regard to Labour Unions, it coincides with mine exactly. I trust that never, ever in the history of these Islands will labour unions take root here. It will be the beginning of the end as far as I am concerned, and I believe that the protection afforded both the employer and the employee provided in the Labour Law should not necessitate the formation of any union whatsoever.

Finally, before taking my seat I, too, must also comment on one major situation facing our country, that is, the political situation in this Honourable House. Far be it from me to attempt to make anyone believe that the Elected Members of the Government are perfect. We are only human beings, subject to mistakes too. But the fact remains that after only one year in office much has been accomplished for the country. Many good plans have been laid which would produce substantial improvements. However, if one were to listen to some Backbenchers, one would be led to believe that everything wrong, every problem and difficult situation with which our country is faced is the fault of this Government or due to inaction or inability. This might be part of the Opposition's role, but this is not the case. This country has a responsible,

capable and hard working Government, both Elected and Official Members. It is my considered opinion that none of those complaining and criticising could do any better under the circumstances with which this Government has been faced. Certainly we have problems, but at the same time we also have much to be thankful for. I understand, like other Members, the role of the Opposition. I can appreciate that, and I have no difficulty in recognising and accepting that. I sincerely believe that this forms an important part of the democratic system which we all value and hold dear.

I will also admit too, that a minority in the majority is a new development for our Legislature. But at the same time if the Government's programmes and projects are bogged down in the political process then the question of responsibility without authority definitely comes into play and must be addressed. The ills and problems of a small developing country did not occur overnight, nor can they be resolved in a flash. Both processes take time, proper planning and cooperation. Yes, cooperation must be the method of giving and taking. It must be a two-way street. Cooperation cannot be interpreted to read "do what I say", and that applies to both sides. Prudent spending is important, but prudent spending cannot be interpreted to mean spend money on my projects but not on yours.

It is easy enough to sit back, ask questions and criticise, but try to change the demands of a people who have been accustomed to plenty; change the working habits of a labour force who can pick, choose and refuse jobs; motivate and redirect children who have been allowed to change their textbooks for televisions. These are some of the things we are expressing concerns about. And yes, they must be addressed but theories and hypothetical cases are easier written down than applied.

I have to also admit that over the past year I have often thought of the words of Abraham Lincoln when he said, "A house divided against itself cannot stand", regardless of who claims to be right or who admits to being wrong, the situation in this Assembly is a dishonour to the Members who served before us and a disservice to those who will follow. The serious business of this country demands better than that. It is my opinion that we must first find a solution to this serious situation before we can solve and address the many problems facing the country which have been debated in this Budget Session. I believe that we must start to put this country above petty differences and this applies to all of us. If the super powers who dictate the destiny of these Islands, as well as many other larger countries, can see the wisdom of getting together in the interest of world unity, what is wrong with us in this small country of ours that we cannot use that as an example and do likewise.

I think one Member from the other side said during this Session that it could be that we are headed on a collision course. I hope not. I sincerely believe that it is important that we find a common ground where the true interpretation of cooperation is applied. Thank you very much.

MR. PRESIDENT: Does any Member wish to speak? [pause] I do not want to make this like an auction, where it is going once, going twice... we really should continue with the debate. Does any Member wish to speak? Well, I do have to have some regard to the balance of the House and I make it three Backbench Members left to speak and one Member of the Government and, of course, the First Official Member in reply. Does any other Member wish to speak? [pause] In that case, the Honourable First Official Member.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Mr. President,

MR. PRESIDENT: You have been saved by the bell. [Members' laughter] The First Elected Member for West Bay.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Mr. President, there was reluctance on all our sides to rise. I can guarantee you that the Member responsible for Education is certainly going to rise after I am finished tomorrow. In rising to speak on the Appropriation Bill, I would offer my gratitude to the Clerk and her staff for their services throughout the past year. Theirs is a busy job because ours is a busy job. But they held up to the task and have done a good job. My thanks are therefore recorded.

That the past decade has been one of changes, dramatic changes worldwide and some favourable growth locally cannot be disputed. The honourable Financial Secretary has given very good advice when he said, and I quote:

"We must assess the strengths and weaknesses in our economy during the 1980s in order to better equip ourselves for the challenge of uncertainty on the economic front that will confront us during the 1990s."

We must now consider where all this growth has taken us. We must now consider whether the policies of the Government are dealing effectively with the problems which that growth has inflicted upon us and we must consider whether it is desirable for those of us who inhabit this country legally to continue this mad rush of development and whether we can live without the rapid development.

It is fair to say that materially this country has come far, on the surface at least. Economically many people seem to be better off. But are we? While I can offer sincere congratulations to the Honourable Financial Secretary on an able Budget presentation, I must be careful how I congratulate the Government as a whole on this Budget. While it contains very good advice from the Honourable Financial Secretary, I think the Budget is very unrealistic in some areas. It questions which way we should go, but the will is not there to say definitely which direction the Government is going to take. As I debate, I do so realising full well that the Budget is the policy of the Elected Government. The Elected Directorate on the Executive Council

must bear full responsibility for its failings.

In the past months and hours we have heard quite a bit about how we Backbenchers must support the Executive Council. We were told time and time again that we must cooperate. They have laid almost all the blame at our feet for non-performances and non-results in some areas. They are trying to do a good job of blaming us to cover up and draw the public's attention away from the real issues facing this country, issues which seem to get lip service from them, from those who have the Departments at their disposal to get the job done. We, who have no staff, not even an office to assist, and who are often times misled going to be the tactic when I was nominated for the Executive Council, I would have gone to the other side. In a democracy such as ours, there should be participation. This Budget is not the result of participatory democracy where the Backbenchers are involved and our input is sought. It is rather a result of closed conference autocracy. When they fail, it will be the result of arbitrary and arrogant attitudes.

In planning for the 1990s I would have thought that this Budget would have contained plans and policies for the districts of this country. But no policies are expounded upon, except the Master Ground Transportation Plan, and even that was unrealistic because it carried no real figures. But that is where the Government seems to emphasise its priority.

The Budget speaks of manpower resources. I thought the Government would have by now brought a well laid out Plan and Tabled it along with the Estimates, as to how they plan to alleviate the problems of indigenous manpower training and development and the blatant lack of it in this country. They have been uncooperative. They are unrealistic and in the meantime our human resources go to waste. We are pounded into oblivion sometimes. We get the blame for projects not taking place. Priorities need to be set.

Our youth get caught up, day after day, in situations which are altogether bad. They plan for roads and material things; things that will get their picture in the paper quickly. But programmes that should yield results in the area of manpower training and other results for our youth, they tie up in bureaucratic quagmire. In my opinion they look for excuses not to do the things they ought to do and bring in experts and consultancies to advise them on how to do the things they should not do. Someone said they are 'weighed in the balance and found wanting' for their indifference to the urgent matters of youth in this country.

MR. PRESIDENT:
suspended until 2:15.

Is it convenient to take the break for you? Proceedings are

AT 12:46 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 2:20 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Proceedings are resumed. The Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill, the First Elected Member for West Bay continuing.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:

Mr. President, before the adjournment I was giving my opinion on the Estimates and that opinion is that firm plans should have been tabled with the Estimates to deal with the problems as laid out by the Honourable Financial Secretary. A cabinet is elected to do that. Not to come to the Parliament and say to the opposition you must find the solutions. That is a joke. If that were so then we would be the Government - and the Government would be something else.

The problems are there. It is obvious. What is needed is direction by them. They must have the political will to take the issues into their hands and deal with them competently. That is management. That is what we sent them there to do. When they have their plans and know what the costs are in terms of money and set backs and we, on this side, are informed intelligently in a manner which we can make informed decisions, as I said is for the betterment of the country and the people, it will get our strong support. If they cannot do that then they should come over on this side. This country cannot go on in this manner, where they think they can ride roughshod over this House. We cannot continue with the situation where in this majority in this House do not want some thing, and they are determined to put it through. I do not care how often we look at a leopard, it is always a leopard.

I heard the Member of Communications and Works saying that he is now prepared to review the Master Ground Transportation Plan. Well, this is what we asked them to do. They were told to look at it. Now he is prepared - after they were defeated. Why did they not accept our advice (if they are so keen on cooperation) before the vote? Was it cooperation they wanted? The situation where the Government keeps getting defeated because they will not cooperate, where will this lead? They can declare that this is the will of the majority in this House that the Government change their attitudes and shift their present priorities. This is what we are saying. But are they listening? No! They are set in their ways and constantly try to find a way around the will of the majority in this House. This cannot work. They will constantly be outvoted.

It is said that inflation will continue to be public enemy number one. But it is expected that inflation will continue to gallop. I believe that this creeping inflation is much higher than what is now mooted. Certainly prices are not going down, nor do they even remain steady. First of all, each of us in this Chamber is a consumer and present day Government policy of a difficult level of economic activity course the difficulty of finding sufficient funds to finance all the plans undertaken. All of this results in a high cost of living and imposes inflationary pressures. The high cost of living in this country is storming the last bastion of individual hope and rights to live within one's means. It is now practically impossible for the head of a family, father

or mother, individual or married couple, to make their salaries support their families from one pay day to the next. Prices have skyrocketed all along the line - food, rent, clothing, fuel, transportation and building. Of course the capital cost of housing, both new and used, has escalated.

Across the country there is general concern about the continuing upward spiral in the cost of living. This topic of conversation is ever present when one speaks to ordinary people from day to day, either on the streets or in the stores. Housewives and working mothers who go to the shopping centres taking their carts around the aisles trying to fill their weekly grocery list, constantly object to the ever decreasing purchasing power of their dollar. I am challenged by the Member for Health to do something. He is one of the policy makers. What is he doing about this? I tried to keep down costs in electricity. What did they do, they voted down the Resolution. The cost of living is definitely high. I know people who last year were spending \$47 to \$50 per week on their groceries. They have not changed their eating habits. They are living the same way and this year those same things are in the region of \$70 and \$73. I have kept a very close check on it.

There are other areas which I point out in particular. Renting has, it seems, become the way of life in these Islands, whereas years ago families could live together. Today even the youngest tends to want to be independent and seeks a place to rent. Sometimes it is a matter of sharing with someone. However, rents are very high and where is this leading us, considering the expense. But is this not all tied up with credit costs and interest rates, and what have you? Is the cost of living affected by the buying, for instances, of those fast expensive cars. Young drivers are charged high rates for insurance because of their inexperience at the wheel. Is it not logical to have a look at where this policy of lending large sums of money for cars rather for a house or land is leading us? Maybe there needs to be more heart-to-heart talks in the living rooms of this country where a young person is tutored on the values of savings.

I, too, believe that lending institutions need to consider their credit policy. Construction costs are astronomical making that more difficult for the people in the lower income brackets to build a house. One thing in this cost of living area triggers the next. High interest causing prices of rent, building and even groceries to escalate because of high overdrafts and so on and on and on it goes. The cost of living is definitely high. This is illustrated very dramatically by the savings of the people being down and by the increased demand for credit. I am challenged! May I ask the Government what are they doing about it?

I wish now to deal with several areas in the Estimates - the Civil Service, Education and Training, Health and Social Services, the Police, Tourism and a few other areas.

The Civil Service - this Assembly has no task so basic, or in my view so fundamental, as to ensure that the public service employment now and in the future shall be an attractive and rewarding career for the very best of Caymanians. With the increasing needs of the country, the public service must be composed of the very best and ablest of our young Caymanians recruited for service to their country. If we are to recruit such young Caymanians we must provide rewards which are genuine and real. Service to the country must be considered the highest form of service and those who pursue a public service career must be given the confidence that they will not be led down blind alleys. That they will not have their potential for advancement and promotion restricted by red tape. That they will not have their initiative blighted by needless frustrating administrative techniques and that they will not have their leadership qualities lost in a worn out mechanism of an inhumane bureaucracy.

What is the Government's policy for recruitment? I was surprised to learn in the Public Accounts Committee that recruiting exercises are done sometimes without the knowledge of the Heads of Department. This is a very shoddy situation and it does not speak well for the management of the Civil Service. In fact, how can a Head of a Department manage if people are being hired and they do not know it? This really causes a hodgepodge to take place. It is my opinion that this kind of action can only lead to empire building, since there is an absence of any rigid frugality.

I trust that proper management techniques will be displayed in these situations, otherwise there will be a blot upon our public administration. I am concerned too that our public service is becoming a dumping ground for people who should have left the country long ago. The situation as seen is not good and I am concerned because of the large expenditure.

The Civil Service raise: I note that there is nothing provided in the Estimates. We are told that this is because they have not yet had the Report from the person who is looking at the situation. That is a very lame excuse because if you are going to be the people who say that you are managing things properly and you present a Budget and you know very well that you have the expenditure coming of at least \$5 million, it could be in that region we do not know, it must be fair to the House and to the public service in this country that they would have put a figure - \$1 million, \$500,000, some figure - in the Estimates. The Civil Service is going to give them a good raise, while we expect certain things from them, we are going to see that they are well paid. I said a few days ago that governments come and governments go, but the Civil Service lasts forever. If we are going to keep good Caymanians in the Service then the benefits have to be attractive. I want to look now at another area.

The Member for Health tried to give us a lesson on the regulations dealing with when a person should get medical assistance. I have a constituent who spent 20 years in the Service and on the eve of retirement had a health problem. That problem was corrected in Miami, Florida, but before going to Florida he was promised help with the bill, although he was not sent there by the Chief Medical Officer. The Member for Health was not yet in the Portfolio but was confronted with the situation just after the Election. He told the man (who was by then retired) not to worry, that if he got the Portfolio he would see that he got some of his bills paid. He told me, in discussing his possible Election to the Executive Council, that he would see to it that the man would be helped. After he got to the Portfolio (which he so badly wanted), I talked with him again about it. He told me to write a letter to him laying out the whole problem and he would take it to the Executive Council and make a recommendation that the bill be paid.

I wrote the letter, but because the Member was, and is, so bitter, so spiteful, he would not take it to the Executive Council. Instead he wrote back telling me about the same thing he talked about a few days ago. I know very well what the Civil Service Regulations say to that extent, but sometimes we bend the rules to suit certain people. Today we are dealing with a civil servant of 20 years' standing. Is it any wonder that the morale in the Service is low? Other people in better financial standing have been in the same situation and the Executive Council made the exception to the rule and assisted them. Why could this man not have been helped? Yet he comes here and talks about us on this side of the House not doing our work. We are doing our work, but if we do not agree with them they say that our districts are going to suffer, they say that our constituencies are going to suffer and that is their plan. That is what they are carrying out.

In the past decade the Government Service has undergone a vast transformation. The work has become more specialised, complex and technical. By all indications the next decade will accelerate that trend. In my view it is of prime importance that proper recruiting Personnel Regulations be adhered to. It is my view that people in the Civil Service of long standing who get into problems must be helped when they find themselves with the kind of problems I mentioned. Otherwise the morale will continue to be low. And what do you get? Less than the best in performance.

I leave that area. The Member for Health spoke quite a long time trying to justify the Government's non-performance in education by saying that the Members on this side do not agree with them and that they place education as number one and health a number two, that is the priority, I guess. Then he claimed they put some \$20 million in the Budget. What I challenge him, is to say where the money is going? What is it doing and what are the results? We have problems, but he said nothing about the low percentage who are unable to go onto higher training after high school. If they are spending all of this money I hardly think it is well placed.

Management is not the best in the world. Can he say why is it that so many students wanting to get higher education, children from poor families, children of one parent homes, are given such a hassle? Students who are trying to get training, for instance, in business management and accountancy, why are they given the runaround? I charge that they get this hassle because there is no real coordination and, at times, the commitment is very weak indeed. One person says one thing and another person says something else and those making the enquiries are confused as to what is the position and where they should go for help. The commitment is not there to help them. Yet the Member comes here beating his chest and talking his not about money in the Budget. Where is it? What is it doing, and are the right children able to get what is placed for scholarships or must they come from a special family? Must they belong to a certain group? I charge that they deal too much with a certain class structure, all in all a plan to help that few and bring in outside help ('expertise' they call it) in the areas where our people should be trained. No matter how much propaganda and belittling words the Member touts out, the fact is that they are lost when it comes to handling education for the benefit of all.

I believe my colleague, the First Member for Bodden Town, was saying that the rate at which the country has progressed is tied very closely to the kind of education that we give to our young people. We, on this side of the House, recognise that the country is facing a period of crisis in higher education, a crisis in training and the Government's priorities are mixed up. Therefore there is no strategy to get us out of the crisis and until the Government takes a different view of people, regardless of which home they come from, regardless of whether they have 2 or 3 'O' levels, then this country will continue to be in a period of crisis as far as higher education is concerned. I know quite a few people who came out of the system on the 1970s with 1 or 2 'O' levels and have held good jobs and have climbed the ladder of success. In some cases are Heads of Departments in banks and other important institutions in this country. Today if you happen to have 1 or 2 'O' levels, it means nothing. Nothing has been visibly done to the matter of apprenticeship that we have agreed on. Are things going to get better then? Not on the course we are heading. We are going on the rocks.

There is glaring mismanagement today in certain areas, and we on this side are getting the blame. At least that is what the Members of the Executive Council are trying to say. They say we are not constructive and that we are uncooperative. How can we be of assistance to them if they do not take our advice at all, in any case? A good example is the Community College. From its inception I told them that I did not see the necessity of putting the College by the High School. All that has taken place so far is a lot of delay. There is, in my opinion, no commonality between the two. Why should the college be put alongside the high school? Are the students of the college going to use the same toilets? Pertinent should be the question of that age group mixing with the younger groups at the high school. I think not.

The Community College should be on a property where it has enough room for expansion. Where, for instance, they could develop a degree institution in years to come. Where, for instance, a teachers college that we asked for could be put. It is woefully wrong for the college to be put there to try and take a poor man's land when there were other alternatives. When it comes to the actual project, it is a shame and disgrace what happens to public money.

If there was a genuine commitment in the first instance, and if the Member had applied proper but simple management techniques we would not have had the gross mistakes made of trying to put the college on a cliff, without either department which was involved knowing the cliff was there. That is the department who looked at buying and the project department itself. Yet the Members come here and talk about their professionalism and their management abilities. It has not been exhibited in this case. All it took was for the Member to pay a site visit, that is all; instead of looking at it from a plan in a book.

After all these delays and after we have been in the Government nigh on six years, when will the college be ready to take students? Another two years? 1992? This is not good enough. This Government has been here since 1984 and a new decade is upon us and we still have not got a proper community college. Why? Is it all because of these delays or is there the feeling of when they get it, they

get it? There is too much negligence in education and as long as the present directorate carries on it will continue to be in a crisis because that attitude has always existed. That is why we have not trained our people the way we should have trained them. The attitude exists that when they get it, they get it. In the meantime we will bring in people to fill the spaces. That is the attitude.

They blame us, saying we have done nothing. We are not constructive in trying to solve the country's problems. What happened to the Motion for a Teachers College? What happened to the Motion for the school leaving age extension? What happened to the Motion for the apprenticeship system? What happened to the Motion for training, that was brought by the Second Elected Member for Bodden Town and myself? What happened to the Motion for identification? What happened to the Motion to get a scholarship for a well qualified Caymanian and for that Caymanian to be called a Cayman Scholar? Yet they beat their chests out there saying that we have done nothing. None of those Members can point their finger at this Member, or any other Member on this side of the House, and say that we have not tried to help, that we have not tried to do the things that are necessary. This Government has been here for six years now. I note that every major issue that has confronted it has been postponed because a study is underway or they are waiting for reports or results of enquiries. It is always going to do something tomorrow, when it receives a report, completes a survey or when somebody makes up their minds as to what should be done and passes it on, in the meantime, Rome is burning.

What happened to the Motions? What is needed is commitment. You will hear, as I said, that the Motion is awaiting the experts. We get blamed for slowing down the Government. You know what is slowing down the Government? Their preoccupation with small matters and petty issues. What is slowing down the Government is the preoccupation with making themselves look good. How many times has that Member who cast the blame on us been away this year? What are the results from the Member for Health bringing his Principle Secretary down here for most of his four hour Budget Address, a whole day in total and did not turn to get a paper. Why have her here? We are not slowing down the Government. Their preoccupation of making themselves look good. That is what is slowing down the Government.

My good friend, the Honourable Member for Tourism, thinks that we should spend money 'on my projects but not on yours.' That remark can only be applied to the present position of the present Executive Council. Somebody is getting all the priority - the Master Ground Transportation Plan, a new hospital building - that is what is slowing down the country. I charge further that what is slowing down the country is the bickering among themselves about which project they should go on but they neither have the political will or the guts to get up and say, "look, this is not going to take place", they come to the House and blame us.

They need to get their priorities right first. They need to get themselves straightened out first, rather than bickering and fighting among themselves. That is the position. That is why the country has slowed. That is why the Government has slowed down. You know what, it does not just exist today, it started back in 1984 when one Member was going to get thrown out the window by another Member. That is why the country is facing the crisis it is facing. Do not blame McKeever. No person in this country can say that this Member did not offer support to them. What more could I do? Lay down my life for my brother? That works sometimes, but it cannot work all the time. I gave them every opportunity in this world, every bit of support that I could, but I am not an extension cord. I refuse to be treated like a little boy. The country had confidence in me. They gave me 1,316 votes.

They cannot blame us for slowing down the Government, so the sad fact is that there is no real commitment. There is the attitude that when the country gets it, it will get it. Education is in a crisis and they do not know how to deal with it because they are wrangling and jangling among themselves trying to get this Master Ground Transportation Plan and the all powerful Dental Clinic. My first concern is our human resources. It has rightly been said by the First Elected Member for Bodden Town, and others, that this must be the decade of youth. This means increasing investments in those sectors which improve education and skill. Education must be the priority. But in addition, to formal education, on-the-job training must be supported by employers. Some do it. There is a woeful lack of it in the country. It should be part of the culture of the workplace for a minimum percentage of a firm's budget to be spent on employee education. As I said some do it but there is not that much going on.

In January of this year 84 Nobel prizewinners in all branches of science met in Paris at the invitation of President Mitterand to discuss the problems facing the world in the next decade. This is what the 84 Nobel Laureates said about the topic I am discussing. They said, "Education must become the absolute priority in all budgets and must help enhance all aspects of human activity." When the world's greatest brains looking at the achievements or the lack of them in the past, and peering into the future conclude that priority must be given not to buildings or prestige projects with nameplates on them, and wide skyways and expressways, no, but first to enlarging human knowledge. When those kinds of people tell us that, we must sit up, we must listen and we must act. I wish it were possible to bring that type of expertise here to give a pep talk to those Members who wrangle and jangle among themselves, over there.

In relation to our manpower needs, our objectives must be to fill jobs with Caymanians wherever possible. It must be realised that there are more jobs today than Caymanians available to fill them. As a result it looks, if we keep going in this direction, as though we will continue to find it necessary to recruit. That is why we are saying that the Government must be committed and demonstrate that commitment with measures to improve education and training facilities to prepare our young Caymanians to take advantage of job opportunities available here.

I am not saying that the opportunities do not exist. They are there. But we must equip our people and we must do it now. We must do it now! Too many excuses... and none of them is the proper one. I have always felt that this country cannot have an intelligent Immigration policy unless

we have an intelligent manpower policy whose purpose should be to assist the growth of the country by helping our people get better jobs or broaden the opportunities open to them. As was said we, on this side of the House, have declared the coming decade the decade of youth. That means that new strategies will have to be employed and the usual old schemes and washed-up programmes and old statistics trotted out year after year are going to have to be done away with. Policies which are not working must be thrown out and new ideas must be given a chance, even if they cannot come up with them themselves, they must listen when we give them ideas. You talk about a schoolmaster, we have some on this side.

I want to support the call of the First Elected Member for Bodden Town for some kind of youth corps established, financed and backed by law in this country. Call it what you will. Whatever name it is given, I believe this youth corps could be for ages 16 to 20. If the Member is not going to take up the suggestion of the school extension, we will have to go a little bit lower. But under the scheme they could be salaried and enrolled as full time students. When not in school they could undergo training in police subjects, for instance, in addition to subjects which I prefer to call "ready for life" subjects which include attitudes, civics, human relations, and that sort of thing. However, discipline would be at the top of the list. It would also have as its aim to organise and carry out programmes designed primarily to widen the opportunities of the young people who leave school before completing it and to help reduce the number of young people who leave school before completing their schooling.

It could assist vocational training projects and organise and carry out projects to emphasize the importance of such training. I believe that, for instance, those young people who are today sentenced to jail, could be made to be a part of the youth corps where one or two years of work and study would be a normal part of a sort of re-education. I am not saying that there must not be punishment for the crimes committed. Certainly there must be some form of punishment. But what happens when, for instance, a person is sentenced to prison for dope. Is he cured? On his way back into society is he prepared? The youth corps would certainly have to work in collaboration with the Courts, but that should not be the excuse not to develop some sort of youth corps in this country.

I do not want anyone getting up after me misinterpreting what I am suggesting. We are not saying that there must not be just punishment for the young offender. I believe in our modern world that there should be a different policy in the treatment of young offenders. I believe they should be segregated from adult offenders. I believe a youth corps could help to provide a disciplined daily routine to provide work, education and other activities of a kind that will assist offenders to acquire or develop resources and aptitudes and to encourage offenders to accept responsibility and to help them with their return to the community.

After they return to the community, there still would be some form of responsibility for supervision. I was told that it probably cannot work here, that they need to bring in somebody from Timbuktu to tell us that it cannot work. I believe the most important aspect of this sort of youth organisation is that it would be concerned with advancing the potentialities that are so latent in hundreds of young people in this country. There are a lot of potential going to waste. As I said, it is not as though the opportunities do not exist. It exists, but without training, without the right attitudes about work it is being lost. We must have a situation where it can be taught that if they have to be to work at 8:30 they should be there and not at 9:00 or 9:30. Work habits would have to include the realisation that there is always someone who would be in charge. One whom you must take orders from and that there is always a boss. There must be the realisation that if one is employed, nonattendance means nonperformance which means the company loses and if there is no performance even with attendance, the company still loses.

There is great potential with our youth. It must be harnessed quickly. I believe that the intention of a youth corps would be to teach the idea of social unity, a community of purpose and the dignity of labour. These are the kinds of programmes that we should be addressing. Let us stop this lip service. Viable opportunities and viable alternatives must be looked at. I believe that this youth corps is something which invites and invokes constructive adventure. I believe if can work in this country. You take a chance on 737s, you must take on these kinds of things. Better worlds do not just happen, they are made. We want this decade to be the decade of youth. This proposition could be the right step forward into a better world for our young people.

I would have liked to have come to this House and heard how the Social Workers are carrying out their work in the districts. I would have liked to have heard whether those few people who go to the drug counsellor are repeating their visits. I would have liked to have heard whether there is any follow up service by Social Workers for those drug addicts. I would like to hear how much contact is made with addicts out in the districts. Whether the Social Workers are visiting the homes on a regular basis. Why did the Member for Health not tell us that. Is it because there is much slackness and lackadaisicalness in that aspect of that work and the work is really failing? That is where we need to expend out energy. Do not come here and talk about friendships being broken up.

There has been no decrease in the use of cocaine in this country. This scheme the Member is talking about, how well is it working for this country, in our peculiar and particular needs? Let us get this in our heads once and for all. This country cannot be run with plans that are developed for cities in the United States. It does not mean that just because something works in Minnesota or Ohio that it will work in our Cayman Islands. If I were the Member I would certainly have developed a plan in conjunction with the police because there must be some coordination between the police and the Department as far as drugs are concerned if both are going to do an effective job. There should be some aspect of apprehension and interdiction in the plan. The only way we are going to help people on drugs is if there is personal contact in their environment.

The drug problems of this country will not be cured from the Tower Building, or an office in the hospital and until such time as money is spent getting enough Social Workers

and counsellors in the districts deployed with the proper plans to keep an ever watchful eye on what is happening in the district, the drug problems in the Cayman Islands will never get any better. All that will happen with the drug problem is the band-aid effect.

Let me tell the Member no one can be written off! No one! I visit the homes of people on drugs. There are people my age on drugs with their own families with small children. This generation that he claims is to be written off, what happens to their children? Will he find enough people to adopt those children? If they were milk white, they might stand a chance. Might, but otherwise, no adoption is likely. I am sorry to hear the Member in his usual high handed manner say he is hell bent on writing off this generation. I would rather he had come to this Honourable Legislative Assembly to tell us his plan will include three Social Worker-Drug Counsellors for West Bay, four for George Town, one for Cayman Brac, two for Bodden Town, two for East End and two for North Side ready to go to the homes, ready to keep an eye on the bars and the bad areas where drugs are peddled and addicts hang out, talking and counselling the young girls who are pregnant and producing cocaine babies, because these are increasing. In any event helping to assist with teenage pregnancies because there are many in this country.

I am sorry it will not be cured from the Tower building, and I do not want to hear that I am speaking of the Social Service staff in derogatory terms, I am not. I am pleading with the Member to get off his high horse and do something about this awful problem from a district level. Do not talk about writing off people. There are many his age who are hooked on drugs in his constituency who have families with small children. If he needs to go to Minnesota or Ohio to get a Plan bring it here and let us discuss it. But do not talk about writing off that age group.

Some of the best minds in our districts are messed up with drugs. Great potential wasting. Do not come to this Honourable Legislative Assembly and ask me what I am doing. We on this side can only do so much. I work with the youth. My time and money is spent. I work with the football clubs. We form youth clubs but I can only do so much. What did he do before in his district now that he has a squadron of consultants and an army of advisors? Now that he has a Department at his disposal what happened to the plans for our districts he promised me if I put him in Executive Council, he would take those plans and put them into action. They contain nothing about writing off a whole generation. Shame on you, Sir! Shame on you! How I kick myself, how I kick myself for putting them in Executive Council to come here with mortar pestles and big rocks to throw at me. It is obvious that their plan is not working.

MR. PRESIDENT:
for 15 minutes.

Perhaps we should take the break. Proceedings are suspended

AT 3:19 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 3:45 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT:
Bay continuing.

Proceedings are resumed. The First Elected Member for West

MR. W. MCKEEVA BUSH:

Mr. President, when I was stopped by the adjournment for the break I was dealing with Social Services. The Member for Social Services talked quite a bit about some scheme to take people up to the Hyatt or the Grand Pavilion. Any scheme to take people up to the Hyatt or the Grand Pavilion for a few hours will not reach the type of people who are hooked on cocaine and cannot keep a job. By the very nature of the place they are going first it will not work. Start in the districts and work at that level and maybe graduate to the Hyatt and the Grand Pavilion, but to begin there will never, never reach the people who should be reached. If social development is going to take place there must be money spent in the districts. A policy must be set up to establish youth centres in the districts which are run in conjunction with youth groups and the Department of Social Services.

Policies must be set up where they can be coordinated with the youth and the youth workers. It will take some money but not as much as the Master Ground Transportation Plan or even the grandiose Dental Clinic. The Member talked about cooperation. They will get our cooperation on those sorts of projects which I am begging for but does he really want our cooperation? I doubt it. Not if we are going to ask questions or give critical analysis.

I was recently told that the manager of the Chamber of Commerce was told that none of them, meaning us on this side, would know what is going on until they see it in the papers or it is tabled in the House. That is what he said and that is how he has been doing things most of the time. We cannot be cooperative if we do not know what is happening. He charges us with political expediency. That was a ringing phrase during his contribution.

A good example is the hospital. If we want to talk about political expediency, when the Interim Plan was to be revealed, what happened? He took a contractor friend of theirs, an architect, two announced political candidates supportive of them, Mrs. Orrett was one, to the hospital conference room. When we, as Elected Members knew anything about it was when we heard about it on the radio news and saw it in the papers. That is political expediency. Thirty million dollars and he expects, in his high-handed, manner for us to accept it without questioning. And when we do question semantics are employed to hide under. Yet they complain about cooperation. They do not want constructive criticisms. They want to spend all the money they can on consultancies to tell them what they want to hear, without due regard for things already existing in the country and for us, as Members, to accept it without a word.

They talk about building political walls so they cannot get

anything done. He has made a big thing out of the fact that I questioned a half-way house for West Bay. What was I suppose to do? He had consultancies for nine months putting together some scheme that they have in Minnesota and bring it to us one afternoon for an hour. Some Members did ask different things about the plan. The Member charged us with not making any input. At that time the people who were presenting the so-called plan were asked who was going to implement the plan. They answered they would have to hire trained experienced professionals. Another question was asked about if they would be training Caymanians for counselling which was all important because of the cultural difference. It is completely untrue, completely untrue for the Member to say that no Member asked questions or said anything at that time and that I only inquired about the half-way house.

I took the opportunity to ask about the plan for my district. What happened? The Member continuously tries to make fun and then comes here to mislead the House and the public. If you raise the matter of privilege you hear that you are censuring him. They do not want cooperation. They want extension cords and there is none in this House now. We got rid of that one in the 1988 Elections. You see what happens when we ask questions? I asked a question here the other day, "Can the Honourable Member say where the funding will come from for the proposed new hospital." The answer was that the Government had not yet made a decision to build a new hospital so the question of funding had not been examined and determined. Here is the Member in a debate earlier this year saying and I quote from the *Hansard*. He is talking about the people he brought in here as consultants:

"It will address the new hospital from a structural standpoint. What kind of hospital we will need. Where the new hospital should be located, what type of building the new hospital should be, whether it is going to be multi-story complex with the kind of spoke and hub design with the essential services, nurses stations, etcetera, etcetera, in a central hub and all the different wards, whether they are the open ward type or private rooms coming off that central hub of activity."

He goes on to say:

"In verbal discussions with the consultants I have asked them to do the plan as if they were preparing it for the United States."

He goes on to say:

"Further to the details of the site development and the actual plans for services that need to be provided the consultants are also being asked to address management, staffing and funding for the institution. The projected timetable for this study is the 1st of April, 1989 with the final Plans being presented by the 31st of December, 1989. At that time we will then be in a position to make a decisions as to where and when the new hospital is going to be built."

That was the Member for Health. Yet he comes to this House and what are those statements saying. They have brought the people down here to build a new hospital and that is what was given to them. Now he comes to the House and says that the Government has not yet made a decision to build a hospital so the question of funding has not been examined and determined. What is that, may I ask the House? Semantics? This country cannot be run by semantics. They are planning to build a hospital. I know it, I knew from a long time back.

Now then, there has been quite a bit of talk about a new hospital. If I felt that the only route this country could go is to build a \$30 million hospital separated by miles from the out patient ward, I would support it, if there were not viable alternatives. The Member seems to have based his request for this \$30 million building on a surgical ward, a maternity ward and a newborn ward. I agree that we could do with a new surgical ward and probably the other two as well. However, it seems that the Member left out the basic necessity of health care and that is service. A thing which the Member, when he was on this side, constantly talked about. Now that he is on the other side he is concerned about this large expenditure for a building, the amount which we do not know yet.

The Member made some accusations about us on this side of the house wanting to put people in a tent. A tent, this is what he has charged this side of the House with wanting to put the Caymanian people in. That is a kind of accusation that his contribution was reeked with. However, I will pass it off as either an attempt to mislead the House or a woeful betrayal of ignorance. Knowing the Member I will make my own decision.

My first allegiance is that the people of this country get proper service and I do not believe we need to spend \$20 or \$30 million to get good service. There needs to be better and more modern equipment. That is what we want money spent on. Recently, we had to go to Miami to get a stress test done. That kind of machine should be available here. We do not need a new building for that. What is more important, working in primitive facilities or being able to genuinely help people.

We realise that money is going to have to be spent on health services to get better, modern services, but do we need to pay out over \$1 million in consultancies to find out how much we should spend on the need for services, something that is glaring us in the face each day and something that a Member claims he is a professional on. Do we need to pay that kind of money? Already we have spent over \$100,000, some \$173,000, now he has in the Estimates \$900,000 for consultancy.

What are these men thinking of? Where is the money coming

from? Our structure is not something that has no end or bottom. Rubbish! We do not need to spend over \$1 million to tell us we need services and, by God, this Member is certainly not going to vote, as the Members for Bodden Town said, one red cent. There is going to be money spent and we will take charge of that. We will see that it is spent to get the very best doctors and nurses that money can get. Money should be spent on the very best of equipment. This is what the Member should be concentrating his time on. Money will be spent but not \$20 million or \$30 million on a building. No, Sir! What I feel needs to be done is that the Government, if they need space, the Government must look at moving the Mosquito Research Control Unit away from the hospital. Put it in the vicinity of the Public Works Department and that Lab space could be utilised for the surgical ward, the maternity ward and the newborn ward. The morgue needs to be moved and upgraded also, to somewhere else on the present hospital compound.

Those things can be done to upgrade our hospital for better services to last for many years. I wonder if this man realises the amount of duplication that is going to take place with the general hospital being miles away from the outpatient ward. Duplication which this country cannot afford. What are they thinking about. Where is the money coming from?

The Member needs to give encouragement to the private sector instead of throwing stumbling blocks in their way. I understand that it is not feasible for the private sector, so the Member says. Well, what is going to happen to the Government? The Portfolio of Health should work in conjunction with the private sector and see what can be done.

Recently a plan has been passed by a group for a 50 or 60 room hospital. Let us give them some encouragement, but as long as the Government keeps putting in the papers these grandiose schemes, the private sector is not going to come out and spend that kind of money because the country cannot take two large ventures like that. We do not have the people unless he is planning to have 100,000 people in the country. The Government - 100 room hospital and the private sector - 50 with room for expansion.

Let us give the private sector a chance on this one. Sit down with them. Do not walk around them. Sit down and discuss with them because we cannot afford any large expenditures like that at this time and we cannot get the service. We cannot get the service! What is needed is the political will by them and I will come to that in a minute. The Member needs to look at the attitudes which I believe largely affects services. What he needs to do is to have the political will to go up there and call them together and say, "Listen friends, you are going to work in this system and do what you are suppose to do or you are not going to work at all". That is what needs to be done. But because of relationships, too wide to mention and probably unparliamentary to talk about, we cannot do that. They need to have the political will to do it.

Look at the attitudes. That affects service. The Member needs to spend and we are going to see that money is spent on the district clinics getting them into proper health centres. I agree with that. That is what we want. Putting on a new door or window or a new paint job does not mean the people are getting the needed attention and the quality care that is needed in the districts. Spend time there instead of wasting time bringing down consultancies to go out in the bush to tell you where you can put a hospital. The district clinics need to have such things as oxygen, an ambulance service, and probably an overnight service. All these things can make for better health care.

Let me assure this House that this side of the House knew nothing about that health care plan until he read from it here the other day. The First Elected Member for the Lesser Islands has extensive knowledge in that area. Why not take him in and say lets look at it, let us sit down and talk. Oh no! You talk about political expediency. That is where it was. The candidate, your contractor friend, my friend too, their architects. You unveiled the plan to them after cancelling the invitations to us about three times. What happened? Let me say this, Mr. President, I have never accused anybody of gaining any 10 per cent. I have never accused that Member. Let me tell this Honourable House that story.

The first time that I saw this man, Mr. Jim Conti, was on my campaign truck on the 14th day of November, when we were having our motorcade. I went on the truck to start the motorcade and there was this man with this big grin on. I did not like it. I said to the candidate, Mrs. Orrett, who was not a member at the time, "What is this man doing here? Who is he?" We are running a campaign of more Caymanian participation and I see this man up here. I do not know who he is. She took me to one side and told me he was the man that was going to do the new hospital, and that she was a partner with him. I have not charged that Member with any 10 per cent. So get that straight. But I guess they know I am the least well-off and probably the most susceptible to falling in Court because I do not have the money to fight any case. But I have not charged him. I charge Mrs. Orrett. She, from then, knew what was going on. She had the plan and there is more then meets the eye with it. That is what she told me, she was a partner in it. I will not be voting one red cent of that \$900,000 if I can get the help I am going to split it up to see that they do right in our districts.

We have been accused of doing nothing but even when we do things, we do not get the credit for it. The Members for Bodden Town asked for different things for their districts. What happened? The Members of the Executive Council laughed at them. We are charged with political expediency. Let us look at that. Some kind of Committee was set up to review the Caring Home. Instead of putting a lady like Mrs. Ena Watler on the Committee who has 28 years of Juvenile Court experience, he puts Daphne Orrett, a known politician and an announced political candidate. Her experience was listed as community service and development.

That Committee had 14 meetings. She attended three or four. I do not know of any organisation in this country listed as Community Service and Development. That is political expediency! It looks to me like once they can get a committee set up and give it a name and make a big splash in the papers or take up half time in the House readings its report, he seems to think that will cure our social problems. Daphne Orrett did not do one thing to assist with the social problems in this country when she was a Member of the House. I do not see how much she can do as a non-member.

Member for East End has been asking for and ambulance for the East End districts. His constituents would benefit. Why not provide that? No, he comes up here and bamboozles us and say we are not doing anything. Yet, our requests they wash aside. A motion which was brought here by me was passed in this House already to build a facility for juvenile offenders and to appoint a magistrate for the Juvenile Court to sit with the Justices. They passed one and rejected the other. They knew of the problem from then. They did not need to set up any committee although, I give credit to the Committee. I am not casting any aspersions on anybody that will help. We need that. What I am saying is that they knew about the problem before. What they need to do is act! Get off their feet!

We need to get facilities for the more hardened juvenile offender rather than sending them to Jamaica. Is there any commitment? The Member who is going to rise after me - the Member for Education - was the Member for Social Services from 1972 to 1976. He found every excuse in the world not to get it. Financial constraints, but again from 1984 the question came before this House in a resolution and, again, he opposed it. Where is their commitment? Do not get up and tell me what the Third Elected Member for George Town did not do. I do not want to hear that. I want to hear what they are doing. I want to hear them say that they are getting these things for the country.

That situation is not good where we are sending our young people off to those people in Jamaica. I asked him sometime back whether a group of people could go and look at the facilities. They refused but I went on my own. The situation is not good. It is terrible. It is terrible that our young people are not getting the help when they come back here they are worse, and if you look in the *Hansards* of 1975 the then Member for Health and Social Services, the Member for Education today, was then talking about why he could not get one done. We should strive to provide our own facilities as quickly as possible, as speedily as possible. I would say that we should endeavour as speedily as possible to provide are our facilities. What did he do? I know he will have to come after me. He must. It is time to stop looking at those things that this country needs and it is time to put the money in place for them. They must have the commitment and the will to want it to get it done. What are they waiting for? It is not only today that I have been talking and making suggestions to help with our social problems, yet you hear that I am not doing my job.

If I had a department at my disposal, any of us on this side, we could get things done because we have been the ones that have been making the suggestions. We have been the ones to bring the motions and you know what, if I had the Portfolio I could get the things done because I have come from that side of the street. I know what it means and only those who come from that side of the street and know what it means and have the strength of character to do it. For years I have been pleading for the Government to restructure the Courts and set up a Family Court so that such things that affect the family unit which need legal sanctions, like divorce proceedings, child molestation and maintenance. There needs to be a simplification and speeding up of the procedure for matrimonial disputes.

There needs to be changes. For instance, there could be joint divorce petitions when a couple agrees to divorce. An end needs to be put to the practice of naming correspondents in adultery cases and listing the details of unreasonable behaviour. Financial claims should carry detailed breakdowns of needs and resources. Detailed questionnaires should be used to ascertain the proposed arrangement for children so the Family Court could deal better with the custodial matters.

These are things that affect our country are begging to be addressed. What happened to the Juvenile Law? Another committee? By God, when will these men act and stop committeeing? As a marriage officer I hate to have to talk about these matters but such is the situation today, unfortunately. I urge the Government to look into this matter of the Family Court to try and sort out the confusion caused by the fact that the Family Law matters are heard where they are today. The Family Law business in the present court structure is chaotic and there needs to be a unified Family Court.

We spend money on smoking 737s and the Master Ground Transportation Plan, Dental Clinics, six Dentists and not one Caymanian training for it. This is where we need to expend our energies. I have urged in the past for a department of youth and community affairs to be set up. Sports would be an integral part of that department. The Member for Health today took the advice of the Member for Education who did not do anything about it. (Members' laughter) Now he gets up and answers for him, to make matters worse.

Not to say that the Member for Education did not do something, I am not saying that, I have given him credit, but he has failed as other Members have failed and it is time that we spend money on those things because social disorder is threatening the destruction of this country and it starts with those things. You must look after the country's business. I have always held the belief that the Government should be participating more in the management of sports. Presently the Government contributes financially to the various organisations. There needs to be some accountability. I feel there should be a Government representative, for instance, on the Executive Committees to work with them, to see their needs and feel the pressures and difficulties and assist in the management. This would help stop the duplication in the various organisations.

A Department of sports should be specifically set up because it deals with young people. This country has progressed when it comes to sports and there are many who are responsible. Today I record my thanks. It is an area where some people have been pulling together and we see some change in attitudes and discipline. We need to impress on the organisations the need to continue with their good work. The Government should be there seeing that it works. You must set up a Department and give more emphasis to sports. Sports can play an overwhelming part in the preservation of the future. It deals with young people and if the sports is properly managed the young people will emulate the greatness of sports. I am greatly concerned or convinced that organised sports is a critical tool in any strategy of national development. The Government must make this a priority.

Housing is doing a fairly good job. We have a fair response from the public to the Bonds. We have to make sure that the money is well spent because it is the public's money we are dealing with. You have to make sure that the right people are getting the loans. I am on the Board. The Member has to move fast to enact the plans for those people that could be helped between the Social Services section and the Housing Development Corporation, the indigent people.

I remember some time ago I brought a Motion here to deal with a particular problem. The then Member for Education, who is today the Member for Education, who had that Department under him, nothing happened. Those people suffered. What was I told? Those people have got to help themselves. It is true. I warned him about certain situations that existed with a particular family. Today my help have come to pass. I assisted them. I went out on my own and got money from people to help them with a home and they are in a better shelter today than they were then. We have to help those kinds of people because this society, this community, that we are pushing for development to fill our own needs, we are destroying a lot of families who cannot understand and help themselves.

I am about to go to another subject, Mr. President, I wonder if we would take the adjournment.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think the House could tolerate another segment of your speech, could it not? Please continue.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: My voice is giving me trouble, Sir and you only have three minutes left according to my watch.

MR. PRESIDENT: I am a bit worried that sometimes we are taking very short sessions in the House. It does worry me.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Fine, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: What do you feel?

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: I will carry on.

MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Mr. President, I note that there are in the Estimates provisions for 20 more new policemen. In my view this is serious. The explanatory note says that this increase and I quote:

"Is due to the growth of the islands and that policing problems in ensuing years have increased well beyond people expectations."

It seems that we keep increasing the force while results in certain areas are less and less in matters, for instance, interdiction and apprehension of dope merchants who import their poison into this country. Is it really numbers that can affect that situation? Or is it proper management and proper deployment of officers? We are spending well nigh \$6 million on the force and we see the police sent out to tape a harmless round table discussion held by two Members of this Honourable House with their constituents.

If this is any indication of proper deployment then it is no wonder that cocaine, ganja and other poisons are making their way into this country in large quantities, killing the youth, the future of this country. It is time that that type of situation be looked at. We bring people into manage, let them manage. I realise that it is a reserved subject. But as representatives we are confronted daily with the problems that dope is causing. We feel the heat from our constituents. Most of all, we see the destruction and my heart is wrung by the destruction being caused on our youth.

Let those responsible for the management of the police force do something about this dope coming into our country. Let them support the calls I made for proper surveillance equipment. One small Customs boat cannot do all the work. It is time, and I make this call, I have made it several times and I will do it again, that the United Kingdom should stand by us on this matter. Why is this being refused? I have asked them for help in this situation. They are responsible Constitutionally for the security of this territory and certainly the importation of dope is posing a threat to internal security in a very wide sense.

They come and tell me that they cannot give us any aid in this matter because we are too rich. Yet they can send people out here, whom we do not want, to tell us what to do after they have helped create through their incompetence for most of the problems. They have made the system get worse. They cannot help us with a helicopter and they cannot help us with a good seagoing craft. Constitutionally they are responsible. I will say again that per capita income that they keep referring to is not caused by the vast majority of Caymanians and the income per capita is overinflated. It is not true. Let them catch the drug merchants.

I am not sure that this vote is going to get my support. I find it hard to believe that out of 200 applicants only 24 Caymanians applied. Only one was qualified out of that 24 for entrance to the police force. If that is so, then it is a severe indictment on the Members for Education or it is a severe indictment on the educational system of this territory.

If you went to school and you, the Member for Education of the

school they went to...

[addressing the Honourable Member for Education] You are laughing? you had better laugh about the seriousness of this - I have a 12 year old son, I have a nine year old daughter. Maybe because their children are already raised is why they are not worried. I am worried. Do not laugh! I am not laughing. If he wants to make an interjection about something I have said, I will sit down, if he has some advice to give... Otherwise do not laugh. Laugh when you talk.

This situation is serious. Drugs continue to come here in large quantities. We need the proper deployment of officers. We do not need more policemen. That is my opinion. I would hope that if the vote is passed and they get the 20 policemen from wherever they are getting them from, that we are going to see better results in regards to the amount of dope coming into this country. If we must spend \$6 million in this small 7 by 21 mile Island, our children should have a much safer life which is drug free. At least the possibility of being kept to a minimum.

We should not be a territory where Britain can find employment for 20 men. Great Britain must help us stop the drugs coming in, in a real way. I call again for us to get some sort of helicopter because I believe it will help and I wonder why some people believe it would not help. I call again for a seagoing craft that is well equipped to deal with the drug merchants. Our little Customs fellows, what are they going to do? Are they going to get out there unarmed to fight people with submachine guns. What do you think we are dealing with? It is serious. I want some action. If it was my department they would have had me kicked out by now probably.

MR. PRESIDENT:

It might be a convenient time to break there?

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:

Just one thing, Sir and I think you might be happy to hear this. I am not saying that the police have not done a favourable job in some areas. That would be a wrong statement. They have. But, by God, I do not think we need 20 more and nothing is being accomplished in a real way to stop the amount of dope that is coming in here. Putting the little barefoot boy in the street in jail is not helping the situation.

ADJOURNMENT

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON:

House until 10:00 tomorrow morning.

Mr. President, I move the adjournment of this Honourable

MR. PRESIDENT:

until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The question is that this Honourable House do now adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. I shall put the question. Those in favour please say Aye...Those against No.

AYES.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Tuesday morning at 10 o'clock.

The Ayes have it. The House is accordingly adjourned until

AT 4:30 P.M. THE HOUSE STOOD ADJOURNED UNTIL 10:00 A.M. TUESDAY, 5TH DECEMBER, 1989.

**TUESDAY,
5TH DECEMBER, 1989
10:06 A.M.**

MR. PRESIDENT:
prayers.

I will ask the Second Elected Member for Bodden Town to say

PRAYERS

MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH:

Let us Pray.

Almighty God, from whom all wisdom and power are derived: We beseech Thee so to direct and prosper the deliberations of the Legislative Assembly now assembled, that all things may be ordered upon the best and surest foundations for the glory of Thy Name and for the safety, honour and welfare of the people of these Islands.

Bless our Sovereign Lady Queen Elizabeth, the Queen Mother, Philip Duke of Edinburgh, Charles Prince of Wales, Diana Princess of Wales and all the Royal family. Give grace to all who exercise authority in our Commonwealth that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety may be established among us. Especially we pray for the Governor of our Islands, the Members of Executive Council and Members of the Legislative Assembly that they may be enabled faithfully to perform the responsible duties of their high office.

All this we ask for Thy great Name's sake, Amen.

Our Father, who art in Heaven, Hallowed be Thy Name, Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done, in earth as it is in Heaven. Give us this day our daily bread: And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us: And lead us not into temptation; but deliver us from evil: For Thine is the Kingdom, the power and the glory, for ever and ever. Amen.

The Lord bless us and keep us: the Lord make His face shine upon us and be gracious unto us: the Lord lift up His countenance upon us and give us peace now and always. Amen.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Proceedings of the House are resumed.
Papers - the Honourable Member for Health.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS AND OF REPORTS

**REPORT OF THE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION
(For the year ended 30th June, 1989)**

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER:

Mr. President, in accordance with Standing Orders I beg to lay on the Table of this Honourable House the Report and Audited Accounts of the Housing Development Corporation for the year ended the 30th of June, 1989.

MR. PRESIDENT:

So ordered.

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER:

Mr. President, the Housing Development Corporation (HDC) was established under the Housing Development Corporation Law, 1981. Its principal activity is to mobilise and administer the financial resources necessary to carry out and provide the acquisition and the building of houses for low and middle income Caymanians.

As a result of the reassignment of Portfolio responsibilities, which took place after the General Elections in November 1988, the political responsibility for the Housing Development Corporation was shifted from the Portfolio of Development and Natural Resources to the newly established Portfolio of Health and Social Services. The Member for Health and Social Services also serves as the Chairman of the HDC's Board of Members. The full Board is comprised of the following nine members: Mr. Rupert Ackerman, Mr. W. McKeeva Bush, MLA, Mr. John Collins, Mr. Gene Ebanks, Mr. Christopher Johnson, Mr. Daniel Scott, Mr. Peter Tompkins, Mr. Darryl Rankine. The General Manager is Mrs. Angela Miller who performs the functions of Secretary of the Board.

I would like to thank the Board members for their valuable service which they donate to this worthy cause. I would like to put on record my sincere thanks to the Manager and staff of the HDC who spend long and dedicated hours reviewing applications.

The Auditor General has certified the accounts and his certificate reads:

"I certify that I have examined the Financial Statements on pages one to eight of the Housing Development Corporation for the year ended the 30th of June, 1989, in accordance with the provisions of section 23(1) of the Housing Development Corporation Law, 1981 and section 44(1) of the Public Finance and Audit Law, 1985.

In my opinion these Financial Statements give a true and fair view of the state of affairs of the Housing Development Corporation as of the 30th of June, 1989 and of its surplus and cash flows for the year then ended.

I have no observations to make on these Financial Statements."

This was dated the 24th November, 1989.

I would also like to take the opportunity to thank those people who have subscribed to the 7.5 per cent debenture offering and to encourage those who have not subscribed to please come forward and subscribe.

Thank you very much, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: The third item on today's Order Paper - Government business, Bills, continuing. The Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill, the First Elected Member for West Bay continuing.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

BILLS

SECOND READING

THE APPROPRIATION (1990) BILL, 1989

(Continuation of debate thereon)

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Mr. President, when we took that adjournment yesterday afternoon I was dealing with the police. There is another matter in that aspect that I would mention which is the gun licensing procedure. I feel that this is an undemocratic procedure. I feel (to put it into a local saying) that "kisses go by favour." I feel that people who should have a gun licence in this country are being denied. I cannot understand why applicants are being told that they must belong to the Gun Club...

MR. PRESIDENT: Excuse me a minute. Serjeant, would you go and deal with whoever is making that loud talking noise? [addressing the First Elected Member for West Bay] Not you, do not misunderstand me.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: No Sir, I realise that I was not talking loud yet. [Members' laughter]

Why are applicants being told that they must belong to the Gun Club to get a gun licence? There is no law in this country that can tell the Commissioner of Police that an applicant must belong to the Gun Club before he can be licenced. What sort of country are we running? Farmers who need licenses cannot get one. Businessmen who have businesses to protect cannot get one. I have, in the past, moved resolutions in this House to get a proper Board for Gun Licensing in this country and that was denied because they say that it must be left in the hands of the police. I move to remedy that situation also by saying that if we set up a Board we would not have to take it out of the hands of the police but other responsible citizens could be appointed to that Board, just as other responsible citizens are appointed to other Boards in this country, which would make for a more democratic procedure.

If the Government expects people to work within the Laws of this country, then the Government must abide by the same Laws. I cannot, for one minute, think why, if I had a business, I should need to join a Gun Club that has no authority, no legal sanction before I could be licensed to protect my business. There is too much of one hand washing the other in this country. If you want to do some cleaning up, we should start right with that Department and that procedure.

We, as representatives, have been approached and we complained. As I said, I tried to do something about it but we got nowhere. Maybe that is why we need the Ombudsman in this country to look into that sort of injustice heaped upon our people. Not that I have ever used a gun, no, not that I subscribe to the wholesale use of guns in this country, but there are many illegal weapons in this country - high powered guns - that we need to be looking into. So it is my belief that if a business person, who is responsible and needs protection for a business, should not be turned down and told that they must apply and become a member of the Gun Club. It is ridiculous.

I hold no grief for anybody. I have nothing against the Gun Club. I support all kinds of sports. Some people like football, some people like basketball and some people like to use guns for sport. I do not mind that, but what I do mind is the law enforcement arm in this country telling the citizens of this country that they must belong to that Gun Club to get a licence for their business. I hope that situation is going to be remedied. I am going to bring back the Motion that was rejected one and a half years ago because I feel that we must have a proper gun licensing authority in this country with citizens on it who are responsible and know what they are dealing with, so that the situation is not left up to one man to his whims and fancies.

In the Estimates there is a provision for a sum of over \$1 million in subsidy for our national airline. Ever since the inception of the national airline I have supported it. Not that I

believe that it was always run in the manner conducive to sound financial judgment, but it got my support. When I was Elected I supported the Government in their moves in trying to get the affairs of the national airline running properly. When the subsidy was asked for I gladly supported it, while the Members who are now on the Executive Council rejected it. I was under the impression after we were elected in 1984 and there were certain measures taken, that we had sorted out the problems, as much as a small country could, for a national airline. We gave it the subsidy and we knew it was losing money but it was living within its means. It is significant to note that in a General Election for the first time since the inception of Cayman Airways you hardly heard a word about the national airline. It is significant because people understood that we had got it to the extent where it was going as best as it could.

I come back to the House and a few months into that administration we heard that we had to change. If any Member can get up in this House and say that this Member did not voice his concern at that point, they would not be telling the truth. I said that we had to be careful where we are heading in this situation when I was approached on that matter. The public knows what developed and how it developed. I questioned and I stand behind my feelings on this as to why we rushed into that situation. We cannot say that it was because there was going to be 'D' checks. I have asked questions in the past and did not get any answers that whether those 'D' checks had been carried out by the people who now have the jets. I said, in the middle part of the ruckus on it, I am not going to support this measure because I feel it is not in the best interests of this country.

I have been taken to task about that. The Executive Council went out to the districts and they gave the country the impression that no subsidy would be needed. That is what was said in my constituency. No Member in this House can get up after me and tell me that was not said. It was said. Now, I am no expert on airlines but I can certainly add 2 and 2. I am here to tell the Honourable Members that we are going to face serious repercussions with the operation as is, with the new airplanes. Either this country is going to pay, and pay, and pay, and pay what it does not have to maintain it or it is going to fall altogether. There have been many problems and they cannot say that we had those problems with the previous airplanes. Problems that are not coming to the forefront. Problems that we are not being told about, as Members of the House. I would hope that it would be sorted out because I hold no ill will to the national airline or anybody connected to it. But I am responsible to the people of this country and we are facing debts and bills with this new situation.

I doubt that it will be the success that it was touted to be some months ago. The Member responsible for CAL made some statements which I think bear examination. He has charged that there are employees of the national airline who are not supportive of the national airline, who are not loyal and dedicated. I believe that. I do not think he is misinformed. It would seem to me that if the Member is aware of these people then it is his duty, it is his responsibility to take the necessary action. This is the second time that I have heard these complaints recently. Either he should act if things are that bad, or it should not come to this House. He has the political authority to do something about it.

It has been charged that there are Members in this House trying to poison the minds of the public against the national airline. The Member should point out which Members are trying to destroy it. My opposition to the present situation has not been made because of politics. My opposition has been based on what I feel is right and wrong. My opposition was based on what they said was their worst deal - leasing the 737s. This is what they said. I know they claim that the national airline has undertaken this liability of \$112 million. I would hope so! But the present entire structure has not demonstrated any ability to take care of its own affairs. Whatever the liability, this country is subsidising the national airline. Who will Cayman Airways come to when it needs something and who will give it a subsidy, or who will give a subsidy to a losing airline except the Government? Do not tell me that I must not ask questions and must not object when things are done without my consent.

I had hoped to hear what the present financial position is, since the advent of the 737s, whether, in fact, the airline is meeting their lease payments of \$320,000 per month per plane. These are the kinds of things that I want to be brought up to date on. Let us face the facts. We have the new jets. We are stuck with them so let us face the facts and come to the House and say this is what is happening. We were often told that we did not need to know because CAL is a private company. We are the Government and we are representatives, then, of the shareholders. I maintain that none of those shares, those assets, should have been sold without the general consent and approval of the Legislative Assembly.

They say that the Executive Council are the trustees of the assets and shares. We say that we, that I, am a trustee of the peoples' right to know that when these assets are disposed of and handled in the best interest of the people. That must be the situation because the people elected all of us to represent their business, and their business is the shares and assets of the national airline. We elected the Executive Council, to the holy of holiest, to be responsible and accountable to us.

In my opinion, the selling off of the assets without consulting us is certainly an assumption of authority that they do not have and we have not given them. Even in a private company where directors wish to dispose of substantial assets of that company or wish to acquire substantial assets of another company to such an extent that it will alter the status quo significantly as the shareholders know it, they call an extraordinary general meeting of all the shareholders to put the proposed matter before them to get their approval.

The Government today is big business and in big business, the alteration of shares structure and takeovers. All those things pertain to a private company. In big business there are buy offs. In big business there are payoffs, insider trading, secret commissions and commissions otherwise. That is why the shareholders have to more vigilant.

The Trustees and the Directors should be more...

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN: Mr. President, I hope that the inference is being made by the Member of what takes place in big business regarding payoffs and commissions is not referring to anything to do with this Member or anybody else in Cayman Airways in regards to that transaction.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Mr. President, the Member knows that I would not charge him with that. There is no inference in what I am talking about. I am talking about the actions that they took on their own to go into a deal which they said was their worst deal. I have never accused him - and I would not, because I have much respect for the gentleman and I object to him saying that there is an inference because there is none on my part...

MR. PRESIDENT: Sorry, I do not think you can object. I was about to ask you whether you were going to make the same inference.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: I feel that I can make...

MR. PRESIDENT: You have made the point clear that you are not doing it.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: ... (inaudible) ... But, Mr. President, you know while he can make an account of himself he cannot make an account for everybody. I was charged here the other day with saying that another Member has some interest and that is not true. I did not. But what I do know was that I was told that a former Member and a colleague of theirs has an interest in the \$900,000 for the hospital consultancy. So we cannot put our necks on the chopping block for anybody. I hope the Member does not take any umbrage to my statements because I have made no charge against him and I would not. I thought he knew that. There was quite a bit of talk about the whole matter. I maintain that it was a bad situation. We should have been better informed and I maintain that there was too much difference in what we were told and what exactly happened.

They asked me to make a fair judgment but we are misled by certain things that people tell us. Now as I said, quite a bit has been talked about with the situation with all the new airlines coming in. I cannot see what all the ruckus is about. Exactly four months before its time, the Member himself broke the moratorium which prohibited other carriers from coming here which, it was always said, if it happened, would pose a threat to our local airline.

I well remember when they came to us about the new planes. One of the things I asked was whether the fact that it was mooted that more airlines would be coming, whether that would affect the national airline. They said that they would take care of it. They must have known that by breaking the agreement a way was being opened for severe competition for our national airline. There is no use talking about too many flights to Cayman now. In my opinion these new airlines will help our tourism. It is a fact that they have helped it. If they affect the national airline adversely, the Members of the Executive Council only have themselves to blame. I can certainly say that we told you so.

I hope that those Members who objected so strenuously to that subsidy the first year it was put there will have a look at it now. Those Members I am talking about are on Executive Council today. They were not then. I believe that those new airlines coming in are going to and will do a lot of advertising to help this country with our growth in tourism.

The National Trust: I feel that is a venture that is well needed in this country. We have a lot of good people working in the National Trust. The Chairman is a well organised man and has run a competent department. I believe he will do a good job. I have supported it and I need say no more.

The Cayman Turtle Farm: We have heard by the laying of Reports that there is a sad situation existing. I do not believe that the present management of the Cayman Turtle Farm is doing a good job. It is obvious what the position is there. We heard the Member say that there is an investigation going on. In any good management operation that man and his wife would have been fired because when you have three or four robberies and there is no stock taking after the robbery and you have thousands of dollars missing (I know I would be told that if an investigation was going on you should not be fired), I would have locked him up until the investigation was finished. I would have seen that he did not go from this country until the investigation was finished. I know the matter is sub judice, but that situation, and although I am a Board Member, bears looking into. Not only the Caymanians there should be investigated, but he and his wife should also be investigated because they were the last handlers of the money. What that place needs is an independent accountant, not a man and wife situation. Somehow we see, all of a sudden, that we have the second generation when after the Board has told him you only have a one year contract. It is a sorry situation. I guess some Caymanians will swing, but I am going to keep a careful eye on this whole situation. I am going to keep a careful eye on this whole situation to see that the right people swing. I will say no more. The Member who is going to speak after me, the Member for Education, can clear up anything that he feels that I might have said that he does not agree with.

Broadcasting: I always give some praise to that Department, the Fire Service and the Customs Department, because I think they are all doing a good job. These are good examples that Caymanians can manage properly when given a chance. The radio station is doing the best it can. I have no complaints about it. It is paying its way to an extent.

I now move to Tourism. Tourism is something that is near and dear to me. I have virtually been raised because my people worked all their lives in the tourism sector. But there are some areas that need looking into.

Entertainment: I do not know whether any study has been done to find out the reasons why people come to the Cayman Islands. We hear all sorts of reasons why they come. The

low crime rate is one. The crime rate is climbing and can cause a disastrous effect on the tourism sector. I warned against any severe increase. But I am concerned as to the type of entertainment in this country. Joe Savage (who has now left our shores, or I hope that he has left our shores) is a situation that should never have arisen. It caused a big furry in the papers and so forth and so on. But why was that man allowed to come in here with that type of entertainment? The Board acted quickly because he was beginning to get to people. I went there one night and I left in disgust. Giant snakes wrapped around his waist and people screaming their heads off and he is running around with a chain saw and a bottle of bourbon.

That alone was a blight our tourism. That is not the Cayman Islands when I entered that building that night. The only thing that reminded me of is a place I went to in London where people had different coloured hair, spiked hair and all sorts of things. That is the only thing that reminded me of something futuristic, satanic, but not good clean entertainment that I believe the majority of North American tourists want. They do not want to come to Cayman to listen to the same screaming music they have in their back-yard. They pay a lot of money to come here. They want to hear good West Indian music; socca, calypso, reggae. And do not tell me that is not part of our culture, it is! Way back from the time they had the dance or the music called 'Mentha', I think it was known as.

I would like to see the Department of Tourism take the Music Association of the Cayman Islands, sit down and have a chat with them and there would have to be some responsibility on their side, there would have to be a variety of music. I remember some years back we had a hot called the Caribbean Cabaret. It was well put together and was jam packed with tourists every night. No loud screaming music or dirty dancing. Nol. Good clean entertainment. Let us see what we can develop. There is a lot of talent in our people. Let us see what we can develop instead of having all the taxis down by the tourist landing. Get some music going so they can feel that they are on an Island. Give it an Island flavour instead of just pushing them into the stores. Let us get the feeling that people are on a vacation. That is what we need to do. That is what we need to encourage.

I hope I see some improvement and I hope I never again in my life will those people who are responsible for allowing 'Joe Savages' into this country. We do need those kinds of entertainment. We have enough bad influences already here.

There has been much talk about the building of large hotels. I feel that an area that we should look at and encourage is the cottage type, with room and board. What is happening now in our given situation is that we build a large hotel and we have to import 300 foreigners to run it. With a small cottage room and board there may be a few more entrepreneurs ready to get into that type of investment. Easy to manage. No hassle. That is what I would like to see developed around the countryside of this country. It has worked in other areas and it can work here.

Another thing that we need to start doing is when they are going to build a building, to give it an Island flavour. Why copy the large cement structures from countries that have no meaning, culturally, to this country. We are losing what the people came here for in the first instance and we are losing it fast. That, in itself, can have an adverse effect on tourism. I would hope that we can get a fair hearing and we will see some action on those things.

Advertising: The Member for Tourism has said that some countries in the region have increased their advertisements by as much as 22 per cent, while the Cayman Islands have only increased by 6 per cent. It is not how much money is spent on advertising but how well the money is spent. We should seek to see that money is spent in the right way and on the right media. It is necessary to ensure that the right prices are secured in the right magazines, newspapers, radio, television or whatever means. If the message of the Cayman Islands is reaching the right people who in turn are motivated to visit the Cayman Islands and fly our airline, Cayman Airways Limited, then it is good advertising. If we have spent millions and millions and we are not achieving that, then money is wasted. But then again with all these new airlines coming in it will be good advertisement because they will advertise.

I now turn to the Labour sector in dealing with tourism. There are many things wrong in the labour market. Some of which I touched on when dealing with other areas in the Estimates. There were some remarks made about labour unions. The bargaining power of the working people has worked in many countries, like the United States of America. I do not know if it could work here. But we in this House should be reminded that employers have their forms of protection. They can hire expensive lawyers when they need to stop a person from getting \$200. They will spend \$1,500 to see that that person does not get his \$200. Right now there is much lacking in the Labour Law. I never agreed in the first instance with the 45 hour week. Right now that is affecting people. Presently some people, especially in the tourism sector, because of the tourist season, some properties interpret the vacation leave section in a way that our people lose it. That is one of the reasons for the upheaval in the Treasure Islands Resort some months back. When decent West Bay ladies were laid off and I mentioned labour unions.

I do not foresee any labour unions. If I were irresponsible that would have been my first preference. The Member says that the Labour Law is sufficient. The country will remember that it was this Member who asked for the Law by way of a Motion because I thought it could head off the formation of unions. No one need point their finger at me. They must remember that I am an employer too. But there are situations where our people are being taken advantage of. And if any union, for the sake of protection, comes, it will be because of the non-action by the Department in certain areas.

I, too, have confidence in the Director. He knows that. But he also knows of the difficult areas where the Law is lax. All I can say to the Member with regards to unions is that, like him, it is a difficult thing for me too, to serve two masters - the people and the employers. All I want is for the right thing to be done on all sides, especially in the hotel industry. In some areas it is very lopsided in favour of the hotel. We know what is happening. We see what is happening.

The system of gratuities in this country is one that is begging to be addressed. Begging! I think enough lip service has been paid to this matter. I do not think our people will go through another season without some upheaval in the industry. They certainly have been patient and gentle and kind. Why is it that a property which used to pay \$800 and \$900 for a month's gratuities under one manager, and under a new one with less staff with the same amount of rooms being rented, the same amount of work, there is only \$300 or \$400 being paid? Blind Bartimaeus could see what is happening. Do not tell me that we must not do something about this situation. There has been enough talk. I have been talking long before I was Elected, ever since I came here in 1984 I have been talking about it. Again, since the Election I have been talking about it. I am here again still talking about it. When are we going to get some results and some relief in this matter?

Do not talk to me about private enterprise. There is no such thing in any Law for private enterprise to steal. Do not tell me that I, as a Member, cannot go down to the Resort and talk to the people. I must, I represent the people. They come to my doorstep and they call me on the telephone. Do not tell me that I must not go and talk to my people.

Recently, at the Treasure Isle Resort there was a big upheaval over gratuities again. Mr. President and Members, no labour union need be formed to damage the tourism sector. But the situations like the gratuity area can, of its own accord, cause havoc. Our people are dissatisfied. They are being taken advantage of. They have been patient, they have been gentle, smiling all the time but they are going to act. There needs to be a system set up. The Government must address the matter. Our people are losing what is rightfully theirs. And nobody talks about that I must work with the Members of the Executive Council. I have worked with them in these areas. I have pointed out where the wrong is. But I alone cannot do it.

I would now like to turn to my constituency. We heard the other day from the Member of Communications and Works that we must forget about our districts. I had to wonder when that statement was made whether this was a man who I had helped put into Executive Council or if this was a changed person. It is time to spend money on our districts. We must spend it now. The districts have suffered for too long in this country and have played a catching up situation, catch up with everything. When are we going to learn by the mistakes of other large metropolitan cities and countries that you can develop your centre and you will over-develop it to the detriment of the outlying areas. That is what is happening in Cayman, that is why we are facing so many problems. Everything is being dumped into this one, George Town, instead of it moving out. They are trying to run everything into it and all that happens is that there is a contraction. They think by building giant highways to come in here that it is going to help. It will not!

They think that by a large expansion of the Port, that will assist our capital. What a mistake. Since I am on that subject before I really get into the districts, I know, because I have information that right now the Government is scheming to build some giant berthing facility right where the old Water Building is. They think they are going put berthing facilities for 4 or 5 cruise ships. They think they are going to dredge to put 35 or 45 feet of water for this berthing facility. Do you know what would happen? The northwesterners are going to put this Assembly up in the old Public Works car park. That is what is going to happen. They have not come to us as Members but we know what is going on. We hear about so many excuses why they should not come to West Bay. Ah, Mr. President, what tangled webs they weave.

They talk about marine conservation. Some years ago we had bought buoys. We spent thousands of dollars on these buoys to place in the different areas. What happened to that plan? We hear now that the Government is talking about another study for anchorage. There was already some studies done. We spent, I heard, in the region of half a million dollars. Why do we need another study? Is it a study they need or are they willing to pay out this country's money so that all that happens is a delaying tactic so that they can build this gigantic dock out here in the middle of George Town?

If we raise it, you will hear because you heard them tell us that we are being irresponsible; we are being uncooperative. What must we do? Four men plan to move heaven and hell and they started on it and all we have to do is come here and give them the dollars. Just take the money, destroy the reserves. Go with it. You heard them say that we put the money there so that we will spend it. That is not entirely so. I will warn against them coming here presenting a Budget, thumping their chests saying that they did not present any tax raising measures. But yet they have all these big large plans in their minds, that they are working on. You are not hearing that. Where is the money going to come from? Where is the money going to come from?

Just ask this House to stop and think about the large expenditures that we are facing, that they want. We do not want them. They want them. But we must stop and think. We have just completed a study on the public service pension, which has told us we need to have some \$32 million. I know they are going to get up after me, the Member for Education, and tell you that we do not need it all at one time. But are they making provisions for it? They have the study, yet they present a Budget that says nothing about it. Where is their responsibility to the public service in this country? As responsible men we have to take those things into consideration when they come up here with their whims and fancies and grandiose Dental Clinics and grandiose expressways and grandiose berthing facilities. We have to take them into consideration.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Proceedings are suspended for 15 minutes.

AT 11:23 A.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 11:50 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Proceedings are resumed.
The First Elected Member for West Bay continuing.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:

Mr. President, when we took the break I was dealing with the proposed berthing facilities for George Town. I was asking where the money was coming from for these programmes? It seems that the Government will go ahead and put these projects and plans into implementation, but they have not come to the House and said where the money is going to come from. We all know that we can borrow. That is an easy job because we have a good name. But, we have to consider the repayment, how much the country can sustain.

The Government is trying to embark on a gigantic scheme called the Master Ground Transportation Plan. When the plan was being organised I gave my support wholeheartedly because I wanted to see what the road network looked like, to get a vision of what we were looking at in years to come. But I also know that there was a particular point of view being pushed in that Master Ground Transportation Plan, especially since the advent of the now Member for Communications and Works. All of a sudden we are giving priority to one little stretch right here in central George Town. Why? I question why? There has to be an answer. There must be a reason and we want to know why. There are only a few offices in that area. I would not deprive them the comfort of being able to get to and from work. No, but to come to this House to seek funds for that little area that is going to cost, as I understand it, in the region of \$2.8 million for land. There has to be a reason why the priority was put on this particular area.

I have stated my position with the Master Ground Transportation Plan. I believe that the Government should be about the business of getting something done now about the West Bay Road. We do not need to wait until 1992 or any other time. They need to do something now. They do not need to let supporters and friends build right up to the road edge and then come to us and say that I cannot do anything for you. No, no! I feel that the West Bay Road can be widened.

While I agreed before (as I said, I consented to the Master Ground Transportation Plan and made complimentary remarks about it) I have to consider where the costs will lead this country. That is what the Members of the Executive Council have had in their lap ever since the completion of the Master Ground Transportation Plan. That is what they have not come to grips with yet. They must widen the West Bay Road. There are points where we can get three lanes merging into two. Maybe at some points we can get four lanes merging into three right down to West Bay. I have a constituent who was recently stopped from developing his land. A young man, an entrepreneur, people that we should be encouraging. He was stopped from subdividing his property and going ahead and making use of it because five or six years from now that Master Ground Transportation Plan road is to come through that area, right in the heart of West Bay.

I am not too sure that any of them have any commitment to West Bay. By all looks it does not seem that way. Everything we ask for, we are told we have to wait. The Members of the Executive Council when they are considering these large projects, and certainly work is facing this country, no one on this side is being irresponsible and saying that the country is fine the way it is. We have not said that and, by God, we have put forward alternatives. We are saying that we realise that we can only do so much. We realise that our present tax structure can only take so much. We are saying that the priority is not the roads or new buildings. Priorities are in education.

I am reminded that during the 1960s and 1970s Nigeria embarked on one of the most ambitious road building and transportation projects in their history, maybe, in that part of the world. Today what has happened is that Nigeria is no longer a debt free country. The oil boom was dissipated and the road and transportation problem still remains. What is significant in this regard is that after many changes in the Government, Nigeria is in a terrible deteriorating financial mess with no end to their problems in sight. Closer to home, there is another country we could take an example from (and I am not speaking derogatorily of that country and since I mentioned one I will mention the other one), Trinidad. I have not been to that country, but the Member for Education is saying they have the worst roads in the Caribbean. I am reminded that they had billions of dollars in reserves. Where are they today?

We must be careful. That is the message. Our finances are not something that is bottomless. Our tax structure is not something that is bottomless. Therefore, when they have not come to us and said that project 'A' is going to take this amount of money and this is where we are going to get the money from and project 'B' is going to cost another hundred million and we are going to get the money from here, while they have not done that we cannot allow them to go on a spending spree without challenging them. We have to do that.

The Member for Communications and Works accused me of wanting to tax the country because I had said in a public meeting that they were going to increase the duty on cars. If that Member had told the House the truth, why I mentioned that was because that is the paper they sent to me. They also sent it to another Member. I would remind them that they are not going to fund the road by putting the tax up on the cars. Not if one little area is going to cost over \$3 million. If that is the depth of their financial thinking, I suggest they sit down and rethink.

My record is that I have never believed in large taxation. I believe that a country must have priorities and that we could raise money in some areas, not that we could tax the dollar of the man in the country that can least afford it. But they have not come here with any position as to what they are going to do. They are telling us that we must find the solution. What a joke! So I must tell the Members that a leopard does not change its spots and their plans for that little piece of road, for over \$3 million, is not going to work, no matter how much they change it. It is not my priority.

The Constituency: We need money for the constituencies. We need to do some services and that is what we are urging the Government to do. We cannot continue to play a catch-up game. For years and years we have been talking about a civic centre in our district. Well, we have come to the conclusion that we would renovate the Town Hall into a proper civic centre which would last us for years and years. It is the biggest Town Hall in the country. That is one that will not take \$20 million.

We have reached a point in the constituency of West Bay, where we need a new infant's school. That is a priority. I know a \$10 vote is in the Budget, although it gives no explanation as to where it is going, but I guess that is where it is going. We now have in the Budget some funds for a new classroom. I do not know when we will ever get it. We must spend when there is a need and we have the money to do so. The danger in education is delay. The School needs an Assembly Hall. We have been begging for years for an Assembly Hall for a school of over 300 children. We have to get that Assembly Hall.

I already mentioned the clinics. Money must be put where that can give the proper health care for our people at the clinics in the districts, as I said yesterday.

Our Post Office needs renovating and work done to it. That is what the Member for Communications and Works should be doing instead of talking about the Master Ground Transportation Plan and the Jennett "T".

A Motion was passed here asking the Government to do a vehicle inspection in West Bay as a pilot project. We have heard back from the police why it cannot be done. Here are two serious questions that are to be answered, according to them. This is what they said and I quote:

"Where will the fees be collected for the inspection? It is hardly practical for the vehicle owner to travel to George Town to pay for the inspection and then return to West Bay for it to be carried out.

If the fees are to be collected in West Bay, a second licensing office will have to be built equipped with computer links and staff. It will need adequate additional staffing of policemen and clerical staff if fees are to be collected.

With the existing establishment it is often difficult to man the inspection bay with properly trained officers as they are police officers and have to be used for operational policing...."

But they are not recommending to build any proposal for vehicle inspection. As I said, that is the position whenever we ask for things for our districts. They find a way around it instead of finding a way to say that we can do it, they look for ways to say we cannot do it.

We have a post office, we have a police compound. I saw where they spent some money to fence the police station. Why? All these many years that police station was there not needing any fence. Why put one up? It does not make any sense. Our present facilities for our post office should be upgraded. West Bay is a large area. It is still a growing district. It starts from the Governor's residence. That is my constituency. The whole western peninsula. What are they waiting on? Do you know the amount of traffic that would take out of George Town, if you got the facilities in West Bay? People from that whole side of the country would use it. That, in itself, would bring more business to West Bay. The shops would get an influx of people. These are the things we need to look at, the things we should do.

If they really wanted to help the people in the districts they would find a way to work the post office so that people could pay there because they have people collecting money there now, they could pay their vehicle inspection fee and licence there, and they could do the inspection in the vicinity of the police station. It does not take any \$30 million building to do that. Why must every time we ask for something they come up with some scheme that it cannot be done? All sorts of things are red herrings, thrown away, and said it cannot be done.

When are they going to do the things that are necessary for our people and our districts? I understand that soon Caribbean Utilities is going to be trying to put a station on a piece of Government land. They are trying to lease it or buy it, but I have not been able to determine what they are doing because you ask questions and semantics are played. I would tell them (if they are going to do that) I hope they are going to allow Caribbean Utilities to make some provisions for the older people in the districts who do not have any checking account so they can go there and pay their bill, rather than having to walk up Eastern Avenue or trying to get a ride. There are hundreds of people who do not have cars in West Bay, older people who have electricity and who also have telephones. I have approached both companies to try and set up some sort of situation where these people can be assisted. They cannot do it. It is not financially feasible.

Well, now the Government has the other end of the rope. They want something? Give us something. At least that is what I would do if I was in the Executive Council. But it seems to me that they are scared of asking people for things when it comes to the districts, but they can kick them in the rear end when they want to get things done for their projects.

Those are the priorities for my district. Roads are continuing, not that I like the policy of what I see happening there. All this year has gone by and they just recently came into West Bay when they could have contracted out the work and problems could have been alleviated. I cannot understand the policy where they built a road last year and they come back this year and do the resurfacing, the second coat as you would put it, while there are roads from 1985 that do not have a second coat. Why? Also there are people who cannot get to their houses, much less a fire truck or an ambulance. These are the priorities. The second coat could wait. The clean-up man for the Executive Council who is going to come behind me is going to tell us that the Government needs to save or to take care of whatever money has already been spent on our roads. That is why the second coat. What I am saying is that it does not make sense to go and put the second coat on a road done yesterday and leave the ones deteriorating that were done in 1985. There is no excuse for that sort of thing.

I hope that when we get into the Finance Committee we on this

side of the House are going to stick together. Do not let them come at this late stage of the game and tell us what they plan to do; let us stick together and get money for our constituencies that have been left behind. I see them lobbying Members at this 12th hour. Let us on this side stick together when we go into the Finance Committee and let us put money for our districts.

The Districts: All the districts in this country need attention right now. West Bay has to get that civic centre. We already have the building, it can be upgraded. We need the plans and the work done for the new infants school. Plans are already in progress for the new classrooms. We need to give that priority and make certain that will be done early. We need a new assembly hall for the school. The clinics are supposed to be upgraded and we should do something about the post office. This is what must be done and throw out their plans for some grandiose scheme.

In closing let me say that it is time to realise that in spite of the growth and developments that have taken place this country faces a crisis in many areas. It is time to recognise that in spite of tremendous developments there is regression. It is time to see that something must be done today. It is time to stop covering the sores of the country with skin-coloured powder of vindication and apologies. I am not satisfied that we have been given direction in the Budget by the Elected directorate. Furthermore, this country must now give much more serious consideration to the problems of wasting money by using it in nonpriority schemes. We must be concerned because we have been deluged with plans that have no cost attached to them. We must be concerned because by all indication this country is called upon to pay for developments which yield no results (or very little) back to the Treasury of these Cayman Islands. We must be concerned because while the Government brings projects for expenditure they will not say where the income is.

We realise that we can only do so much; that out of all the years of growth that we have seen and all the years of billions of dollars being invested in this country we only have a small sum put aside. The Budget does not say how much that sum is. I have not yet heard. We usually know, but I doubt that it is one year's Budget. Not that much. And with the billions of dollars and all the development it should be much more. I asked the Members on this side of the House let us stick together as a strong wall and refuse to let them use our reserves.

There has been quite a bit of discussion on where do we go from here. Our Honourable Financial Secretary has given us some pertinent advice in his Budget presentation. It is now for us to decide, although the Government should state as to where they, as policy makers, intend to take us. Where do we go from here? In 1959 Cayman received a new Constitution doing away with the first which dated back to 1832. On that occasion the late T.W. Farrington, CBE, had this to say. I crave the indulgence of the Chair to quote from Mr. T.W. Farrington, who was a J.P. at the time, now gone onto glory:

"I have had the honour and the great privilege of serving as a Member of this House continuously, without a break, for the past 37 years. As I look back and take stock of what has happened during this long period of time, I can, with a certain amount of pride and satisfaction, say that we have progressed steadily and surely.

This has been most pronounced during the past 10 years and we now come to the time when we will have to scrutinise every step we make most carefully if we are to maintain many of the traditions that we cherish so dearly. I would like at this time to quote a remark made to me by Commissioner Cardinal of Blessed Memory on the eve of his departure and promotion to the Falkland Islands: 'Willie, my boy, you have now been put on the map. For God's sake promise me that you will not allow outsiders to come and take this beautiful Island away from you.'

As we take stock of what is happening all around us we can well appreciate what Sir Allan Cardinal meant. However, if we are willing and ready to shoulder our responsibilities we may well look forward to the future with confidence and optimism."

He went on to add:

"Be watchful, be vigilant, be wise. Let us not lower the flag but press on with courage and determination that as we go forward into the future we shall always be proud to be called Caymanians."

That advice is so very pertinent today. I do not need to add much to that. But I wish to quote another Caymanian at that time who was in the House, Mr. Ormond Panton, OBE. He had this to say, and I quote:

"It is an honour to be elected to any public office. But to accept that honour as an honour alone is to harm oneself and his fellow man rather than do any good. I say to you that in the days ahead each and every one of us must put on his thinking cap, take up his armor in the name of honesty, justice and integrity for we are entering upon a crucial time of our development. A time when suddenly all can be changed from good to bad by the crave of power, filthy money, of personal gains.

By the same token, many of those vultures may come before you, as it were, in

sheep's clothing promising you anything, most of which they have no intention of fulfilling even if it were possible to fulfill them and it is in that direction that I am trying to lead your thoughts.

You and I have stuck together through thick and thin in the past and what has been achieved is to the complete satisfaction and good of us all. What is more important, we are all happy about. Let us therefore, look forward in that same spirit to strive to do all the good for all the people at all times."

That was in 1959. Those are immortal words befitting our situation today. It will serve us, one and all, to heed that advice of the late T.W. Farrington and Mr. Ormond Panton.

Our country can only take so many people. Our social fabric will not hold up much longer. The peace and tranquility for which we are renowned is being threatened. It is so because Caymanians feel threatened. Runaway development has taken its toll, while there are those amongst us with get-rich-quick ideas, there are those of us who are concerned about the long term effects.

I have some goals for the decade ahead. The first goal has been said by the Member for Bodden Town. The decade of youth. It will then be our duty to balance the labour availability with the economic development activities to ensure that the growth occurs at the desired rates and to ensure to the maximum degree possible that new jobs being created are for Caymanians. We must determine the long range growth for our economic sectors and devise labour budgets to fit those growth needs which includes looking at the available Caymanian labour and what foreign workers will be required. We must set a time table for replacement by Caymanian labour policy. We must upgrade and expand the general education levels to meet the growth in the financial sectors, not tomorrow because we should have started on that long ago. We must do more. We must increase both the Governmental and required private training in the technical and professional areas by the expanded curriculum, mandatory understudy requirements and on the job training. We must continue to increase the business opportunities for Caymanians by providing protection for Caymanian owned businesses from competition by foreign owned businesses. We must continue to provide job training in the areas currently occupied by expatriates. We need to do that today. We need to strengthen the priority given to Caymanian labour in hiring practices.

In my opinion, these are worthwhile goals for these Cayman Islands. Any development taking place now should be done with the average Caymanian in mind. See what his total benefits will be. A majority of Caymanians today are concerned as to where we are headed. It is the job of the Government to make sure that development is done with the wishes of our Caymanian people in mind.

The Members of Executive Council will have my support, even if propaganda is trotted out by the Members of the Executive Council. I have taken my responsibility seriously. They want cooperation? They must cooperate. It has been said that it is a two way street. I have told my country - and I tell the Members in this House - that I am not going to stand to be bamboozled by any Member on that side. In the past decade I have done my share. I wish I could have done more. I look forward to the new decade, the decade of youth, for youth. "The woods are lonely, dark and deep. I have miles to go before I sleep, miles to go before I sleep."

I thank our Honourable Financial Secretary for his Budget presentation. I look forward to getting what is best for us in the Finance Committee of the Cayman Islands, where we have a majority.

Thank you.

The First Elected Member for the Lesser Islands.

MR. PRESIDENT:

CAPT. MABRY S. KIRKCONNELL:

Thank you, Mr. President.

I rise to offer my contribution to the debate on the Second Reading of the Appropriation (1990) Bill, 1989. This is the tenth Budget that I have had the opportunity as a representative of the district of the Lesser Islands, the Sister Islands, to offer my contribution and I am very grateful to that constituency for having returned me to the House to have this opportunity. I take my responsibility very seriously. I would like to say to all within the listening audience that I feel it is a privilege and a pleasure that we have Parliamentary democracy within the Cayman Islands and the opportunity of free Elections, genuine free Elections, where we can choose who stands in this House to represent us.

I also have the distinction of being the only Elected Member who resides off the Island of Grand Cayman, so some of the kinds of air transport and other differentials hit me harder than it does my colleague, the Second Elected Member of the Lesser Islands who resides in Grand Cayman. But, nevertheless, we are very happy that we do have two representatives from the Lesser Islands here to represent our people.

Before congratulating the Honourable First Official Member, the Financial Secretary, on his Budget Address, I would like to make some brief remarks concerning events in this House during the year 1989.

As I said, all of us being duly Elected to represent our constituents have a very definite responsibility to the nation and we have the obligation to chart the future course on which these Islands should go. We should all take this responsibility, and I am certain that we all do, very, very seriously. I am concerned that during recent months and on many occasions, many very unpleasant situations have arisen which, as historians write our history, may not be a very beneficial chapter in our history in the final

analysis. I call upon all of my colleagues here today to let us attempt as we go forward into the decade of the 1990s to put our differences behind us and let us unite as the team we were elected to be. Let us try to be as open with each other as is physically possible. I fully realise that due to collective responsibility and the Executive responsibility placed on the Executive Council, they have certain things that cannot be discussed with us Backbenchers. But I would ask them to please keep this side of the House as fully informed as is humanly possible in order for us to be able to keep our constituents informed.

I would like to say this: It is most embarrassing when I return to Cayman Brac and am confronted by some of my constituents (who were not necessarily my supporters) asking questions when they already have the answers which I, unfortunately, do not have. They then say, 'You know what I am saying is correct. You might as well admit it.' I say, 'Honestly I do not, I have not heard that before.' Therefore, what I am trying to emphasize today is that I think I could be a better representative if I was better informed. I think each and every Backbencher could be a better representative if they were better informed. I am not asking for the confidential information to be divulged to us as I am fully conversant with our Constitution and the responsibilities of the Executive branch. I hasten at this time to say that I support the Executive Council. I recognise that they were elected by the Members of this Honourable House to that high position and we look to them for their leadership. I am not here to be critical of anything that is being done, any criticisms that I may give will be given in a manner of constructive criticism for the betterment of this country.

I hasten to say that the constituency which I represent is unique inasmuch as we are separated by over 60 miles of ocean water between the shores of Grand Cayman, Cayman Brac and Little Cayman. The other outlying districts in Grand Cayman would fare no better as far as employment and development if they had similar water distances between their districts. Most of those outlying districts seek employment within the George Town area. They seek medical services, central Government facilities and everything from George Town. It is just that they have the good fortune of having road networks connecting them with central George Town. Therefore, consideration must be given to Cayman Brac and Little Cayman in a very special manner.

It has been said from time to time that possibly we get more than our share of the Capital Budget. I do not know just what ratio you would use to share it up, whether it is a population basis. I think we should put in on human needs and necessities. We need a hospital and air service. We need everything that everyone living in downtown George Town needs and those living in East End and West Bay have the same needs as those in George Town. Therefore, I cannot find a formula that I know of which would be correct to determine what percentage each district should get in Capital Projects.

I do say, that over the past many years that I have been in this House the criteria for which I have asked for the Capital investments to be made in Cayman Brac has been to supply labour to the people of my district. As I said we cannot seek employment in the other districts because of our remote location and the Capital projects that are labour intensive need to be available when there is nothing going in the private sector. So to stand in this House and say that we have gotten too much or too little - I do not know when I would be correct in saying which one. Again, I would like to say that we of the Lesser Islands (and we do not particularly like that title I prefer to call it the Sister Islands but in the Constitution that is how we are referred to) have great respect for the central Government. We realise the benefits of a three Island nation; we realise that our revenue is not sufficient for the capital projects and the recurrent expenses that are spent there, but we are doing everything within our power to increase those revenues. Revenues in the District Administration has gradually increased. It is my hope this year that for the first time we may approach the \$2 million mark in revenue collected in that district.

Before I go on to the actual part of the Budget, I would like to make one last appeal to the Honourable Members of this House to let us, as we go into Finance Committee and we go into meetings in the years to come in our duly elected positions here until 1992, follow the words of a former President of the United States who I had the opportunity of meeting when I was at the University where he lectured us several times, President Lyndon Baines Johnson (the President who succeeded John F. Kennedy after his assassination). When referring to unity or cooperation he always had to motto for the best way to be successful: "We come to reason, not to dominate; we do not seek to have our way, but to find a common way." I say today a common way for both sides of this Honourable House - the 12 Elected Members, the four Honourable Elected Members of the Executive Council with their three Official colleagues and the eight Backbenchers - can be the proper way for the future development and continued prosperity of the Cayman Islands.

MR. PRESIDENT: Excuse me, would it be convenient to break here before you go into the Budget? Proceedings are suspended until 2:15.

AT 12:43 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 2:26 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Proceedings of the House are resumed. The First Elected Member for the Lesser Islands continuing.

CAPT. MABRY S. KIRKCONNELL: Thank you, Mr. President. When we took the lunch break I was just completing my preliminary remarks. I would like to congratulate the Honourable First Official Member, our Financial Secretary, on the very comprehensive Budget Address which he delivered in his usual eloquent manner to this Honourable House. The format was substantially different from what we have experienced or heard him deliver in this

Honourable House in previous years. But I think it was very timely, as we approach the 1990s. It had a lot of economic statistics and its definitely a valuable reference document.

As I have said here before, I think the Budget Address and the Throne Speech should be bound in order for it to become a part of the libraries of this country for future references, in particular this one with its statistical analysis, I think would be helpful to many of us in determining where we have come from and what it takes to get us to where we want to go. This year has been a good year, in my opinion, for the Cayman Islands. We have been very fortunate in not having experienced a hurricane as we did in the previous year, and our economic development has continued at a rapid pace. I am very grateful that we are once again able to stand in this House and debate the prospects of a balanced Budget for the year 1990. Indeed a very large Budget, but a Budget that the country can definitely support. I shall deal with separate Heads as we go along in more detail later.

The Judiciary: I would like to express my appreciation to our retiring Chief Justice, Mr. Collett, as he has served this country well in his high capacity and I wish for him a very happy and long retirement in his native country. I think the country has benefited much by his short term with us. One of the many things that I think the country will remember him by is the fact that he started getting the court reporter to help record the affairs of our Courts. We still have problems with housing for our Courts. I hope that will soon be able to be adjusted and the use of the Town Hall will not be necessary. Previous Members have spoken about the need for a Family Court and this is an area which I think would definitely have to be looked into. We must ensure that justice is administered, and there is no place better to start than in the family itself to try and correct anything that would disrupt our family organisations because I think the stability of our nation begins with a good home.

A very important part of our Budget, some \$11 million, will be spent on education this year. I feel that, too, is something that we can be proud of. Our education system has developed over the years at a pace which has matched our economic development. We will never reach a perfect system, as even the major developed countries are constantly having to change systems and improve external examination and all of this, but on a whole I think for a very small country as the Cayman Islands are, we can be justly proud of the system which has been provided. I look forward to the expansion of the Community College and the construction of a new home for it. I hope that during 1990 we will see the first phase of that construction completed so that the college can move into its new home.

The Community College is very necessary in order that we can keep pace with the educational needs of this nation. In the earlier days the grammar school education, or an elementary education, was sufficient to get you by somehow - then in secondary you could scrape through. But today that is no longer possible. To reach the heights that all Caymanians strive to reach a higher education is needed. I look forward to the day when the Cayman Islands Government Community College can expand to a four year institution where they can issue tertiary degrees in different subjects.

The first and most important phase will be a Teachers College as that is something we need to look very seriously at. As our population grows we will need more teachers. It is an expensive venture bringing expatriate teachers in from overseas and it is an opportunity for Caymanians to improve their own financial status and our culture will be preserved if Caymanians are teaching Caymanians. So I look forward not only for the introduction of the new Community College in its new buildings, but also the continuation of the Community College Branch which is held at the High School in Cayman Brac. The people of Cayman Brac are very grateful for the extension courses that are offered there and we look forward to an extended curriculum as the years go by.

I would now like to touch on health. Much has been said in this House pertaining to health. I am one Member who would like to express my appreciation to the Honourable Member responsible for Health and Social Services. We can never overestimate the importance of health to a community. In a time like this, when serious diseases and epidemics are around the world, we need to build up stronger medical facilities in the prevention of the spread of disease in our territory. A few years ago a few hospital beds could handle our needs, but today we live in a very complicated world and the health fields are more complicated than most others.

Medical care is expensive in the outside world. It has been particularly high in cost because of malpractice insurance which has become a part of the medical profession in the outside world. Some medical practitioners are paying in excess of \$150,000 to \$200,000 per year for just for malpractice insurance. Therefore, their fees must be high. When we as a Government are forced to send people who are not able to pay their own bills overseas we must expect that this fee will run into hundreds of thousands of dollars in countries where malpractice insurance and the cost of doing business is expensive, as it is in the industrialised nations. Therefore, it is very important that we provide facilities to handle, not all but most, cases that we will encounter here in Cayman. Those requiring tertiary medical care will continue to have to be sent to the specialised institutions overseas I realise, but we will be able to eliminate much of what is now having to go overseas.

I realise the facilities here in George Town are crowded. I understand that we lack sufficient beds to properly accommodate the population. It is quite a problem finding surgical beds sometimes and ordinary beds most of the time. This is a serious problem. It is not one that we can put on the back burner, waiting and hoping that time will cure it. As the population increases one of the things we are sure of is that people will continue to be ill at times. I do feel that we are going to have to make some interim repairs or improvements to the present site while we prepare for the new medical centre complex, which we hope will be built on another site. As all Members know, something as complex as a hospital is not something that you can pick up a plan in any architect's office and get on with its construction. It has to be tailored to the needs of this community. It has to be tailored to the needs for a specific time, whether we are building a hospital for 10 years, 20

years, or whatever it is, all of this must be taken into consideration and a major study must be made prior to this construction. I have had some experience within the medical field and I know what it is to be involved when you are trying to save a life and the equipment you have is just not adequate. You feel helpless and there is nothing you can do but say that you did your best. We, as legislators, want to be able to say in here that we did our best in providing the best medical care that we could for the people of the Cayman Islands.

I realise that the district clinics play an important part. As far as creating inpatient facilities here in the districts of Grand Cayman I really do not subscribe to that. I think we would be defeating the purpose of trying to create a central medical facility providing the type of medical care that we need. As I said earlier, it is a different story because of the geographical location of Cayman Brac and Little Cayman for in-bed facilities and outpatient facilities, both must be provided there. I hasten to say not because that is the district that I represent, but because we cannot drive by highway to the hospital in Grand Cayman.

I would like to say to the Honourable Member that I offer him my support in anything that I can do. I think he has been very energetic since he took over the Portfolio. He has handled it in a most professional manner and I am happy that we are moving ahead. I fully realise that we have to be cautious with our expenditures. We are not a country of the stature of the United States of America, or others that can become a debtor nation and not worry about it. We must be cautious in what we spend and that will have to be taken with due consideration, but I think we must establish our priorities and certainly education and health must be very high on our list of priorities.

As I said before, I do not feel that the new facility will be in place in time to solve the needs of the George Town hospital now, so I think some arrangements on an interim basis are going to have to be done within the complex we now have to provide additional beds. I do not know just how the Honourable Member can arrange this, but I see a need.

I go now to the Ships Registration. Ships registration has become, in my opinion, a much needed addition to our Island. I was one of the Members here who was very supportive of us not closing our Ship's Registry. I think most of us have had a seafaring career of our own and our ancestors had seafaring backgrounds, therefore, we fit into the shipping circles. We have what can be accepted world wide as a first class Marine Survey Unit and a first class Ships Registry. It is up to par with the United Kingdom or any of the other leading flags of the world. I am very proud that it can no longer be said that the Cayman Islands is a flag of convenience. I am also very happy that all the conventions necessary to make us that type of registry have been extended to us. In particular, the arrangement for manning has been worked out. That has been most necessary to make our registration a success.

One thing I would like to speak about with regard to the Ship Registration is that I think we need to look into a classification for smaller vessels with a limited distance offshore. Most territories have classifications for 'lighters' which land short cargo inside harbours and deal with passengers from cruise ships. Certain requirements will not be the same as it is for ocean going vessels. A similar classification will have to be established for our live aboard dive boats as this is an essential part of the tourist industry. I think it offers great potential for development here in the Cayman Islands, but we want to make sure that we offer a safe and secure leg of our industry. So I think if it could be looked into, a separate classification limited by the distance offshore, which would lessen the severe requirements for international trade which our Marine Survey Department must adhere to, would be very beneficial to small fisherman, ferry boat operators, deep sea fishermen and the live aboard dive boats and other very small freighters.

It is true that we have a 60 mile span of water between here and Cayman Brac, but probably some special concessions could be given for the trip across on a one trip basis, as is now being done for fuel transport. I feel this is necessary and I would ask the Honourable Member responsible if he would look into this, otherwise I am afraid that we are going to lose what can be changed and those that cannot be changed will just have to go out of business because it is impossible for some of the real small operators to get their vessels that are not built to specifications to meet the standards required by international marine standards.

I would again like to congratulate Radio Cayman on its broadcasting coverage. We are proud that we have our own radio station and it is very much appreciated in my district because through that we are able to keep abreast of the happenings here in Grand Cayman and also we can hear the broadcast of the Legislative Assembly. One problem we still have is that we are having problems with the A.M. broadcast. The F.M. seems to have been corrected and certain people who have some experience with broadcasting radio have said to me that one of the solutions would be if the transmitter which is now located at Gun Bluff in East End were located in Cayman Brac, East End would get equally as good coverage. But Cayman Brac would not be on the extreme fringe area, it would offer better reception to those two Islands. Also, it would enable it to be operated there from Cayman Brac Power and Light facilities that in the event of Radio Cayman being off the air completely, a small transmitting station could be put in place there so it could be broadcast from Cayman Brac in case of a national emergency. I would ask the Member if he would give some consideration to that matter. But we do wish to congratulate them for the service they are rendering.

The Immigration Department: Mr. President, this is a very important Department and they are the ambassadors of good will. They are usually the first Caymanians that the tourists coming to this Island meet, and the impression that our tourists get of Cayman and its people is from an immigration officer. The attitude they have is very important. Most of them are very friendly and I know it is appreciated by the people coming here. It is unfortunate that we do not seem to be able to recruit enough to get our immigration service up to its full staff, but I am very grateful to some of its loyal employees who are willing to work long hours of overtime to provide the necessary facilities at Owen Roberts Airport for the late arrival of aircraft. We congratulate them for the job they are doing.

We look forward to their new headquarters which will be completed in the year 1990. We hope that they will have much more comfortable quarters in which to work. The

separation of the Caymanian Protection Board from the Immigration Department will enable both to function, in my opinion, more efficiently and to operate separately. Right now they are doing wonders to operate in the small quarters that they now have.

We are now looking at Immigration Legislation and the Protection Law. We have had several meetings in the Select Committee and I am sure there will be many more. We do hope that we will get sufficient input from the public that when the amendments are made it will be what the public wants and will be a workable law. Over the years certain elements have suffered from restrictions, and our goal would be to have this be corrected. I feel we have to provide protection for our Caymanian workers but at the same time, we have to provide labour for our Caymanian employers who cannot find labour here in the Cayman Islands.

There are certain areas of employment Caymanians do not want to get involved in. Not necessarily that they do not want to work for what they are being paid, but they do not particularly want to do that type of work. In my opinion, we are going to continue to have to allow domestic help, gardeners and particularly farm labour to come into these Islands. I know in Cayman Brac we have an acute shortage of help to the farmers. The few farmers that we have in Cayman Brac have a very difficult time (when their crops produce) getting their crops to market. Most people listening to me may not know, but most of the farming in Cayman Brac is done on the Bluff and there is no road to most of that territory. Therefore, it becomes very difficult and the produce has to be carried by the individual on his back to the nearest edge of the Bluff or the road. That becomes very hard and tedious work. As I said there are certain types of work that Caymanians just do not want to do.

I know, from talking with people of the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB), that one of the avenues they would support us in is agriculture. They would support feeder roads for farmers and I feel that this would be an avenue which we have discussed with the Honourable Member responsible for Communication, Works and Natural Resources. Although there is no appropriation in the Budget because of financial restraints this year, I am asking him, as the year goes by, if some consideration could be given. We are not talking about a black-top road, we are talking about an access road so that a pick-up truck could get nearer to the cultivation, and the farmers could at least reap their crops. This would be very beneficial.

Our Police Department is another very important department. That, too, is suffering from not being able to get up to full strength. We have a need for a few more constables in my district as well. We are fortunate that we do not have the problems as severe as you have here, so we can continue with what we have until a higher rate of recruitment can be secured. I compliment the Police Force. Many of our young men from Cayman Brac are serving in the Police Force here in Grand Cayman and I try to encourage the young people to seek the employment as their profession. I think it is a very honourable job. It is not an easy job, particularly, to police your own friends, but it shows that we have people with integrity when they can be policemen within their own community and they are contributing to the development of their country.

While speaking on health, I should have spoken on Social Services, but I have them separated so I will go back to that now. Social services plays a very important part in our aging population. The Cayman Islands is finding itself now with a population rapidly approaching retirement age with no retirement provisions made. In earlier days many of them were covered by Seamen Unions in the United States and other countries, and also by the U.S. Social Security System. Since they have returned home to work they do not have that benefit to look forward to on retirement and the burden on our Social Service system is becoming even greater. They have a large task. I think they are doing a good job. We do need more social workers. District social workers are very important, but nevertheless, we must crawl before we can walk.

I particularly would like to speak on the Housing Development Corporation. I congratulate the Member responsible, the Honourable Member for Health and Social Services, in the way he has revitalised with the injection of new capital which has been raised. They are now able to offer more loans to more young Caymanians who are in need of a home. It is hard to make some of our young Caymanians understand that they must start with a small home but, nevertheless, you finally get them to understand that you cannot build a \$100,000 house for \$45,000. Nevertheless, it is wonderful that this country is in a financial position that it can offer loans to young Caymanians at an interest rate better than the commercial institutions and we have giant commercial institutions in our country. It is regrettable that more of those giants have not seen fit to buy debentures in the Housing Development Corporation and let the Government take the risk. I encourage them all to come forth and fill out the \$5 million subscription in order for the Government to provide housing for all the young Caymanians who need homes.

It is almost impossible for people in the lower income bracket to qualify to buy a home under the short period of loans to be amortised in five years. It is just physically impossible to be repaid out of their earnings. So I ask all institutions who have not subscribed to help the Housing Development Corporation, to come forth and make their contribution and realising that they will be lifting the standard of living in the Cayman Islands. I would also like to ask the Honourable Member if arrangements could be made when applications from people in Cayman Brac have progressed to a certain point, if an arrangement for a loans officer to go to Cayman Brac and talk with the clients directly would be possible. I try to do my best to talk with them, but not being a banker nor a loans officer, many times I am unable to convince them and it takes months for them to ever get their loan applications completed. If this professional individual could come over for a day or two, at specified periods when a request for a loan has been made, I think it would speed up the process and would be encouraging to the people there that are in need of homes.

It was very encouraging to hear the Honourable Member of Communications, Works and Natural Resources report a few days ago (in answer to a Parliamentary Question which I asked) about the possibility of potable water, desal water, being available in Cayman Brac sometime during 1990. This has been an item that has always been in short supply in Cayman Brac and it is something that is much

needed. I feel confident that we will get the support of all the hotels and all the commercial customers. He said that there is a possibility of a piped pressure system in the West End area, which is even better than I had hoped for, and I am very grateful for this report. It is something that I have asked for and thought about from the time I came into this House and I am very grateful to know that it is moving ahead. I can assure the Honourable Member that I will continue to support it any way that I can.

The Planning Department: Many people in this country do not realise the important function of the Planning Department and the amount of work which is done by this department. It is almost always understaffed. Again, they have a problem in recruiting particularly office staff and Building Inspectors, but without the Planning Department to control development and the Central Planning Authority to approve applications we would have a chaotic situation in our building industry. I would like to congratulate Miss Christine Ballard, our Director of Planning, for the very capable job she is doing as Head of that Department, also the other members of her staff and Mr. David Arch as the Chairman of the Central Planning Authority. At many meetings the Central Planning Authority is there until 7:00 P.M., or later, in order to clear the agenda and to keep development going.

As has been said in this Honourable House before, one of our really very serious needs is a complete review of the Regulations of the Development and Planning Law of 1977. This is long overdue. It is very difficult to administer and it does not cover most of the more important aspects of this development. I ask the Honourable Second Official Member responsible for legal affairs if he would give this his attention. It falls under the Honourable Member for Communications and Works, as far as Planning, but the legal part is our Honourable Second Official Member's. It is most essential because the Planning Department is having great difficulty, and as the projects get larger and larger, the consequences become larger and larger.

Lands and Survey: This is another department that has a large volume of business. For some reason, they seem to be overworked, particularly in the Survey Department. When there are subdivisions it is very difficult to get the mutations done and the parcel numbers assigned. Sometimes it is actually months. For people who have a lot of time that is fine, but for somebody who is in a hurry to do a development, it can be a very costly project if you have to sit and pay interest on money while you wait to get the subdivision approved and the parcel numbers assigned so that titles can be issued. The Lands and Survey, as I said before, are very busy and they are essential to our well-being, but if we are to continue to develop we need this particular area speeded up - whether it needs additional staff or what, I do not know - but the time frame is a bit long.

Tourism: Much has been said, since hurricane Gilbert about a downturn in tourism, but I am very grateful to know that has turned around and it is on the upswing. I believe that we are producing a good product and think that tourism will continue to grow in these Islands. If we continue to give value for money I think the Cayman Islands will continue to grow as a tourist destination. There are fears as we see major changes taking place around the world (which none of us thought would take place just a couple of months ago - Glasnost and all of the others), nevertheless, I feel the Cayman Islands with its stable Government and its friendly people will continue to get its fair share of tourists from North America and Europe.

One thing I would like to touch on very briefly is what the Honourable Member for Tourism, Aviation and Trade, spoke about on the possibility of a moratorium on hotel construction for a five year period. I agree that there is some need, particularly in the West Bay beach area. Of course, the amendment to the Hotel Aids Law sometime ago sought to correct that. I would like to caution the Member that, particularly in the Lesser Islands, for tourism to really be viable we need at least three times the number of rooms that we have now in order for Cayman Airways' jets to have a full load and the air service would be improved. So I would ask, before any very serious consideration is taken to curtailing all districts, that very, very serious consideration be given to the underdeveloped districts of the Cayman Islands.

We have a very able Civil Aviation Department. I think we can be justly proud of the job they are doing. We are proud of the new terminal in Cayman Brac which is now operated by Civil Aviation and the progress that has been made there and also here in Grand Cayman. We realise that Cayman Brac does not pay its way, as far as Civil Aviation is concerned, but we would hope that the day will come when that tide will turn and can be more supportive. We are very grateful that with the introduction of approach lights at the western end of the Gerrard-Smith Airport, night flights of the jets were reinstated to Cayman Brac. This has improved air service there immensely and it is my hope that there will be no problem in the future that would force a curtailment. The past history with Cayman Brac has been that as soon as we get accustomed to a service and the travel agents were familiar, something came up and it was cancelled. We had to start all over again and this just defeated the purpose.

We are trying to build up tourism and better service. So I sincerely hope that if there is anything else that is necessary, from a civil aviation standpoint, that we will have sufficient notice that it can be installed, or the necessary corrections can be made that will prevent any future cancellations of jets. We do feel that if Cayman Brac and Little Cayman is to continue to develop, if land sales are to continue, we must continue to be in the jet age. The commuter type, propeller driven aircraft are very handy for commuter travel but the international travellers are accustomed to jets around the world and without jet service to Cayman Brac, we are not going to attract the quantity of tourists that we need.

Turning now to Cayman Airways: Mr. President, Cayman Airways during the year 1989, history has again repeated itself. It has been a political football. It has been a very popular topic. I have been on one side of that argument. I hope the right side. Nevertheless, time and history will record who was right and who was wrong. But, I would like to say to all Members that Cayman Airways now has two lovely 737-400s which I am proud to fly on. I think all the people of the Cayman Islands should patronise Cayman Airways, realising that if we do not patronise them in the form of tickets, we are going to have to patronise them in the form of subsidy, an increased subsidy.

I would never want this country to be without its own national airline. Those of us who are old enough remember when British West Indian Airways changed their equipment with very short notice (and could not land at Owen Roberts Airport) and gave notice that they were discontinuing service to Grand Cayman. Had it not been for Lasca we would have been completely out of international air travel. We cannot afford to let this happen again. I feel that we must accept Cayman Airways as we do our road network, or our hospital, or our education system. It is definitely an integral part of our infrastructure. We must not decide that because we are not getting a profit back from it, it must be disbanded. If we do, and foreign directors meet in a director's meeting and decide that the load factors on the flights going to Grand Cayman have been too low, and they will be suspended that is all you will hear. That will be the end of air travel.

I am very concerned that over 300 Caymanians (maybe not all Caymanians but 300 in total) are employed by Cayman Airways. Many of these young men and women have chosen a career in aviation and if Cayman Airways was ever disbanded there would be very little future for these young individuals who have a very promising career in an upcoming field if our flag carrier was not available to hire them,

I caution that it is not hard to issue an order and close something down. It is very difficult to start it up and get it back to the position it was in before you closed it. I feel it is an essential service. I think it is, as I said before, a part of our way of life. We are a small Island dependent on many things on the outside world and we must continue to control our air travel here without being completely dependent on foreign carriers.

MR. PRESIDENT: How long do you think you will need?

CAPT. MABRY S. KIRKCONNELL: About 15 minutes.

MR. PRESIDENT: Well, let us take the break. Proceedings are suspended for 15 minutes.

AT 3:15 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 3:46 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Proceedings of the House are resumed. The First Elected Member for the Lesser Islands continuing.

CAPT. MABRY S. KIRKCONNELL: Mr. President, when we took the break, I was about to start on the District Administration. The year 1989 has been a busy year with almost full employment in all trades in Cayman Brac. In the private sector, the Tiara Beach Hotel project has continued throughout the year. Tibbett's Shopping Centre in West End, Cayman Brac, and the Steve Foster Cottage Development on the south coast has been the largest projects under construction. Many private homes are presently under construction. The major Government capital projects have been the construction of several secondary feeder roads and the reconstruction of Burt Morrison Drive. This is the road that leads to the hotels on the south coast of Cayman Brac and the Aston Reed Drive which is a cross-island rough road in Cayman Brac.

In Little Cayman a major road construction project is under construction. This is to realign, raise and widen the south coast road leading from the village in Little Cayman to the Point of Sand, which is the south/eastern point. The major development on Little Cayman in the private sector has been the Cayman Brac Power and Light installation of generating equipment and distribution lines to most of the south coast of Little Cayman. It is hoped that they will be ready to commence the distribution of electricity before the end of the year 1989. This is a bold step for a company the size of Cayman Brac Power and Light and I wish to congratulate their Manager, Director, Chairman and their staff for this undertaking, a company which is almost entirely owned by Caymanians, to undertake a project the size of this with the low potential revenue which they will generate in Little Cayman certainly took a lot of courage.

I wish them the very best of luck in their venture because I know it will be the beginning of development in Little Cayman as electricity has played a major part here in Grand Cayman and also in Cayman Brac. The electricity there will be supplied, along the south coast first and as soon as the cross Islands road is completed, near to their generating plant, they will run their lines up along the north coast, east to west.

A major problem in Little Cayman during this year has been air service, because we continue to have problems with the Shorts SD330 aircraft. The capacity to take passengers out of Little Cayman (because the strip is rather short in length and is a grass strip) is limited to a maximum, under normal conditions, of eight passengers. The Shorts is capable of taking 30 from an airport such as Grand Cayman or Cayman Brac, but in Little Cayman it is a maximum of eight and sometimes it is reduced even further depending on conditions. The number of passengers taken out on any one flight is decided by the pilot on the situation existing at the time. This makes it very difficult to plan because you never really know how many will be able to be lifted when the plane does come in.

We must do something during the year 1990 to improve the air service to Little Cayman. I sympathise with the hoteliers trying to do business in Little Cayman. Cayman Brac has a problem, but Little Cayman has a much larger one as that is their sole source of getting passengers in and out.

The economy of Cayman Brac and Little Cayman continues to look good as long as the present construction projects are underway. Most major projects that we know of have been completed or are nearing completion, namely, the airport terminal which was done by Civil Aviation and the

Government has been completed; the Tibbett's Shopping Centre is due to open later this month; the Tiara Beach Hotel expansion itself has been completed; there are time-share apartments, one will be occupied by the end of 1989 and the other one expected in the first quarter of 1990. It is my understanding that the other major project that the Tiara Beach had planned to do will not take place as planned. This gives me great concern for without construction projects we are going to suffer a severe downturn in our economy and employment. I look to some other private sector investor to start a project, but as of now there are several projects in the talking stage but none that I know of starting within the near future.

What has contributed, in my opinion, more to the upswing in the economy in Little Cayman and Cayman Brac, has been the 5 per cent import duty concession. Most of those houses are now completed and there are a few applications which I hope may be started before the Tiara Beach project is finished. This has certainly been beneficial and I am happy that it is extended for a further period (that is the 5 per cent incentive on duty for condos and Caymanians returning home). I think this is the proper time to address the problem of the slowing down of the economy here in Grand Cayman. I fully realise that there is a problem here with the heating up of the economy but I think it is imperative that the Government try to integrate the three Islands in a more positive way, so development could take place on Cayman Brac and Little Cayman as well, and maybe the outlying districts here on this Islands. My real concern is that although I stand here and admit that I realise that it is necessary, my concern is that it is no problem for Members of this House to pass legislation which can slow down the economy, it is another story whether you can pass legislation which can start it up again. That may be in our hands and I doubt that it would be.

Investor confidence and security is an important factor. I would like to recommend that very serious consideration be given to advertising the possibility of company registration in Cayman Brac. I realise that there is a lot of difference in the stage of development of Cayman Brac and that of Grand Cayman, in particular the George Town area, but I am also aware that the development in the Turks and Caicos Islands is far behind Grand Cayman and also the development of Tortola in the British Virgin Islands; yet they are rapidly becoming recognised competitors of the Cayman Islands as off-shore registration destinations. I do not see why, if proper incentives were given, we could not attract investors to register companies in Cayman Brac and to operate. At the present time the rent is cheaper in Cayman Brac than it is in Grand Cayman and I am sure that there are people who would build the necessary office buildings available to rent, provided tenants were available. So I would ask that serious consideration be given to this. If an improvement in our revenue earning ability could be made, it would help generate revenue for the Government, while at the same time improving the economic conditions in the Lesser Islands.

I realise that you cannot tell an investor where to go, neither can you give him a cheaper rate, but possibly for new companies coming in some arrangements could be made. I have always had as my motto, "Where there is a will there is a way."

The estimated ordinary Revenue for the year 1990 is \$98.2 million and this includes a \$4 million contribution from the CAL escrow account. Estimated recurrent expenditure will be approximately \$83.8 million and this excludes the Water Authority revenue. Capital expenditure is estimated at C\$18.3 million and \$14.2 million of this will come from local financing and \$4 million from loans. Again, we see new services amounting to \$2.4 million. Our total Budget for the year amounts to \$110,864,356.00. This is indeed, a large sum of money for such a small country, but I am very happy to know that the Lord has blessed us that we are again able to stand in this House and speak of such large figures. I ask almighty Gods' continued blessing on these Islands.

In closing, Mr. President, I would like to thank you for your leadership over this year. I would like to extend my appreciation to the Clerk and her staff, the Sergeant and Miss Mary for all their kindness to me here. If I do not have the opportunity to speak again, I would like to take this opportunity to extend a very Merry Christmas and a happy and prosperous 1990 to you, Mr. President, and your wife, to the Clerk and her Staff, and to all the people of the Cayman Islands I say Merry Christmas and a happy New Year.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Honourable Third Official Member.

HON. J. LEMUEL HURLSTON: Mr. President, I rise to make my small contribution to the Second Reading debate of the Appropriation (1990) Bill, 1989. I would like to begin by endorsing the many accolades that have been extended to my colleague, the Honourable First Official Member, for his precedent-setting Budget Address, delivered on the 17th November, 1989. It summarises the activities of this country during the 1980s and makes a very bold attempt at forecasting expected developments on the 1990s.

It is said that at the end of every successful trading period a merchant should stop and take stock, particularly of his inventory items, and prepare his balance sheet before proceeding to embark upon the next period of trading. Governments, regrettably, do not seem to have the luxury of being able to close down the shop whilst the taking of stock and inventory occurs. Nevertheless, my understanding of what the Honourable First Official Member has given us in the Budget Speech is an indication that perhaps we need to pause and begin as best as possible to take stock and chart the course for the future of the Cayman Islands. I believe a number of stock-taking activities have already commenced and these include the conducting of a population census and the preparations for the work on the development of a comprehensive Economical and Physical Plan.

We anxiously await the outcome of these and other studies because they will help us to understand how well we have traded in the 1980s and how well we might anticipate the results of the 1990s. It is also said that global change in the next five years alone (let alone the next decade) is

going to be described as dizzying change, meaning that the change is going to be major, substantial and rapid. In preparation for that roller-coaster ride, it would serve us well to be reasonably trained and prepared to undergo that bumpy journey.

I will make a few comments on a number of areas falling under my responsibility and to perhaps answer a few points of concern that have been raised thus far in the debate by Members. I would like to begin by summarising the position in respect of the Portfolio of Internal and External Affairs as reflected in the revised financial position for 1989 and looking at the projected expenditure for 1990.

The Portfolio of Internal and External Affairs is comprised of seven Heads of Estimates, numbers 15 through 21 inclusive, 15 being the Administration of the Portfolio, 16 being the Broadcasting Department, 17 being the Immigration Department, 18 Police, 19 Prisons, 20 Personnel and Management Services and 21 District Administration. The year 1989 commenced with a total approved recurrent Budget of \$17.9 million. During the year, Finance Committee very kindly acquiesced on two separate applications to supplementary expenditures for the Portfolio totalling \$1.014 million, making a total Legislatively approved expenditure package of \$18.9 million.

The Chairman and Members of the Public Accounts Committee might be interested in knowing that thus far it would appear that the Portfolio will have an end-of-year balance in hand, and will have only spent a total of \$18.3 million against an authorisation of \$18.9 million, leaving a good \$600,000 (approximately) of unspent appropriations.

The Portfolio for the year 1990, as shown in the Draft Estimates is projecting a total expenditure of \$20.5 million which represents 24 per cent of the national budget. This sum of money is broken down as follows: \$20.5 million for recurrent expenditure, \$2.8 million for capital, and \$730,000 in new services. A reasonable rate of growth has been projected in the major areas of the Portfolio and I will demonstrate, as best I can, the areas responsible where increases are likely to occur. May I first say a word or two on the matter of the Civil Service in general? The Civil Service has had a very busy year, a very difficult year, a year that has been filled with many challenges. Yet amidst all of the difficulties I am confident that we will end the year on a very high and happy note and that once again the Civil Service can be proud of its many public service accomplishments.

The Civil Service presently comprises 1,499 officers, 67 per cent of whom are Caymanians, that is, two thirds of the Civil Service being Caymanian. The remaining one third of the service (or 32.8 per cent) are currently non-Caymanians. These non-Caymanians are serving on contracted terms or in a few cases temporary or local contract terms. The 1,499 is further broken down into 950 as permanent and pensionable, 289 as overseas contracted officers, 54 local officers on local contracts and 206 on temporary service. Of the 37 Heads of Departments in the Public Service, 21 are headed by Caymanians. I regret to say, however, that the vacancy rate is running at a very high percentage. There are now over 200 posts in the establishment running vacant. This leads me to highlight one of the greatest problems that has faced the Civil Service during the year, that of being able to attract, maintain and retain good professional and support staff.

We have attempted to redress this difficulty in part by the recently conducted salaries review exercise and we are hopeful that some of the areas of difficulty will be overcome very soon. We heard Members speaking earlier placing a great emphasis on the need to improve our ability to work together as a team. One of the challenges that the Civil Service addressed very early on in this year was its ability to work together as a team. We started the year with the continuation of a senior public manager's training programme and throughout the year we have undertaken a very aggressive and ambitious inservice training and retraining activity. We started at the very top. The three Official Members of Parliament, together with Principal Secretaries and 40 heads of Government departments were immersed in two senior management workshop interventions, the first being conducted in November of 1988 and the second and final segment in January of 1989.

These workshops were designed to help to stimulate the service and the managers of the service in to making sensible plans for the future. We hope that we have achieved something from our efforts. Every Portfolio and every department has prepared a goal action plan, a mission statement and a number of steps that are required to achieve the targeted objectives. This was followed in April with a middle management workshop intervention where deputy Heads of Department and senior supervisors were given a similar opportunity to exercise their creative talents in designing programmes for their particular areas of responsibility in the Public Service - plans and programmes that had to, of necessity, dovetail and fit in with the mission statements earlier prepared by their senior officers. This was followed in the summer by a further workshop dealing with supervisors and persons in the next tier in the service. They, too, were asked to lay the groundwork for improving areas of efficiency within their units and offices.

I am happy to say that the general attitudes and outcome of all of these interventions were very positive and encouraging. It is left to be seen how effective the results are when completely implemented. It was also significant that the facilitators of these interventions in reporting on the results of the training indicated to management how pleased they were to see Caymanians and non-Caymanians alike interacting and intermixing in addressing the common problems facing a rapidly growing Civil Service.

Speaking of public and private sector cooperation and participation, later in the year the Community College in association with the Government's Personnel Training Unit organised a programme of in-service training on a day release basis for a number of persons to undertake the studying of a programme called the 'Association of Accounting Technicians' programme and there are currently 28 persons, both from the private sector and the public sector undertaking that three year academic programme. This is a fine example of the Government working with the private sector to enhance and promote the training and educational development of Caymanians. Also undertaken during the year were courses in Numeracy and Statistics through which 22 officers were put. Additionally, an ongoing clerical officers training intervention was conducted three times during the year. I say all of that in some considerable detail to emphasize that a considerable

amount of effort is being made in the area of training and development, recognising that our human capital is our most valuable resource.

I will not repeat, as I did earlier in the year, that these policies and programmes are spelled out in the Public Service General Orders. The philosophy, the general statement of intent is well documented. I would just like to complete this section by pointing out that in addition to that range of inservice training, the Training Unit of the Personnel and Management Services Department have also coordinated and liaised with a number of Caymanians who have been awarded fellowships for study abroad. Again, I crave the indulgence of the House to read a bit of detail into the record which I think is important. For example, there are three Caymanians currently studying abroad in the areas of Accountancy and Finance, one in Planning, one in Dental Technology, one in Health Inspection, two for Attorneys-at-Law local, one in Architecture, one in Social Work and one having just recently completed in Surveying and Mapping.

We also have some new students who have recently gone to train: one in Operating Technology - Medical, another in Accountancy, another in Computer Technology, another as an Electronic Technician, three in Nursing, two in Education, one in Land Survey, one for the Water Authority, one in Archives and Records Management, two in Sports and Coaching, one in Civil Engineering and one as a Pharmacy Technician. We also have studying abroad under fellowships sponsored by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) five persons: two studying Civil Engineering, one in Town Planning and two in Architecture. In addition we have a number of officers studying on short special list attachment courses. These include one in Ultrasound Techniques, one in Social Work attachments, two on an Insurance seminar, six on Building and Safety Codes, two on Computer Data Processing, two on Customer Service and Sales and 10 on Communication and Broadcasting. I would just like to re-emphasise that this is all inservice, locally funded, training together with the UNDP training component.

We have also heard that the Civil Service has become too large. Yet we hear cries for more and more services which inevitably require more and more people. In order to redress the deployment of the existing work force, the Personnel and Management Services Department is shortly to recruit an expert in organisation and methods (O AND M), more modernly referred to as Management Services Practices, and if we can have a small unit of professionals in place on an in-house basis to carry out some O and M work, we may find that we can create some savings by reorganising how we deploy our staff. We may find that this unit can pay for itself by creating savings elsewhere. However, in a rapidly developing environment and society such as this country is, it is difficult to effect considerable reductions in the total number of officers that are going to be required in that environment. We may be able to effect some economies in savings, but I doubt very much if we are going to be able to effect too many reductions in total numbers of staff. However, I am not the expert and I hope if there is any way possible of reducing the size of the service, that will be found, and found speedily.

So the problem for the Service this year was how do we maintain the high momentum of service whilst releasing as many of our staff as we possibly can to undergo in-service training and to upgrade the quality of our production. I believe that we have done reasonably well and if we can have a similar programme continuing into the future we should be able to see the results implemented into the service in terms of the efficiency and the quality of work being produced.

I hesitate to dip into an area that I know is going to be very thoroughly covered by the Honourable Member responsible for Education, but I am afraid that we are all fishing in the same pond in terms of scouting for good human resources. The Civil Service has to compete, of course, with the private sector in its desire to attract the best brains and the best Caymanians to its ranks. But one of the problems that we suffer from is that, because we are all fishing in this pond, we have to first look at the size of the pond that we are fishing in. It appears to me that the pond is very small, indeed. For example, I understand from information that I have seen just recently, that the number of high school graduates who are academically prepared to go on to post secondary education on an annual basis is less than 100. If that be the case, with the strong competition between private sector and public sector, not to mention the fact that many of these graduates will opt for neither the private sector nor the public sector - and, indeed, some of them go on to obtain scholarships and go on to do post secondary education - it leaves very few well qualified high school graduates to enter the work force. This would seem to be where our greatest difficulty lies, that is, that the size of our pool of resources is so limited to begin with, that we are not able to dent the demand that is constantly ever brewing.

In that regard I would just like to read for re-emphasis a sentence from the Budget Speech which is found on page 34, where the Honourable First Official Member highlighted what, I think, is the essence of the problem he said and I quote:

"It cannot be denied that until we develop an indigenous pool of quantity and quality professional personnel, the economy will be hard pressed to maintain its competitiveness without continuing importation of highly-trained professionals from abroad."

So that is the equation, as I see it: How do we maintain good competitive professional standards, whilst at the same time producing the professionals at such a very slow and small rate? That seems to be fundamental to the whole area of human resource development, training and Caymanianisation. We have heard that we must try to attract the best brains and the best character, together with the best money. No quarrel or disagreement with that at all. The only problem is that it is taking longer than we have, in terms of time, to produce the best brains and the best characters to match the best money. Until such time as we can produce those things ourselves, if we are to retain our competitiveness we have very little alternatives but to continue to shop around in the international market to try to bring in such expertise as is needed.

ADJOURNMENT

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON:
House until 10:00 tomorrow morning.

Mr. President, I move the adjournment of this Honourable

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that this Honourable House do now adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. I shall put the question. Those in favour please say Aye...Those against No.

AYES.

MR. PRESIDENT:
Wednesday morning at 10 o'clock.

The Ayes have it. The House is accordingly adjourned until

AT 4:30 P.M. THE HOUSE STOOD ADJOURNED UNTIL 10:00 A.M., WEDNESDAY, 6TH DECEMBER, 1989.

**WEDNESDAY
6TH DECEMBER, 1989
10:18 A.M.**

MR. PRESIDENT:
Trade to say prayers.

I will ask the Honourable Member for Tourism, Aviation and

PRAYERS

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN:

Let us Pray.
Almighty God, from whom all wisdom and power are derived: We beseech Thee so to direct and prosper the deliberations of the Legislative Assembly now assembled, that all things may be ordered upon the best and surest foundations for the glory of Thy Name and for the safety, honour and welfare of the people of these Islands.

Bless our Sovereign Lady Queen Elizabeth, the Queen Mother, Philip Duke of Edinburgh, Charles Prince of Wales, Diana Princess of Wales and all the Royal family. Give grace to all who exercise authority in our Commonwealth that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety may be established among us. Especially we pray for the Governor of our Islands, the Members of Executive Council and Members of the Legislative Assembly that they may be enabled faithfully to perform the responsible duties of their high office.

All this we ask for Thy great Name's sake, Amen.
Our Father, who art in Heaven, Hallowed be Thy Name. Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done, in earth as it is in Heaven. Give us this day our daily bread: And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us: And lead us not into temptation; but deliver us from evil: For Thine is the Kingdom, the power and the glory, for ever and ever, Amen.

The Lord bless us and keep us; the Lord make His face shine upon us and be gracious unto us: the Lord lift up His countenance upon us and give us peace now and always. Amen.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Proceedings of the House are resumed.
Government Business - the continuation of the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill, the Honourable Third Official Member continuing.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

BILLS

SECOND READING

THE APPROPRIATION (1990) BILL, 1989

(Debate continues thereon)

HON. J. LEMUEL HURLSTON:

Mr. President, yesterday, just before the adjournment I presented details of the in-service training programme that had been undertaken in the Civil Service during 1989. I believe that it was quite a heavy diet of training that has been undertaken. I tried to point out, too, that we are embarking on the establishment of a small management services unit to undertake O and M work with the view to improving the organisation and proficiency of performance within the Public Service. I would like to get off of the Public Service by making two points. The first is that by comparison the Public Service has performed better than its private sector counter parts in respect to the efforts for Caymanianisation. The Public Service has a 33 per cent non-Caymanian work force within it and this compares favourably to the 40 per cent of non-Caymanians in the private sector. This has been achieved at a time of rapid Public Service expansion and development generally.

The final point I would like to make on the Public Service is that arising from a Private Member's Motion raised in Parliament earlier this year. The Personnel and Management Services Division recently issued an amendment to General Orders which, among other things, clarified the current provisions and procedures used when dealing with the retirement of public officers, in particular those officers who wished to continue working over and beyond the mandatory retirement age of 60 years. I have issued to all Members copies of that circular and I hope and trust that helps in some way to clarify the procedures for retirees working beyond the age of retirement.

I would like to next turn to District Administration, but before I do, let me assure Members that I am not going to take too much longer. I say that in the interest of time and also in recognition of the fact that Christmas is approaching very rapidly and I would prefer if we could get on with some of the Christmas celebrations and come back in the New Year with a new determination to face the challenges that

new year must inevitably bring. I trust that Members will understand that my summary presentation of the next few topics is in an effort to conserve on the time of the House.

I am grateful to the First Elected Member for the Lesser Islands for his articulate and comprehensive presentation of the economic activities which have taken place in the District Administration in 1989. I do not wish to go over that subject at all. District Administration continues to perform reasonably well, despite slow delivery of public projects which have been the result of some delays, particularly in the surveying section. Since we are in the era of summarising events for the 1980s, I thought it might be appropriate to simply put on record the growth that has taken place in the last nine years or so in the District Administration. For example, Sir, revenue and expenditure of District Administration has increased substantially in the last nine years. In 1980 the total revenue collected in the District Administration amounted to \$626,000, compared with almost \$1.5 million nine years later, in 1988. For the first six months of 1989, revenue collected in District Administration is just under \$1 million. Expenditure, on the other hand, has increased from \$862,000 in 1980 for recurrent expenditure, to \$2.5 million of recurrent expenditure in 1988. Capital expenditure has increased from \$852,000 in 1980 to \$1.3 million in 1988. For 1989 it is projected that capital spending in District Administration will be approximately \$1.1 million.

The management of the affairs of the District Administration is carried out in a cooperative spirit. I invite the two Elected representatives to accompany me whenever I am visiting their district. They accompanied me on inspection of public projects and we generally share a very good cooperative relationship, and long may that continue.

Turning next to the Police: I would like to begin by saying that we have heard calls during this Sitting indicating that perhaps the police are growing at a rate that is beginning to raise some questions in Members' minds. I would like to begin by assuring Honourable Members that has always been a concern of the Government, not only today but always, for the size of the police force in any community makes a very bold statement and one does not wish to under do, nor over do, the level of policing in any society. Therefore, the growth in the Royal Cayman Islands Police Force is kept under constant and regular review and increases in it are merely tolerated when there is no question as to its justification.

We heard a remark that perhaps the police officers are not being properly and adequately deployed and that officers should be out engaged in drug interdiction activities rather than covering meetings in constituencies. Therefore, it might be helpful (since that appears to be the level of perception that prevails) if I simply reiterate that the Royal Cayman Islands Police Force is divided into four general branches: there is the Uniformed Branch, Marine Branch, the Criminal Investigations Branch, and there is the Administration Branch.

The Criminal Investigation Branch is subdivided into Scenes of Crime and Fingerprints, Special Branch, the Drug Squad and Intelligence. The Uniform Branch includes the officers that are stationed in Cayman Brac as well as all of the districts on Grand Cayman. Whilst they work in a coordinated and cooperative fashion, each have their distinct and separate tasks. There are policy meetings held by seniors regularly to ensure that the left hand knows what the right hand is doing and each branch ultimately dovetails into the administration and management of the force. I am satisfied, as are Government, that this branch is efficiently and well managed. These officers work long, unsociable hours under very difficult and trying circumstances, and they really deserve the fullest support of every quarter of this society.

Following a change in the management of the force earlier in the year, the present Commissioner took up appointment and commenced with a round of district consultations with members of the public. He made it abundantly clear that he was not going to be embarking upon any hastily contrived projections, but that his plans for future development of the force would only come after broad and general consultations.

The submissions contained in the 1990 Budget are, therefore, a reflection of a well thought out plan resulting in the need, in certain instances, for more equipment, more material, and more manpower resources. At all times during this process the management of the Force and the Government have kept the public informed of plans for expansion and development so that there are no last minute surprises in this regard. A recent press release indicated that if the request for new services for additional staff was granted, the Force would just now reach the size and limits as were recommended six years ago by one of Her Majesty's Inspector. Therefore, there is no question that the Police Force is over stretching itself in terms of size and capacity; if anything it is on the conservative and under provision strength.

The difficulty lies not only in the establishment of the Force, but keeping those establishments filled with competent individuals. The Force is having the same problems as everyone else in trying to attract the best brains, character and the best characteristics and attitudes of persons who wish to join the force. One Member asked why it is that we are not able to attract more Caymanians to join the force? I would have thought the answer was obvious. Caymanians have so many opportunities for employment that there are much better and more varied opportunities elsewhere for employment within the country than in the Police Force. Policemen are somewhat like teachers - you have to want to be a police officer in order to do it well, as you would have to want to be a teacher in order to engage in that profession. We are experiencing considerable difficulties in making the force attractive, particularly to the younger Caymanians; nevertheless, we soldier on.

Crime is always the topic that attracts much attention. I do not wish to over-do it on this occasion but I believe that I have a bit of good news for a change: that, generally speaking, based on the statistics gathered for the first six months of 1989, it would appear that crime may have levelled off and, in certain instances may be decreasing. Total crimes reported for the first six months of 1989 (these are preliminary figures) totalled 1,354, compared with the same period in the previous year when the total crimes reported were 1,771 - a decrease of 417, or 23 per cent. I do not want to dwell too much on the details

because they will be presented in a much more intelligent fashion in a few months' time when the 1989 Annual Report together with the Annual Statistics will be published. But just to touch on two areas of general interest, theft and burglary appear to be down by about 19 per cent and drug offences appear to be down by 32 per cent.

In the case of drugs, it could be said that part of the decrease in the numbers is the reflection of a deliberate police policy to focus more attention and resources on importation and distribution rather than consumption. For example, for the first six months of 1989, offences involving marijuana have dropped from 161, in the first six months of 1988, to 106 in the first six months in 1989 - a decrease of 34 per cent. Offences involving cocaine have reduced in number from 139, in the first six months of 1988, to 105 for the first six months in of 1989 - a decrease of 24 per cent. This is merely pointing to, hopefully, a trend of a tapering off of the level of criminal activities that are taking place in the country. We can all only hope that this is a very good omen. It could be analysed in a variety of ways. We know, for example, that the police have embarked on a very aggressive Crime Prevention Education Programme this year, particularly in trying to reduce the number of burglaries and thefts in apartments, condominiums, etcetera. All of these efforts will ultimately show dividend end results in these kinds of statistics.

It has been suggested that the police might consider establishing a Cadet Corp. I am grateful to hear Members on the Backbench offering this suggestion because it is a suggestion that is receiving active and ongoing consideration. It is part of the proposal submitted by the Police Department for the Development Plan.

Finally, on the subject of interdiction generally, may I again explain briefly that there is a basic distinction between who is responsible for interdiction of drugs when it comes to the importation of drugs into the country. The primary duty, function, and responsibility for this is not with the Royal Cayman Islands Police but with her Majesty's Customs Service. Of course, intelligence has to be shared and operations often have to be jointly carried out, but the primary responsibility for the prevention of the importation of any illegal substance, be it drugs or anything else, is principally a Customs matter. I am happy to say (as we are aware) that the Customs Department is also one of those that is headed by a dedicated Caymanian. I believe he is from the republic of West Bay...

MR. W. MCKEEVA BUSH: Not republic, Mr. President. We are not a republic.

HON. J. LEMUEL HURLSTON: Turning next to the subject of Immigration: I will try to be brief on this subject for the simple reason that as Members are aware the matter of Immigration Legislation is now the subject of a comprehensive review by a Select Committee of the House and is going to be dissected and will reappear in a new form, hopefully, in the not too distant future. An interim Report of the work of this Select Committee was laid on the Table of this Honourable House during this meeting and the Committee will press on with its task.

In the meantime, a Departmental examination of the Immigration Department and its services has been undertaken, thanks to a three month consultancy under the auspices of the Commonwealth Fund for Technical Cooperation (CFTC), and the appointment of an Immigration Advisor, in the person of Mr. Allan Carter, who completed his assignment recently and has made certain pertinent recommendations. These recommendations are now before the Government for examination, acceptance, and for implementation as resources become available. In the meantime every effort is being made to try to enhance the delivery of Public Service within the existing constraints.

Again, although only preliminary figures, I would like to place on record the growth in the grant of gainful occupation licences which have occurred in the first nine months of this year. It will be evident that the claim we often hear, that the Caymanian Protection Board is such a wicked and mean Board that people cannot get all of the permits that they need and want and desire, contrary to that belief, Sir, I believe these statistics will demonstrate that the growth in the granting of licenses has been matched by the corresponding growth in activity in the economy.

During the first nine months of this year gainful occupation licences rose from a year end total of 6,708, to a total of 8,261 as at the 30th of September this year. That represents a nine month increase of 1,553 licences, a 23 per cent increase. It also represents an average monthly grant of 172 work permits. What is significant in these statistics, however, is that they are subdivided into regular licences and single term licences and this is as a result (and reflects the Government's policy which is now two years old) of focusing on short term immigration needs whilst balancing the need for limited long term immigration. In this respect, the number of single term licences now represents a significant portion of licences, meaning that the policy to concentrate on short term guest workers is working. We have as of the 30th of September, 1,471 persons licenced under these short term licences. That is where Government believes that its policies have to be (if you like) experimented with, we have to try and find ways and means of balancing the short term needs against the long term immigration strategy.

We also hear charges, from time to time, and allegations that certain geographical areas are being discriminated against. Yet the policy is clear, the policy simply says that, for the time being, the world shall be divided into five geographical areas and that licences granted from any one of those areas will not be allowed to exceed the next largest area by more than 20 per cent. The five geographical regions do not limit employers to a particular country. It simply says a region... and I believe there are between 170 and 200 recognised countries in the world today. This Government has not said that recruitment shall be limited to any one or two of those 170 countries. Simply, we have said that we would like to balance our immigration by having a cosmopolitan mixture of persons, rather than a preponderance of persons from any one region - be it near or far. Since we appear to have the luxury of choice which many countries do not have, why should we not exercise that choice sensibly, since it is said that the Cayman Islands have come this far on the basis of a

partnership with foreigners and Caymanians working together in a cosmopolitan effort for growth and development. Why should we not continue? If that is what has worked in the last 25 years to get us thus far, why should it not be sensible to look at it as an alternative for the future?

At the moment, the West Indies and the Central American region seems to be the areas that comes in for the most criticism, for the simple reason that this region has traditionally been, and continues to be, the source from which our largest supply of immigrant workers come from. As of the 30th of September, 4,086 licences were in respect of persons from the West Indies and Central American region. This represents just under 50 per cent of total permits that are valid. On the other hand, we hear sarcastic comments that the Government is telling the people to bring all of their maids from Ireland and a lot of staff from the United Kingdom. Based on these statistics, as of the 30th of September, the number of licences granted in respect of persons from the United Kingdom totalled 1,066 representing 12.9 per cent. If we added the United Kingdom and the United States together, combined they are still 20 per cent under the number of licences that are granted to the West Indies and Central American region. So I think we have to put this into perspective: we have a balance between regions, not between countries, that is point number 1; point number 2 is that since we have the luxury of choice, why do we not exercise it wisely. Enough said on that, Sir.

Turning next to the Broadcasting Department, I would just like to make two comments: First, Radio Cayman continues as best as it can, and with a considerable amount of criticism tries to deliver a reasonable Public Service. It has a small staff complement of 20, the vast majority of whom are Caymanians, and it is currently operating, and continues to operate, with a number of vacant posts. Of the established posts of 20, 16 are currently filled. The remaining positions are occupied by persons on a part-time basis.

During the year it was suggested that the station may look at reviewing its policy in respect of political advertising, or advertising of political meetings in particular. Whilst a final policy has not yet clearly emerged, there is an emerging policy that is being considered. That policy, in conceptual terms, is going to be something like this: Possibly beginning early in the new year information of political meetings will continue to be carried on the Bulletin Board seven days prior to the meetings, or earlier if the information is received earlier. Information about political meetings that is not readily available within three days, or 72 hours prior to the meeting, will be carried on a commercially paid announced basis subject to the Department reserving its right as to its general advertising policy. Such announcements could, in certain circumstances, also be aired as Public Service announcements free of charge at the discretion of the management. Now I say, emerging policy because it is not yet policy. It is something that is being considered. I hope that will go some way to meeting the desire of Honourable Members and of others who have political aspirations.

Also, the Broadcasting Department did this year begin an effort to improve the amount of knowledge and information and news which it was making available from the Government sources by setting up a programme called 'Official Talk'. These were half hour programmes aired twice monthly, every fortnight, and they were designed for the seven Members of the Executive Council in particular, to have an opportunity to have one half hour on the radio to explain the work of their Portfolios. To date, that programme has not been as successful as we would have liked it to have been, but we are going to renew our efforts in the new year to try and revitalise it.

I think that I can sum up my small contribution by saying that we have come a long way in a short time. We have a young country and a young Civil Service, and we have all of the challenges and range of problems that older and more developed societies have. What is worse is that we have them in a fishbowl context, meaning, we have them in a highly visible, small society. Having come a long way in a short time I think the Honourable Member for Tourism summed it up quite nicely when he said, "Perhaps, in some ways, we are victims of our own success." We have seen many self-help efforts succeed and we have seen others fail. I am a great believer in the self-help philosophy because I believe that persons who help themselves appreciate more the results of their efforts. There is a tendency to overreact to public announcements, to panic at changes in policies, and a tendency to be personally critical of those persons who are charged with the responsibilities for seeing those policies implemented. Somehow, we have to educate ourselves, to advise ourselves on how to discharge our duties without fear or favour, politely but firmly, as necessary. We have a golden opportunity to take this small community into the 1990s with the same degree of commitment that our forefathers brought us into the 1950s and 1960s. There is no question in my mind that there is a competence and commitment here to do it. What is required, perhaps, is a willingness to follow the leadership that is in place. To be a good leader one has to be a good follower. I think if we demonstrate that as we come up through the ranks and build up our experience, we will, ourselves, in turn become good leaders.

I have a pet saying, that I use every opportunity I can because I believe it to be true, and that is, "We cannot all be heroes at the same time, because if we were all heroes there would be no one to stand on the sidewalk and clap."

I would like to close by reading the words of a poem which I received in the mail just this morning from a senior citizen from North Side. This is from a lady who has served in the hospitality industry for over 30 years who is now retired. She sent me a Christmas card and enclosed this poem with it and she asked my opinion if I thought it was a good idea for her to send a copy of the poem to all Members of the Legislative Assembly. I thought to myself that I could do better than that for the lady, I can read it into the *Hansard*. The Prayer is entitled "A Prayer for our Islands":

"A PRAYER FOR OUR ISLANDS"

"God our Leader, Lord and Guardian,
Shine upon our Island home;

Show us Lord thy ways and purpose.
Make us never from thy precepts roam.

Teach our leaders to be humble,
to depend on Thee alone;
As they govern this blessed Island,
May Thy loving ways be shown.

Keep the pattern before them ever
What a nation ought to be;
That in all their deeds and actions,
They may practise equity.

Let Thy spirit guard our portals,
That no fool may enter in;
Banish creeds and cults and morals
That would cause our land to sin.

In Thy Holy Book 'tis written,
'Without righteousness we fall'.
Be our watchman, keep the city,
Holy awe put over all.

Make this Island, Lord, a sign post,
To thy loving ways of guide;
Lest we trust in self and politics,
And be lost in the times swift tide."

I believe that is a little expression of poetry that one can learn a great deal from, particularly in this professed Christian society.

Finally, as we head on home for the Christmas, I would like to express my grateful thanks and appreciation to all of those persons who have served, voluntarily or otherwise, on the various Boards and Committees in the Public Service. In particular, I would just like to mention those in my own Portfolio, the Caymanian Protection Board, the Liquor Licensing Board, the Parole Commissioners Board, the Computer Steering Committee and the Broadcasting Advisory Committee. Finally, special thanks to the members of my staff for their tireless and unstinted support and loyalty. May the 1990s bring us much happiness and prosperity, and may God bless us all.

MR. PRESIDENT:
Member for Education.

Does any other Member wish to speak? The Honourable

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS:
I wish to associate myself with the remarks of previous speakers who have congratulated the Honourable Financial Secretary on his Budget Address delivered to this Honourable House on the 17th November. That Address, together with the accompanying Budget, demonstrates quite clearly that the economy and the financial position of these Islands is in good condition. There is also evidence to show that since 1984, in particular, the Government's fiscal policies have been right on target. On page 26 of the Address, paragraph 3.1, it is stated:

"The economy's growth performance during the 1980s has been characterised by a policy environment that stresses reliance on the free enterprise system, with limited government intervention as the best solution to the problems of economic growth. The growth experience of the economy during the 1980s provided abundant evidence as to the wisdom of this approach. The free enterprise led growth expansion has been ably supported by prudent and stable public policies with respect to public revenue measures and public spending."

Now, Mr. President, we heard at an earlier stage in the Financial Secretary's Address that the early 1980s were lean years for the Cayman economy, so in the paragraph I have just quoted it would be reasonable to say that at least since 1984, where 1980s is used for the second time. I am sure also that Members know that wherever 'public' is used, one should read 'Government'. So that this paragraph would be more clearly understood by everyone if it was paraphrased as follows:

The economy's growth performance during the 1980s has been characterised by a policy environment that stresses reliance on the free enterprise system, with limited government intervention as the best solution to the problems of economic growth. The growth experience of the economy, at least since 1984, provides abundant evidence as to the wisdom of this approach. The free enterprise led growth expansion has been ably supported by prudent and stable Government policies with respect to Government revenue measures, that is taxes, and Government spending.

the annual Budget of the Government has grown from some \$49 million with an overall deficit position of nearly \$1 million, to a Budget of \$110,864,356 proposed for 1990, the Reserve Balance of some \$17.2 million plus interest, with most of the same Members on the Government bench, one can easily understand why the public should be concerned when they hear freshman politicians, who have not even yet gotten over the Election jitters, talking about whipping the Government into line and how their economic policies must prevail. I would suggest to them that they heed the advice of the Third Elected Member for George Town, that when you have something that is working as well as this Government is, you do not go around trying to fix it - leave it alone.

I do not believe that there is anything in this Address...

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN:

I never used that in relation to his Government, Sir. It was something that was used generally because I think the Government needs fixing. I will sit down.

Mr. President, I do not know if the Member would just give way. It was something that was used generally because I think the Government needs fixing. I will sit down.

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS:

something is working well, do not fix it. So I merely said that (following his advice) when you have a Government that is working well, do not fix it. I am glad for his endorsement, Sir. [Members' Laughter]

Mr. President, I accept that. What the Member said was when I do not believe that there is anything in this Address or in the track record of this Government to cause the First Elected Member for Bodden Town to want to whip this Government into line, or to fear that we would take the country into the abyss of debt and borrowings or into the hands of the International Monetary Fund. To the best of my knowledge our only contact with the International Monetary Fund has been that for some time... at one time it supplied our Bank Inspector, at our expense of course, and it does not even do that any more. There is abundant proof in the Budget Address that our debt burden is nothing to worry about. Read the section of the Address commencing at page 41, paragraph 5, headed 'Public Finance'. Mr. President, Members should read and digest that section, if nothing else, of the Address. From this Chapter we see that although actual Government expenditure increased by 88.2 per cent between 1983 and 1988 from \$45.8 million in 1983, to \$86.2 million in 1988, that as a percentage of gross domestic product the size of the increase in the Government expenditure was marginal - from 19.5 per cent in 1983, to 22 per cent in 1988. Evidence that the Government's policy did not fuel inflation.

We see further that the Government was able to finance its annual Recurrent and Capital Budget obligations, primarily from an increase in revenue collections from existing sources. Actual revenue collected from these sources grew at an annual average rate of 15.2 per cent, from \$45.9 million in 1983, to \$91.3 million in 1988 - an increase of 98.9 per cent. The fact is that the Government has not unduly on debt financing during this period. What is most important is that our credit worthiness and our ability to service the public debt without putting undue pressure on the economy all improved during the period. The Public Debt declined from 36.4 per cent of the annual revenue in 1983, to 30.4 per cent in 1987. So that is evidence that the Government has been following prudent policies.

I have given the worse case scenario because if we really look at the details of the Government's borrowings up to the end of 1988, we see some very interesting things. We will see, for example, that of the \$24.8 million shown as owed by the Government, some \$12.1 million is owed by the Water Authority, and \$6.7 million by the Civil Aviation Authority. So a total of \$18.8 million of the \$24.8 million is, in fact, owed by two Government statutory authorities which, according to all projections, will have no problems...

MR. PRESIDENT:

that is consonant with the behaviour of the House. [addressing the First Elected Member for West Bay] I do not think Would you please desist from waving that flag?

MR. McKEEVA BUSH:

Will the Member give way so I can explain?

MR. PRESIDENT:

There is no explanation at all...

MR. McKEEVA BUSH:

Yes Sir, I think I owe the House an explanation.

MR. PRESIDENT:

I have not asked you to give one. Would you please be seated?

MR. McKEEVA BUSH:

No, Mr. President, you cannot very well accuse me...

MR. PRESIDENT:

Would you please be seated?

MR. McKEEVA BUSH:

I am not waving a flag.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Would you please be seated? Thank you. Perhaps we might take the break, if it is convenient to you.

Proceedings are suspended for 15 minutes.

AT 11:16 A.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 11:44 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Proceedings are resumed.

I should advise the House that at a later stage I shall be making a statement on the matter which occurred immediately before the break. Continuation of the Second Reading of the Appropriation (1990) Bill, 1989. The Honourable Member for Education, continuing.

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS:

Mr. President, when we took the break I was pointing out that of the \$24.8 million owed by the Government at the end of 1988, \$18.8 million of that was, in fact, owed by two Government statutory authorities which according to all projections, were quite capable of repaying those loans. In reality, we are looking at a situation where there are some \$6 million of Government borrowing which is not in respect of income producing, self-liquidating, loans. What is even more significant is that at 31st December, 1988, the Government had loans owed to it by various entities amounting to \$6.4 million. So the Members opposite should not try to unduly frighten anyone about the Government's financial position. It is as solid as the Rock of Gibraltar. It is because of our successful handling of financial policies in the past that we can confidently support this Budget as presented now.

I believe that far more frightening in the Budget Address than the financial facts are the statistics given in respect of the composition of the work force and the population in these Islands. I realise that in most instances estimates in numbers only are being used. Because of this I wish the 1989 census figures were available to speak from. However, there can be little doubt that unless steps are taken to contract the rate of growth in selected sectors of the economy we are heading for social disruption in our society.

It is my opinion that no race of people, regardless of how tolerant and understanding they may be, can long endure the prospects of being out-numbered in their own country and this is specifically what the statistics reveal. I know that there are those who will disagree with that conclusion and will hold up the example of the United States as to what can be achieved when a diverse group of people come together in a new and emerging country. But I would ask those advocates of an uncontrolled rate of development to listen to what is happening in the United States today. If they do, they will discover that even at this time in the United States there is resentment and unrest in many communities over the number of citizens moving in from other communities, even from within the United States itself.

In the case of the Cayman Islands, we are told that during the four years of 1983 to 1987 24 per cent new jobs were created, at the same time 5.1 per cent more Caymanians came in the labour market to fill those jobs. Put in another way it could be said that during the period 1983 to 1987 for every Caymanian coming into the labour force, four expatriates had to be brought in to sustain the rate of growth. So, with the best will in the world, if every cent of money coming into the Government's treasury was spent on education and training, it would have been physically impossible to produce enough Caymanians to supply the demand.

As I have said, there was one Caymanian for every five jobs, irrespective of what category of job we are talking about.

I contend that there is no way our society can cope with that pace of growth. I do not accept that the quality of life or the standard of living in Cayman has to automatically fall if contraction of growth is introduced in selected sectors of our economy. For example, it seems to be taken for granted that if 100 people are brought in to build a hotel, and that increases the labour pool in the construction industry to 1,700 people, that we must forever, thereafter, find employment for 1,700 people in the construction industry and not 1,600 as was the case before the hotel was to be built. In fact, if that argument is accepted, then you will have to find another 10 or 15 workers from outside because that hotel will need at least that number to work as maintenance people to keep up the building. I will not get into the numbers that will be required to run the hotel, I am dealing just with the construction aspect of it. But I contend that we have reached the point where in selected sectors, such as construction, labour will have to be brought in to do a specific job and then the labourers return to their country of origin at the completion of that project.

I believe that we have reached the stage in our development, in tourism, for example, where we can afford to call a halt to any new hotels being built in the immediate future. Let me say here that the Member responsible for Tourism, Aviation and Trade, has dealt in detail with that aspect, so I am speaking rather more philosophically and will not go into any detail. I would just like to make the point that any moratorium would exclude Cayman Brac for the immediate future. That is my understanding of the Member's position when he spoke. With the rate of occupancy being what it is, I believe that we can increase the rate of tourists coming in considerably over the next several years without having to build any new hotel rooms. If the increase is tourists coming to existing properties, then the number of people required to service that increased number of tourists would be less than if they were going to new properties. I am sure that not all the staff in all segments of all current establishments are working fully at all times. If that was the case, then they would not be able to cope during the more busy periods.

It would seem to me that if the owners of hotels or condominiums enjoy greater occupancy and make better return on their investment, they would be inclined to keep their properties in better shape. Hopefully, they would be able to pay more to the local employees and everybody would be happy including the visitors who we hope, would return in increasing numbers. What I am really saying here is that whatever contraction is to be done, it must be carefully thought out and applied. From the examples I have given with the hotel rooms it would be seen that if construction was cut back in this area, the Government's Revenue from import duty would be reduced, and import duty represents 40 per cent of all of the Government's Recurrent Revenue. So, if the Government's revenue is not to suffer in reality, it will have to be made up somehow.

That is why I have called attention to the possibility of increasing the number of tourists in the same accommodations. If more tourists arrive, import duty from the food they eat, and the drinks they consume will improve. Rent-a-Car companies would likely require more cars, they would have to be brought in and import duty would be collected on those. The gasoline that is used is dutiable. If they are divers, the gasoline that is burned in providing their dive trips is dutiable so that there is a return into the

Government's coffers in the respect of Import duty. Additionally, Accommodation Tax and Departure Tax would also be increased. So I am satisfied that if we get our sums right, there can be income substitution to account for what will be lost on the import duty of the hotels. I think we should remember that for the hotel, duty on that has been at a concessionary rate in any case, until quite recently. No duty, as far as I know, has yet accrued under the increased rate on the West Bay Beach.

I contend that contraction in selected sectors can be achieved without lowering the standard of living. In fact, as I have said earlier, in my view we have no alternative but to find ways and means of adjusting this growth rate pattern downwards.

I wish to deal with some of the departments falling under my Portfolio, and I guess there is no better place to start than with Education, since that is very closely related to this whole question of indigenous manpower. For emphasis, I wish to repeat again that at the pace of development experienced during the 1980s, according to the statistics contained in the Budget Address, Cayman produced only one Caymanian for every five new jobs created in that period. So the cold, hard fact is that under those conditions, four people had to be brought in from outside for every Caymanian who entered the work force.

I also believe that we must understand what has been said about the employment of Caymanians during the period before we panic. Percentages are an interesting element of mathematics, but it is also one that can mislead us if we are not careful. Be that as it may, I would like to call Members' attention to the statistics and information on pages 37, 38 and 39 of the Budget Address. Here we will see that the number of Caymanians employed in the banking sector increased by 126 between 1983 and 1987, whereas the number of non-Caymanians over the same period increased by only 25. In the insurance industry, we also find that the number of Caymanians to non-Caymanians employed over the whole 1980s remained constant at a rate of eight Caymanians to two non-Caymanians. We find further that there is no statistical information to say whether there has been any discrimination against Caymanians in the distribution of jobs, that is, in the quality of job distribution. We are also told that it is in the financial sector that most young Caymanians tend to have occupational aspirations. I will confirm this later from further statistics from the Education Department which I will be presenting.

Now, I believe that we should examine the statement made about the supply of indigenous human capital or indigenous Caymanians. Having seen earlier that there is an under supply of native Caymanians of four for every five jobs created, it should not be a shock to anyone that we do not have trained Caymanians to fill all the jobs being created. In fact, we do not have Caymanians of any kind - trained or untrained - for those four jobs. I believe the excitement of some Members is due to the fact that it is not clearly understood what is being said, when it is said that the slow growth in the quality of the indigenous labour force is an outcome of the problem of under investment in post secondary education and training or human capital formation during the period. Nowhere here does this statement lay the blame at the feet of the Government. It is a straight forward statement that merely says, for whatever reason, less Caymanians than would normally be expected for a population of our size are in full time university or college education.

The position is further clarified at the bottom of page 48 of the

Address, and here I quote:

"Under investment of post-secondary human capital is rather the result of a downwardly rigid wage structure that generates high-wage clerical jobs for school leavers which in turn creates disincentives for undertaking further investments in the education and professional training necessary..."

I believe it should be pointed out here that in banking and insurance, in the United Kingdom contacts in particular, but also throughout the world... and accounting to some degree is a profession with experience oriented with on-the-job study and qualifications for advancement to management levels. It is not a professions in which one normally finds a large number of university graduates.

I also call attention to the statements on pages 61 and 62 where

the Financial Secretary says, and I quote again:

"A young Caymanian returning to the job market with a Bachelor's or Master's degree after 4 or 6 years study in an applied field will need to develop on-the-job specific skills and work experience as further preparation for assuming middle and upper-level managerial and professional positions..."

That is a significant statement because many Caymanians, including some on the Bench opposite of this House, believe that once someone obtains a Bachelor's or Master's degree they are ready to take over the top jobs in commerce and Government. But it is a fact of life that on-the-job specific skills and work experience are essential ingredients - they are indispensable to making good managers.

Here, I think it would be appropriate if I gave some statistics about the training of Caymanians which is taking place overseas and in the Community College here at home, because it will demonstrate that our education system and training is not in the doldrums the Opposition has been saying it is in, nor is the Government and the country neglecting training to the extent that the Opposition claims.

Mr. President, as far as I can ascertain, at this moment there are 50 students overseas on full time Government scholarships. These scholarships are broken down into the following categories:

Education and teaching	13
Business	13
Law	1
Medical technology	1
Medicine	3
Nursing	4
Architecture	3
Psychology	1
Communications	2
Biology	1
Library Sciences	1
Civil Engineering	1
Economics	1
Quantity Surveyor	1
Social Workers	4

I would just like to add that four teachers returned this year and joined the teaching service. But I believe it is significant to stress that for the first time in our history the number of Caymanians taking teaching courses equals those taking business. Of course, most of the students are female, as is the case as those who are successfully leaving our school system, so it would be readily understood that the call of business would be less attractive than it is to the young men. There are 14 students overseas on full time scholarships from the accounting profession and a further 13 in accounting are completing postgraduate experience to get their professional qualifications.

I understand further, that there are currently three scholarships by the Banker's Association, one by the Hospitality Industry Association, and there are, at least, another ten to 12 scholarships by individual banks - full time scholarships overseas. I have no special interest in pushing the interest of the Banking community because I think you will also see that the accounting profession has been doing quite a lot of training. But my information is, that over the last five years the banking community gave 30 full scholarships and assisted with eight partial scholarships. In addition, many banks assisted with short courses, both overseas and here at the Community College. Additionally, there are also many employers such as Cable and Wireless, Caribbean Utilities and various business houses that have many of their employees overseas on short specific course oriented training, at any given time.

At the Community College there are 96 students distributed over

the disciplines as follows:

Business studies	39
Hotel studies	38
Trades and Technology	19
Electricity	10
Auto Mechanics	5
Architectural	4

It is significant to note that there are 39 persons in the business studies, the greater number in any discipline, which bears out what I said earlier about Caymanians having a natural tendency to seek their future in the business world.

On a part-time basis at the Community College, there are 394 students registered for 583 subject classes in 39 classes. In Cayman Brac, there are 35 part-time students. In every area there are increases over last year except in technology, where the registration dropped from 29 to 19. Additionally, in 1988, the College offered courses at an introductory level leading to a certificate of accountancy of the London based Association of Accounting Technicians. This year a total of 40 students, comprising of 28 from the Government and 12 from the private sector, are enrolled in higher level courses leading to membership of the Association, that is, the Association of Accounting Technicians. Further, 36 students are currently studying for the examinations of the Institute of Bankers - 20 at the preliminary, and 16 at the final level of the certificate.

Other training courses involving the cooperation of the Government's Training Unit and other departments continues to be offered. These include statistics courses and executive officers courses. Here, I should point out that by the establishment of their own training unit within the service the Government is demonstrating their commitment to training civil servants.

To give some indication of results at the college, let me hasten to add that at the Community College for the year ended September 1989 there were 539 subject passes with 40 distinctions, and these all in recognised external examinations. The overall pass rate was 62 per cent. So Mr. President, when the Second Elected Member for the Lesser Islands talks about this Government striking the death knell to the Trade Schools he is talking rubbish. I want him to tell me of any students who passed a recognised external examination under the previous set up. The policies of 1977 to 1984, when the policy was to not worry about how much the students benefited as long as the public thought something was being done, have gone. We are now concentrating on quality output and, despite physical limitations of space and equipment, the College has steadily expanded its services to the community because the story does not stop there. For example, the College has so far this year (in addition to all I have listed before) run nine courses in computer training for private sector banks, hotels and commercial establishments.

Now that I have established beyond doubt that the Community

College is alive and well, let me say something about the new premises for the College. First, let me say that I reject totally the advice of those who say, "Do not worry with plans and consultants, get on with the job and build something." That was said at least by the Second Elected Member for the Lesser Islands, and when he speaks we know he is speaking for all of the schoolmasters on the other side. [Members' laughter]

In the first place, the European Development Fund (which is financing the first stage of the College by over \$1 million) would not give the money if there were no proper plans. Any organisation wants to see proper planning; in fact, there has to be a complete statement of why the College is being built, how many students are anticipated to pass through it and one has to establish the need. So one cannot work without plans, and one cannot make plans without proper advice. It is beyond my acknowledgment why these people had to go into the Public Accounts Committee to find out about the cliff on the land where the College is to be built. I gave that information to them in this House in May of this year in answer to a Parliamentary Question number 36. There is nothing to hide and no move or attempt is being made, or was ever made, to hide anything. Let me hasten to add that I take no responsibility for the presence of that cliff being found on the site later than it should have been, nor will I allow the Education Department to be blamed.

The Government has a policy that when land is to be purchased it is done through a Land Purchasing Committee which has no politicians on it, specifically to avoid accusations (such as we have heard in this House during this Session) of politicians taking care of themselves. The process of that Committee includes valuation of the site, and it is reasonable for me to assume that in order for this to be done the type of land that is being valued has to be known. Additionally, architectural drawings, including working drawings, were done, and in my opinion that would include site inspection. So I cannot see why some Members would expect me or members of the Education Department, or of my Portfolio to be out there looking over the shoulders of at least two other persons.

Anyway, be that as it may, engines are full speed ahead again. The bids from the contractors were opened a week ago Monday by the Public Tenders Committee and it is anticipated that the contract will be signed shortly and construction will commence in January 1990. I am sure that the completed facility will be one of which we can all be proud and will provide a service towards the education and training needs of the country that we all desire.

Mr. President, I heard the Member opposite interject as to whether Hadsphalic was going to build it. I do not even know who is getting the contract. The Public Tenders Committee takes care of that in our operation. The politicians do not know who gets the contracts until they are ready to be signed.

The output from the High School has also been challenged and berated. I happen to have records of what happened to the 1988 graduates of the Cayman High School and, for the benefit of the Members, I would like for them to know that of Upper Sixth Form (that is the highest we can take them here), 44 per cent or 11 students went into local employment; 48 per cent or 12 students went onto higher education. It is to be noted that of the 44 per cent who went into local jobs nearly all anticipated entering higher education at a later time. A comparison with 1987, shows that from that class 29 per cent went on to higher education and 53 per cent to local employment, a marked number going to further education in 1988. I believe that we are beginning to see a turn around in Caymanians attitudes to higher education. I believe that it is as a direct result of the emphasis that is being placed on career guidance within the system.

For the 'O' Level students, or 5th Form, 51 per cent went on to local employment, and 38 per cent to further education. Other interesting statistics are that of the 47 students who went on to the Community College, 24 did business studies and nine took hotel training. A further indication that those who went to work went into those two main sectors of our economy. A further interesting statistic is that of the 163 children who went to work from the 5th Form. 14 young men went into electrical work, 42 went into banking and insurance, and 18 into construction, including plumbing. Of all of the students taking the examinations, 16 per cent of the 5th Form students received four passes and seven per cent had six or more passes. These are all students who could have either entered the 6th Form with a hope of doing well at 'A' Level or they could have gone on to college in North America.

The statistics for 1989, hold constant for the 'O' Level students, but in the 'A' Level results we had an increase from 30 passes for 61 entries in 1988, to 50 passes from 77 entries in 1989. A movement in the right direction and a result which indicates that children who go on to higher education are not all wasting their time.

I believe it would be well and interesting if I gave a comparative analysis of what happened to the students from comparative comprehensive schools in England in 1987. From a school of 1,000 children (approximately that of our own), results showed that 15 per cent went to work as compared to 51 per cent in Cayman; 20 per cent continued their education past age 16 as compared to 38 per cent in Cayman; 10 per cent were unemployed, and 55 per cent went on to Government Youth Training schemes. So it should be readily realised that the ease with which youngsters here find employment is a great pull for them to get out and earn their own money immediately after school. Even so, the numbers from our 1988 class showed that a reasonable number are going on to higher education much better than a comparative school in the United Kingdom.

I believe it was the Third Elected Member for West Bay who said, during his contribution, that if we were to check there would be no more today who qualify for University than when he went to school. I want to ask him if during his days he ever produced 50 or 74 children who would have gone on to University from one class, or if he ever heard of a school in those days producing seven GCSEs or 'O' Levels at any grade?

So, Mr. President, while I will not say we are satisfied - and we are certainly not complacent - I maintain that the school is not doing so badly. If we were complacent with our

achievements we would not be commissioning the consultancy that we have had to look over our entire education system which is to start in January. The Honourable Third Official Member told us yesterday that there is a well known principle that when you finish a successful year in training you take stock. Well, every now and again it is a good policy to take stock of our education system. What is more important is that changes over which we have no control - changes in the examinations that we are now using and the syllabus for those examinations - in the countries that control the examinations... We have no alternative but to take a good hard look at where we are going and, in fact, what we must do to get there. Yes, that includes the study of whether to put another year on to the school leaving age and where should it go. Talk is cheap Mr. President, and the Opposition Members can talk all they wish but a decision will not be reached until a proper study has been made, and also in consultation with the private schools for reasons which I will give a bit later in my contribution.

Mr. President, Members have spoken at great length about the Motions which they have brought asking for another year to be added to the school system for the establishment of a Teachers Training College and for the setting up of a special fund for training. Some have stated that they have heard no more about them, but this is not so, Mr. President. This Honourable House is aware that I have said from where I am standing that the extra year in the system will be part of the consultancy which we will get into full swing in January.

One Member during his debate said that while he is not an educator, he did not see anything difficult about implementing the proposal. I would suggest that he is not very practical either. Such a move takes considerable study if it is to benefit the children. An in-depth study has to be made to determine at which level (that is, primary, middle or high) the year will be added and even at which end of that level, that is, the beginning or the end that year will be added. Curriculum will have to be developed and existing ones adjusted, accommodations will have to be provided for at least another 250 to 300 children depending on which level it is added. This will involve construction in just about every district in these Islands. A further consideration is that depending on the decision reached, the proposal will affect some, if not all, private schools in these Islands, and they need to be consulted. In fact, the Private School Association have expressed the wish to be included in any study which will be undertaken, and that I will do.

Mr. President, on the question of the Teacher's College, most of the Members on the other side know that when their proposed Motion was discussed, I told them that was a matter with which I had no problem as it would be thoroughly examined when the new facilities for the Community College are in place. I even mentioned the exciting possibilities that I saw for distance learning once we have a proper centre, and which is gaining respect and popularity in the education world today. There has been a delay of about a year in the construction of the College, and therefore, there is a delay of about one year in seeking to implement this resolution. The implementation of the resolution regarding the training fund, is also connected with the new Community College.

Mr. President, before I leave the matter of the Community College I wish to place on record my thanks to the advisor, Dr. Bynoe, who is now the Acting Principal, all the staff, the Chairman of the Board, and all other members of the Board of the Community College for the sterling job they are doing in laying a solid foundation for the Community College. Once we have our premises we will be able to go the like fire through dry bushes because of the work that is being done now in developing the infrastructure of the College, and I want to place on record my gratitude to the Board, to Dr. Bynoe, and all the other staff members.

Mr. President, before leaving here (lest I get carried away with others matters) I would also like to thank the members of my Portfolio, the staff of the Education Department, and all other Departments under my responsibility for their support. I would like to place on record the Government's gratitude to all the teachers in our system, be they in Government Schools or in the Private Schools.

Mr. President, it would be amusing if it was not so serious to hear Members opposite on the one hand talking about adequate planning and getting priorities right, but then on the other hand, hear them talk about getting on with the job. No need for plans, just find a steel building large enough to cover half of the Cayman Island; and another suggesting that we throw \$300,000 at it and the problem will go away. It is also interesting too, to hear Members from the other side castigating the Government about employing consultants, then to read the Public Accounts Committee's Report where they recommended that the Government hire a firm of Auditors to advise them on the ways and means of securing and collecting monies due and owing to the Government.

I have to wonder whether this is not one area where the Government with its Legal Department, the Treasury staff and Audit staff, at its disposal should not be placed to act. But on examination it might very well be that their advice on this occasion is right. I mentioned this merely to demonstrate that even they, the Members opposite, recommended the services of consultancy. Mr. President, a consultant is a consultant regardless of who pays for his fees. It is what comes out that is important. Most of the speakers from the other side claimed that education is in disarray. But the statistics which I have given disprove this, there are problems but not greater than normal, and we are tackling them in a systematic way.

On the question of discipline, it is amusing to hear the schoolmasters on the other side of this House talk about teaching respect for people in authority, for one's elders, and about being good role models. They also talked about the system not getting any better until we get all Caymanian teachers. While I share the hope, that some day - and it will not be tomorrow - we will achieve self-sufficiency in teachers, Mr. President, there has never at any period, since the settlement of these Islands, been a time when there were sufficient Caymanian teachers. But the difference was that those teachers who came to a time when they were appreciated and made to feel at home. They were not maligned and ridiculed as they are today, and I help us were appreciated and made to feel at home. They were not maligned and ridiculed as they are today, and I would suggest to those Members on the Backbench, who do so in public, that they stop it. They are not doing the youth of this country any good. They are not being good role models for our youth, and I would also suggest that the behaviour of some Members of this Honourable House is a poor example of respecting those in authority. I

would suggest that they begin by correcting their own behaviour. If this is an example of the professionalism I have heard about, God have mercy on us.

MR. PRESIDENT: Would you care to take a break there?

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Yes, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: Proceedings are suspended until 2:15 P.M.

AT 12:46 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 2:20 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Proceedings are resumed.
The Honourable Member for Education continuing.

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Mr. President, when we suspended I was dealing with the matter of discipline within the schools. I said that it is amusing to hear the schoolmasters on the other side of this House talking about teaching respect for people in authority and for one's elders, and about being role models. They also talked about the system not getting any better until we have all Caymanian teachers, and this will not happen until we first get all West Indian teachers. While I share the hope that someday - and it will not be tomorrow - we will achieve full self-sufficiency in teachers where we will have all Caymanian teachers, there has been at no time since the settlement of these Islands at any period when there was sufficient Caymanian teachers. The difference is that those teachers who came here to help us were appreciated and made to feel at home. They were not maligned and ridiculed as they are today. I would suggest that the Members on the Backbench who do so in public stop it, because they are not doing the youths of this country any good and they are not being good role models for our youths either.

I also said that in my opinion Members should start by displaying better behaviour in this Honourable House and show more respect for authority if they intend to be role models for the youths of this country. I also said that if the behaviour which I have seen in here is an example of the professionalism I heard about, then God help us. Mr. President, even children at school today are now talking back to teachers and telling them that they, the teachers, cannot discipline them because they are not Caymanians. This has never happened before.

The First Elected Member for West Bay talked on Monday about bringing new ideas and approaches to our problems. I agree with him, but he should be the first to start throwing out old ideas and approaches, together with his buddies, the First Elected Member for Bodden Town, the Second Elected Member for the Lesser Islands, and the Third Elected Member for West Bay.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: You must be confused.

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: You will be more than confused when I am finished. The chorus which they have been singing has been sung by the First Elected Member for Bodden Town for a long time. Here I will quote from his famous Thesis, written over 10 years ago, which he obliquely referred to in his contribution. I quote:

"Education, which should be one of our greatest guarantees against these kinds of social-ills, is failing. The reason for this is that the programmes offered in the school system are mainly for the children from middle class backgrounds in an industrialised society. These programmes are designed and implemented by expatriate teachers, mainly from the metropolitan countries, who have no interest in the needs of Caymanian society and who, furthermore, are not interested in the achievements of Caymanian children. Unless this system is revamped, Caymanians are going to be faced with a revolution of rising expectations."

So, Mr. President, what the First and Third Elected Members for West Bay, the First Elected Member for Bodden Town, and the Second Elected Member for the Lesser Islands are chanting, is not new. If this had been true 10 years or more ago, what would have been our fate today? Time has proven this to be wrong. When it was first written...

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Mr. President, I wonder if the Member would give way, that is, if he is not afraid to be refuted.

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Mr. President, is the Member rising on a Point of Order? I do not think at this point I am...

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Mr. President, I would like to clarify something because he is misleading the House. The Member...

POINT OF ORDER

MR. PRESIDENT: That is a Point of Order, please state it. That is a Point of Order, you are alleging misleading the House.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Mr. President, the Member has said that in my contribution I talked about teachers - West Indian versus English. I will give him some of my text to see where he can find that, Mr. President. And the bad behaviour was probably emulated from him.

MR. PRESIDENT: Now, that is unnecessary. As to the first one, perhaps the Honourable Member should re-state what he has said. I do not think he referred to individual Members when he made that remark you are referring to. I think he has said some Members. Would you please confirm?

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: That is correct, Mr. President. I was referring to him when I spoke about new ideas, and so on; also the idea of the Caymanian and West Indian teachers. I was referring to that because it is old hat over the Island now, that is all we hear.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think before we get into a debate within a debate, that point certainly was made by some Member or another of the House during this debate. I cannot recall who, so it is in order for the Member who is speaking to say, 'some Members', or, 'it was said'... That is reasonable.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Yes, but he cannot be mischievous and include me in that.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think he has made it clear that he did not specifically include you in that.

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Mr. President, I have said what I have said, and unless the Member can prove me wrong from the *Hansard*, I stick by what I have said, Sir. My plea is that we throw this rubbish out the window and follow more rational approaches. Government employs teachers from wherever they can get the best teachers, and I believe that is a good policy. To employ teachers from this region - where there is already a shortage of good teachers and most countries themselves are importing them - merely because they are from this area - would be a serious mistake. Those from this area who measure up to our standards and apply are employed, and we have some good and excellent teachers from the Caribbean region on staff. But they are there because they are good, not because they are from the Caribbean area.

Mr. President...

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: (Interjecting) Tell him about that letter you wrote to W. S. Walker, and the one he wrote you.

MR. PRESIDENT: Would you excuse me one minute, please? I have said before that interjections are fine, they are part of the interchange of debate, but within reasonable limits. I think speakers should be heard without too many interjections. Thank you.

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Thank you, Mr. President.

The Member for Health correctly pointed out in his contribution to the Budget Address, that the budget revealed youth is the priority of this Government because the greatest amount of expenditure in the Budget is for Education and Health. This has been disputed by most of the Backbenchers. In particular the Third Elected Member for George Town who asserted that only \$1.2 million is in the Capital Estimates for Education, while there is \$4.1 million for road construction. But the Honourable Member for George Town is wrong. There is \$4.4 million in the Capital Estimates for Education. There is \$1,381,818 under Head 43 for the construction of the Community College; \$1,811,212 under subhead 41-005 for the Community College; and \$1,219,956 under subhead 41-022 for the construction of school buildings for a total of \$4,412,986, and with new services amounting to \$266,562 the actual Capital and New Services is up to \$4.7 million.

With the Recurrent Expenditure in excess of \$16 million can easily be identified for education. This represents 14.55 per cent of the total Budget. Mr. President, to this expenditure on education could be added a considerable further sum of total expenditure for the development of our facilities for youths. Both the Third Elected Member for George Town and the Third Elected Member for West Bay commented on the amount of money allocated for grants to private schools. Let me hasten to say that the figure has been increased annually over the last few years. For example, in 1988 \$70,000 is allocated; in 1989 \$100,000 is allocated; and in 1990 \$120,000 is allocated. Honourable Members will readily understand that this is an increase of 20 per cent, a far greater rate of increase generally than the Budget. Additionally, the Third Elected Member for West Bay said that some schools received only \$6,000 or \$7,000. That is true for 1989, but that was not always the case. The smaller schools received much less in 1988, the greater amount only came about by a change of the method of allocating the money which the Portfolio of Education introduced in 1989. For example, a school which received \$2,190 in 1988, received \$8,080 in 1989; another school which received \$1,788 in 1988, received \$6,716.69 in 1989. I hasten to add that without the change which I mentioned having been introduced this year, in 1989 the school receiving the \$1,788 last year would have only received \$1,716. Under the new formula no school will receive less than \$10,000 in 1990, unless their attendance is reduced dramatically.

Mr. President, I agree that assisting private schools is a good

investment. But when we find that some of those schools are installing air-conditioning while we are not able to do so in our own schools, we have to question how far we can go in assisting the private schools without doing more for our own children. After all, that is where the masses are and it would take a lot of money to air-condition all our schools in one sweep.

I think it was the Third Elected Member for West Bay who said that private schools are turning out better students than the High Schools on a whole. In fact, he said that the private schools were better than the whole Government system. But I challenge that Member to name any private school that has produced a student with 7 GCSE subjects at "A" grade and this was done at the High School last year, and it was a Caymanian who did it. Further Mr. President, our public schools are producing at least 75 per cent of the university-bound students each year.

Mr. President, you know that same Member, together with the First Elected Member and others, made much of the overcrowding at West Bay Primary School and said it was a lack of planning. But when we decided to change the Principal at that school a year ago last September, we had only planned to improve the school. It was not our intention to take most of the children from the private schools, including some very near to home of those Members. The registration at the school increased from 275 at the time of the change to presently some 343 students. The school was built to accommodate 300 children before additions were made, and attendance has been constant at 275 or less for many years. So we could not have foreseen (nor planned) for this dramatic increase in numbers. But we are glad that the school is now held in such high regard and we have the money in this Budget to construct two new classrooms in 1990.

I understand the First Elected Member wants a whole new infants school next year, maybe so that he can really close his friend's school. In the case of the Savannah School, that school was built to accommodate 150 students, and there are 169 enrolled. There are two new classrooms under construction. In the same electoral district, Bodden Town, there is a Primary School with a capacity of 150 which has an enrollment of 108. So there is no real serious overcrowding, and what there is, is being taken care of.

The Third Elected Member for George Town called attention to the five token votes on page 35 of the Budget, and concluded that this was because of a lack of money and that these token votes were put there hoping that money would become available next year to complete the projects. He called special attention to the Special Education rooms and said that these were badly needed. The truth is that the Capital Expenditure in this Budget is very much dictated by the ability of the Public Works Department to carry out the projects, either by direct labour or supervised contracts. The fact is, they can only do so much and no more, just like any other organisation. The reason why token votes are there is because it is not thought that the Public Works Department will be able to do the work during 1990, but if they can get on to the project then work can proceed. In the case of the Special Education Room, existing Science Labs will be converted to those rooms so they cannot be converted until the new Science Lab Block is built, and it is doubtful if both jobs can be done this year. That is the simple explanation for that.

Before I leave the services for youth, let me point out that the library services for 1989 was highlighted by services for children. The children's librarian began 1989 by visiting each primary school on Grand Cayman to promote the Library and to introduce new books acquired for the collection. She visited 60 Primary School classes and as a result, use of the children's library materials increased by 300 per cent and 350 children applied for library membership. During August, a summer reading programme attracted 135 children with puzzles, games and story time sessions. Children read over 500 books as part of the programme. In addition, over 1,000 new books added to the library's general collection, a selection of video cassette programmes were donated by CASA for library patrons to borrow. These cassettes promoted an anti-substance abuse message, to reinforce this message, a book list of library books dealing with substance abuse and related issues were prepared and distributed to the community.

The long awaited Branch Library in Cayman Brac was opened in October providing a core collection of reading materials for adults and children. Branch Library services are supplemented by a book-by-mail service from the George Town Library. So you see, Mr. President, we did not wait until we got in the House, or on the radio to work for the youths of this country. We did not do so by requesting roads, street lights and abattoirs either.

Mr. President, the First and Third Elected Members for West Bay have said that they know of young people in West Bay who are qualified, and who desperately want to further their education. I ask them to please bring those youngsters to me, and I will direct them on what to do. I ask them not to waste any more time announcing it over the radio, but please bring them to me and I give my assurance that if they are qualified in all respects, certainly, they will get help. The truth is that I have no knowledge of anyone who met the criteria for a scholarship who has been turned down, and I beg the Members, if they know of anyone, please bring them forward. They should not allow those innocent youngsters to be punished any longer. They have had their air time now. They have had their air time now, Mr. President, so please bring the youngsters forward. We need qualified Caymanians desperately.

Mr. President, on the subject of culture, the First Elected Member for Bodden Town after his recent visit to Barbados, expressed his surprise at how culturally advanced the Barbadian people are. Perhaps he is not aware that the country of Barbados is at least 150 years older than we are, and that it has one of the oldest educational systems available to all its people in this region. We are making some advances in the area of culture. Recently the high school celebrated Heritage Week and some of the items were great. The National Cultural Foundation is presently conducting workshops in short story writing which is to culminate in the winning play being performed at the Harquail Theatre. Quite a number of people are participating, 22 adults and 20 students have signed up. The workshops are being conducted by experienced play writers from within the area and outside.

Mr. President, we talk about being role models. I recently

attended a presentation of classical music at the Harquail Theatre performed by young musicians which was organised by Mrs. Hyacinth Rose. These performances were of a very high standard and I do not recall seeing any of those bleeding hearts we have heard here at that performance encouraging the youth. I wonder where they were. I did not intend to say so, but since the Member has raised the matter I can now tell the House that at least the Second Elected Member for Bodden Town and the First Elected Member for West Bay were at the cocktail party, because I left them there - they could not leave to go to the performance...

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:
found me there.

It was not at the Government House, or you would not have

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS:

Now they come crying about our children.

The Turtle Farm, Mr. President. As I said while presenting the accounts earlier, the farm is operating profitably which reflects well on management and staff. During this year the second generation farm-bred turtles have been reproduced which is a milestone in the life of the farm. It was suggested yesterday that the production of the second generation turtle might have been due to some fiddle. That is, in my opinion, a great disservice to the farm and the country. If there had been any desire to lie about that, it could have been done when those three farm-bred turtles laid on two previous occasions. There has been no change in the contract terms of the Managing Director, his contract has always been on a yearly basis because this coincides with his work permit. I say there is no change!

The farm continues to be a major attraction for tourists to these Islands. And Members will be happy to hear that a decision has been taken by the Board to increase the herd of turtles being raised for slaughter to 1,000 with a view of supplying the local demand for turtle stew. Of course, this will not affect the supply of meat locally, for another four years since this is the age at which turtles are slaughtered.

I will not comment further on the matter of the investigations being carried out by the Criminal Investigation Department. I have every confidence that they will do a thorough job and not allow anyone from outside the Force to direct their investigation, including the manager of the farm. The First Elected Member for West Bay seems to want to direct the investigation, but I would advise him to leave that alone, because you know what is said about 'rushing in where angels fear to tread.'

In the area of recreation, work has been carried out in most districts this year on playing fields and recreation facilities. In the 1990 Budget the sum of \$591,370 has been provided for continued development of the Sports Centre and various district facilities, including the field in Cayman Brac. In addition, the Portfolio now has on hand a Director of Sports, three assistants with another officer on study overseas, as a nucleus for coaching and developing sports in the schools and the districts.

Mr. President, all going well, the Islands should have a strong contingent at the Commonwealth Games in New Zealand in January, and funds are included in the Estimates under Sports Grants for a contribution for expenses in this connection.

Rebuilding of the old Court Building on the waterfront to house the National Museum began on 10th July, this year. It is hoped that this will be completed in January of 1990, with the opening taking place by mid-year. The museum staff have been working jointly with the National Trust on the Cayman Islands Memory Bank project. The National Trust is doing a good job and is worthy of the support which is provided for it in the Budget. Their work is well known and I will not elaborate further at this time.

Mr. President, we have been lectured by the Backbenchers during this Session. We have been told that we are arrogant and uncooperative. However, since these proceedings are aired on the radio, I am certain that the public must by now be wondering whether those Members on the other side who speak about arrogance did not, in fact, gave birth to it. When they see the video of the news conference of the Public Accounts Committee, I am sure that they will conclude that their arrogance is surpassed only by their vanity. If that is professionalism, Mr. President, God have mercy on us.

It has been said that some Members of the Government have asked the Backbencher to allocate priorities and find solutions to problems. That is not what was said, nor is it the case. The Government has set out its programme in the Budget and the Backbenchers have declared that they are not going to support the priorities set by the Government; and some Members of the Government have said that it is not good enough to say that you do not accept the Government's priorities and solutions to problems, unless you are prepared to offer alternatives that are practical, reasonable and acceptable to the Government.

Mr. President, I do not feel that the opposition to many of these projects is genuine. It seems odd to me that every Member of this House but one supported the Master Ground Transportation Plan in May of this year, and agreed at that time that wide publicity had been given to it from the time the study began in 1987; and that those Members could now be so vehemently opposed to the Master Ground Transportation Plan. At the time it appeared Members understood clearly that the composite maps were designed to preserve the road corridors to facilitate planning and development; that development of the actual roads would take place as and when the funds could be provided, either by loan or otherwise. Now, all of a sudden, it appears that roads have no place in our development strategy. As a measure of the support that the Master Ground Transportation Plan received in May of this year, as compared to the opposition which it is now receiving, I crave your indulgence to read from the *Hansard* of the 23rd of May, 1989. Mr. President, what I am quoting is from the First Elected Member for West Bay, and I quote:

"As far as this amendment to the Development and Planning Law goes, we were informed for quite a long time - the public have been informed and, as I have said, even with the suspension of Standing Orders, nobody can say that they did not know anything about what the Government intends to do.

The Third Elected Member for George Town agreed for the speedy handling of the chronic traffic problem, yet after a year of advertisement and consultation, he still refuses to admit that the Government needs to get going on this aspect, bearing in mind the traffic problem is not getting any better. He also said that he sees the need for roads. He mentioned that back in 1976 not many roads were put in under their plan. He also said that another three or four months would not matter.

What the Member could have said (and this is what I am fearing will happen again), was that the Opposition between 1972 and 1976 told the public that the building of roads was a communistic act by the Government. For instance, the road between West Bay and George Town was opposed, and today we reap the rewards of their folly.

Mr. President, I believe that all of us have had adequate time to consider and deal with the matter. It is not that Government is being communistic in any way, or is going to take anybody's property without the person being duly compensated. This cannot happen in this day and age in this country. The traffic problem that each citizen of this country must put up with is, to say the least, bad. Therefore, in order for the Government to get going on this matter I will offer my support to the resolution." [Hansard, 23 May, 1989]

Mr. President, I believe that some Members of the Backbench have indicated that their refusal was conditioned on further consultation with the public being necessary. I am convinced that others merely opposed it to attempt to have the Government introduce revenue earning measures at a time when it said it would not do so. Some of those Members, and this included the First Elected Member for West Bay, had a lot at stake because they went all over the place telling people that the Government would have to tax them to pay for the two 737 jets. There has been politics at work between the Master Ground Transportation Plan and the change of equipment at Cayman Airways. Perhaps, when Cayman Airways flies into fairer skies, we will be able to get on with the Master Ground Transportation Plan. What further worries me Mr. President, is when I hear Members stand in this House and say that traffic jams are universal, that people come to Cayman because it is unique, and if people have to endure traffic jams that would make the New Jersey Turnpike on a Friday afternoon look like child's play, they would not mind.

I am concerned also, that some Members seem to be saying that vastly improved medical facilities are not required. It is disturbing to hear the First Elected Member for West Bay say that we should send anything that we cannot handle locally overseas...

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: I wonder if he would give way, Mr. President?

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: We have heard...

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: It seems not.

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Mr. President, I assume that the Member is complaining that I said the First Elected Member, it is really the Third. Mr. President, whatever one of them says the other agrees with it. [laughter] We heard them say that so their names are interchangeable.

We heard the Member for Health give statistics which show that in pure numerical terms, the present facility is inadequate. It should not be difficult for us to accept this in view of the rapid rate of economic development and population growth which we have had explained to us in the Budget Address. Certainly, no one that has visited that facility recently can truly say that it is a medical facility becoming a progressive society such as the Cayman Islands.

I do not know precisely what kind of new facility we need. That is why we employ consultants to tell us. People who are trained and experienced in determining those matters. But the fact is that this whole argument boils down to a question of quality of life. Caymanians deserve nothing but the best in health care and while we will not be able to cater to every medical need, we have to attempt to do all that is humanly feasible on the Island. If we are to remain competitive in the two main areas of our economic activities, that is, financial services and tourism, then we have to have first rate medical services and road system adequate to our needs.

Members have pointed out competition in the area of international finance is becoming greater each day. Anything that is being offered here can be done elsewhere. So unless we retain an atmosphere of a pleasant and secure quality of life, then the players in the game will not remain in these Islands. No one is going to tolerate a situation in these Islands where he sits in his car for hours waiting to get to work unless he knows there is reasonable medical services for himself and his family. Similarly, our long-staying visitors and residents and even the cruise ships will not continue to come if we allow our medical services to lag behind. Everyone wants to know that there are reasonable medical services here, both in terms of availability and quality. Unless we are prepared to provide them, then our tourism business will certainly fall. So, Mr. President, it is a matter of economic survival that we must improve our road system and health care.

I believe it would be well for us to remember that no one should have the desire to see our economy and standard of living decrease. I hope that what everyone is advocating is for a slowdown in the pace of growth, not to stop or move backwards. I realise that what we are talking about is a

costly exercise and it concerns me too. But nothing in life is free and these are the costs of doing business and it should not be beyond our ability to sit down and reason and come up with an acceptable answer to these problems. The attitude of 'I am not voting one red cent' is not good enough. I can assure Members that these projects are not grandiose schemes. They are real needs. As I said, if we have the will the solutions can be found.

For example, in the matter of the hospital, the Member has said that he intends to place the hospital under a Statutory Board. The matter of medical insurance, which many people in Cayman already have, is being investigated for everyone on a broader scale. He has said that it is his belief that with those two developments, a new hospital would become self-sufficient financially. I have every reason to believe that. I know of one Island, whose economy is similar to ours, where the hospital is run on this basis and I was advised that that hospital contributes over \$1 million to the Government's revenues annually. I am sure Members will realise that if the hospital is placed under a statutory Board most of the annual recurrent expenditure will automatically disappear from the Budget. In other words, there would be an automatic reduction on that on closer examination Members will see that a new hospital is definitely within our ability to provide without any additional taxation. I do not believe this is to the exclusion of a private facility. Doctors practice privately now on the Islands, as do dentists. I have not heard any representation that one should be exclusive to the other.

MR. PRESIDENT: Shall we take the break there? Is it convenient?

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Yes, Sir, thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: Suspended for 15 minutes.

AT 3:15 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 3:50 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Proceedings continued. The Honourable Member for Education continuing.

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Mr. President, when we took the break I was saying that doctors practice privately now on the Islands, as do dentists, and I have not heard any representation that one should be exclusive to the other. The Government's record is clear that it supports private initiative.

In my opinion a very important portion of the Budget Address, which I do not recall anyone addressing up to now, is the chapter dealing with the public sector investment planning. This chapter highlights the necessity and need to adequately identify, prepare, evaluate, implement and monitor public sector investment and advocates the resuscitation of the Capital Development Committee. In passing, I would mention that to the best of my recollection those projects in the Master Ground Transportation Plan, which were approved as stage one projects, had the benefit of a cost benefit analysis study and that the results were positive.

Mr. President, one Member opposite made the point that why we have so many American airlines on the Miami route now is because the Government surrendered the moratorium which was in place on the Miami/Cayman route. I would just like to put this into perspective. This moratorium was placed on the Miami/Cayman routes only in April 1983, for a two year period until 1985, by an agreement reached between the United States and the United Kingdom Governments. The basis on which this was granted was primarily due to the small number of hotel and condo beds to be filled at the time. In other words, the size of our tourism market. In November of 1984 after the General Elections, it was discovered that nothing had been done about extending the moratorium and negotiations were started with the United States after the Elections for an extension for another two years. We were successful and the expiry date then became April of 1987.

In considering whether to once again seek a further extension of this moratorium, the Government gained the distinct impression that it was unlikely that any further extensions would be approved. Two new hotels were being built at the time and other properties were being expanded, an increase of some 1,100 beds, so the case which had been made in 1984 no longer existed. Based on this situation the Government then held discussions with the United States, and with the assistance of the United Kingdom, reached an agreement whereby in exchange for accepting termination of the moratorium three months earlier the Cayman Islands was granted route Rights to three additional U.S. cities, bringing the total to five. We originally held Miami and Houston and now we have Tampa, Atlanta and New York.

By any standards this is considered to have been a good arrangement as the Cayman Islands do not hold any other bargaining tool to gain access to United States cities. It should be pointed out that under the Air Services Agreement signed between the United States and the United Kingdom in 1977, any number of United States airlines can serve the Cayman Islands from any United States point. The moratorium was only, at that time, between Cayman and Miami. Any number of flights could have been mounted from any other gateway and any number of gateways. So I think the deal was a good one. To the best of my knowledge, and I happened to have been at the meetings referred to, I have never heard it said that Cayman Airways would not need further subsidies. What I understood to be said was that Cayman Airways would not require further guarantees from the Government to consummate the deal which it was doing. To the best on my knowledge that is what has taken place.

Members opposite have said that they see their role as one that chastises the Government when they think the Government is wrong and to inform the people when they think the

Government policy is unsound. At first glance, that may not appear too unreasonable but in deeper consideration, I wonder whether that is really their role. One thing is certain, and that is that the four Elected Members of the Executive Council did not get here alone. They had to receive the votes of at least some Members from the other side. One is left to wonder what in the world could have happened in less than one year (in six months to be exact) to reasonable men that could not be solved by dialogue other than over the radio which - let me assure you, Mr. President, and the Members - solves nothing. Those of us who have our country's interest at heart had better realise that there are those amongst us in this House and on the outside who never ever supported us and who are laughing their heads off at us, attempting to destroy each other so that they can creep in and collect the spoil.

I am sure that there are genuine differences of opinion over some of the Budget items. While it would be foolhardy of the Government not to listen to representation, it will be just as foolhardy for Members opposite to try to present their own Budget at this point in time. In the final analysis I would hope that we are all here for the same purpose and that is to serve our country to the best of our abilities. As the First Elected Member for Bodden Town is prone to say, history and succeeding generations of Caymanians will not be lost to us if we fail in our responsibilities. I would add that what would be worse is if we have to live with ourselves knowing full well that we failed or, worse, deliberately destroyed our country.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT:

The Elected Member for East End.

MR. JOHN B. McLEAN:

Mr. President, before entering into the debate I ask your permission to address a matter which I have been watching and observing for some time and see that we are headed for a serious position if some fences are not mended. My tenure in this office is some 13 years of unbroken service to this country and my people. I daresay, that I have seen many, many changes. I now see that there is growing harsh attitudes among some of us which will do this country no good, and I am glad that the last Member mentioned something similar to what I intended to say.

It is a fact that most of this came about a few months ago as a result of actions taken by Executive Council with regard to the purchase of new equipment for Cayman Airways. It is unfortunate that many of us were politically attacked in our respective districts, not only attacked but embarrassed; and I have watched the situation from that time grow into what we have here presently today. Much was said concerning the Third Elected Member for George Town, the Second Elected Member for the Lesser Islands and myself with regard to turning three previous Backbenchers against the Government. I would like to say that this was not the situation. I am pleased that the three Members who have spoken before me have in one way or the other made it abundantly clear as to the reason. I would like to say that it is my opinion that we, as responsible men, representatives of the people and the Queen's representatives, should not in any way allow personalities to go this far. I would say that regardless of our different points of view in this Chamber, and on the outside as the case may be, we must endeavour to control our feelings and be able to socialise among ourselves in here and deal with issues rather than personalities.

We are the 12 Elected Members, elected by the people. Politics in these Islands is our problem, our business, and I feel that we should deal with it accordingly, never feeling ourselves too big to say I am sorry or to deal with the matters as they come. I am aware that sometimes our tempers will flare but when this is all over these beautiful Islands are still our home. We are still 12 Elected Caymanians and let us endeavour to work together as much as possible.

The Second Elected Member of the Executive Council said that we on this side are no role models. The eight Backbenchers on this side of the House are good examples to the Executive Council, as to what communication means and what role models are, and what working together is all about. It is not the eight of us that you hear about quarrels. In truth, and in fact, I see it as the problem nowadays - it is really not with the eight Elected Backbenchers. We are capable men. If we were not considered capable by our people we would not have been elected to this high office. The one problem is - and I would say the sooner this is accepted by the other side the better - that we will never, ever be treated as little boys. In whatever we do communication in all things is very important.

Mr. President, I join fellow Members in paying tribute to the Honourable Financial Secretary. He is to be commended for his usual Budget Address. It was very comprehensive and I would say that it is a document for the future. It is my intention to deal with this Address on a department by department basis and also with the various sectors of the economy, beginning with banking. The banking sector does play a very important part in our economy. It is my opinion that much more can be done and should be done as far as contributing to these Islands, and, indeed, to our people. Each year we hear and see from balance sheets the huge profits which were made by certain banks in these Islands. What portion is utilised in the areas where our people would benefit? The banks are not here for the love of our people, but instead for the stability which these Islands offer.

It is my opinion that more should be done in the banks to train and develop our people and prepare them for senior positions within the banks. I know that many of our people have been in the banks for many years, who are quite alert and knowledgeable in their jobs, yet they are not given the opportunities they deserve. I have received numerous complaints as to the attitudes of some from other countries working in banks here who continue to domineer our people and, as I mentioned, it is my honest opinion that the time has come for this to be stopped.

Besides training, I feel that more should be done to offer more loans to lower paid individuals, especially for homes and property. I am speaking of those individuals who could afford a low cost home. I guess we sometimes refer to them as the little people. Even if it was only \$3 million or \$4 million per year amongst the banks, this amount could offer several people an opportunity to own a small home or

parcel of land and, indeed, develop a future. I am aware that the Housing Corporation is in place, but we still have a gap in the lower income bracket and I would say that if this is not attended to at the earliest possible time, it cannot become smaller but will mushroom into something that will be much harder in the future to address than it is at the present.

I believe that the Government should do more to encourage the banks to take such action. I am always happy to hear of large developments for this country, but we need to ask ourselves who is benefiting from those structures. Certainly, it is not the type of individual that I have just mentioned. We cannot allow attention to be paid to the well-off and allow the little people to be ignored. We constantly brag of the progress of these Islands, and I am glad that we can, but with all of this we still have in every district of these Islands, those who are less fortunate and those who need the assistance as I have mentioned earlier.

Moving on to tourism. It is good that tourism continues to be the mainstay in our economy. From all predictions it seems that 1990 will be a better season than this year which, I would say, has been far from favourable. I have to agree with previous speakers who felt that we may be pricing ourselves out of the market in this area. We have to continue to think of the various areas around us that are offering competition and, in some cases, I would say have much more to offer than we do here in these Islands. Our mainstay is the sun, sand and sea and, of course, our friendliness, which we have always been able to maintain, and I should say we must endeavour to continue.

I am aware that tourists are constantly unhappy with the high rates, and I would say that I feel that the Member with responsibility is aware of this. It is my hope that he, with the help of the Government, will do whatever possible to keep a close eye on this. I also feel that we must continue to upgrade our advertising to a higher quality in more areas with the hope of reaching more quality tourists.

It is good to see that we have among us certain local investors who are trying in every way to do what is possible to cater to tourists. Quite recently we have had a complex opened by the Kirkconnell Brothers which I would say this country can be proud of. This in itself will assist the tourists in their shopping and it will help us to promote ourselves in the future.

We have heard much with regard to the problems with our work force in the hospitality industry, especially with gratuities. I feel that we have many individuals, Caymanians, who have really dedicated themselves in this area for many years and I feel that our people should be, and must be, compensated, and of course, the Department of Tourism and the Labour Office should always try to be on top of this through constant checks to see that our people are not abused in any way.

Another area that I have been concerned about for a long time is that we have many who come to our shores who enjoy the beautiful waters. I am aware that we have in these Islands an official Sea Code. I believe the time has come - before the matter becomes more serious than it is - for certain sections of this Sea Code to be enforced. I have received complaints from fisherman, responsible individuals, who complained that constantly tourists are found swimming and diving in areas where they could be harmed by passing boats. I think it is section 128 of the Sea Code which deals with this. I am not only saying what I have heard, but I have also seen it with my own eyes right here in the George Town area. We have to do whatever possible to encourage the tourists, but at the same time we must protect them as much as possible.

Also, in dealing with the tourists on our roads, it seems as if we will continue to have a problem with those who come here and continue to drive on the side of the road that they are used to back home. I believe that the Government, through the Department of Tourism, could give a little bit in this area and perhaps save a lot in the long run. I would suggest that the Government should try to include for the tourists at the various hotels a copy of the Road Code and a copy of the Sea Code with a friendly note highlighting the parts which I have mentioned. I would further say that if it is that, we have certain tourists who are not confident that they will drive on the correct side of the road here on the Islands, perhaps a little note to this effect encouraging them to use another means of transportation, rather than for them to come here and leave with a bad impression because of a spoiled holiday. I do not think this would be too much of a costly exercise for what we could achieve in the end.

On the Customs Department: I would like to say, as I have said previously at another Budget Address, I am most happy to see that we have a young Caymanian who is doing a very good job at the head of a Department, that is responsible for the larger portion of our revenue in these Islands. This is a key department and I feel that with his leadership and guidance we can continue to be proud of this area in the future. I would just add that the Customs Department can be a good example of what a Caymanian can do when he/she, as the case may be, is given an opportunity and the necessary training, the job exposure and, of course, the opportunity to sit at the top.

The job of a Customs Officer is not an easy one. I would say, however, it is as important as the job of a Police Officer. It is quite similar in many ways. I am most pleased to see that we have a very good working relationship between these two important departments. I believe in this day and age in which we live, it is most important to have the strength of these two units in a united way to continue to combat drugs and the drug offenders who are found on our Islands. I would urge the Government to study the performance needs, especially in the area of the Customs Department. I am a believer that performance is based on the tools the individual is given. I feel certain that note will be taken of this because I certainly have every confidence in the world, in the Member who has responsibility for the Customs Department.

I know it was mentioned by a previous speaker as to overtime for Departments such as Customs and Immigration. I feel that in each of these areas long, hard hours are demanded of the individuals, we are all human, the individuals have families and, of course, in order to perform the duties which are necessary they must be away from their families, so I would say it is only fair that they are compensated and compensated fairly for the hours that they put in.

MR. PRESIDENT:

I now move to the Legislative Assembly.

MR. JOHN B. McLEAN:

Perhaps we might suspend here until tomorrow.

That is fine, Sir.

ADJOURNMENT

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON:
House until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. President, I move the adjournment of this Honourable

MR. PRESIDENT:
until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. I shall put the question. Those in favour please say Aye... Those against No.

The question is that this Honourable House do now adjourn

AYES.

MR. PRESIDENT:
Thursday morning at 10 o'clock.

The Ayes have it. The House is accordingly adjourned until

AT 4:30 P.M. THE HOUSE STOOD ADJOURNED UNTIL 10:00 A.M. THURSDAY, 7TH DECEMBER, 1989.

**THURSDAY
7TH DECEMBER, 1989
10:06 A.M.**

MR. PRESIDENT:

Prayers by the First Elected Member for the Lesser Islands.

PRAYERS

CAPT. MABRY S. KIRKCONNELL:

Let us Pray.

We beseech Thee so to direct and prosper the deliberations of the Legislative Assembly now assembled, that all things may be ordered upon the best and surest foundations for the glory of Thy Name and for the safety, honour and welfare of the people of these Islands.

Bless our Sovereign Lady Queen Elizabeth, the Queen Mother, Philip Duke of Edinburgh, Charles Prince of Wales, Diana Princess of Wales and all the Royal family. Give grace to all who exercise authority in our Commonwealth that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety may be established among us. Especially we pray for the Governor of our Islands, the Members of Executive Council and Members of the Legislative Assembly that they may be enabled faithfully to perform the responsible duties of their high office.

All this we ask for Thy great Name's sake, Amen.

Our Father, who art in Heaven, Hallowed be Thy Name, Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done, in earth as it is in Heaven. Give us this day our daily bread: And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us: And lead us not into temptation; but deliver us from evil: For Thine is the Kingdom, the power and the glory, for ever and ever. Amen.

The Lord bless us and keep us: the Lord make His face shine upon us and be gracious unto us: the Lord lift up His countenance upon us and give us peace now and always. Amen.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly are resumed. A

statement by the Honourable Third Official Member.

STATEMENT BY MEMBER OF THE GOVERNMENT

GOVERNMENT'S POLICY IN RESPECT OF LICENCING FIREARMS,

HON. J. LEMUEL HURLSTON:

Mr. President, in accordance with the provisions of Standing

Order 30, I wish to make the following statement:

"Government's policy in respect of licencing firearms, which is a statutory responsibility of the Commissioner of Police, remains unchanged and is as follows:

Applicants for new licences are required to satisfy the Licencing Authority that they either:-

- (a) are genuine sportsman; or
- (b) own or access lands and wish to kill vermin or shoot game using an appropriate weapon.

Membership in a regulated gun club is generally the accepted proof of genuine sportsmanship for this purpose. Further general requirements stipulate that applicants must be over 18 years of age, of good general health and good character before the grant or renewal of licences.

All weapons are examined by the police as to safety factors and storage arrangements are similarly inspected, as necessary. Where appropriate standards are not met or the circumstance of purpose and use have changed, steps are taken by the police to persuade licensees not to pursue renewals.

Appeals against the decisions of the Licencing Authority are made to the Governor in Executive Council. Should the Law be amended in such a manner that the licencing function were to be undertaken by a Board or such similar group it would still be the responsibility of the police to ensure security

arrangements."

Thank you.

SHORT QUESTIONS
(Standing Order 30(2))

- MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:** Mr. President, a question, if you will allow it. Is the Member saying that you have to be a sportsman and not a businessman to qualify to get a licence to protect your business?
- HON. J. LEMUEL HURLSTON:** Mr. President, I was referring to the policy in respect of the grant of new licences. In the case of renewal of existing licences there are some licences that, under previous policies, were granted for the protection of business interests. There is no longer such a policy, therefore no new licences are being granted in that category; and yes, I am referring to genuine sportsmanship in the case of that category.
- MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:** For the sake of clarity. You are saying, then, that the genuine sportsman can get it, but a businessman cannot get a new licence granted?
- HON. J. LEMUEL HURLSTON:** That is correct, Mr. President.
- MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:** Is that contained in the Law?
- HON. J. LEMUEL HURLSTON:** No, Mr. President, that is contained in the policy.
- MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:** I mean under the regulations, I suppose.
- HON. J. LEMUEL HURLSTON:** No, Sir, that is a policy handed down to the Licencing Authority by the person responsible for Internal Security.
- MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:** Commissioner of Police? Are you talking about the Governor in Council or the
- HON. J. LEMUEL HURLSTON:** Mr. President, under the Constitution His Excellency the Governor is responsible for Internal Security.
- MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:** What I am trying to ascertain. So it is not the Governor in Council, it is the Governor? That is
- HON. J. LEMUEL HURLSTON:** The Governor will take the advice of his Executive Council, but
- MR. JOHN B. McLEAN:** Mr. President, before I start my debate I find this cross-fire here quite interesting. I wonder if the Honourable Member could say what would happen to an individual who is a sportsman and also a businessman?
- HON. J. LEMUEL HURLSTON:** Mr. President, a person who is a sportsman will have a weapon for the purpose of sportsmanship. The weapon that he may have had under previous policy for business purposes will be dealt with under the policy which states: "that where appropriate standards are not met, or the circumstance of purpose and use have changed, steps are taken by the police to persuade licensees not to pursue renewals."
- MR. JOHN B. McLEAN:** Sir, am I to understand that individuals with businesses will no longer be able to have protection?
- HON. J. LEMUEL HURLSTON:** No, Sir. If those licences were granted under previous policies for that purpose, and the purpose remains unchanged those licences are continued to be renewed.
- MR. PRESIDENT:** The Second Elected Member for Bodden Town.
- MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH:** Mr. President, I understand the Honourable Member to say that if a person owns land and wishes to destroy vermin and perhaps game birds, if they applied they will not be granted a new licence? Did you say that, Sir?
- HON. J. LEMUEL HURLSTON:** That particular matter is covered in the statement that I just read, Sir. It says persons who own or access lands and wish to kill vermin or shoot game using an appropriate weapon may be granted a licence.
- MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH:** Mr. President, if the Honourable Member cared I could produce an abundance of names where those particular applicants who owned land, in particular farms, and wished to have

a licence were refused.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think I must intervene. The rules about clarifying questions are clear. I suggest that you should put those cases to the Member separately outside. Another question, or are you going to continue your debate? In that case we move onto the resumption of the Second Reading debate on the Appropriation Bill, the Elected Member for East End continuing.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

BILLS

SECOND READING

THE APPROPRIATION (1990) BILL, 1989

(Continuation of debate thereon)

MR. JOHN B. McLEAN: Thank you, Mr. President. On the adjournment yesterday afternoon I was about to move on to the Legislative Assembly. I consider it an excellent place to start off this morning.

Mr. President, I have been asked by the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee to extend his apology, on behalf of his Members and himself, to the Clerk for the incident which took place here a few days ago. I felt that since I was going to deal with the Assembly this would be a good place to deal with it. I, too, would like to pay tribute to the Clerk of this Assembly, and her staff, as they continue to do an excellent job. I was a bit disturbed to hear what was brought before this House a few days ago because I felt (like the First Elected Member for Bodden Town) that this was uncalled for. It is my honest opinion now, as it was before, that this office is one of the most efficient offices in the Government service. I believe this efficiency could be improved even further with a few things put into place. As I see it, the work load for the Clerk, especially with the number of Committees that there have been over the last few months, is certainly not getting any easier. I would honestly support the idea of an additional Committee Clerk for this Department. I would certainly support a stand-by system for the Computer for this area. My reason for this is that it is my opinion that if this were done with the quantity of *Hansards* which are (and have been) done this could be kept more current and, as I mentioned, a lot of strain would be taken off the shoulders of the Clerk and her staff. Furthermore, I feel that it is important enough that the Minutes should always be up to date, and this would be the mechanism by which it could be done.

For an office as important as this one, I think the time has come for us to put in a proper telephone system. I do not believe there are too many places that have one as antiquated as we have here. Also, I am sure many times it would be much easier for the Clerk and her staff to walk into a room and fax a message, rather than having to go elsewhere to do this. A fax machine is not that costly nowadays. Again, I would suggest that one is purchased for this Department. I also see a shortage of space for this Department. It is a known fact that in Cayman land does not get any cheaper. It may be the right time for the Government to look at properties adjoining this property endeavouring to secure whatever space is still available for future extension of space for the Legislative Assembly. We know that it was bad planning in the first place to put this beautiful building on such a small piece of property but we must look at the future, and it is with that reason in mind that I have made that suggestion.

Mr. President, on the matter of the Cayman Islands Marine Division of the Ships Registry: I must say that I am alarmed and greatly concerned and, to say the least, it is discouraging to know that the present number of staff is now six (99 per cent of which are persons from the United Kingdom), and to see that salaries are costing us in the region of \$132,000. I say this to say that history has it that the Cayman Islands created a mark in the world having produced some of the most knowledgeable and outstanding seamen at all levels dealing with the Marine Divisions. Yet, we do not have not even one Caymanian making up the complement of the division. I am saying that it is only another area where it seems as if our Caymanian resources are not used properly and instead, we have foreign labour in place. I have always been a true believer that we should utilise the resources that God has given us. Mr. President, I am not saying this with any disrespect, I am aware that we still need foreign labour, but I am just making a point that where our people can be utilised in top jobs, let us use them. They have earned their experience. These are their Islands and it is my opinion that they will do as much as anyone brought into these Islands. They will always try to make us proud. Therefore, I am appealing to the Government to investigate the possibilities and, if possible, try and replace some of the posts within the Ships Registry with some of our knowledgeable seamen.

Mr. President, in the Budget Address on page 81... I quote what was said: "The most urgent road investment projects are those that are needed over the next 2 to 3 years as indicated in the Master Ground Transportation Plan (MGTP)." I totally disagree with this statement, and I do so on various grounds. First, and foremost the cost factor; secondly, there have been no assurances given to me as to where the money to meet this cost will be derived; and thirdly, I see this project as one which will create unrest among our people.

It is a fact that tampering with people's land in these Islands is indeed a touchy subject, and as I see it from the maps accompanying this Plan there are many, many acres of land - not only acres of land but homes and businesses - which will have to be acquired in order for the Government to

put this project forward. Mr. President, I know much has been said by Members of Executive Council with regard to individuals who would be able to sell their property, relocate and have money in the bank. I have a question for those Members: I wonder if they ever thought that those individuals, if they had so wanted, could have sold their properties and relocated without this destructive plan coming on line? That tells us something, Mr. President. That speaks for itself. It tells us that these individuals are satisfied with where their homes and businesses are, and I would also say that Executive Council should realise that money is not all there is in life.

It seems to me that in many cases these individuals would be removed against their will. Although this is not my district, I (like the Second Elected Member for Bodden Town) received complaints from several areas (especially in George Town) from individuals who were dissatisfied when they heard of this Plan. I am not going to say what areas in George Town. Because the Member for Bodden Town mentioned the Rock Hole area, it seems as if they have not allowed that to die. I think the Member only meant to air the concerns of an area of concerned residents. As I have said, while I was not elected for George Town, I try my best to do what is best for the Cayman Islands, and this is one of the reasons why I cannot, and will not, go along with this Plan.

I am dealing with this matter also to show that this Plan is no more urgent than roads to the eastern districts. I am especially speaking of the roads from Frank Sound to East End and on to the Queen's Highway. This is nothing new to Executive Council because it was on this road that the four of them had to travel when they drove out to my district to deal, supposedly, with the matter of Cayman Airways Limited. Mr. President, it would have been good if that meeting had dealt with the issue on Cayman Airways Limited, rather than endeavouring to embarrass me. I am not saying that this was done by the four Members of Executive Council, because I must say the First Elected Member... and as bad as the Second Elected Member may be they were on their best behaviour and stuck to the issue that should have been addressed when they came to the district. But, Mr. President, the bad behaviour was from the other two Members, because it was really a joke to hear the Third Elected Member of Executive Council inviting my people and telling my people who should run against me in the next Election, when he, himself is only inside of this House because of two votes. He is looking at someone whom the people have confidence in.

I have been in here on two occasions undefeated, and I have a track record of looking at the needs of my district. I have a letter from a past Governor who congratulated me on my ability to sit on the Government bench and take care of my district at the same time. I wonder if we are going to find the same thing at the end of this term. But if John McLean wants to run in 1992, it is going to take a lot more than those four Elected Members to come to my district to try to stop me. While they were able to have someone on the platform with them, let me tell you that if something different was done by that individual I would have been shocked, because all through my political career he has been against me, so they must pick somebody else next time.

To say a little more on the roads going up to my district, let me touch a little more on this Jennett 'T'. I must say that I was surprised to see the timing of the letter that was placed on my desk a few days ago with regard to the construction of the famous Jennett 'T'. As I read this letter I was hoping that somewhere in its contents I would have been told of their plans to offer funds to the Government for this construction. Certainly, it seems as if the success of their building stems around this Jennett 'T'. But I must say that it will take more than this letter to convince me that we should spend the kind of money that this will cost this country to put through the Jennett 'T'.

I know a suggestion was made here a few days ago that we should consider this project over our districts. Let me say that there is no other part of this Island, there is no other project presently or in the future, that is more important to me than obtaining something here for my district. I am not like some, who believe that prestige is all in life. I do not forget where I collect my votes, and I do not forget where I come from. My first obligation is to that God-chosen district, East End, and no longer can we allow the Island of Grand Cayman to end at Crewe Road. My district has suffered in the past, prior to 1976, because of that type of attitude. Likewise the other eastern districts. I have seen a repeat from 1984 to the present day... and let me say now that if this is what is going to bring an election to this country, I feel certain that trying for my district will not cause me to lose my seat. Let me say (lest someone misunderstands) that I am not here to say that absolutely nothing was done in my district, I will give credit where credit is due. What I am saying is that much more could have been done from 1984 until today.

In this pile here on my left, I have letters dating back to 1984 because I felt that this would happen, and I wanted to know that I had it in black and white. Presently there is only one Member in the Executive Council who, as I understand it, made a joke of my letter in 1984. My list was referred to as the shopping list of the century. But if that list is checked today, one would see that the requests were not personal ones - they were not for John McLean - but for his people and his district. I feel that it should have been dealt with in that respect, rather than to spite me, as the Member who was with the previous Government. They should have thought of the needs of the districts.

I am not going to read the letters back to 1984 because I have respect for the time of the House, but there is one thing that I asked for in that letter that I am going to mention because, had the Second Elected Member of Executive Council, instead of enjoying or making fun of my letter, agreed with me and tried to fill the request to have a full time Social Worker in my district, I feel that today we would not have as many social ills as we do. This is going back to 1984, and we heard other Members crying the same tune I am crying today, because their districts were also not treated fairly with regard to the Social Workers.

Mr. President, as I said awhile ago in dealing with the Master Ground Transportation Plan and the road system for this area, to me this is no more important than the road from Frank Sound to North Side, or from Frank Sound to East End. Therefore, I would even say that much was said here in regard to other new roads. Members were put down, although they knew what they had requested in their letters.

I would think this very discouraging for new Members, but I would say to them fight the good fight. As long as you know you are right your constituents will stand by you.

The roads to my district have served well, but at this time they need urgent and immediate attention. I would say that this road has coped with more heavy equipment than most other roads in this Island. It is a known fact that we have the Islands' largest quarry there, so on a daily basis (sometimes, as I understand it, right around the clock) we have trucks transporting material to other parts of the Island. Likewise, we have the largest water resource on the Island. We have had many, many water trucks tear in over the piece of road in question. Taking into consideration the two things that I have mentioned should give the Government enough reason to support my request. Instead of hearing so much about this Master Ground Transportation Plan (MGTP), and this famous Jennett 'T', we should be hearing about how we are going to attend to the road going to the eastern districts. Although this was brought to the attention of a previous Government from 1984, and to the present Government, nothing has been done with the exception of patching a few holes, and as soon as the rains come it gets washed out again.

A few days ago one Member in his debate on Government Motion number seven - and I am not trying to quote him, but he did mention that tourists did not come here to spend their time in traffic jams. My question to him would be: How, then, can we expect that tourists would like to drive over the dilapidated roads to East End and on to Colliers, where the district's largest tourist related building is sited? It is no different. If anything, they would be harmed less by being in a traffic jam than by going out to East End and on to Colliers and, because of pot holes, becoming involved in an accident. I would say that if the Government is truly encouraging development, such as I have mentioned, then it should be considered that more urgent attention be given to the roads leading out there. I would further point out that the people of my district deserve better. We have the longest way to travel to the Capital. We have to pay the same tax on our motor cars as anyone else, therefore, it is only fair that the roads leading out there should be as good as the other parts of the Island.

I would say that instead of creating this expensive monster, the Master Ground Transportation Plan, why does the Government not consider upgrading the roads as I have outlined? Indeed, not only out to my district but upgrading them elsewhere. I am sure this exercise would be much less costly. Furthermore, I would point out that past Governments of which I was proud to have been a part, started something with roads in these Islands that should have been continued. Each year they tried to put in each district a certain amount of road development, and if this had been continued from 1984, I am certain that the road to my district, and the road to North Side, and the roads which were questioned in Bodden Town, and other parts of the Island, would have been almost, if not, completed. But no, because of personalities, what that past Government did had to be undone. Now we are paying for it because until now we have no true figure as to what the Master Ground Transportation Plan will cost this country.

I believe that if roads are widened throughout this Island we will be able to cope with the amount of traffic we have now and for several years to come. When going to the outlying districts, in many areas you find that we have wide shoulders and if they were extended they would not only protect automobiles but would also protect those who walk the streets. No, it seems as if there are certain things we do not see for ourselves anymore and when the advisors tell us something, regardless of what it might cost the country, we are prepared to do it!

Mr. President, I will now make a few observations on the Police force. I would say that I am very much alarmed at the certain matters which have been brought to my attention with regard to the employment of Caymanian officers. I cannot appreciate the fact that more local officers could not be found, and we have to bring the alarming number (that I have been told of) of English officers to our shores. I know we are told that this will only be for two year contracts and thereafter they will depart our shores. But, with the history of bringing in officers to this country, I cannot appreciate that. I would say that many of our officers are concerned, and rightfully so, if we look back some 18 years ago we had brought into this country a number of officers from Barbados. We heard the same thing. But what has happened? Today our Chief Superintendents and Superintendents are made up of these officers. I am not saying that these are not good officers, because I am great friends with some of these gentlemen. I admire them. But I am just showing you what has taken place over the years. This is my fear today, with regard to bringing in more English officers.

If we look back 15 years ago when we had to change to Jamaican officers - now they are Chief Inspectors and Inspectors. What happens when it comes time for the Barbadian police to leave? Then they will be replaced by the Belizians and Jamaicans. I am trying to show how I cannot see, in the near future, where more of our Caymanian officers will have an opportunity to reach the top. So to go on to the importation of the English Officers, if history is to continue, it would seem to me that some of those officers will definitely stay here, if not all. Then we are going to be faced with the time when the Belizians and the Jamaicans will retire and they are faced with the English, so where does this leave our people? This is my concern. I am not saying it with any disrespect. I am saying it with the hope that it will fall on the right ears and that something will be done before it is too late.

When I debated the last Throne Speech, I said: "Mr. President, as I understand it, the morale of the Force is low and I trust that our newly appointed Commissioner will exercise his leadership ability and endeavour to do whatever possible to mend the fences that have been damaged." If my information is correct, I do not think too much mending has been done. If my information is correct we still have, in certain areas, low morale. It is my hope that something will be done. Much time has now passed since I made those remarks and I question what has been done.

Quite recently I received information with regard to certain matters of the Force which certainly alarm me. On one occasion I did mention to the Member with responsibility the concern of mine which was brought to my attention with regard to the Force. I am not speaking of the officer

walking the street, I am talking about a little higher up than that. This is why I am so concerned, because it is a fact that any Department, any household, is only as strong as its head.

On a matter of the district stations, I must say I was pleased to learn that plans are afoot for strengthening of manpower in the near future. I have questioned this matter more than once - I should say, for some years now. I am more than pleased that some action will be taken. My district and the district of North Side are the furthest from the Capital. I believe that, with the way things have changed in this country over the past years, the time is right for those stations to be manned 24 hours a day. Why should the district of East End have to wait for manpower to be sent from the Central Station?

You know, I still say that it is unfortunate that the age limit for a police officer to retire is 55 years of age. I believe that some thought should be given to rehiring some of the stalwarts who are well known for their work of keeping Law and Order in these Islands, even if they are only utilised for District Constables. I can think of individuals like Mr. Royal Anderson, from Bodden Town; Mr. Radley Gourzong, from East End; and many, many others who are known to be officers that paid respect, but also demanded respect when it was needed. This is what we need today.

I recall that as a boy, when we saw individuals like those I mentioned, we turned and walked in the opposite direction because of the fear that was there. We were going to be questioned as to what we were doing, and I assure you we had to show them respect. Nowadays, you see the youngest children ready to talk back to police officers. This did not happen in my day. I am saying that I believe that the individuals I have mentioned would do much to bring back that respect, especially in the out-lying districts.

Briefly, on the Water Authority, I wish to register my concern over the extraction of water from the water lens in the district of East End. It is my understanding that there are several individuals, some local, who are ready and willing to enter into water production in these Islands. It is my understanding that we have a company, locally owned, called 'Aqua Design' that is managed by another capable Caymanian who is prepared and willing to go into this production of water. But, for whatever reason, I further understand that certain obstacles might have been thrown in his way. I believe that we should encourage this type of activity in producing more water for these Islands. I, for one, would encourage it because, as I said before in this Honourable House, it is a deep concern of mine knowing that so much water is extracted from the lens in my district, and knowing that it is a fact that we have less rainfall out there than other parts of the Island. I honestly hope and trust that the Government will give this matter their urgent attention. I know that I have been told in the past that the lens in my district is constantly monitored. This may be true. I am not expecting that it will be monitored for diesel oil, but what worries me, is that we were told likewise about other water lenses, which we now know are no longer available for pumping. I would further request that the people of my district be given a chance, and the opportunity which they deserve, in being able to utilise the water from the water lens in that district. I am asking that the Government consider having a feasibility [study] done on having water piped from the inland lens reservoir to my district, East End. This is not asking for too much, Mr. President.

I move on to the Civil Service. I would like to pay tribute to all civil servants. I agree with previous speakers who have spoken in regard to the pay increase to the civil servants, I support this 100 per cent. It is due, and I am prepared to support it in Finance Committee when we get there. On the Civil Service I would say that we have many Caymanians who we can be justly proud of whom we know to be exceptionally hard working men and women. Therefore, I would say that they deserve a good pay increase and that we should be man enough in this Chamber to give them what they deserve.

When I think of individuals like the First Official Member - and not because he is sitting across from me when I say this before his face and not behind his back - he is, indeed, a gentleman that these Islands can be justly proud of. He is not only (like the lady Member used to talk about) a six footer, but he is a gentleman in every sense. I feel justly proud to know that we have such an individual who can act in the absence of the Governor, as a Governor of these Islands. It gives me a thrill when I see that Daimler driving by, knowing that he is sitting in there. I am not saying this with any disrespect, I am saying so out of the true feelings of one Caymanian for another.

As I said, we have many in the Service deserving of the credit I have just poured out. But to each coin there are two sides - we have those that need to be shaken up a bit. What is happening to the Civil Service today, because of a little dead wood, the Service is getting a scar and we must weed them out to make way for the brilliant school leavers who are prepared and ready to face the future.

I now wish to touch briefly on substandard housing. I refer to the last Budget when I said I was pleased to know that the survey was completed which had reflected that there was about 3 per cent of the population of Grand Cayman with this type of housing and that the necessary steps should be taken to address the problem. I know that some action has been taken but there are still those who need urgent help. We still have substandard houses, and substandard sanitary facilities in various areas all over these Islands. Let me also say that to some Caymanians, regardless of how old and ragged their little home is, it is their little home. They still want to be independent and they do not feel safe and secure in a rest home or an old people's home. I can cite several cases, but I will deal with one in particular in my district. I know I would not cost the Government more than \$2,000 plus, to repair or rebuild a little home for this aged lady. I have reported that matter, along with other matters, to the Social Services Department for many months now. So far I was told that the first thing I needed to do was to get the lady out and put her in the old people's home in East End. I did try that but, as I pointed out, when an individual spends 60 or 70 years in an area, where they know they can shout through one window and call to a friend, it is not so easy to uproot that individual and take them to an old people's home.

We need urgent action to deal with matters such as this. Let me say that the Government spends much more than the amount which we would need to attend to this matter on other less important matters. Let us vote money, let us take care of this problem before it mushrooms into one which we cannot handle.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Proceedings are suspended for 15 minutes.

AT 11:27 A.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 12:08 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT:
continuing.

Proceedings are resumed. The Elected Member for East End

MR. JOHN B. MCLEAN:

Mr. President, when we took the break I thought I was just about finished on that Head, but I would like to make one last comment on substandard housing. It is more, I would say, in the form of a question because I have made my point with regard to substandard housing throughout the Islands. I would like to ask the question: Why has the survey not been dealt with which was carried out by the Environmental Health Department which showed the various homes and homeowners that needed the help that I spoke about? I must say that was a very good survey, and I was happy to see both when it was done and how it was done. It was my hope that it would have been followed up and, by now, we would have seen some action in that area.

The new hospital: Much has been preached on this recently, but it is not convincing to me. I would say (from what is quite evident) it is not a new hospital building we need. We do not need to change the hospital building. We need to change attitudes - attitudes from the top to the bottom in dealing with our present facility. It is very rare that you hear a complaint in regards to the actual structure but, certainly, constantly you hear complaints in regard to human attitudes, either at the hospital or at the Head. I would further state that many people in this country are disappointed in the Member with responsibility for the hospital, to know that with all that has been said in the past by the Member with regard to the hospital that he has not yet come to grips with these problems. I would strongly suggest that we allow this to be a private enterprise project. I believe that this would take a lot of the burden off the shoulders of the Government, and the end result would be that our people would, no doubt, receive an increase of quality in health care in these Islands.

You know what is most upsetting about this new facility is not only the \$20 million that we heard about, but the fact that outsiders knew about this long before the Backbench did. I heard about the old Crisis Committee that was put together to deal with this and I heard about the membership of that Committee. It seems as if that Committee has backfired the same way that the quarry backfired, and the Master Ground Transportation Plan has backfired, and the Jennett 'T' has backfired; and that is the way it will be until the Government realises and recognises that on this side of the House we have eight men who are as capable of operating a portfolio as they are.

We are not boys, so do not go behind our backs and form your committees and talk about building hospitals that are going to create a burden on the people of this country for some \$20 million; and then, when you find that Committee can operate no further, run to the Backbenchers and say you need our support. I am not going to use the term 'not one red cent', because that has taken on too much - I am going to say not one brown cent, not to be voted by John McLean, and I trust that my seven other colleagues will follow suit.

We agree that we need services, but what we cannot, or will not, tolerate is the way that we have been treated. You know, they wonder why they have lost their three Backbenchers. They should not blame the Members over here because we took our stand. It was through my efforts (and the Members here are honest people) that we voted for the First Elected Member because I felt then, as I feel now, about that individual. That is why he had twelve votes and the others had seven. But I would just issue a warning that I am as patient an individual as these Islands hold, but let me say that when I see abuse, I can become a boat that nobody can row.

The efforts spent to commit this country to \$20 million should have been spent in upgrading our district clinics. How long will I have to stand in this House and beg for a 24 hour service for the district which is the farthest away from the Capital? You know what I am told? Not only recently but the Second Elected Member who held responsibility previously, he is as guilty of it as the present Member. How long must I plead for an ambulance for the eastern districts?

The thing that bothers me with the ambulance is when I first came up with the idea, the Member with responsibility at that time (who is now the Second Elected Member with responsibility for Education) discouraged me in every way, talking about it costing the Government too much; it did not warrant it. At that time I had the full support of the then Member for North Side in trying to get that ambulance for the eastern districts to be stationed at the Fire Station. But what has happened? The shoe is on a different foot now. I am told the same thing by the Member who is also the Member for North Side. It does not warrant it, it is going to cost too much to have an ambulance for the eastern districts. Let me tell you something: The way that I see it, if it was only one trip per year it is necessary. Are we going to sit down and wait until the day when somebody dies on the way? Are we going to sit down and wait until an accident occurs because of having to rush from George Town to East End or North Side or Bodden Town, wherever the case may be? Are we going to treat this like we treated the problem of the trucks running around with blocks on the back and no tailgates, and wait until somebody gets killed before we take action?

I am not asking too much. I am thinking of the safety of my people. I am thinking of the safety of those who drive the roads between East End, North Side and George Town. You need only be on there sometimes to see the way that those poor ambulance drivers have to drive, risking their lives and risking the lives of the public. Yet we have two Members, present and past - who constantly credit themselves with their ability - who cannot see the problem that I am putting forward. What is \$20,000? What is

\$50,000? What is \$100,000 per year, if that is what it is going to cost to operate an ambulance for the eastern districts? The people out there are no different from those here. How many ambulances do we have in George Town?

Let me say something again, if this is going to be one of the matters that drives us to an Election, John McLean will be standing for it when he gets in that Finance Committee. I trust that I will have the support of the Members on this side of the House. How long can we go on this way, keeping our heads buried against the problems of the country? Or is it that it is simply because it is a suggestion from me, John McLean? Let us clean this House of personalities. Let us deal with the issues. Let us deal with the needs of our people.

You notice the Second Elected Member has vacated his seat. He has a right. Lest I get overheated I had better change the subject.

I will now move on to a subject that has always been near and dear to me. The subject for which, at least I can say on this side, I now have a back up. I speak of agriculture. I have always tried in every way to promote agriculture in the Cayman Islands. I (like the Second Elected Member for Bodden Town) practice what I preach. As I pointed out in previous addresses, this country has many farmers - many farmers who have been determined for many years to prove that agriculture can be done even if it is on a small scale. But, of course, it can be successful. It is not an easy task for anyone to do agriculture in these Islands.

I must say that I am pleased to see that the Government is trying to assist with some technical advice. I am certain that, like myself, the farmers appreciate this. I can speak on behalf of the farmers, because I am also the President of the Agricultural Society. We appreciate whatever the Government does to assist us.

For some time the Cayman Islands has been one of the countries that contributes to the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB). I think they are referred to as less developed countries (LDCs), which are made up of Islands like Antigua, Belize, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Dominica, Grenada, Montserrat, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines and the Turks and Caicos Islands. It is my understanding that one of the things which the CDB encourages is something that I have constantly been asking for - more roads, more farm roads. I am talking about the roads like the Members for Bodden Town were talking about, new roads - roads that are going into virgin territory for the first time. That is what we call new roads. We are not talking about those that we are going to resurface.

It is a fact that the CDB encourages agricultural feeder roads. It is a fact that they will also fund agricultural feeder roads. It is laid down in some of their regulations in most of the CDB regional member countries, agricultural development is hampered by an inadequate system of motorable roads in the farming areas. The relatively few existing feeder roads are often in a state of disrepair. Although here in the Cayman Islands, at least in the eastern part of this Island where there are only a few farm roads - and I can credit myself for having the first one put in place - it is encouraged that a good road system is necessary for the safe and efficient transport of both perishables, for example, bananas and other fresh fruits and vegetables, and non-perishables, primarily commodities from the farm to marketing and processing centres. It also encourages the creation of new farming units by opening up additional agricultural lands and facilities, the injection of capital and new technologies into farming systems.

If we are to be ever near the point of becoming self-sufficient in agriculture, we must adopt the recommendations of providing more feeder roads in the areas which still have farmland. There are other needs of the farmer, no doubt. The farmer needs equipment that can be utilised on the terrain that he has to work. Many farmers who would like to go into farming full fledged have been hindered because of equipment. I refer to my tenure in the Portfolio when we were able to secure a tractor from the Canadian Government. I must say I am far from being satisfied that the farmers have gotten full use of that piece of equipment.

I further support the view of the Second Elected Member for Bodden Town when he mentioned that the Government should take steps to secure a bulldozer, especially for the farmers. I agree 100 per cent because in my position as President I have spoken with many farmers who assure me that numerous times they have tried to rent a bulldozer from the Government and when they believed that they were to the point of getting it, they were turned away because it had to be used elsewhere. If this is the problem, I am asking all Members who agree with the Second Elected Member and myself to assist in putting this equipment in place which will assist and, no doubt, promote agriculture in these Islands. I am not being selfish when I refer to the bulldozer or the tractor. I am speaking for farmers here and also in Cayman Brac - we use it here and transport it there. We are all one, it is only water that separates us.

Mr. President, it was not my intention to speak on the abattoir but I now feel it is my duty to do so. I think I should put the record of the history of plans for an abattoir for Grand Cayman right. When I was in the Portfolio plans were prepared for an abattoir. I am not talking about plans made by the Public Works Department, I am talking of plans made by a company that specialises in abattoirs, not only in the actual structure of the building, but also in the facilities it takes to operate. The plans were drawn, the site was on property owned by the Government called the Demonstration Farm. I vacated the seat in 1984, and because the plans had been put forward by me, the Member who replaced me (and I am not referring to the present Member) at that time did absolutely nothing with the plans. A lot of money went into those plans. There was no reason why that project should not have continued from where I left off, and today, if this were done, the farmers would, for several years now, have had a facility where their meat could have been prepared properly. Let me say that the efforts of the Second Elected Member for Bodden Town and myself with regards to this abattoir is not for any personal gain, it will not be built for the two of us; it will be built for those poor farmers who desperately need it.

It was shocking to see that in the Estimates we now have a figure of some \$43,000, with a footnote for further consultancy or further drawings or plans or preparations,

whatever it may be. To me we should not have to spend money again to prepare for something that was already prepared. This money could be utilised toward the actual building. I cannot say that the plans are still at the Portfolio, because it has been many years now since I have been there. A few days ago I actually called the company in Miami that prepared the plans (they still knew who I was and about the plans that had been drawn), and I believe that with a bit of luck I might have them in my hand next week. Mr. President, these are the things that I consider as spending money in the wrong way. I am not saying that everything that a Government or a Member does is right. But in the event that it is right, I honestly feel that it should be a continuing process rather than tearing down what has been built up.

While on Agriculture, I must also mention cattle-dips. Mr. President, when Dr. Bell (who was the Chief Agricultural and Veterinary Officer) came to these Islands, his first job was to have plans prepared. Again, many years have passed prior to my leaving the Portfolio. We have had farmers in the Lower Valley area who consented to giving property where a dip could be built. Again, it is the same thing in my district. I will agree that quite recently some work was done by the present Member in preparing the property in my district (for which I am most grateful) but recently I heard that new plans had to be drawn. I do not know what changes so much about a cattle dip. We have cattle dips in this country that I would venture to bet are probably over 100 years old and still operating the way they should.

Just to give you a little history of what happened when I left the Portfolio, in trying to undo what I had done monies were spent on a piece of equipment which was bought somewhere (I think in Puerto Rico) which is only used on dairy farms where you have animals that you can walk and lead where you want them to go. It was brought here and then taken out to my district, I guess in an effort to try to put me down because I did not agree with it. But the end result was that I was correct because I knew what it meant to deal with animals. You cannot take an animal that is constantly running in the wild and expect to bring him near a facility like that. Furthermore, I recall the day it was demonstrated - a full sized animal could hardly fit in it. Mr. President, I cannot, in any way, see this as forward thinking.

MR. PRESIDENT: Do you feel this is a good time for the break?

MR. JOHN B. McLEAN: Yes, Sir, it is a good time.

MR. PRESIDENT: Proceedings are suspended until 2:15 p.m.

AT 12:45 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 2:20 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Proceedings of the House are resumed. The Elected Member for East End continuing.

MR. JOHN B. McLEAN: Thank you, Mr. President.

When we took the break I was about to make a few remarks on Education, as I have said many times that whatever we spend on Education in trying to educate our young people is money well spent. There are several areas which I would urge the Government to continue to give its help and attention. One area is the International College of the Cayman Islands. I believe that this College has contributed much to these Islands. Indeed many of our people who would not have had an opportunity to go abroad have been able to further their education at the College. At this Meeting we have heard the matter raised and I would urge the Member with responsibility to look thoroughly at what can be done to upgrade this facility. Of course, whatever contributions the Government can offer, it is my belief, should be offered.

It is the same thing with the private schools. As it has been pointed out many times, private schools in this country play a very important part in the education of our children, taking an added burden off the shoulders of the Government. I honestly believe that the Government should contribute more to these schools. I believe that an evaluation should be carried out to see the needs and whatever Government can possibly do, should be done.

Sporting Facilities - and I am speaking especially in the outer districts. I am far from being satisfied that enough has been done over the years. Again I have to refer to my district, and my efforts to upgrade the sporting facilities there. In 1984 there was a sum in the Budget of some \$30,000 which was earmarked for property in the Gun Bay area for sporting facilities and other community needs. Until now, nothing has been done. The Second Elected Member and I visited the area. I have spoken to the individual who owns the property, and they are prepared to sell it at what I consider an exceptionally good price. I am hoping that this matter will be treated with the urgency it deserves. Like other growing districts you will find that we have a community in itself in the Gun Bay area. Over the years most of the facilities, including the schools, were built in central East End. I feel it is time to look at this area as a community in itself and prepare things like playing fields, a community centre, and other needed facilities. All of this could be done in the same area I mentioned. Again, I am urging the Member to do a follow-up on this, and I am asking that when we go into Committee we endeavour to secure this property before it is sold privately.

I have spoken to the same Member with regard to upgrading the facilities in East End central, and I must say that I was very disappointed with the attitude. A group of young people from the district visited the Portfolio, and decided that they were going to construct a playing field. Until now nothing has been done with that. I feel that the Member with the responsibility for education should have consulted me as a representative for that district, and also knowing that I had already approached the Government in an effort

to try and upgrade the facilities in the district. However, Sir, once again it proves that Backbenchers are constantly ignored and outsiders (by way of the Government) are more up to date on matters than we are. The outlying districts need more attention with regard to sporting facilities, amusement parks, etcetera. We need to create more for our young people. As one Member put it we must invest more in our young people.

We have a problem today in these Islands. It is a known fact that the horrible effects of drugs have crept into our society. It may be easy for some people to refer to the 'writing off a generation', but I take no part in that. I believe always, that where there is life, there is hope. We should continue to do whatever is possible for our youth. I believe that the idea put forward by the First Elected Member for Bodden Town, when he said "we should label this the decade of our youth", is a very good idea. But it is unfortunate that some people look at it with a dim view. It is very sad when our young people become involved with drugs or, as a matter of fact, when they become involved in any type of crime. We must continue to do something about it.

I fully support the idea of a Cadet Corps. I am glad that the Member from the Government Bench spoke about this. I believe that the lack of discipline which we see today among many of our youths could be helped if we had such a facility. I further disagree with having to put first time offenders with seasoned criminals and, perhaps, if we had such a disciplinary corps we could have a proper separation. We must continue to fight against drugs in our society, and not only this society because it has now become a worldwide thing. You can hardly turn on your television set and you do not see another area of the world that is slowly, but surely, becoming infested with the ills of hard drugs. Our society is small in many respects and we must do whatever possible to keep this problem small and, if possible, eradicate it fully.

The First Elected Member for West Bay spoke of assistance from the United Kingdom, I thought it was an excellent suggestion. Today the United States is trying as much as possible to help other nearby territories. I believe the least that the Mother country can do for us is to assist us in this area. We are not like other territories - constantly begging. We look after our own affairs. And, Mr. President, this one has become a very serious one, and I feel it should be communicated that way and we should receive the necessary help to fight it.

Mr. President, on Immigration and the Caymanian Protection Board: Let me say that I am one Member who welcomes the review that is presently going on. I believe, Sir, that if the Immigration Law, and the Caymanian Protection Law as it is, is not dealt with properly this time we, in these Islands, are going to find ourselves in a lost position. I have said many times that I am concerned over the grant of Caymanian status. I believe it is probably the one area that the Second Elected Member for West Bay, and myself, have fully agreed on. Where it says "12", he normally says it was meant to be one or two. I agree, Mr. President. We are a very small country, we can only have so many people, and I believe that history will bear me out that we are exhausting the amount that we can absorb. It is now for us to stand firm and to make the proper recommendations in the Committee as we are dealing with this Immigration Law.

I would say, Mr. President, that the present staff of the Immigration Department continues to do a good job. This is an area where long and hard hours have to be worked. I believe that we should pay for whatever staff has to work. In other words, if overtime is built up we should pay it. We must continue to encourage departments such as the Immigration, Customs and the Police Departments. Therefore, we should make sure that proper compensation is paid.

I wish to deal briefly with the Public Accounts Committee: indeed, I will begin by saying that I feel the Committee is to be commended for a very thorough report. I would say that this Report has reflected a number of serious matters and it is my hope that the Government will see it fit to accept the recommendations and have them corrected. I know that some Members of the Executive Council have shown some opposition to this. But this Committee was appointed by them themselves. The terms of reference are clearly laid out in the Standing Orders, and I would say that the actions of the Committee were only taken as a result of what appeared in the Auditor General's Report. It is ridiculous to know that after such a wonderful job was carried out by that Committee an out right attack was launched, especially on the Chairman.

I have been a young Member in this Assembly (although it has been several years now) and I can imagine that the First Elected Member for Bodden Town must have felt discouraged and upset, and he should. I have served on the Public Accounts Committee in the past, as a matter of fact recently, up until the time when this Board was put together. I can afford to say that the Chairman and his Committee did an excellent job. It is unfortunate that what was done did not meet the best wishes of all, but I would say to the Chairman and his Committee that they have done a wonderful job and should have no apologies for anybody.

It is clear in the Standing Orders that "There shall be a Standing Select Committee, to be styled the Public Accounts Committee, to consider the Reports of the Auditor General." As I understand it, the Committee was nominated the right way, the witnesses were summoned the right way, and the Chairman is a man of ability, he was able to guide his Committee and Members to conclude a very thorough Report. We should not begrudge him for his ability. I would say that this Report has shown to us every reason in the world why we should scrutinise everything and discourage this open check policy. I give him the assurance that he has the support of this Member, and if I had to vote for him to go back on that Committee tomorrow I would do so without fear or favour of contradiction.

I would say Members from this side have shown the Government how capable they are. In most cases I would venture to bet that we will be proven correct in the end with the Public Accounts Committee. We have been accused so many times, and the *Hansard* will bear us out, we have tried in every respect to work along with the Government. I would say that we have supported 90 per cent of whatever has been brought before us. I know of the occasion when we did not support one Bill, the Music and Dancing Law, and it did not take long before we were proven correct on our stand on, as I termed it, the "Bill of

Repentance". So, Mr. President, I do not consider us hard individuals to get along with.

I would like to deal with the few matters which were raised here by the Honourable Member with responsibility for Education, as he spoke here yesterday on points that the Member made to give the financial position of the Government as of now. He said that it was exceptionally good. I would say that I do not believe anyone is disputing it at this time, but our argument is that if projects which were put forward by the Government, such as the MGTP, the hospital, the Port, the Dental Clinic, and we are already committed - be it directly or indirectly - with Cayman Airways Limited, if this was taken into consideration I am certain that we would not be looking at the healthy position that he was trying to paint. But with all of that, we, on this side of the House, have the greatest respect for the ability of our Honourable Financial Secretary, and we feel certain that he will do whatever possible to knock them in line. I feel certain that he is not the type of individual who believes in the open cheque policy, so I am sure we can depend fully upon him at this time, because by now he has seen the stand from this side.

Another point which the Honourable Elected Member with responsibility for Education tried to saddle us with was (as he put it) the maligning or ridiculing of teachers. Mr. President, I do not know of any Member on this side who outrightly ridicules teachers or maligns them. We are representatives and we have a right to have our say. In each case whatever we say is out of concern and I would say that we are further concerned that he is not doing enough with regard to preparing more Caymanian teachers.

Now, I do not know which one of the Members on this side the Honourable Member might have been referring to about ridiculing or maligning teachers, but if he is referring to the one English teacher, Mr. Howard Smith, who literally abused one of our senior citizens - and he was from my district - let me say that I had my say on him at the highest level. And since the Honourable Member has afforded me an opportunity to deal with it, I will again say as I said when the matter first came to my attention, Mr. Smith should not only have been relieved of his teaching duties, but he should have been considered a prohibited immigrant and sent away from these Islands. I do not care if he was from Timbuktu, much less England. Mr. President, I hope and trust that in my lifetime we will never, ever have a school teacher with that sort of behaviour.

Mr. President, what worries me is the fact that this individual is given the opportunity to freely move around our Islands after having carried out an injustice to an aged individual. It proves one thing, Mr. President, and that is that his ability to conduct himself is far from something to be admired. Who is to tell us he would not do it again? A leopard never changes its spots, Mr. President. I suppose the next thing we will hear is that he has status.

Members on this side have also spoken on the education system with regard to using more teachers from the region, and this was pointed out because of similar cultures. Mr. President, I do not see anything wrong with that. I believe that to have the mixture would do us good. Furthermore, I would say that we have had some of the best qualified teachers right here in these Islands, and in most cases they were relieved of their jobs for one thing or another. The Honourable Member is aware of this. I wonder if in his term of office he has done anything to encourage them to come back?

Mr. President, I have to deal with this final one on the Honourable Member because as I listened to his speech again late last night when he gave this side a lecture on behaviour and setting an example in this House for the youth, I certainly had to wonder. I was appalled! The first time that I have ever seen a Member put in his place in this House was when the Honourable Member returned here between 1980 and 1984. It was something completely new to me because we did not have that type of behaviour in here, and I must say that this was coming from a Presiding Officer who had a lot of patience - I speak of Mr. Russell, and even he was pushed by that Member to where he had to make a ruling from the Chair. I know of several occasions...

MR. PRESIDENT: off except for the speaker. Thank you.

Would Members make sure that their microphones are switched

MR. JOHN B. McLEAN: I know of several occasions when you, Sir, as Presiding Officer, have had to do the same thing. I can think of only one Member who was almost struck by another Member because of his bad behaviour, and it was the same Member, Mr. President. So how can he come now to scold the Members on this side and to give them a lesson on behaviour in this House, and to tell us that we should be setting an example for the young people in this country, when he has never, ever done so? He is the longest serving Member in this House. The Caymanian people will not be fooled further.

I would just like to deal with my request from a district level. Although I have been treated very badly from 1984 until the present day with regard to achieving things for my district - as it was said it was done in an effort to unseat me - but I trust that the Member saw that at the last Election the attitudes that were put forward against me only strengthened my position. I do not lie to my people. When I write a letter or stand in this House and make a request, my people know that I am doing what I can. I cannot do it by myself. Anyway, it is my hope that this will change. I wrote a letter to the four Executive Council Members and I said:

"Re: The Budget.

Lands and Surveys, at present, are doing an evaluation on a piece of land in the Gun Bay area which I have requested for a play field, hurricane shelter, civic centre area. (Mr. Benson and myself visited the site some time ago and at the time he agreed with my proposal). I would appreciate if the amount involved here could be placed in the Budget. As a matter of fact, the owner would take payments in

Installments."

With all this, I was very shocked to see that there was not even a token vote for this request. I went on to say;

"Also, the road from Frank Sound to East End needs urgent attention and I would appreciate if a substantial amount could be included to have the necessary work done."

There is a small sum in the roads vote. But, as I understand from the Chief Engineer, that amount of money could not do very much as far as the work that is needed on the present road. I included in this letter, and I read: "Again, I would humbly request that funds be included in the Budget for an ambulance for the eastern districts as this is very important." I have seen that there are at least two or three ambulances identified in the Budget. There is nothing there that identifies them for the eastern district, but it is my hope that I will be able to garner enough support to have that imbedded in the Estimates. As I pointed out earlier, there is no other request as important as the one for an ambulance for the eastern districts. I went on to say, "The present playing field needs to be fenced and further upgraded." I am pleased to say that through the kind cooperation of the Public Works Department I have been able to get some fencing. I am now further requesting that (contrary to what the Member for Education may think of the area which we use for a playing field) he would see fit to help me have it upgraded to where the young people in my district will have a nice field for the present and, indeed, if we can develop the other field for the future I would certainly appreciate that. I went on to say:

"I should have mentioned this when addressing roads, but the Queen's Highway on into Gun Bay also needs surfacing and I would suggest that the Public Works Department be requested to look at this and give an estimate so that this can also be done.

There are several areas in East End, Gun Bay and Colliers area where additional farm roads could be placed and I would like to discuss these with you."

If we are to continue to encourage agriculture, that final paragraph is the most important and necessary.

My final request was for some street lights. This time it is not for 36 lights, it is only for 15 and it is for the district of East End, not Bodden Town. But anyway, the Members for Bodden Town know that my support is with them for their 36 or 63, as the case may be, and I am hoping that I can at least get my 15. Mr. President, in conclusion I would again like to remind the Executive Council that they should, at all times, look at the eight Backbenchers on this side as great examples of what communication means, and role model means - what it means to work together and be together.

This is a little bit off, but the Third Official Member mentioned it yesterday and it did slip my mind to mention it earlier, but I would especially like to express my thanks to that lady from North Side who sent us that meaningful poem. It is my hope that all Members have listened to it and have understood the true meaning of that little poem. To put it in a few words, be humble, change your hostile attitudes. The Member who read that poem is correct in saying that that lady has contributed to the hospitality industry. I am appealing to the Government, and the Portfolio with responsibility for Health and Social Services, to look at her situation and to offer some assistance to that lady. She is a deserving Caymanian, and regardless of our personal feelings towards her, it is the duty of the Portfolio to address the matter.

Let me say that we are drawing close to the Christmas season and I take this opportunity to extend my best wishes to you and your family, all Members of this Assembly and the Clerk and her staff. Last, and most importantly, to extend best wishes to the people of East End and, indeed, the people of the Cayman Islands. My hope is that we will all enjoy a very warm season. It is my hope that when we return here for a future Sitting of this Assembly that the Christmas season will have changed our attitudes and our minds, and that we will come here as a united front with one thing in mind - the people of the Cayman Islands.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Before the Honourable First Official Member begins to reply to the debate on the Second Reading, he suggested that in the interest of his finishing today, that Members should take the tea break individually, while he continues to speak. He assures me that you will not be offended by this.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: I am certain that all of us would like his reply. Maybe we could take the usual tea break and go on a little earlier so we can all be in the Chamber when he is speaking, as we really want to be here when he is speaking.

MR. PRESIDENT: That is a very courteous expression. Perhaps we could limit the tea break to 10 minutes. Proceedings are suspended for ten minutes.

AT 3:15 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 3:29 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Proceedings of the House are resumed.

The Honourable First Official Member.

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON:

Mr. President, I feel a little nervous this afternoon. Maybe it is caused by the debate that has taken place and the rumblings on the marl road about elections. But I am not as bad as the story I heard about a U.S. Government official, who was about to give a speech and the story, Mr. President, goes like this:-

"Upon entering a room in a Washington hotel, a woman recognised a well-known government official pacing up and down and asked him what he was doing there. 'I'm going to deliver a speech shortly', he said.

'Do you usually get very nervous before addressing a large audience?'

'Nervous?' he replied, 'No, I never get nervous.'

'In that case', demanded the lady, 'what in the world are you doing in the Lady's Room?'

Poor fellow, he did not even know which room he was in. As I said earlier, I am not quite that bad.

Mr. President, Honourable Members, may I today begin my winding up of the debate on the Appropriation Bill by accepting, with gratitude, your kind remarks and congratulations on the Budget Address and its delivery. The Address sought to bring to Honourable Members, and the people of these Islands, the issues affecting the future which resulted from the rapid development of the 1980s. Surely we have some reason to be concerned, but let us keep it in context with the enviable success we have attained. For example:

1. Cayman had no deficit. Indeed, it has accumulated \$17.2 million in General Reserves over the 1980s, with an estimated accumulated surplus balance of \$9.2 million at the end of 1989;
2. We have more jobs than we can fill;
3. Better social harmony than many countries all over the world;
4. Less crime than most countries which have this level of affluence; and
5. A better standard of living and quality of life than many countries including the industrialised countries.

So, let us take what I will say now and bear in mind these successes.

Mr. President, before I get into the substance of winding up the debate on the Budget, let me offer the following comments. I place on record my grateful thanks to Mr. Gerald Collett, who brought to this country judiciary expertise, which this country deserved. Regardless of the compliments and deserved thanks for his services, we have lost a good Chief Justice. I wish Gerald and Jill a healthy retirement and may Almighty God bless them for the competent and friendly services they have given to the people of this country.

Mr. President, on a separate subject, I call to your attention, and the Members of this Honourable House, a press statement issued by President Bush's Press Secretary on 30 November 1989, and I quote: "President Bush has directed that Panamanian flag vessels not be permitted to enter United States' ports after 31st of January, 1990." While we do not relish hearing of countries which may be losing business, our facilities at the Shipping Registry are available and stand ready to accept good ships which may wish to come to us. We will do all we can to capture some of the business if it leaves that country and we are already spreading our message.

On another subject, I would advise that it was the Government's intention to deal with the Salary Commissioner's Report in the Standing Finance Committee, as we were certain that the Report would have reached Government before we finalised our deliberations in the Committee. My recommendation to this Honourable House is that this review be tied to a substantial O & M Review without any delay, and with sufficient staff to carry out the required work within a 24 month period. I believe, subject to technical advice, we need four to six professionals, and I offer my support to getting on with the task.

Mr. President, and Honourable Members, I offer my explanation to the methodology used in compiling the 1990 draft Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure, after much deliberation and cutting of expenditure proposals for two reasons: 1) The economy is overheating, thus the reason for inflation now reaching 6.5 per cent versus, a year ago, 5.2 per cent and, two years ago 4.3 per cent. And the practicality of getting a lot of capital work done given that all of the contractors in the construction industry are fully occupied. So, if they are fully occupied, in order for Government to attract the contractor from one of his jobs to occupied. Government, we will have to pay a premium price to attract him and maybe (please check it for yourselves) it is the reason why citizens are becoming concerned with some of the high cost to Government of contracts being awarded this year.

So when Government attracts the contractor and pays this premium price for its works in an already overheated economy, I say, Mr. President and Honourable Members, is this cost effective? Does it make good sense, especially if the project can be deferred for a year or two without any real hardship to the community? In other words, Mr. President and Honourable Members, we live in a practical world, and I say let us be practical when putting forward this 1990 Budget.

2) We have all witnessed, over the last seven years (to select a period) where Government has attempted to carry out capital works and the budgeted total capital figure invariable is much in excess of what was actually done. And in some cases, we blamed the Public Works Department for their inability to carry out the expected and estimated total capital works. Perhaps, in their defence, without asking them the simple question, "Can you, Mr. Public Works, carry out \$19 million worth of Capital works?"

Mr. President, and Honourable Members, when I asked that question this time in preparing the 1990 Budget, I got what I believe to be an honest and practical answer from Public Works. They told me "we (PWD) cannot carry out this amount of work", and then they proceeded to tell me the reasons why, project by project, and invariably the answer fell into three categories: 1) Drawings for the project had not been completed, in some cases it had not even started; 2) land purchases for the project not yet finalised; and 3) Insufficient briefs from the relevant party so that drawings could be done. In other words, Mr. President, and Honourable Members, the project preparation stage had not been completed, or was not sufficiently advanced to allow the project to be completed or substantially started. I believe that it is bordering on being unwise, if you get a proper answer to your question, which I posed to PWD, and then you go ahead and disregard that information and put this huge sum in for capital works - perhaps, to please the public and raise their expectations that the project is going to be done - when you know you are doomed to fail at least within the next twelve months. Because when you fail to deliver the completed project in 1990, the public has every right to complain and give us flak.

Therefore, Mr. President and Honourable Members, the projects in the 1990 Capital budget meet the following criteria:

1. a) Project preparation has been completed, i.e. Drawings have been completed.
- b) Quantities have been determined and costed.
- c) Land is available and site is known.
2. Project is in an advanced preparation stage, so that in the first half of 1990 the project can go to tender, or Public Works Department can begin the work. Some of the token figures in the estimates are put there to indicate to Members that, should funds be available, the project can begin - some are more likely to begin in the second half of the year.

However, Mr. President, and Honourable Members, some funds are provided for projects to allow the "projection preparation stage" to be completed. Before I leave this matter, I wish to advise you, Sir, and Honourable Members, that the Capital Development Committee has been resuscitated, as mentioned on page 82 of the Budget Address. We want to establish a polished procedure for capital projects, which includes the practicalities I mentioned earlier, and to ensure that all projects proposed represent cost-effective, or least-cost solutions to the relevant problem. I ask Honourable Members, to please bear these remarks in mind when considering the 1990 Draft Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure in Finance Committee.

The last subject of commentary is that we are well on our way to negotiating an agreement to conduct a Manpower Demand Survey which, hopefully, with the assistance of local businesses and the public, will provide the hard facts (mentioned on page 79 of the Address) to allow us to make a policy decision on Manpower, Training and Development. It is our hope that the survey will be completed by the summer of next year.

Mr. President, the Budget presentation was divided into three broad sections. The first section gave a brief overview of some of the main developments in the world's economy during the 1980-1989 period with particular reference to conditions in the industrialised countries. It noted how these developments affected the local economy. The second section built upon the first section and presented a review and assessment of the growth performance of the Caymanian economy over the period of 1983-1988. The second section also highlighted major development policy issues that came out of the analysis. The third and final section presented a two, to five year review of the potential economic growth for both the industrialised world and the Cayman Islands. It outlined some medium development priority considerations for the Cayman Islands and provided the main figures for the 1990 Budget.

Mr. President, in the first section of this Budget Address I stressed that it was important that we consider our own economic situation in the broader context of world conditions, because small open economies like ours are influenced both directly and indirectly by world economic conditions. The overview of world economic growth during the 1980s suggests that when the industrialised countries experience strong growth, the Cayman economy tends, generally, to perform well. And when the industrialised world experiences recession, growth in the Cayman economy tends also to experience contraction.

The main reason why our economic performance was so strongly influenced by growth in the world economy during the 1980s is that our economy has become more strongly linked into the developed market economies through growth in tourism and financial services. Furthermore, our overall economic performance is dominated by movements in the foreign price level of our

imported goods, interest rates and exchange rate movements, the amount and type of foreign investments and the inflow of imported labour. Thus, economic conditions in the world economy, especially in the industrialised countries creates the external conditions for our own economic performance, particularly in the areas of tourism and financial services because our economy is linked into the world economy through exports and tourism and financial services. There will always be opportunities and challenges we must recognise, and for which we must plan.

Mr. President, the implementation of the Single European Act in 1992 which will combine all individual western European economies into a unitary economy, and will eliminate all internal trade and economic barriers within western Europe, and create a single market - larger and wealthier than that of the United States and Japan combined - will present opportunities and challenges to us and will demand forward looking tourism and financial services market diversification strategies.

Turning now to the main section of the Address, the section analyses that and assesses the growth performance of the economy, I suggested that this Honourable House should take cognizance of the fact that the indigenous segment of the population increasing at a decreasing rate during the 1980s, and the principle causal reason for this development was a fall in the live birthrate. I then proceeded to present two implications for the observed decline in this rate. One implication was that if the birthrate among indigenous Caymanians continues to fall over the next 15 to 20 years, as it did during the 1980s, holding the death rate constant, then there is likely to be a relative proportion of more mature adults, age wise, in the Caymanian segment of the population than Caymanians of younger age. The second implication I outlined is that a trend towards such a shift in the age distribution of the indigenous population would have major implications for the health service delivery system, the social service delivery system and the labour force.

Mr. President, turning now specifically to my analysis of growth and economic activity, I conclude that on the strength of the available data, despite the volatility in world's economic conditions during the 1980s, the Caymanian economy has generally performed well. To reemphasise by way of a summary, some of the main points giving rise to this conclusion include: -

1. Overall real growth in the economy's output and sustained growth in per person standard of living resulting in substantial improvement in the overall quality of life.
2. Expansion of the labour force.
3. A low and stable inflation rate during much of the 1983-1988 period.
4. Strong growth in import demand, resulting in an increasing import bill and widening of the merchandising trade deficit.
5. Offsetting growth in invisible earnings (like tourism earnings) that produce a surplus on the invisible trade balance, resulting in a decline in the current account side of the balance of payments.
6. Stable Budgetary management which has increased credit worthiness and foreign reserve position and which has little or no perceived impact on the level of domestic prices.
7. The expansion of both domestic and external demands.
8. Labour productivity growth.
9. Sectorial output growth.
10. Growth in the level and rate of domestic savings, and
11. Real growth in capital formation.

There are seven main factors that appear to explain the strong growth performance of the local economy during the 1980s. These factors appear to have been: -

1. An economic policy environment that provided the incentives for stable and sustained upward growth.
2. Buoyant domestic and external demands. The latter pertains particularly to tourism.
3. Growth in the capacity of the economy to produce services as reflected in the growth of domestic investments and savings.
4. Growth in overall labour productivity.

5. Growth and productivity of the different economic sectors, particularly the financial services, tourism services, professional business services and wholesale/retail trading.
6. Government Budgets that did not fuel inflation, and
7. Growth in the productivity of expatriate labour.

However, I indicated that the strong performance of the economy has brought the number of underlying structural weaknesses to the forefront. These weaknesses include:

1. A shortage of native manpower skills.
2. Inadequate port facilities and road networks.
3. An increasing dependency on expatriate labour and inflationary dependence on consumer and capital good imports.
4. An over reliance on international trade specialisation and tourism and financial services which has led to the development of an economy with a narrow and economically fragile labour and sociocultural sensibility production base.
5. A structural bias against agricultural development or other industries which could potentially transfer hard technical skills to Caymanians; and
6. An uneven acceptance of the function of economic development planning.

Mr. President, I also indicated that the assessments of the economies strengths and weaknesses raises a number of development challenges with major implications for the direction and rate of growth in the economy for the 1990s. These issues pose political and economic challenges which I invited this Honourable House to rationally debate and address in terms of future policy direction.

The first challenge has to do with the rapid pace of structural economic and demographic change experienced by these Islands within a relatively short period of time. The inevitable socioeconomic outcome of these changes has made a transformation of the nationality composition of the population and the work force and of the traditional social and cultural characteristics of the native population. This has created concern about the perceived demographic and cultural consequences of continuing this rapid pace of economic growth. These concerns have prompted proposals for alternative development strategies from two of the Islands most influential private sector institutions. These proposals are:

1. Leave the status quo unchanged. That is, to continue with policies aimed at continuing or increasing the current level and rate of economic growth; and
2. A restrictive growth policy. That is, to implement policies aimed at slowing down the current base of economic activity, or at increasing the total output of goods and services at a decreasing rate over a given period of time.

I outlined, that the explicit development objectives of these proposals are both demographic and economic. It is either to allow the base of economic growth to continue at the current rate with the objective of maintaining and increasing per capita income, or to reduce per capita income growth through restricting economic activities with the objective of enabling Caymanians to catch up demographically in the terms of the quantity and quality of their labour skills. I also indicated that the proposed development objectives appear mutually in conflict, but they raise substantial issues which should bear heavily on choices of future development policies.

Mr. President, in developing any policy this House should be cognisant of the important contribution expatriate labour performs in our economy. In my address I pointed out that gross real output in the professional business sector averaged 6 per cent annually - increasing from \$65.3 million in 1983 to \$81.4 million in 1987 - and that overall growth was approximately 25 per cent. These figures reflect the importance of the productive role of professionals in the growth performance of the economy.

Mr. President, while the growth in the quantity and quality of expatriate skills in the economy may have resulted in a numerical realignment of the population and labour force in the 1980s, this Honourable House, and the community at large, must not overlook the very important fact, that the strong, growth performance of the economy cannot adequately be explained without recognising and emphasising that the productive contribution of expatriates has been a stimulant in overall economic performance.

The second challenge I outlined focused on the training and the development of Caymanians for the more critical occupational job categories. Trade-offs will have to be found between the selective reduction in immigrant labour importation and the training and utilisation of Caymanian manpower. In this connection, short term, medium term and long term manpower planning and development programmes would need to be considered in conjunction with the terms of the existing contractual arrangements between employers and immigrant workers. This would require a close working relationship, as we have between

the private sector and the Government.

Educational policy would also need to be geared to producing more and better quality high school graduates. The Government's long term training policy would also need to be modified to ensure that Government financed students attend post-secondary institutions of competitively high and rigorous quality. Mr. President, in this section, I also outlined a number of other challenges which are before us. These include:

1. Inadequacy of the existing road network, especially in George Town and on the West Bay peninsula.
2. The urgent need to develop and effectively implement policies and programmes aimed at diversifying the productive base of the economy; and,
3. The need for universal acceptance in the Public Service of formal economic planning and public sector capital investment programming, as effective institutional resource management tools.

The third section of my Address noted that the current economic expansion in the industrial economies is expected to continue well into the 1990s, but at a slightly slower pace. Interest rates, inflation rates, exchange rates, trade and fiscal account balances and a unitary European market in 1992 will determine the future course of economic action in these countries. Within the context of the local economy, given assumptions of no change in the existing economic growth policies of the Government, and assuming that local economic growth would not be adversely affected by world economic developments, no more than in the 1980s, I conservatively project a 7.4 per cent average annual rate of economic growth over the 1989-1993 period.

I point out that this would imply that if the overall population grew at an expected average annual rate of between 3 to 4 per cent, and inflation at an expected average annual rate of 7.1 per cent, gross domestic product would need to grow at an average annual rate of 6.6 per cent in real terms, in order to maintain our 1987 real per capita income of \$13,200.

In this section I suggested that, given the above projections for further growth, and being more aware now of the structural weaknesses in the economy, that the 1980s pace of growth has brought forcefully to the forefront, this Honourable House should consider the following as policy priorities in the 1990s:

1. Slowing down or sustaining and/or extending the current pace of economic growth and the economic and financial consequences of alternative courses of action, implication of adjusting growth in these areas.
2. In addition practical policies and programmes that should complement what ever course of action this Honourable House may deem desirable where also proposed as a priority. These programmes include:
 - (a) indigenous manpower training and development, guided by well informed policies.
 - (b) development of light technology transferring industries linked to the programme of indigenous manpower training,
 - (c) action oriented agricultural development policies and programmes,
 - (d) implementation of the phase one road programme as outlined in the Master Ground Transportation Plan, and
 - (e) development of the institutional mechanisms to ensure that projects proposed by portfolios and Government agencies for public funding do, in fact, represent cost effective or least-cost solutions to the relevant problem, or set of problems, they are intending to address.

Mr. President, this is just one set of priorities I have suggested. They are overall development priorities. As we have heard during the course of the sitting of this Honourable House, there are a number of other considerations that should be included in this list of priorities. Once we have identified and organised all our major development priorities we can sit down, order them, diligently pursue them, either simultaneously or in ordinal fashion, within an overall development policy framework.

Mr. President, one of the objectives of the Budget Address was to set the framework for rational and enlightened policy discussion on these and other priorities anticipated by Members, and to arrive at a clear course of action within the context of economic and political realities. To the extent that Members utilise the Budget Address to inform and guide their own individual contributions, this objective has largely been achieved. In this respect I want to thank all Members of this Honourable House for their

contributions. I am sure that upon leaving this Honourable House we all will leave a little more informed and, perhaps, a little bit wiser. However, it is my humble opinion that as we close this memorable Session we should all ask ourselves the following questions:

1. What are the relative merits, or demerits, of the politics of confrontation versus the politics of cooperation in a very small developing country such as ours?
2. To paraphrase John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the late President of the United States, "Ask not what our country can do for us but what we can do for our country."

Mr. President, I am not quite finished yet, and I hope all of us are still awake. When the Great Architect that reigns in Heaven made the mold from which Caymanians were born, I believe he richly endowed it with common sense. In all of my travels around the world I have not found many people as endowed with common sense as Caymanians are. Common sense is, of all kinds, the most uncommon - it implies good judgment, sound discretion and true and practical wisdom applied to common life. Fine sense, and exalted sense, Mr. President, in my view, is not half as useful as common sense. To act with common sense according to the moment is the best wisdom I know and the best philosophy is to do one's duty, take the world as it comes, submit respectfully to one's lot; bless the goodness that has given us so much happiness with it.

Mr. President, on Friday, November 17, 1989, we heard a factual economic presentation from the Financial Secretary, and right now he is on the edge of some commentary on political stability. Common sense is the knack of seeing things as they are, and doing things as they ought to be done. Knowledge without common sense, in my mind, is folly; without method, it is waste; without kindness, it is fanaticism. But with common sense, it is wisdom; with method, it is power; with charity, it is beneficence, with religion, I think, it is virtue and life and peace. The Good Book says "The meek shall inherit the earth", and "Blessed are the peacemakers for they shall be called the children of God." Our forefathers and theirs, in some cases, have given their lives to build what Cayman is today. A country where affluence abounds. Three little Islands with a population of 26,000 and \$200-plus billion dollars on the books of our banks. In terms of the world leading banking centres we are fifth only to United Kingdom, Japan, United States and France. A friendly people who have the ability to reach their own common sense judgments on all issues.

There is no doubt in my mind that political stability is the cornerstone of this success and all of us would be well advised to conduct ourselves in such a manner that political stability remains that cornerstone. All of us, at times, are at fault, we are human beings, but when we make those mistakes and harbour hate and malice in our hearts, to my mind, it is like a cancer eating away at our insides. My God, let us settle these differences. These Islands are too precious to us, and too big to let petty differences ruin our friendliness and, if not corrected, maybe our country.

The 1990s are not going to be an easy decade and we need to concentrate, buckle down and get on with running this country. The people of this country, in addition to rarely coming to sit in the gallery to hear the debate, are now turning off their radios. They say "I cannot stand to listen to the bickering anymore". We are all guilty, Mr. President, because, as the adage goes, "We are judged by the company we keep", and there are 16 of us in here. Are we not big enough to shake hands, forget the past and get on with running the country? I have a job to do, Mr. President, no time for fighting with each Member. I believe the people of this country expect me to do just what I have said - buckle down, concentrate and assist in running this country. There is no time to spend looking over my shoulder.

Let us remember and take a lesson from what happened in the Bahamas in the very early 1970s, when the wrong political signals were given and the companies came to the Cayman Islands, I tell you, in droves, suitcase after suitcases loaded with company files. Make no mistake it can happen here too. Any change in our stand can and, in my mind, will have repercussions - business wise. Any election out of the normal will be damaging to our image. I am not suggesting that we have extension cords, as some Members put it, and surely the democratic process is better served without them. But, Mr. President, we should not allow this bickering to go on. It does not resolve itself into good government, and there are many offshore financial centres in the Caribbean that will be happy to have some of our business. Please, let us not cause it to happen. If we adopt an attitude of 'I will show you', and the other person decides, 'I will show you, too' - only harm to the country will be the result.

Mr. President, and Honourable Members, all my Budget Speech would have been for nothing, because we will not need to take any decision to control the economic growth - external forces will control it for us by moving some, if not all, of our business. Let us leave this Honourable House as we suspend and refer the Appropriation (1990) Bill, 1989, to the Finance Committee, wiser Members who have resolved to mend the fences and get on with running the country.

Mr. President, on Sunday I was reading my Bible, from the Book of Sirach, Chapter 27, and I believe it may be fitting for us and the radio audience to hear what it says about malice, anger and vengeance. I am not, Mr. President, a theologian, but I know that the original title of the Book of Ecclesiasticus was the "wisdom of the son of Sirach: written between 200 and 175 BC in Hebrew, and translated into Greek after 132 BC. Because the authorship was in doubt, it was called *Liber Ecclesiasticus* - translated means Church Book. It was written by Joshua, son of Leazar, who was the son of Sirach. Because the introduction was written by the grandson, that is why there was confusion about who actually wrote it. In the *Common Bible*, which is a version of the *Good Book Bible*, Chapter 27:22 reads: "Whoever winks his eye plans evil deeds, and no one can keep him from them." But the *New American Bible*, which is the one I was reading from, translates as follows:

"He who has shifty eyes plots mischief and no one can ward him off; In your presence he uses honeyed talk, and admires your every word, But later he changes his tone and twists your words to your ruin. There is nothing that I hate so much, and the Lord hates him as well. As a stone falls back on him who throws it up, so a blow struck in treachery injures more than one. And he who digs a pit falls into it, and he who lays a snare is caught in it. Whoever does harm will be involved in it without knowing how it came upon him.

Mockery and abuse will be the lot of the proud, and vengeance lies in wait of them like a lion. The trap seizes those who rejoice in pitfalls, and pain will consume them before they die; Wrath and anger are hateful things, yet the sinner hugs them tight.

The vengeful will suffer the lord's vengeance, for he remembers their sin in detail. Forgive your neighbour's injustice; then when you pray, your own sins will be forgiven."

Mr. President and Honourable Members, as you have heard the Almighty looks unfavourably on malice, anger and vengeance, and may we stamp it out from among us. Before I sit down, let me offer thanks to the Clerk and her staff for the able assistance, including the delicious snacks that we have in the Common Room during the Session so far, and to thank to all my staff for their loyalty and support for the little and large things they do in supporting me, they are appreciated very much.

Thank you, Mr. President and Honourable Members, this concludes a few comments on the Cayman Islands' political stability.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question will now be put on the Second Reading of the Appropriation (1990) Bill, 1989. Those in favour please say Aye...Those against No.

AYES.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Ayes have it.

AGREED. THE APPROPRIATION (1990) BILL, 1989 STOOD COMMITTED TO THE STANDING FINANCE COMMITTEE.

ADJOURNMENT

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, before I move the adjournment, may I ask the Members if they would be willing to start Finance Committee at 9:00 a.m. tomorrow morning?

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: I believe that on this side of the House that would be a good suggestion for time.

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Some Members are having difficulty, they have committed themselves... 10:00 A.M? Mr. President, I move this adjournment of this Honourable House until the Finance Committee is ready to report.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that the House do now stand adjourned until the Finance Committee is ready to report its proceedings on the Appropriation Bill. I shall put the question. Those in favour please say Aye...Those against No.

AYES.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Ayes have it. The House is accordingly adjourned sine die.

AT 4:26 P.M. THE HOUSE STOOD ADJOURNED SINE DIE.

**FRIDAY
22ND DECEMBER, 1989
10:45 A.M.**

MR. PRESIDENT:

Prayers by the Honourable First Official Member.

PRAYERS

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON:

Let us Pray.

Almighty God, from whom all wisdom and power are derived: We beseech Thee so to direct and prosper the deliberations of the Legislative Assembly now assembled, that all things may be ordered upon the best and surest foundations for the glory of Thy Name and for the safety, honour and welfare of the people of these Islands.

Bless our Sovereign Lady Queen Elizabeth, the Queen Mother, Philip Duke of Edinburgh, Charles Prince of Wales, Diana Princess of Wales and all the Royal family. Give grace to all who exercise authority in our Commonwealth that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety may be established among us. Especially we pray for the Governor of our Islands, the Members of Executive Council and Members of the Legislative Assembly that they may be enabled faithfully to perform the responsible duties of their high office.

All this we ask for Thy great Name's sake, Amen.

Our Father, who art in Heaven, Hallowed be Thy Name, Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done, in earth as it is in Heaven. Give us this day our daily bread: And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us: And lead us not into temptation; but deliver us from evil: For Thine is the Kingdom, the power and the glory, for ever and ever. Amen.

The Lord bless us and keep us: the Lord make His face shine upon us and be gracious unto us: the Lord lift up His countenance upon us and give us peace now and always. Amen.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly are resumed. I understand that the House would wish to defer the Presentation of Papers, item 2 on today's Order Paper. Proceeding directly to the Second Reading of the Towns and Communities Amendment Bill, that would be item 3, Government Business, Bills Second Reading.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

BILLS

SECOND READINGS

THE TOWNS AND COMMUNITIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1989.

CLERK:

The Towns and Communities (Amendment) Bill, 1989.

MR. PRESIDENT:

The Honourable Attorney General.

HON. RICHARD W. GROUND:

Thank you, Mr. President.

The Towns and Communities (Amendment) Bill, 1989, was designed primarily to provide the Police and the law enforcement agencies with a weapon with which to combat the increasing problem of noise nuisance. Noise nuisance may take many forms. There may be establishments where the bars or discotheques, or whatever, are regularly and repeatedly making a loud noise and disturbing the neighbours and the residents. In fact, they are quite easy to deal with because everyone knows where they are and the police take action over an extended period. If necessary they can be curbed through their Liquor or Music and Dancing Licenses. Unfortunately, they are not the whole extent of the problem. Private parties, particularly at this holiday season, may become an intolerable nuisance to those living near them if they go on for an undue period late into the night or on Sundays, or whatever. Also, many people have come to me and said is there not something that can be done about mobile noise nuisances, cars with very powerful sound systems in them that are driven around with the windows open or, again, parked in residential districts so at night when people are trying to sleep are disturbed by them.

At present the provisions of the various Laws that touch upon this subject are, I am afraid, inadequate, particularly to deal with those last two classes. The provisions are contained primarily in the Towns and Communities Law, section 12, which this Bill is designed to amend. But there are also some relevant provisions in the Public Health Law. The problems with those in the Public Health Law is that they are rather cumbersome and require the Chief Environmental Health Officer to issue and serve a formal written abatement notice, then only if that is not complied with is an offence committed. That procedure may be very useful

for industrial noise or noise generated over a long period by a static site, but it is not very helpful at all to the Police Officer who, very late on a Saturday night or the early hours of Sunday Morning, is confronted with a loud and rowdy party which is disrupting residential districts.

For that reason we have come back to the Towns and Communities Law and sought to put these new proposals in this, admittedly, rather archaic and old Law. The opportunity is also being taken as that Law was being amended, to sort out a muddle that the Draughtsman had got in back in 1980, when an amendment had been made to section 3 of the Law - this is quite unrelated to noise uses. An amendment had been made to section 3 of the Law, in particular to section 3(e) which deals with furious riding. Back in 1980 the Law in paragraph 3 was amended in relation to furious riding to extend the offence. Prior to 1980 it was an offence in any thoroughfare, or on any highway, to ride or drive furiously so as to endanger the life or limb of any person or passenger therein, i.e., on the highway. In 1980 that was extended to include any public place - not just roads, but any public place. At the same time the penalty was increased from 6 pounds to \$100. That increase in penalty applied to all the many paragraphs in section 3 of the Law. It runs from paragraph 'a' to 's' - so there are numerous provisions in that.

Unfortunately, what the Draughtsman did not notice when he made those sensible and modernising changes, was that the penalties for second or subsequent offences under some of those paragraphs of section 3 were covered in a completely different section. They were covered in section 9. And one of the most important offences covered by section 9 is furious riding or driving. There are others covered - indecent exposure in a public place; doing obscene drawings on walls; being drunk in a thoroughfare; found lying drunk in a thoroughfare or in a piazza. I do not think we have any piazzas here so that, perhaps, shows how archaic the Law is. As I said, section 9 was overlooked with two important consequences: First of all the second or subsequent offence provisions still only apply to highways and thoroughfares - they were never extended to public places, generally; and more importantly, the penalty was left at the 60 shilling level and was not brought up commensurate with the increase of the general penalties to \$100. So, we have taken the opportunity in the first substantive clause in the Bill to amend section 9 to correct both those defects. First of all, the penalty for a second or subsequent offence is raised to \$500, or to imprisonment for a period not exceeding 3 months. Then, secondly, in respect to furious riding or driving, the places where the offence can be committed were extended from highways and thoroughfares to include any public place.

That was really an aside because as I said in the beginning the main purpose of the Bill is to deal with noise nuisance. I would now like to outline to the House the proposed new provisions and how they would work. To do so I first have to say what the old provisions were. If I might very briefly read the existing subsection (1) of section 12 of the Law. That says:

"Every person who between the hours of 9:30 p.m. and 6 a.m. sounds or plays upon any musical or noisy instrument, or sings or makes any noise whatsoever, in any town, or district, after having been required by any person resident in such town, or district, or by any constable, to desist from making such sounds or noises, either on account of the illness of any person, or because such sounds or noises are audible beyond a distance of two chains, or for any reasonable cause, shall be liable on summary conviction to a penalty not exceeding forty shillings." [In the original Law then it was put up variously. I think it now stands at six pounds] "In default of payment thereof to imprisonment for a period not exceeding one month."

Now, on numerous difficulties with that provision, not least of which is the need to measure how far away the sound is audible, the thought of officers getting out chains and measuring off the length of 2 cricket pitches is not something that is really practical, nowadays. The requirements is that the thing is only a nuisance if it is because of the illness of any person or for any reasonable causes are contradictory. The requirement that residents can trigger the offence can well lead to all sorts of difficulties as to proof of the resident having required the person to desist.

For all those reasons and for numerous infelicities in that section, the recommendation was to do away with those provisions and bring in a new subsection (1), worded as follows:

"Any person who makes any noise in any town or district [so it is any noise, it does not have to be singing or playing a musical instrument] which is likely to cause annoyance or discomfort to any inhabitant of that town or district, after having been required by a constable to desist from making such noise, shall be liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding \$500 for a first conviction; a fine not exceeding \$1,000 for a second conviction; and a fine not exceeding \$5,000 or 6 months' imprisonment or both such fine and imprisonment, for a third or any subsequent conviction."

Very briefly, this has the following qualities. The possibility of causing a nuisance is not limited to the night time, it could occur at any time. Loud noise can be just as disruptive at midday on the weekend as it can be at 10:00 P.M. on a week day night. A new test has been introduced that the question is whether the sound is likely to cause annoyance or discomfort to inhabitants. That is the test of nuisance in Civil Law. It is thought to be more appropriate to use that than to talk about measuring off chains or determining whether sick people were nearby. Only a constable can trigger the offence. The constable makes a request for someone to desist. Only if that request is ignored and the annoying noise continued, is an offence committed. It is

not an offence to make a noise, it is an offence not to comply with the request of a police officer. It now has to be a police officer, not just any resident.

Then a sliding scale of penalties has been introduced, so that on the first offence which may be a one time occasion, the maximum liability is \$500. But if someone (and it is most likely to be an institution or a club) persists night after night, after having been penalised once, then they are at risk of a greater penalty; \$1,000 a second time. If they did not learn their lesson by then, they are at risk of \$5,000 or imprisonment.

Various other changes apart from that substantial amendment have been made to section 12. It is not always possible to enforce the Law against the person who makes the nuisance. The police find, for instance, that if they turn up at the site of a disturbance, find out who is making the noise and tell them to stop, when they come back 10 minutes later because he has not stopped, that person is gone. Somebody else answers the door and he does not know the person the police spoke to the first time. In order to combat this the original Towns and Communities Law also imposed a burden upon the occupier of the premises. It said that any occupier of any premises, on which any other person contravenes subsection (1), in other words made a loud noise after the police have told him to stop, was guilty of an offence unless he could prove affirmatively (this is the original Law), that he was not present upon the premises at the time that the contravention took place or that he had taken all reasonable steps to prevent the contravention.

That is a very sensible provision. It works, except for the fact that the penalties are rather low. So the penalties for that subsection, subsection (2), have also been increased in line with the increase in subsection (1), i.e., a sliding scale of \$500, \$1,000 and then \$5,000 or 6 months imprisonment. However, that provision in subsection (2) does not meet all the possible enforcement problems the police might encounter. The same problems with the person who makes the noise disappearing later can still arise because of the requirement that an occupier is only liable if a contravention of subsection (1) can be proven.

In order to combat that, a further new subsection is being proposed in the Bill and that says:

"That an occupier of a premises is also liable under the following circumstances; He is liable if he is the occupier of the premises from which noise is emitted, which is likely to cause annoyance or discomfort to any inhabitant of the town or district... and if that occupier is required by a constable to cease such noise and such noise does not cease."

In other words the constable does not have to determine who is making the noise. He does not have to go into the party and find out who is running the discotheque, it is enough if he finds out who the occupier of the premises is and tells them, "You make the noise stop". If they do not do that then they are liable for the offence and the same sliding scale applies.

"Occupier" is a term well understood in the law generally. It has a broad meaning and includes a resident owner or tenant in the case of somebody living in real terms and occupying premises. It would not include an absent owner. So it really does mean someone living there and a result of someone having charge and custody of the premises.

The opportunity has also been taken to remove the requirement that is in the old subsection (12), that criminal proceedings can only be brought with the permission of the Clerk of the Court. That requirement dates from the days before there was an Attorney General. Consideration was given to substituting the permission of the Attorney General, but really this is not the sort of level of offence that should require the Attorney General's fiat (as it is called) so that has simply been abolished. Police officers can bring prosecutions if they are confronted with a breach of these provisions and, quite frankly, nowadays, with the growth and the size of the George Town and West Bay areas I am afraid that most week ends, the police officers on patrol are confronted with some sort of problem with noise nuisance.

The Bill goes further than that and introduces a completely new section to the law. The proposed new section 12A (which, in essence, is an enabling section) allows us to take advantage of some modern technology, that is, that nowadays you can measure how loud noise is by a decibel meter. The systems are quite sophisticated and the other countries (in the United States and I believe in the United Kingdom) this is now the practice rather than the constable sitting down thinking; 'Is this noise so loud as to cause annoyance to the people nearby?', you can fix the level. The level everybody agrees that above which the noise is unacceptable and then the constable can go out and stand the prescribed distance from the source of the noise, hold up his microphone and if the meter records above a certain level, then the noise is deemed under the law to be unacceptable.

At the moment we do not have the technical details as to what the equipment should be, what the levels should be, so the proposed new section simply enables regulations to be made, prescribing levels of noise, the methods of the measurement of noise and prescribing the types of machines that might be used to measure the noise. However, again, the section is careful not to simply make it an offence to make a noise above the prescribed level. That would be unfair a person may not know they are making an excessive noise. So again, the system is that if someone is making too much noise, a constable can go up and require them to desist, stop it, and if they then do not stop it they commit an offence. It is hoped that when the technical details are sorted out, which can be done in regulations, this will make a simple and certain method of determining whether or not a noise is a noise nuisance.

Again, we have the same sliding scale of charges - \$500, \$1,000, \$5,000 and 6 months imprisonment. One slight difference from the other provisions is that an Environmental Health Officer is also empowered to operate these machines. That is it reflects two concerns, partly because

Environmental Health Officers already have some duties, as I mentioned, under the Public Health Law for noise nuisance. Noise nuisance, when it is extreme, can become a health problem. It can become a health problem for people living nearby and also because the equipment, when acquired, might more happily belong in the Environmental Health Department than with the police because it will have other uses than simply monitoring these provisions.

Finally, just to round out this package of provisions to deal with noise nuisance, a further new section is proposed, section 12B, that reads as follows:

"Upon conviction of an offence under the provisions of either section 12 or section 12A, in addition to any other penalty provided, the Court may order forfeiture of any equipment or device used in the commission of the offence."

I would stress that this can only be done upon conviction and by the Court, but it means that in a glaring case the Court thinks it is appropriate that somebody has been using their sound system, whatever sort of system that is, to create a nuisance and does not stop when the police have told them, they may also face the forfeiture of that equipment. That is in there as a deterrent because I think we all know the way some people pride and cherish their means to which they have to make noise, to make life miserable for others, and this allows the Court, and I stress that it is the Court, not the police, to forfeit that equipment in appropriate cases.

That completes my review of the provisions of this Bill. I commend it to the House, the problem is becoming quite acute. It is one that will not get any better unless a package such as this is put forward to enable the police to do something about it.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that a Bill entitled, The Towns and Communities (Amendment) Bill, 1989, be given a Second Reading. The Motion is open for debate.

The First Elected Member for West Bay.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Mr. President, the Bill before the House is long overdue. As representatives, I believe that most of us have been confronted with noise problems in the country in our constituencies. Not only people in the bars and what have you, but here of late, vehicles have caused concern, not just general discomfort but concern, because I believe that the loud music in cars poses a traffic hazard. Therefore the sections referred to by the Second Official Member are supported. I believe that no reasonable citizen has the need to fear this Bill. It will only affect those who are unreasonable and continues to ignore their neighbour's comfort at 1:00 or 2:00 in the morning. I hope that Law enforcers will be judicious in the enforcement of the Law.

However, we are most disappointed that the Government has ignored the resolution which was passed some months back which dealt with complaints about horse riding on the beach. The Bill, in its entirety, is dealing generally with nuisances. We asked that the Government take cognisance of a practice, which hitherto had been stopped in this country because of the general feeling that it was causing a problem to visitors on the beach. We have had requests from hoteliers and residents on what is Cayman's Gold Coast, the Seven Mile Beach, about horse riding. I say that hitherto Caymanians have slowed down, or stopped in some instances, horse riding on the beach.

Having had those requests from hoteliers and residents, a Motion was moved and passed by the eight Members on this side of the House. I would have thought that the Government, in all seriousness, would have taken cognisance of that resolution. I can only say that we brought the resolution because people complained about the matter. Tourists complained and I would hope that the amendment would pass in Committee stage, where it will be taken, as much as the resolution was passed which has now given birth to this Amendment. If the Amendment is put, I will feel duty bound to support the Amendment.

Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: Does any other Member wish to speak? It seems not. Would the Member in charge to the Bill wish to exercise his right of reply?

HON. RICHARD W. GROUND: Thank you, Mr. President. I am grateful to the Members for that tacit support and to the Member who spoke for his overt support of the provisions of the Bill relating to noise nuisance. I hear what the Member who spoke says in respect to the amendment.

Members of the public should know that an amendment has been lodged for consideration at Committee stage to add a new subsection, a new paragraph (i) to section 3 of the Law to make it an offence and the penalty will be the general penalty of \$100, to make it an offence to ride a horse or other animal on the Seven Mile Beach between the northern boundary of the George Town burial ground, lot 13E Parcel 13, and the line running due west of Northwest Point Road and Town Hall Road.

I do not think there is anything I can add to the debate on that proposal that was not already put forward very eloquently by the Third Official Member in his response to the original Motion, I think it was Motion 24, at the last Meeting. At that stage the Government indicated that the question of limitation of rights like this needed consideration and put forward proposals for limiting the riding of horses. That has not been dealt with at this stage and I would like this Bill to be left as the straight forward and simple noise nuisance Bill that it is. As I said in opening it, furious riding has come in because everyone's attention, we all know, has gone to furious riding on the debate of that Motion last time. That attention, at least alerted me, to

that muddle that we got into in that Law. So it was not the primary purpose of this Bill in coming forward to address that question.

I do not think I can take it further at this stage, save to mention that the Member says that Caymanians hitherto have stopped riding on the Beach. I think it was accepted during the debate last time that the problem related to a variety of sources and that there were little boys who rode furiously on ponies and so on. So it is not a question of all Caymanians having stopped, but at this stage I do not intend to take that further.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question will be put on the Second Reading of the Towns and Communities (Amendment) Bill. Those in favour please say Aye...Those against No.

AYES.

The Ayes have it.

MR. PRESIDENT:

AGREED: THE TOWNS AND COMMUNITIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1989, GIVEN A SECOND READING.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Bills, Second Reading continued.

THE DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING (AMENDMENT) (NO. 3) BILL, 1989.

CLERK:

The Development and Planning (Amendment) (No. 3) Bill, 1989.

MR. PRESIDENT:

The Honourable Member for Communications and Works.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, in accordance with Standing Order 58 I beg to move the withdrawal of the Development and Planning (Amendment) (No. 3) Bill, 1989. It is my intention to bring back this Bill after further consultation with all Members.

MR. PRESIDENT: Does any Member wish to speak on the Motion before the question is put? No? The question is that Bill referred to be withdrawn. I shall put the question. Those in favour please say Aye...Those against No.

AYES.

The Ayes have it.

MR. PRESIDENT:

AGREED: THE DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING (AMENDMENT) (NO.3) BILL, 1989 WITHDRAWN.

MR. PRESIDENT:

The House will now go into Committee to study the Towns and Communities (Amendment) Bill, 1989.

HOUSE IN COMMITTEE

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House is now in Committee. With the leave of the Committee may I assume, as is usual, we authorise the Honourable Second Official Member to correct minor printing errors and such like in this Bill?

Would the Clerk state the Bill and read its clauses?

THE TOWN AND COMMUNITIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1989

CLERK:

The Towns and Communities (Amendment) Bill, 1989.
Clause 1 Short title.
Clause 2 Amendment to section 9 of the principle Law.
Clause 3 Amendment of section 12 of the principle Law.
Clause 4 Insertion of new sections 12A and 12B.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clauses 1 to 4 do stand part of the Bill. If there is no debate, I shall put the question. The amendment comes next. Those in favour please say Aye...Those against No.

AYES.

The Ayes have it.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

AGREED: CLAUSES 1 TO 4 PASSED.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Now we have an Amendment proposing the insertion of a new

Clause.

MR. JOHN B. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, I seek leave of the Chair to withdraw the proposed amendment until further consultation with the Government and the Backbenchers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I take it that the Committee agrees to that?

CLERK: A Bill for a Law to amend the Towns and Communities (Amendment) Law, 1989.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is that the Title do stand part of the bill. I shall put the question. Those in favour please say Aye...Those against No.

AYES.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Ayes have it.

AGREED: THE TITLE PASSED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That concludes proceedings in the Committee on this Bill. The House will resume.

HOUSE RESUMED

MR. PRESIDENT: Report on Bills.

REPORT ON BILL

THE TOWNS AND COMMUNITIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1989

HON. RICHARD W. GROUND: Mr. President, I beg to report that The Towns and Communities (Amendment) Bill, 1989, was considered by a Committee of the whole House and passed without amendment.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Bill is set down accordingly for Third Reading. Bills Third Reading.

THIRD READINGS

THE TOWNS AND COMMUNITIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1989

CLERK: Towns and Communities (Amendment) Bill, 1989.

HON. RICHARD W. GROUND: Mr. President, I beg to move that the Towns and Communities (Amendment) Bill, 1989, be given a Third Reading and do pass.

MR. PRESIDENT: I shall put the question. Those in favour please say Aye...Those against No.

AYES.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Ayes have it.

AGREED: THE TOWNS AND COMMUNITIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1989, PASSED.

MOTIONS

GOVERNMENT MOTION NO. 8/89

DRAFT DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS, 1989

(WITHDRAWN)

MR. PRESIDENT: Government Motion number 8/89. The Honourable Member for Communications and Works.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, as in the case of the Development and Planning (Amendment) (No. 3) Bill, 1989, with the leave of the House and in accordance with Standing Orders 24(14), I wish to withdraw this Motion until further consultation with all Members of the House.

MR. PRESIDENT: Under Standing Orders this does not appear to require a Motion, but rather the leave of the House. May I take it the House agrees? I shall put the question. Those in favour please say Aye...Those against No.

AYES.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Ayes have it. The Motion is withdrawn accordingly.

AGREED: GOVERNMENT MOTION NO. 8/89 WITHDRAWN.

MR. PRESIDENT: Government Motion number 9/89. The honourable Member for Communication and Works.

GOVERNMENT MOTION NO. 9/89

AMENDMENT (NO.2) TO THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN, 1977

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, in accordance with Standing Order 24(1), I beg to move Government Motion number 9/89 which reads as follows:

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Legislative Assembly, pursuant to the powers conferred on it by section 8 of the Development and Planning Law (Revised), that the Development Plan 1977 (being the plan referred to in subsection (5) of section 6 of the Law) be this day altered by the amendment of the map incorporated with and forming part of the Plan as follows :-

- (1) Block 73A Parcels 52 - 54, Part of 32, 70, 50, 49, 67, 35 - 47, part of 62 (East of the Queen's Highway), 27 - 31 Colliers to be rezoned from Agricultural/Residential to Hotel/Tourism;
- (2) Block 14BJ Parcel 3, George Town from Low Density Residential and Beach Resort/Residential to Commercial."

MR. PRESIDENT: Government Motion number 9/89 has been duly moved. Would the Member wish to speak to it?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Thank you, Mr. President. Appendixes 1 and 2 attached to the resolution form an integral part thereof. Appendix 1 provides relevant information on the proposed rezoning of Block 73A, parcel 52 to 54, part of 32, 70, 50, 49, 67, 35 to 47, part of 62 east of the Queens Highway, 27 to 31 Colliers, from Agricultural/Residential to Hotel/Tourism. In Appendix 2, it provides relevant information on the proposed rezoning of Block 14BJ, Parcel 3, George Town from Low Density Residential and Beach Resort Residential to Commercial.

In the case of the proposed rezoning at Colliers/East End, the rezoning is being considered because the affected parcels of land located on the sea side of the road are zoned part hotel/tourism and part agriculture/residential. This situation is a result of the construction of the Queens Highway. When the Highway was relocated, the zoning was not amended to reflect the change in the road.

This area is primarily undeveloped with an occasional residential development. The only hotel/tourism related development is the Tortuga Club. The Tortuga Club has plans for the expansion of the hotel and the construction of condominium units. The development has outlined planning approval subject to rezoning. The rezoning is necessary for the development because part of the expansion is proposed for the agricultural/residential area.

Upon hearing representations on this matter, the Appeals Tribunal concluded that the rezoning will be consistent with the Government's declared policy of encouraging smaller hotel/tourism projects in areas outside of George Town and the West Bay Road. Of course, it was announced in this House that a moratorium is being considered on the larger hotels in the country. Rezoning was also fully supported by the Central Planning Authority.

On Block 14BJ 3, the rezoning of this area is being requested by the owners of this parcel of land. The site is currently zoned Low Density Residential, east of South Church Street and Beach Resort/Residential west of South Church Street. Commercial zoning, which is being requested, allows commercial development including retail sales offices and apartments at a density of 25 per acre. Commercial zoning also allows a maximum of five stories for commercial uses or three stories for residential uses. Set backs and minimum lot size are at the discretion of the Central Planning Authority.

The trend of development in the immediate area appears to be commercial. A proposed development has been submitted by Commonwealth Properties to the Central Planning Authority for parcel 4 to the north, which is the old Dr. Roy McTaggart house for a commercial project. Also, the proximity of Boilers Road providing access to Walkers Road encourages further commercial development. Because of the set back requirements on the sea side this area cannot be developed and will therefore remain open space. I am speaking specifically of the area of the Eden Rock, which is an underwater coral reef, and this is a very

popular dive area not only by the tourist but by local Caymanians.

The Planning Department advertised the proposed plan amendment in accordance with section 8(2) of the Development and Planning Law. While one objection was received on parcel 4, parcel 3, which is the subject of this resolution, did not receive any objections. In reaching their decision the Central Planning Authority (CPA) took into consideration all possible negative impacts. It was, however, resolved by the CPA that the area west of South Church Street would remain Beach Resort/Residential thus rendering it free from development.

I recommend and commend Government Motion number 9/89 to this Honourable House and trust that it will meet with the support of all Members.
Thank you, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: Does any other Member wish to speak? The First Elected Member for the Lesser Islands.

CAPT. MABRY S. KIRKCONNELL: Mr. President, I rise to give my support to Government Motion number 9/89. Having been on the Central Planning Authority I am very familiar with the extensive research that has been done into these areas and the deliberation of the Planning Department. I feel they are in the best interest of development on the Islands of Grand Cayman. I give it my full support.

MR. PRESIDENT: It appears that no other Member wishes to speak? Would the honourable Member moving the Motion wish to reply?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, just to thank all Members for their support of this Bill, in particular the expressed support from the First Elected Member for the Lesser Islands and to all other Members for their quiet support.
Thank you, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: Let us put the question, therefore, on Government Motion number 9/89. Those in favour please say Aye...Those against No.

AYES.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Ayes have it.

AGREED: GOVERNMENT MOTION NUMBER 9/89 PASSED.

MR. PRESIDENT: We now move to Other Business, item 4 on today's Order Paper. Private Members' Motions - Private Member's Motion number 26/89 - the Second Elected Member for Bodden Town.

OTHER BUSINESS

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NUMBER 26/89

ASSISTANCE TO FARMERS

MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH: Mr. President, I beg to move amended Private Member's Motion number 26/89, Assistance to Farmers, standing in my name, which reads:

"WHEREAS it is considered that there is a need to encourage local farming;

AND WHEREAS it is considered that there is a need for monetary assistance to farmers on a continual basis for a trial period of three (3) years;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Government, on an annual basis, consider the setting aside of \$200,000.00 for the purpose of assisting local farmers, subject to the requirements of the Agricultural Development Board and the proposed recommendations of the Agricultural Development Plan."

MR. ROY BODDEN: Mr. President, I respectfully beg to second the Motion.

MR. PRESIDENT: Private Members Motion number 26/89 has been duly moved and seconded. Would the Mover wish to speak to it?

MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. President.
In the essence of time, I will try to be brief in my speech and I would like to say that one of the reasons I moved this Motion was because of a suggestion that came from the

Finance Committee, tabled in this Honourable House. Questions were asked concerning monies to the Agricultural and Industry Development Board, (AIDB) and the Government's part in assisting with farm relief due to the damage of hurricane Gilbert in 1988. The Chairman, in an effort to come to a reasonable conclusion after some questions and comments, suggested that a recommendation be made to the Government to inject into the AIDB account the sum of \$80,000 to assist with agricultural projects of this type, giving priority to the needs of Mr. William Ebanks and also that the Government should decide whether or not it is prepared to develop agriculture in the Cayman Islands and if it is to agree to deposit a fixed amount annually for this purpose.

With that being in the Minutes of the Finance Committee, I felt it was necessary for me to move a Motion to this effect because if I did not, that is as far as it would get.

The Honourable First Official Member in his Budget Address said: "Overall Imports ('visible' and 'invisible') grew from 63 per cent GDP in 1983 to 73.2 per cent in 1987. This suggests that nearly three quarters of the economy's total income goes back out of the economy in terms of expenditures on imports in 1987."

He went on to say: "It also suggests that although the economy's productive capacity may have expanded, the expansion may not have been in those areas that would allow the economy to reduce its dependence on imports. Nevertheless, it is the capacity to generate income which is translated in the capacity to import. The problem comes, however, when the capacity to generate income falls."

He went on to say: "On the invisible side of the trade balance, 'invisible' exports expanded from \$106.3 million in 1983 to \$190 million in 1987."

While I will agree, as the Honourable Member has said in his presentation, that we may never reach the stage where we will be able to stop importation or become completely self-sufficient, but if we do not take some steps now we will never reach or have any success in the future.

Having read about the amount that the Honourable First Official Member has said, even \$106 million is a lot of money, and as he said \$190 million in 1987, and I am sure that in 1988 has gone much above that. Even looking at that \$190 million, even if we can start production in this country and we are able to stop \$2 million from going abroad, I ask all Members of this House to consider that \$2 million will help our economy, not somebody else's.

The Honourable First Official Member said diversification is the productive base of the economy. There are two areas which a diversification strategy could be feasibly pursued. One is the development of agriculture into a more practical form of economic activity for practicing farmers. He said: "As indicated earlier, agriculture appears to have the potential to meet a greater portion of the growing demands by local consumers for fresh farm produce, as well as to meet the incipient demand of tourists for locally grown fruits and vegetables."

As we are told, tourism is on the increase yearly. I have found that not only the visitors who come and stay for a couple of days, but mostly the working population of expatriate workers who reside here show a great demand and interest in locally produced fresh fruits and vegetables along with the local indigenous Caymanians because they realise that they are getting fresh from the farm produce. What is being imported is not from the farm but from the icebox or chillers and might have been there for months with chemicals sprayed on it to help preserve the shelf life.

The Honourable First Official Member also said: "It is proposed as a priority also from the point of view that providing farmers with the capabilities to meet a portion of the local demand for fresh agriculture produce will help reduce the economy's inflationary dependence on imported foods. I wish to inform this House that the Portfolio responsible for Agricultural Development is currently in the process of developing the appropriate policies and programmes". I support that. It has taken a little time but we will get it.

Having seen the need to move this Motion, I feel that because some of the restrictions of the AIDB (which is tied to the Caribbean Development Bank), and because some farmers are not able to meet the criteria and would have no chance of developing any further projects that could prove feasible in the future of this country. In particular, the production of tomatoes, I would hope that early next year... I believe the Honourable First Official Member as Chairman of the Board of Agriculture and Development and, in particular, I said in my Motion the Agricultural Development Board, and I wish to emphasize that I would hope that industrial would not come into this because agricultural development and industrial development are two different issues and that is why I left out the "I" from the Agriculture Development Board.

I would also ask that whenever the Government makes this money available that the present industrial person at the AIDB (whom I consider is there as the Caribbean Development Bank watchdog to discourage development here in these Islands) will have nothing to do with this request of \$200,000 that this Motion is asking the Government to set aside. There are some farmers in this country who have been discouraged by this gentleman and no matter how much money the Government should inject in agriculture in the future they will never apply for it. They would rather go out of business before they would approach that Board and have any dealings with this gentleman. I find it hard to believe that we have to continually pay and keep this post open for that one gentleman who is not benefiting this country in agriculture. He only serves as a discouraging factor for borrowing money from that Board. I believe there are Caymanians who could be trained, if they are not capable now, to fill that post. I would certainly hope that in the near future that some consideration is given to that particular post, to be filled by someone who has knowledge of agriculture development; so that when someone applies for a loan for a project in agriculture they can make some headway.

While I realise that \$200,000 is not any great amount, I believe it is a start. I would also like to ask the Honourable Member in charge of the Portfolio for Communications, Works and Natural Resources that he would take into consideration, and also the Honourable First Official Member, that more agriculture feeder roads are needed in this country, in particular in the northern, middle and eastern districts of this Island and also, in Cayman Brac.

I am happy to say that if all goes well the Cayman Brac farmers will benefit in the near future. Looking at the Agriculture Development Book from the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB), I wish to say that section 6(25),

"In most of the CDB regional member countries agriculture development is hampered by an inadequate system of motorable roads in the farming areas. A good road system is necessary for the safe and efficient transport of both perishables, for example bananas and other fresh fruits and vegetables. It also encourages the creation of new farming units by opening up additional agricultural land and facilitates the injection of capital and new technologies into the farming system, thus increasing productivity and production."

While I realise that the Government can only be called on or be expected to do a certain amount, I appreciate that. I would venture to say that in the little Bluff area, in particular, for years I can remember when the farmers would use boats from East End and the Old Man Bay area to reach a certain road that was put there for the farmers and then use the boats after carrying the produce on their backs and in baskets to the seashore to carry the produce back home in their boats. The opening up of the Queens Highway helped a great amount. It helped those particular farmers so they did not have to use their boats. They could drive and park by the footpath.

I would stress that the farmers of this country are not asking for any expressway or paved road, all they are asking for is some help to open up new lands. Sir, I believe that if more roads were pushed into the interior of some areas in East End, North Side, and Bodden Town where good farm land is located, I would stress that is why we keep hearing that there is not much land available in Cayman for farming. If you drives along the main highways, certainly what one sees and the impression you get from that, you would believe there is no farm land available. Back in February, when I went to the Brac and if one drove along the road in the Bluff, one would be discouraged and think that there is no farmland on the Bluff. There are certain areas of the Bluff that have beautiful areas of farmland but, again, one cannot see it. The farmers on the Brac would be happy and would be able to help stop the importation of produce from other countries if they are given the chance, they help. This booklet say that the CDB will therefore provide finance for the construction of feeder roads where these are justified. As I said before, while we cannot ask the Government to do everything, if Government would look at the construction of a few more small roads pushed in to the interior at East End and North Side and Bodden Town where good farmland is located more farming would be done.

Just to use the figure that \$250,000 was needed for the year 1990 to construct a few feeder roads for the farmer, the Government may not be able, at this stage to find that \$250,000 too easily but again, if we look at this Book, it says the CDB will therefore provide finance for the construction of feeder roads where these are justified. I believe it would be very helpful if that \$250,000 was sought to be borrowed from the AIDB or the CDB branch here. In turn the Government would only be required, on a yearly basis (I do not know what the percentage of interest would be to the Government to repay that loan but I would use the figure \$15,000 to \$20,000 would be much easier for the Government to come up with every year) to repay that back than for them to find \$250,000 right off hand. So in turn the Government would just be putting out the cost of loan repayment each year on a long term basis.

I am not saying that the Government has not done anything or is not trying to do something. I am happy that the Government has seen the need to help and is taking a step in the right direction. Unfortunately, there are some things that need a good amount of money that would be helpful to farmers this year, but I am afraid that I figured the Appropriation Bills would have been tabled already, while I would have liked to take the opportunity to have given some praise to this I will not, at this stage, as it has not been finally approved in this House.

Having said that, I would ask all Members of this House to give their full support to this Assistance to Farmers Motion where it is asking the Government to allocate \$200,000 this year to be loaned to help in the development in agriculture. As I said before, I see a great need for the continuance and the further development of, one in particular the tomato production, in this country. The demand is here and we can certainly do it.

Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT:

The Honourable Member for Communications and Works.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Member's Motion number 26/89 which reads;

On behalf of the Government bench I rise in support of Private

"WHEREAS it is considered that there is a need to encourage local farming;

AND WHEREAS it is considered that there is a need for monetary assistance to farmers on a continual basis for a trial period of three (3) years;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Government, on an annual basis, consider the setting aside of \$200,000.00 for the purpose of assisting local farmers, subject to the requirements of the Agricultural Development Board and the proposed recommendations of the Agricultural Development Plan."

I feel that the Motion now before this House is a good one and that the Member piloting this Motion and the seconder of this Motion should be congratulated for its timeliness. I feel that it may be viewed from three perspectives, namely: 1) disaster relief; 2) agricultural incentive programmes; and 3) agricultural credit or subsidy. The main planks of an agricultural incentive programme are currently being investigated and studied by the consultants engaged in the production of the Agricultural Development Plan. These measures will, hopefully, seek to provide expansion and some protection of domestic agricultural production and should also attempt to stimulate the enhancement of institutional support services in the area of finance and marketing.

Also, it needs to be emphasised that the peculiar characteristics of agricultural production must condition the principles which inform and guide the operations of credit institutions serving the sector. In particular it should be understood that the vagaries of natural and biological hazards such as hurricanes, severe northwester, pest and diseases must be reckoned with. This should therefore indicate that we will have to carefully consider the principles of credit and finance as it may apply to agriculture as now applies to other areas.

In considering this Motion as it pertains to farm relief, one must therefore deal with the following relevant issues: 1) timeliness of disbursements; 2) appropriate structuring of the disbursements; 3) adequate technical expertise; 4) agricultural insurance protection (which I should say is causing grave concern to the farmers in this country); and 5) more realistic tradable instruments of collateral. There is the need, therefore, to address a set of policies relating to improvements of the existing structure and administrative competence of the credit institutions as well as innovations which would serve to modernise the credit system in general.

The farmers have complained, and rightly so, about the interest rates being charged by the AIDB and other local banks. It is therefore hoped that a much more attractive rate than what now exists, will be available to farmers. I would briefly wish to comment on a few of the remarks made by the Mover of this Motion. In particular, the remarks concerning the development of some of our local produce, particularly, the production of tomatoes.

Much has been done in this area of agricultural development in these Islands. I would venture to say that the locally produced tomatoes and other crops are much more favoured by the local residents of these Islands, then those that are imported. There are many, many residents I have heard say that it is a pity that there is not more of our local produce available because they would much prefer to buy the local produce. In order, therefore, for agriculture to become a viable and feasible industry in these Islands it is my feeling and my view that the Government will need to give this sector its full commitment that is now being demonstrated, that is financial commitment and otherwise.

It is certainly my view as the Member responsible for agriculture that these Islands can become self-sufficient in a number of areas with the appropriate support from the Government. The Member moving this Motion has requested that the Government consider more agricultural feeder roads and that this be given urgent attention. I support this view because, as I stated, in order for us to seriously look into the development of agriculture in this country, we will have to provide the necessary infrastructure facilities.

In our development of agriculture in Grand Cayman, I agree with the Member that we must also give our very close attention to the Lesser Islands, as history will show us that that Island, especially Cayman Brac, is capable of producing very, very good crops.

I am happy to report that the Agricultural Development Plan should be completed within the next few weeks. Other areas of farming, other than just the agricultural crops, that I feel can be given urgent attention would include poultry farming, dairy and livestock farming. As the Member piloting the Motion stated, we are unable to comment on any matters that may be raised in the presentation of the report of Finance Committee but I am happy to say that our Budget will show that provisions have been made in the Budget for the improvement and the expansion of agriculture in these Islands.

I also feel that, as in other countries, particularly in the Caribbean, the Government will need to look into the possibility of offering incentives in the way of peppercorn leases on land to farmers in order that farming can become a viable industry. This will also mean that available farm land that is capable of being used by farmers should be looked at very carefully.

With some amount of mechanism much can be accomplished in these Islands towards agricultural development. I am heartened when I consider from an historical perspective that the Israelis were able to make the desert bloom. If they can do so, I believe, that with some amount of dedication and concerted effort that we, in the Cayman Islands, can see a major expansion of agricultural development.

It is therefore, against this background why I stated earlier that this Motion is a good Motion. This Government has no problem at all in supporting this Motion as it is generally felt that such assistance is needed by many farmers and will thus, provide a necessary incentive to the agricultural development in these Islands.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Does any other Member wish to speak? Would the Mover wish to reply?

MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH:

Thank you, Mr. President.

I would like to thank the Honourable Member for his support and to all Members for their silent support.

The Honourable Member mentioned insurance that we are

concerned about. Yes, that is a concern to the farmers. We fully realise that it is needed and I believe that every effort should be made and I will approach the Honourable First Official Member, the Member in charge of Communications, Works and Natural Resources and the Superintendent of Insurance and some other people who might be able to help us set up an insurance among the farmers who will benefit from it.

I believe the Honourable Member who spoke mentioned something about collateral. I agree with him there too. In some instances some farmers would do well in the production of agriculture, but again in some instances they do not have a great amount of collateral to put down.

I would just like to mention that I know that we cannot call on the Government to do everything, but in some areas there are some very good lands that are available in this country for farming. In particular some areas that could help millions of dollars stay in this country with the production of bananas at a very good cost of maintenance and show profits, but again that cost of that land to buy it, to develop it, because the owners of land will not lease it or use it because it is for sale. For the farmer to approach a commercial bank to buy that land, it is impossible. We cannot approach the AIDB because their policy is not to lend money to buy land. Sir, I feel that this area where the Government could help by either purchasing the land and then leasing it to the farmers who have the capability of developing that land because today there are supermarkets who would give a contract for 600,000 pounds of bananas each year. I could go and get that contract but the commercial bank or the AIDB is not going to lend me the money. It could prove to be very profitable but getting the land to develop to plant the bananas that would help this country is the problem. This is where I am hoping the Government would look into some areas of this. Then this country could move in the right direction in agriculture.

Again, I must mention that I do not believe the farmers of this country are asking the Government to give them the money. I can speak honestly for a number of farmers that I know of, no one is asking the Government to give them the money. They are asking them to make it available with, perhaps, lower interest rates than what the local banks charge. In particular a moratorium on the repayments because some crops take up to a year or two years or three years before you reach production. That is what causes the problem when you go to a commercial bank they expect you to start repaying the money right away. If you are not making the money from the crops you have planting until they are producing, where are you going to get the money to pay the commercial bank back. I believe this is all the farmers need help with, some financing that would give them that scope to start production in this country.

Having said those words, Sir, I would like to thank all Members who have indicated their support for this Motion.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: I shall put the question regarding Private Member's Motion number 26/89. Those in favour please say Aye...Those against No.

AYES.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Ayes have it.

AGREED: PRIVATE MEMBERS MOTION NO. 26/89 PASSED.

MR. PRESIDENT: Private Member's Motion number 27/89 - the Third Elected Member for West Bay.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 27/89

ESTABLISHMENT OF A SELECT COMMITTEE TO REVIEW CONDITIONS EXISTING IN THE WATERSPORTS INDUSTRY

MR. JOHN D. JEFFERSON, JR: Mr. President, I beg to move amended Private Member's Motion number 27/89 entitled, The Establishment of a Select Committee to Review Conditions Existing in the Watersports Industry and which reads as follows:

"WHEREAS the Cayman Islands is a well established dive destination; and
AND WHEREAS it is thought that it is increasingly difficult for Caymanians to enter and to survive financially in the watersports industry;
BE IT NOW THEREFORE RESOLVED that a Select Committee of all Elected Members of this House be established for the purpose of reviewing the conditions that exist in the watersports industry, with the objective of promoting the interests of Caymanians involved in the industry."

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Mr. President, I second the Motion.

MR. PRESIDENT: Private Member's Motion number 27/89 has been duly moved and seconded. Would the Mover wish to speak to it?

MR. JOHN D. JEFFERSON, JR:

Thank you, Mr. President.

The Cayman Islands are now considered the number one dive destination in the world. This is because of the natural beauty of our marine environment and because of the high quality of watersports services that are made available in this country.

Presently, 35 per cent of all air arrivals, that is visitors, to these Islands are divers. Based on the 1989 figures, as of the 31st of October 1989, when the air arrivals stood at 183,846 persons, that means that approximately this year we had 46,000 divers visiting the Cayman Islands. Divers make a substantial contribution to the economy of our Islands. It is estimated that contribution amounts to approximately \$45 million each year. What is also significant is that between 75 per cent and 80 per cent of all visitors to these Islands are active participants in some sort of water sports. According to information made available to me there are a number of operators in this industry, the largest of which are members of the Cayman Watersports Association which, at the end of June 1989, boasted of 34 members. Charter fishing operators listed amounted to 11 parties. There are a number of other small operators who are offering services in this area. When I refer to watersports, I include diving, snorkeling, charter fishing, jet skis, sailing, glass bottom boat rides, evening cruises, etcetera. At the present time, as I mentioned before, the dive industry contributes \$45 million to our economy and that is significant.

Another fact is that the majority of persons involved in the ownership and management in the watersports industry are foreign nationals. Another fact is that all major hotels have their own concessions and many of these are also attempting to control not only their business, but the business originating from the condominiums that are also established along Seven Mile Beach and other parts of the Islands.

What alarms and concerns me is that Caymanians, and we have a few large Caymanian entities that are involved in the industry who are doing quite well, but there are a number of small Caymanian operators who are trying to make a living in this area and they are gradually being squeezed out of the industry by the large operators. I am an individual that believes in the free market system. That is as long as the rules of the game are the same for all parties involved, which in this industry is not the case. I think that we, as legislators and leaders in this country, must ensure that Caymanians who are involved in the industry, or those wanting to get into the industry, have a fair opportunity to do so and can make a living in this area.

When we refer to our history, we recall in the early days the men of this country went to sea to make a living. They became known as some of the best seaman in the world. That has not changed. But, it is sad to say that what is happening now, and I am thankful for the opportunity that has been made available to many Caymanian men who had to go to sea to make a living, they now have the opportunity to earn a living locally, but those Caymanians who still have an interest in making a living from the sea are gradually being driven onshore to make a living. I personally feel that this is very unfair and sad. I think it has to be corrected. My suggestion for consideration would be, restrict any new hotels from owning their own watersports services, but to be in a position to contract the services from local entities who can make these services available. I also feel that because of the availability of Caymanians in this area that maybe we should consider requiring ownership of any new companies involved in this industry to be 100 per cent Caymanian owned.

I would also like to see more financing available to Caymanians who would desire to enter or remain in the industry from such institutions as the AIDB and the local commercial banks. That would enable Caymanians to acquire the necessary equipment for services in this area. I am recommending that this situation be referred to a Select Committee consisting of all Elected Members of this House in an attempt to arrive at solutions that are fair to all parties involved in the industry, but with particular emphasis on ensuring that Caymanians who are in the industry or wanting to join the industry do have a fair chance to do so.

At the Committee stage, I would encourage that we invite representatives from the industry to put forward any suggestions they may have for solving the present situation. I would also suggest that consideration be given to appointing the Member for Communications, Works and Natural Resources, under whose Portfolio this would fall, as Chairman of this Select Committee. The main reason why I chose to bring this Motion is because of the concerns that have been expressed to me from Caymanians who are involved in the industry. I do not think our people are greedy. I think all they want is to ensure that they get their fair share. I think we would be prudent to ensure that in all areas of our economy the Caymanians continue to benefit from the economic success that we are experiencing.

I am recommending and requesting support of all Members for this Motion. I think it is very important and timely and I look forward to their support.

Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: Proceedings are suspended until 2:15 P.M.

AT 12:46 THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 3:56 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Proceedings of the House are resumed. The House was debating Private Member's Motion number 27/89, which has just been moved, seconded and spoken to. Does any Member wish to speak? The First Elected Member for West Bay.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Mr. President, this situation existing in the watersports industry is one that is adversely affecting the small local operators who for years helped to build the industry. My colleague, the Mover, has pointed to areas which I for some time have complained about to no avail.

There are all kinds of tactics used to hamper the small operator. In April of last year I moved a resolution dealing with the use of the sandbar in the North Sound where attempts were being made to control and regulate the use of that area. In the debate upon the resolution I pointed out the many areas where our small local operators were being run out of the watersports business.

Traditionally the North Sound, for instance, was used only by the small operators, mostly from the West Bay area. Today, there are operations from large hotels carried on in the area. These large hotels are, for one, monopolising the business to the detriment of our local operator. I think the House will have to take note that the local operators have gone out and borrowed money, in some cases, to upgrade their business. In some instances they cannot pay their loans and are under some duress. It is those people we must seriously consider. We must consider that they do not have the financial resources to fight the kind of competition that the large operators offer them. We welcome all reasonable investors into the country to do any amount of business, but our people must share in the opportunities that our country offers. In our district, we have some very able people in the business who have been there from the 1950s who are not only in the business for the sake of being there but because they love it, they love the sea which they count as their heritage. For the sake of time, I am going to be brief. As it was said by my colleague, the reason why this resolution is before us is because of the many concerns expressed to us about the situation as obtained. For one thing, it is sorrowful to see people who have little or no experience in the industry handling boats (people from the outside), while the businesses of experienced men are suffering.

I feel we are moving in the right direction with the Motion. I trust we will get some results. As I said, I have been complaining for quite a long time about this matter.
Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Honourable Member for Communications and Works.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in support on behalf of the Government of Private Member's Motion number 27/89. This Motion as was described by the Mover is asking to establish a Select Committee to review the conditions existing in the watersports industry. The resolution section of the Motion asks that a Select Committee of all Elected Members of this House be established for the purpose of reviewing the conditions that exist in the watersports industry with the objective of safeguarding the interests of Caymanians involved in the industry.

When this Motion was first circulated to Members, as the Member responsible for the watersports industry, I felt it necessary to obtain first hand information from those individuals who are directly affected. On the 27th of November 1989 I met with the following individuals for the purpose of discussing this problem. Two members from my Portfolio were present, Mr. Kearney Gomez and Mrs. Gwenn Ebanks Thompson, and the following members: Mr. Adrian Briggs, Chairman of the Cayman Islands Water Operators Association; Mr. Atlee Evans, Quabbin Dive; Mr. Peter Miburn, Dive Cayman; Mr. Don Foster, Dive Grand Cayman; Mr. Ron Ebanks, Charter Boat Headquarters; Mr. Winston McDermot, Brac Aquatics; Capt. Eugene Ebanks, Captain Eugene's Aquatics; Mr. Peter Tibbetts, Island Girl Charters; Mr. Randy Ebanks; Mr. Chuck Ebanks.

The basic topic at this meeting was are Caymanians encountering difficulties due to foreign competition in the watersports industry. That meeting was very lively and much information was garnered that has enabled me to form an opinion on the problem that is being experienced by local individuals involved in the industry. I am of the opinion that there is, indeed, a problem. I do not at this time want to state specifically what I see as the major problems but I would state here that it is not quite correct that all the concessions in the large local hotels are totally owned by foreigners. I was able to get reliable information that in respect of two of the very large hotels on the West Bay Beach area, 60 per cent is owned by Caymanians, and this is not what we refer to as fronting. These Caymanians actually own 60 per cent of the concessions at these two large hotels. In one of the large hotels, one that has been recently completed, or near completion, the concession was given 100 per cent to a Caymanian.

While I agree that there is a problem there it may not be to the extent that I had initially been advised. But I agree that there should be a restriction on applicants who come from abroad owning 100 per cent of a concessions for the watersports industry because I take the points raised by the Mover of this Motion that there are many, many Caymanians that are available who can fill these positions. This point was also echoed by the First Elected Member for West Bay. I do not feel that we should sit by and allow the Caymanians to be pushed into the background. It is not my intention to spend a very long time replying to this Motion, as it is the intention of the Motion to have it taken to a Select Committee of the House and the deliberations of that Committee will be reported to the Honourable House in due course, but I would like to state four basic points which I would like to summarise.

As indicated from the information that I received, it seems that only 10 per cent of the watersports industry is foreign controlled. However, there are strong references made that sign on the line, or fronting situations, do in fact exist within the industry. Perhaps, as I said, not to the extent that I had initially believed, but there are indications that there are fronting situations in existence. Just to clarify the term 'sign on the line' that term refers to Caymanians that on paper are indicated as the 60 per cent share holder of the company but do not actively participate in the company. I also received information from various sectors including the Immigration Department on this problem and on the problems of fronting. Also from members of the Cayman Islands Water Operators Association, one letter states that very serious difficulties exist within the watersports industry due to foreign involvement and should be investigated.

As stated by other individuals that contributed to the report, while we recognise that there is a problem we must also recognise that it is a free enterprise system and that

legitimate business dealings should be allowed to continue without undue interference. It was the overwhelming view that Caymanian success must not be jeopardized in any way by unfair foreign competition.

As stated earlier, this Motion will, in fact, go to a Select Committee of the Elected Members of this House, and accordingly I will not, at this time, make any further comments and I am pleased to support this Motion.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: Would the Mover wish to reply to the debate?

MR. JOHN D. JEFFERSON, JR: Mr. President, I appreciate the Government's support on this Motion. I agree with the Honourable Member replying on behalf the Government that maybe on paper only 10 per cent is owned by foreign nationals, but in reality that is far from the fact. I think in this area, I do not have any statistics to support my statement, but I really suspect that there are serious problems with fronting in the watersports industry.

I appreciate the Government's approach to accept the idea of this matter being referred to a Select Committee of all Elected Members to look at the problem and see whether or not the concerns that we have and that have been voiced to us are legitimate. I think we should go in there with an open mind, invite as much representation as possible and come up with fair conclusions on this matter.

I thank the Government for accepting the Motion. I also thank my colleague, the First Elected Member for West Bay, for his support in this area. I look forward to us getting down in a Select Committee to review the situation.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question will now be put on Private Member's Motion number 27/89. Those in favour please say Aye...Those against No.

AYES.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Ayes have it.

AGREED: PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTION NO. 27/89 PASSED AND REFERRED TO A SELECT COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE.

**CHAIRMAN NOMINATED
(Standing Order 69(2))**

MR. PRESIDENT: In accordance with Standing Order 69(2) I nominate the Honourable Member for Communications and Works as the Chairman of that Select Committee. We now return to item 2 on today's Order Paper. Papers - the Honourable First Official Member.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS AND REPORTS

REPORT OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, I am pleased to see that the Report of the Finance Committee be laid on the Table of this Honourable House.

MR. PRESIDENT: So ordered.

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, before I begin to deal with the Report, let me take a moment to say how much I appreciated seeing the cooperation that transpired between Elected Members while dealing with this Budget. It reminded me of a joke I heard about cooperation. It goes like this: -

"A very nice young lady walked into a sporting goods store and ordered all the equipment necessary for a baseball game, including a baseball, a bat, a catcher's mitt and a catcher's mask.

"Are you sure you want all of these?", the salesman asked.

The girl nodded, "Yes, I do. My boss said that if I play ball with him, we would get along just fine."

I am not going to try to enlarge on that, Mr. President.

Also the Members of the Finance Committee obviously did not acknowledge defeat in the awesome task in reconciling their views on the Budget. To them, since poems are the thing of today, I would read the following in a tribute to them:

"If you think you are beaten, you are.
If you think that you dare not, you don't.

If you would like to win, but you think you can't,
It is almost certain you won't.
If you think you'll lose, you've lost.

For out in the world you'll find,
Success begins with a fellow's will,
It is all in the state of mind.

If you think you are outclassed, you are.
You have got to think high to rise.
You have got to be sure of yourself before you can ever win a prize.

Life's battles don't always go to the stronger or faster man,
But sooner or later the man who wins is the man who thinks he can."

That poem is to the Elected Members, Mr. President, and I think it is that will which they had that allows me to stand here today and to read this Report.

The Committee had five meetings. We met on the 8th, the 12th, the 13th, the 20th and we also met today. All the attendances of the Members and the persons who were invited to attend the Finance Committee are recorded in the Minutes which forms a part of this Report. The Committee, after all these hours and days of dealing with budgetary matters (the longest that I have ever been a part of or heard about) reduced the total expenditure by \$311,822.00, thus having a total expenditure approved in a Supplementary Appropriation Bill of \$104,122,262.00.

There are a number of Minutes that deal with the meetings held on the various days. We could probably spend the rest of the afternoon if we wanted to read each one but I would propose that all of those earlier Minutes which shall be attached to the report for the benefit of covering the matters and for the benefit of those who wish to read them, I would propose to deal with the Report of the fourth sitting.

The Committee (at its second and third meetings, held on the 12th and 13th of December) considered various recommendations put forward by the Backbench and commenced on that day's meeting by considering the Government's response to the Budgetary reallocation requested by the Backbenchers. The response included certain reductions, increases and additions. The paper presented indicated that the Government's response to a request by the Backbenchers to provide a bulldozer (and the request was \$150,000 for a new bulldozer, I think it initially was \$100,000, and based on information from the Public Works Department and the Central Funding Scheme the sum was increased to \$150,000). The Government's response was that we should provide \$20,000 to repair a bulldozer presently at the Funding Scheme and which is in need of some amount of repair as well as certain implements that are needed to add to it.

The Government's response for a request for an ambulance to service the Eastern Districts was to agree to a sum of \$45,000. The response also, to the request for the renovations of the West Bay Town Hall was \$150,000 and a further \$10,000 to provide an office for the MLAs of the district of Bodden Town, either in the Town Hall or in the Civic Centre, whichever is decided to be the better place to have it.

The Government's response in respect of:

HEAD 41 - LOCAL CONSTRUCTION:

Sub-head 006 - CONSTRUCTION OF ROADS: A sum of \$275,000 for Little Cayman for Roads and \$100,000 of it for the East End road link on this island. And \$275,000 for roads in Cayman Brac, broken down as follows:

\$ 100,000 for the Bluff Road,
125,000 for the South Coast Road,
50,000 for the Bluff Feeder Road.

The following are all roads:

\$ 350,000 for East End,
350,000 for Bodden Town,
200,000 for North Side,
350,000 for West Bay,
200,000 for George Town and
680,000 for the School Access/Boilers Road,
250,000 for the Master Ground Transportation Plan winding own,
15,000 for a Bodden Town back road survey.

SUB-HEAD 007 - DISASTER PREPAREDNESS: A request for two generators for West End and the Creek Hurricane Shelter. A provision of \$1,500 was already in the Budget so we agreed to increase the sum by \$10,500 which upon information the total amount required for the purchase of the two generators.

SUB-HEAD 009 - FARM DEVELOPMENT: A provision of \$200,000 for six district slaughter houses and

\$80,000 for the agricultural pavilion.

SUB-HEAD 012 - GOVERNMENT OFFICES: There were two token votes of \$10 each for the District Administration in Cayman Brac and the Courts in Grand Cayman.

SUB-HEAD 013 - HARBOURS AND DOCKS: A total offer of \$120,000 for launching ramps, broken down as follows and \$15,000 for each area: South Sound, Bodden Town, Newlands, Gun Bay, North Sound - George Town, North Sound - West Bay, Spotts, and Frank Sound.

SUB-HEADS 020 - PURCHASE OF LAND: The Government's proposal was \$95,000 to purchase a playing field area in Gun Bay of 3.5 acres and on this particular sub-head we also inserted a note that \$100,000 for the West Bay Post Office site extension to be taken from the provision of \$1,275,000 set out in the Budget and set aside for Grand Cayman.

SUB-HEAD 022 - SCHOOL BUILDINGS: \$15,000 was offered for West Bay Primary School Assembly Hall.

SUB-HEAD 023 - SPORTS CENTRES: Playing Fields and Parks: For bleachers in Bodden Town and East End - \$18,000 each a total sum of \$224,000;

Bleachers for North Side -	\$ 12,000
A basketball court in West Bay -	10,000
For a park in George Town -	50,000
Breakers playing field -	25,000
Boxing rental and equipment -	15,000
Boxing hall	
(design and commencement) -	20,000
Wesleyan hard court -	10,000
Tennis Court fencing & swimming pool -	10,000
West Bay soft ball complex -	36,000
Total	\$224,000

SUB-HEAD 013 - HARBOURS AND DOCKS DEVELOPMENT: There was a note which I missed and I will make it now, that the Honourable Member for Communications, Works and Natural Resources to look into all channel aspects and report back to the Committee. That is the channels surrounding the entire three islands.

SUB-HEAD 025 - YARDS AND STORES: \$5,000 provided for toilets at Pedro Castle area and \$10,000 for toilets at the Cayman Brac Bluff lighthouse area.

SUB-HEAD 019 PUBLIC BUILDINGS: \$14,000 for fencing at the Boatswain Bay cemetery and a note to that sub-head as well, the First Elected Member for West Bay requested that the building of five vaults in the Northwest Point Cemetery and 10 in Boatswain cemetery be a stipulation of the vote. The Honourable Member gave his undertaking but stated that the dispensing of the vaults would be handled in the normal way.

RECURRENT EXPENDITURE

HEAD 26, EDUCATION, RECREATION AND CULTURE

SUB-HEAD 08-033 - SUPPORT GRANTS: \$10,000 provided for cultural performances.

HEAD 36 - POSTAL

For a sub-post office on Seven Mile Beach, \$122,000 and the capital expenditure in relation to it is \$164,600, a total of \$286,600 and the increased revenue from the Postal Department of \$279,700, and there is a note to this as well, that the Government undertakes to upgrade the district post offices in East End, Bodden Town, Savannah, North Side and West Bay.

HEAD 29 - MEDICAL HEALTH SERVICES

Further, under new services: The ambulance for the Eastern districts we offered to provide \$155,000 for staff and operations cost of that ambulance. In order to fund all of this, it was proposed that cuts in the Budget would be as follows: Under 41-006 dealing with the construction of roads, we would cut the following:

The Jennet 'T' -	\$360,000
The district works -	630,000
The school access road -	680,000
The MGTP, Phase one -	660,000
The land acquisition -	1,000,000

We would use the surplus of \$727,960 and we would delete the allocation of \$60,000 being a duplication provided for boats, it was provided under head 40 as well as new services.

The Committee suspended at 9:40 and resumed at 2:40 and following the lunch break Mr. Truman Bodden, on behalf of the Backbenchers, advised that of the proposal put forward by the Government bench, there were several items they were not satisfied with and that they would wish to put forward additional amendments to be incorporated in the proposal. Much discussion ensued on the matters included by Government, and it was necessary for Backbenchers and the Government Bench to ask for suspensions to discuss and agree among themselves proposals put forward. The Committee suspended at 3:15 to 4:52, at 5:03 to 5:38, at 5:45 to 6:15 and 7:03 to 7:50, after which the following decisions were reached.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE

In accordance with the provisions of Standing Orders 65(1) the Chairman moved the following increases:

HEAD 40 - SUB-HEAD 008, MECHANICAL HEAVY EQUIPMENT

The Chairman moved that the amounts be increased to \$150,000 to provide a bulldozer to be made available on a rental basis to farmers as recommended by Messrs. Franklin Smith and John McLean. That sum was agreed. The Chairman moved that an increase of \$45,000 to provide an ambulance service to the eastern districts as requested by Messrs. John McLean and Roy Bodden be considered. That sum was also approved. In respect of Sub-Head 006 - construction of roads, the following were proposed:

\$ 100,000-	Little Cayman, for the east end link road,
200,000-	Cayman Brac Bluff road,
50,000-	Cayman Brac Bluff Feeder Road,
400,000-	for East End, dealing with Frank Sound to East End Road,
600,000-	For Bodden Town, including a re-vote of \$250,000.
200,000-	For North Side,
550,000-	For West Bay, to include the re-voting of \$250,000,
200,000-	For George Town,
415,000-	For the school access/Boilers Road, and
250,000-	For the Master Ground Transportation Plan winding down,
50,000-	For the Bodden Town back road survey and commencement.

The Committee agreed that the sum of \$3,015,000 be approved.

SUB-HEAD 007 - DISASTER PREPAREDNESS: The Chairman moved that the amount be increased by \$10,500 to provide for two generators for the West End and Creek Hurricane Shelters as requested by Mr. Gilbert McLean and Capt. Mabry Kirkconnell. The Committee agreed that the sum of \$10,500 be approved.

SUB-HEAD 009 - FARM DEVELOPMENT: The Chairman moved that the amount be increased by \$280,000 to provide: (A) \$200,000 for six slaughter houses for each district, and (B) \$80,000 for the agricultural pavilion at Lower Valley, on the recommendations of Messrs. John McLean and Franklin Smith. The question was put and agreed, \$280,000 approved.

SUB-HEAD 012 - GOVERNMENT OFFICES: The Chairman moved that the amount be increased by \$300,010 to provide: (A) \$300,000 for the district administration/Faith Hospital on the recommendation of Messrs. Mabry Kirkconnell and Gilbert McLean, and (B) a token vote of \$10 for the Courts Building in Grand Cayman on the recommendation of Mr. Truman Bodden. Such considerations, however, were given on the condition that a study be conducted on these projects and the findings reported to the Finance Committee.

SUB-HEAD 013 - HARBOURS AND DOCKS: The Chairman moved that the amount be increased by \$120,000 to provide for launching ramps on the recommendation of the Backbench, broken down as follows: \$15,000 for each - South Sound, Bodden Town, Newlands, Gun Bay, North Sound, George Town, North Sound, West Bay, Spotts, and Frank Sound. The Honourable Linford Pierson was asked to do an investigation on the conditions of all channels to ascertain what extent work was needed. The question was put and it was agreed that the sum of \$120,000 be provided.

SUB-HEAD 020 - PURCHASE OF LAND: The Chairman moved the following that the amounts be increased by \$95,000 for the purchase of 3.5 acres of land in Gun Bay for a playing field on the recommendation of Mr. John McLean. (B), It was noted that the amount of \$100,000 would be taken from the \$1,275,000 provided for Grand Cayman for the purchase of land adjacent to the West Bay Post Office for the proposed improvements on the recommendation of Messrs. McKeeva Bush and John Jefferson, Jr. The question was put and it was agreed that the sum of \$95,000 be approved.

SUB-HEAD 019 - PUBLIC BUILDINGS: The Chairman moved that the amount be increased by \$164,000 to provide a \$150,000 for improvements for the West Bay Post Office and \$14,000 for the fencing of the Boatswain Bay cemetery on the recommendation of Messrs. McKeeva Bush and John Jefferson, Jr. The

question was put and agreed that the sum of \$164,000 be approved.

SUB-HEAD 022 - SCHOOL BUILDINGS: The Chairman moved that the amount be increased by \$150,000 to provide for an Assembly Hall at the West Bay Primary School on the recommendation of Messrs. John Jefferson, Jr., and McKeeva Bush. Question put and agreed to the \$150,000 be provided.

SUB-HEAD 023 - SPORTS PLAYING FIELDS AND PARKS: The Chairman moved that the amount be increased by \$214,000 to be distributed as follows:

Bleachers for Bodden Town -	\$18,000
Bleachers for East End -	18,000
Bleachers for North Side -	12,000
Basketball court for West Bay -	10,000
Park in George Town -	50,000
Breakers playing field -	25,000
Boxing hall design and commencement -	20,000
Wesleyan Hard Court -	10,000
Tennis court fencing	
and flood lights in Cayman Brac -	10,000
West Bay softball complex -	36,000

The question was put and it was agreed that \$214,000 be provided.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER 10(2)

Hon. Thomas C. Jefferson: Mr. President, under Standing Order 83 I would move the suspension of Standing Order 10(2) to allow me to finish what I am trying to say.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think we are all rather assumed... but for the record the question is that Standing Orders be suspended to enable the business on today's Order Paper to be completed. Those in favour please say Aye... Those against No.

AYES.

The Ayes have it.

MR. PRESIDENT:

AGREED: STANDING ORDER 10(2) SUSPENDED.

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Thank you, Mr. President.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE (continuing)

SUB-HEAD 025 - YARDS AND STORES: The Chairman moved that the amount be increased in the sum of \$15,000 to provide toilet facilities at Savannah/Newlands playing field by Mr. Franklin Smith and (B) the Cayman Brac Bluff Lighthouse, \$10,000 as recommended by Messrs. Mabry Kirkconnell and Gilbert McLean. The question was put and agreed that the sum of \$15,000 be approved.

RECURRENT EXPENDITURE.

HEAD 26 - ADMINISTRATION OF EDUCATION, RECREATION AND CULTURE

SUB-HEAD 08-024 - PRIVATE SCHOOLS: The Chairman moved that the amount be increased by \$120,000 as recommended by Mr. Truman Bodden. The question was put and the sum was agreed. Sub-Head 08-032 - Sport Grants, the Chairman moved that the amount be increased by \$75,000 as recommended by Messrs. McKeeva Bush and John Jefferson, Jr.. The question was put and it was agreed that the sum be increased. Sub-Head 08-033 - Sport Grant, The Chairman moved that the amount be increased by \$10,000. The question was put and it was agreed that head 26 be increased by \$205,000.

In order to offset some of the increases approved above, the following cuts were made. The cuts in the Budget are as follows: Head 41, Sub-head 006:

Roads, Jennett 'I' -	\$360,000
District works -	\$630,000
School access road -	\$680,000
MGTP phase one,	\$660,000
Land acquisition,	\$1,000,000
Surplus used,	\$727,960
Vote duplication under Head 40, Sub-Head 002,	\$60,000

Consideration of the schedule of the Bill under Standing Order 64, in accordance with the provision of Standing Order 64, the Committee considered the schedule of the Bill with the Chairman calling each head of expenditure in turn and putting the question thereon.

HEAD 1 - HIS EXCELLENCY, THE GOVERNOR

In accordance with provision of Standing Order 65(3), Mr. Truman Bodden moved that Head 1, Sub-Head 07-045 be reduced by \$6,500. It was agreed by a majority that Head 1 be reduced by \$6,500. The question was put and agreed that the reduced sum of \$259,298 for Head 1 stand part of the schedule.

HEAD 2 - AUDITOR GENERAL The question was put and agreed that the sum of \$267,562 for Head 2 stand part of the schedule.

HEAD 3 - PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION: The question was put and it was agreed that the sum of \$265,331 for Head 3 stand part of schedule.

HEAD 4 - FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT: The question was put and agreed that the sum of \$7,778,542 for Head 4 stand part of the schedule.

HEAD 5 - BANKING INSPECTORATE: The question was put and agreed that the sum of \$258,477 for Head 5 stand part of the schedule.

HEAD 6 - CUSTOMS: The question was put and agreed that the sum of \$1,638,771 for Head 6 stand part of the schedule.

HEAD 7 - INSURANCE: The question was put and agreed that the sum of the \$500,608 for Head 7 stand part of the schedule.

HEAD 8 - LEGISLATIVE: The question was put and agreed that the sum of \$823,526 for Head 8 stand part of the schedule.

- HEAD 9 - MARINE SURVEY**
- HEAD 10 - REGISTRAR GENERAL**
- HEAD 11 - STATISTICS**
- HEAD 12 - TREASURY**
- HEAD 13 - JUDICIAL**

The question was put on all of those and the sums as stated in the Appropriation Bill was agreed.

- HEAD 14 - LEGAL DEPARTMENT**
- HEAD 15 - INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS**
- HEAD 16 - BROADCASTING**
- HEAD 17 - IMMIGRATION**

The question was put on those and the Committee agreed that the sums, as set out in the Appropriation Bill stand part of the schedule.

HEAD 18 - POLICE: The sum of \$5,494,763 for Head 18 stand part of the Schedule.

HEAD 19 - PRISONS: It was agreed that the sum of \$2,808,456 for Head 19 stand part of the schedule.

HEAD 20 - PERSONNEL AND OFFICE SERVICES

In accordance with the provision of Standing Order 65(3), Mr. Truman Bodden moved that Head 20, Sub-Head 01-109, Housing Allowance, be reduced by \$1.4 million as agreed by the Committee. The question was put and agreed that Head 20 be reduced by \$1.4 million in respect of Sub-Head 01-109. The question was put and agreed that the reduced sum of \$3,484,707 for Head 20 stand part of the schedule.

HEAD 21 - DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION

In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 65(1) the Chairman moved that the Head 21, Sub-Head 07-028, other operating and maintenance services, be increased by \$2,580 for the mail carrier in Cayman Brac on the recommendation of Mr. Gilbert McLean. That Head 21 be increased by \$2,580 in respect of Sub-Head 07-028. The question was put and agreed that the increased sum of \$3,060,253 for Head 21 stand part of the schedule.

- HEAD 22 - THE ADMINISTRATION OF TOURISM, AVIATION AND TRADE**
- HEAD 23 - FIRE SERVICES**
- HEAD 24 - TOURISM**

HEAD 25 - TRADE AND LABOUR.

The question was put on those and it was agreed that the sums as stated in the Appropriation Bill stand part of the schedule.

HEAD 26 - THE ADMINISTRATION OF EDUCATION, RECREATION AND CULTURE

In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 65(1), the Chairman moved that Head 26 be amended as follows: Sub-Head 08-024 Private Schools by an increase of \$120,000 as recommended by Mr. Truman Bodden. The question was put and it was agreed that the Sub-Head 08-024 be increased by \$120,000. Sub-Head 08-032, still within the Head of 26, Sport Grants, by an increase of \$75,000 as recommended by Messrs. McKeever Bush and John Jefferson, Jr., the question was put and agreed that Sub-Heads 08-032 be increased by \$75,000. And Sub-Head 08-033, Support Grants, by an increase of \$10,000. The question was put and agreed that Sub-Head 08-033 be increased by \$10,000. The question was put and agreed that head 26 be increased by \$205,000 in respect of the above Sub-Heads. The question was also put that the increased sum of \$2,387,663 for Head 26 stand part of the schedule.

HEAD 27 - EDUCATION: The question was put and agreed that the sum of \$10,100,364 for Head 27 stand part of the schedule.

HEAD 28 - THE ADMINISTRATION OF HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES

In accordance with provisions of Standing Order 65(3), Mr. Truman Bodden moved that Head 28, Sub-Head 07-014 fees consultancy be reduced by \$450,000. For the record, Mr. Truman Bodden gave notice that he wished to Table a statement regarding the various Backbench proposals and that the statement form an integral part of the Report. For clarity only, approval was granted as follows; \$100,000 for the solid waste consultancy and pension plan, \$350,000 for management systems consultancy for George Town Hospital, Faith Hospital and the district clinics, but not the new proposed hospital. The Honourable Ezzard Miller stated he was in support of the reduction provided the amount increased the surplus and that supplementary expenditure be considered in 1990. He gave the undertaking that he would provide the Committee with details of proposed expenditure in relation to the management system before committing the funds. The question was put and agreed that Head 28 be reduced by \$450,000 in respect to Sub-Head 07-014. The question was also put that the reduced sum of \$1,645,206 for Head 28 stand part of the schedule. Head 29 - Medical Health Services. The question was put and agreed that the sum as set out in the Appropriation Bill stand part of the schedule.

- HEAD 30 - SOCIAL SERVICES**
- HEAD 31 - COMMUNICATION, WORKS AND NATURAL RESOURCES**

The question was put on those and it was agreed that the sums as set out in the Appropriation Bill stand part of the schedule.

HEAD 32 - AGRICULTURE

In accordance with the provision of 65(3) of Standing Orders, Mr. Truman Bodden moved (A) that Sub-Head 03-022 - Horticulture, that the sum of \$9,800 for Horticulture be removed in its entirety. The question was put and agreed that Sub-Head 03-022 be deleted. (B) That Sub-Head 06-007 - Water, that the sum of \$50,000 for water be removed in its entirety. The question was put and agreed that Sub-Head 06-007 be deleted. In accordance with Standing Order 65(1), the Chairman moved that Sub-Head 07-012 - Farm Development, be increased by \$50,000 to provide for tree grafting expenses. The question was put and agreed that the Sub-Head 07-012 be increased by \$50,000. The question was also put and agreed that the reduced sum of \$1,198,380 for Head 32 stand part of the Schedule.

- HEAD 33 - MOSQUITO RESEARCH AND CONTROL UNIT**
- HEAD 34 - LANDS AND SURVEY**
- HEAD 35 - PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT**
- HEAD 36 - POSTAL**
- HEAD 37 - PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT**

The question was put and it was agreed that the sums as set out in the Appropriation Bill stand part of the schedule.

The Committee amended Heads 21, 29 and 36 under new services.

HEAD 21 - DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION

The Chairman moved that Sub-head 21-01 Personal Emoluments be increased by \$20,088 of the employment of two Nurse Assistants at the Faith Hospital, as recommended by Capt. Mabry Kirkconnell. The question was put and agreed that the Sub-Head be increased by \$20,088. The question was also put that the

increased sum of \$45,264 for Head 21 stand part of the New Services.

HEAD 29 - MEDICAL HEALTH SERVICES

The Chairman moved that under that Head 29 be increased by \$155,000 in respect of various Sub-Heads as recommended by Messrs. Franklin Smith, Roy Bodden and John McLean. That sum would provide, among other things, three ambulance service officers, three registered nurses at N3 scale, three ambulance service officers for the eastern districts. The question was put that Head 29 be increased by \$155,000 in respect of various Sub-Heads. The question was put and agreed that the increased sum of \$452,394 for Head 29 stand part of new services.

HEAD 36 - POSTAL EXPENDITURE

The Chairman moved that Head 36 be increased by \$122,000 for the establishment of a Sub-Post Office for the George Town area, preferably in the vicinity of Merren's, but no further north. The question was put and agreed that Head 36 be increased by \$122,000 under various Sub-Heads and the question was also put and agreed that the increased sum of \$152,912 for head 36 stand part of New Services. There is a Revenue Item related to this. The question was put and agreed that Head 36 include new revenue for Postal Services of \$279,700. The question was put and agreed that the increased sum of \$2,407,522 stand part of the schedule.

DEVELOPMENT

HEAD 40, LOCAL VEHICLE, FURNITURE AND EQUIPMENT

Sub-Head 008 - Mechanical Heavy Equipment, the Chairman moved that this be increased by \$150,000 to provide a bulldozer on an rental basis to farmers. The question was put and agreed that Sub-Head 008 be increased by \$150,000. Sub-Head 018 - Vehicles, The Chairman moved that Sub-Head 018 - Vehicles be increased by \$45,000 to provide an ambulance for the eastern districts to be located in one of the eastern districts. The question was put and agreed that Sub-Head 018 be increased by \$45,000. The question was also put and agreed that the sum of \$60,000 provided for the purchase of a boat which is duplicated in New Services be deleted. The question was put and agreed that the increased sum of \$2,147,400 for Head 40 stand part of the Schedule.

HEAD 41 - LOCAL CONSTRUCTION

The Chairman, in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 65(1), moved the following; Sub-Head 004 - Civic Centres and Museums. The Chairman moved that Sub-Head 004 be increased by \$150,000 for repairs to the West Bay Town Hall as recommended by Messrs. McKeeva Bush and John Jefferson, Jr. The question was put and agreed that Sub-Head 004 be increased by \$150,000. The Chairman moved that the Sub-Head 004 be further increased by \$10,000 to provide MLA offices in Bodden Town at the Town Hall or the Civic Centre. The question was put and agreed that Sub-Head 004 be increased by \$10,000 and it was also put and agreed that Sub-head 004 as twice amended stand part of Head 41. Sub-Head 006 - Construction of Roads. Increases. The Chairman moved that Sub-head 006 Construction of Roads, be increased by \$3,015,000 as follows:

Little Cayman (East End Link Rd)	\$100,000
Cayman Brac Bluff Road	200,000
Cayman Brac Bluff Feeder Road	50,000
East End (Frank Sound to East End Rd)	400,000
Bodden Town	600,000
North Side	200,000
West Bay	550,000
George Town	200,000
School Access/Boilers Rd	415,000
MGTP (Wind Down)	250,000
Bodden Town Back Road Survey and Commencement	50,000

REDUCTIONS

Mr. Truman Bodden moved that Head 41 be reduced by \$3,330,000, itemised as follows:

Jennett T'	\$ 360,000
District Works	630,000
School Access	680,000
MGTP (Phase I)	660,000
Land Acquisition	1,000,000

The question was put and agreed that Sub-head 006 be

reduced by \$3,330,000. The question was also put and agreed that a sum of \$3,785,000 in respect of Sub-Head 006 stand part of Head 41.

Sub-Head 007 - Disaster Preparedness: The Chairman moved that Sub-Head 007 be increased by \$10,500 to provide two generators for West End and Creek Hurricane Shelters in Cayman Brac, as recommended by Messrs. Gilbert McLean and Mabry Kirkconnell. The question was put and agreed that Sub-Head 007 be increased by \$10,500.

Sub-Head 009 - Farm Development: The Chairman moved that Sub-Head 009 be increased by \$280,000 to provide: (A) \$200,000 for 6 slaughter houses, one for each district; and (B) \$80,000 for the Agricultural Pavilion at Lower Valley, as recommended by Messrs. John McLean and Franklin Smith. The question was put and agreed that Sub-Head 009 be increased by \$280,000.

Sub-Head 012 - Government Offices: The Chairman moved that Sub-Head 012 be increased by \$300,010 for: (a) \$300,000 for District Administration/Faith Hospital; and (b) a token vote of \$10 for the Courts Building in Grand Cayman, on the recommendation of Messrs. Mabry Kirkconnell and Gilbert McLean. Such considerations, however, were given on the condition that a study be conducted on these projects and the findings reported to the Finance Committee. The question was put and agreed that Sub-Head 012 be increased by \$300,000.

Sub-Head 013 - Harbours & Docks: The Chairman moved, on the recommendation of Messrs. John McLean and Franklin Smith, that Sub-Head 013 be increased by \$120,000 to provide for launching ramps for:

South Sound	\$15,000
Bodden Town	15,000
Newlands	15,000
Gun Bay (assistance to be given by Gun Bay fishermen)	15,000
North Sound, G.T.	15,000
West Bay, N. Sound	15,000
Spotts	15,000
Frank Sound	15,000

The question was put and agreed that Sub-Head 013 be increased by \$120,000.

Sub-Head 019 - Public Buildings: The Chairman moved that Sub-Head 019 be increased by \$164,000 to provide \$150,000 for improvements on the West Bay Post Office and \$14,000 for the fencing of Boatswain Bay Cemetery, on the recommendation of Messrs. McKeeva Bush and John Jefferson, Jr. The question was put and agreed that Sub-Head 019 be increased by \$164,000.

Sub-Head 020 - Purchase of Lands: The Chairman moved Sub-Head 020 be increased by \$95,000 for the purchase of 3.5 acres of land in Gun Bay for a playing field on a recommendation by Mr. John McLean. NOTE: \$100,000 taken from the \$1,275,000 provided for Grand Cayman for the purchase of land adjacent to the West Bay Post Office for the proposed improvement. The question was put and agreed that Sub-Head 020 be increased by \$95,000.

Sub-Head 022 - School Buildings: The Chairman moved that Sub-Head 022 be increased by \$150,000 to provide for an Assembly Hall at the West Bay Primary School on the recommendation of Messrs. John Jefferson and McKeeva Bush. The question was put and agreed that Sub-Head 022 be increased by \$150,000.

Sub-Head 023 - Sports/Playing Centres and Parks: The Chairman moved that Sub-Head 023 be increased by \$214,000 as follows:

Bleachers for Bodden Town	\$ 18,000
Bleachers for East End	18,000
Bleachers for North Side	12,000
Basketball Court for West Bay	15,000
Parking for George Town	50,000
Breakers Playing Field	25,000
Boxing Hall Design and commencement	20,000
Wesleyan Hard Court	10,000
Tennis Court Fencing and Swimming Pool	10,000
West Bay Softball Complex	36,000

The question was put and agreed that Sub-Head 023 be increased by \$214,000.

Sub-Head 025 - Yards and Stores: On the recommendation of Messrs. Mabry Kirkconnell, Gilbert McLean and Franklin Smith, the Chairman moved that Sub-Head 025 be increased by \$15,000 to provide for toilets at: (a) Savannah/Newlands Playing Field - \$ 5,000 (b) Cayman Brac Bluff Lighthouse - \$10,000. The question was put and agreed that Sub-Head 025 be increased by \$15,000.

The question was put on Head 42 and 43 and agreed that the sum as set out in the Appropriation Bill stand part of the schedule.

Consideration of the clauses of the Bill Clause 1 passed and the question was put and agreed that Clause 2 be amended to read

\$104,122,262. The question was put and it was agreed that clause 2, as amended, stand part of the schedule. The schedule as amended passed unanimously, the title passed unanimously and the total expenditure as amended is \$104,122,262 is the approved expenditure for 1990.

Mr. President, I thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Bill is accordingly set down for Third Reading. Before we go to the Third Reading, I think we have to take the other two Reports. Reports continued - the Honourable First Official Member.

THE FINANCIAL STATEMENT FOR THE AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BOARD AND REPORT FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31ST OF DECEMBER, 1988.

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, I beg to lay on the Table of this Honourable House the Financial Statement for the Agricultural and Industrial Development Board and Report for the year ended 31st of December, 1988.

MR. PRESIDENT: So ordered.

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, to be brief I would only like to thank the staff and the members of the Board for their able contribution during not only 1988 but years before and this present year as well. They have done a commendable job. Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: Reports continued - the Honourable Financial Secretary as the leader of Government business.

THE REPORT OF THE STANDING BUSINESS COMMITTEE.

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, I beg to lay on the Table of this honourable House the Report of the Standing Business Committee.

MR. PRESIDENT: So ordered.

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, the Committee had one meeting on Thursday the 16th of November, 1989 at which all Members were present. The minutes of the meeting form a part of this Report. In terms of business papers a total of 11 business papers setting out the business of the House was circulated to all Members and the Committees agree that this Report is the Report of the Standing Business Committee to be laid on the Table of this Honourable House.

MR. PRESIDENT: Government business. Bills - Third Reading.

THIRD READINGS

THE APPROPRIATION (1990) BILL, 1989.

CLERK: The Appropriation (1990) Bill, 1989.

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, I beg to move the Third Reading of the Appropriation Bill and that we approve that Bill.

MR. PRESIDENT: I shall put the question. Those in favour please say Aye...Those against No.

AYES.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Ayes have it.

AGREED: THE APPROPRIATION (1990) BILL, 1989, PASSED.

ADJOURNMENT

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, I move the adjournment of this Honourable House until we need to meet again in the opening session which I believe to be the 16th of February, 1990.

MR. PRESIDENT: Before I put the question on the adjournment, it is customary - and I am very happy to take the opportunity and I am sure the House will agree with me - to thank very warmly the Clerk, the Deputy Clerk, the Serjeant and all members of the staff at the Assembly for their continuing excellent support of the House in all its functions. They work extremely long hours and deserve particular commendations for the speed with which they produce the records of the work of the House. Accordingly, I therefore wish them and all

Members a peaceful Christmas and New Year and the fortitude and good will in cooperation to meet the challenges which the New Year will bring.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Mr. President, Before we conclude I would like to wish for you and all Honourable Members of this House, the Clerk and her staff, and your respective families a Merry Christmas and Happy New Year. To all the people in the Cayman Islands and especially my constituents I wish you a very merry Christmas and a prosperous New Year. Lastly, Sir, I wish to repeat what was said at the end of the Finance Committee at about 10:30 P.M. on last Wednesday night (which is in the Report laid on the Table) and it says as follows:

"The people of the Cayman Islands and Honourable Members owe a deep gratitude to the Honourable Financial Secretary who has so ably and patiently and in a statesman like manner presided over a most difficult five days in Finance Committee ending at 10:22 P.M. on the 20th of December, 1989. The eight Elected Members and the four Executive Council Members were able to bring about agreement on a Budget and avoid much of the confrontation which otherwise may have ensued without the Financial Secretary's wisdom, knowledge and patience.

We thank God for this achievement which is in the best interests of the Cayman Islands and for the cooperation between all Elected Members which we hope will continue in the future.

The Committee also wishes to record its grateful thanks to the Clerk and her staff and the Budget Officer for their services."

That ends the quote, Sir and I would also like to ask for God's guidance in the future of these Islands and our people.
Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that the House do stand adjourned until the 16th of February, 1990...

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Mr. President, I think other Members would wish to do likewise.

MR. PRESIDENT: Certainly, but nobody seemed to... The First Elected Member for West Bay, do go ahead. Nobody seemed to be ready, so I put the question.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Mr. President, Christmas is a time of hope and giving, of sharing, of peace, of love and joy. It is in that spirit that I offer best wishes to the Clerk and her staff, to the President, to Members and their families for this yuletide season. It is that spirit that I trust will lead in the New Year. Remembering it is not in our stars to fail but in ourselves. Merry Christmas to everyone.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Honourable Member for Education.

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Mr. President, on behalf of the Elected Members of Executive Council, I would like to you, your wife and family best wishes for a merry Christmas and a Happy New Year. To the Clerk and all the staff of the Assembly and their families and to all Members and families of the Legislative Assembly, we wish a merry Christmas and a prosperous 1990.

MR. PRESIDENT: The First Elected Member for Bodden Town.

MR. ROY BODDEN: Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague for Bodden Town I would like to take this opportunity to wish for you and your family a very merry Christmas and a happy New Year, when that comes, and the same to the Clerk and all of her staff at the Legislative Assembly and to my colleagues, both on this side of the House and also those who form the Executive Council. Also to my constituents and the populace of this country. And may I further wish that we all thrive successfully under God's guidance in 1990 and beyond. Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Honourable Member for Communications and Works.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, even though the Member for Education spoke on our behalf I, too, would wish to express my gratitude to yourself, Sir, as President of this House and to the Clerk and her staff for the wonderful work done over the past year and to extend to you the Christmas greetings to you and your wife and to the Clerk and her staff of this House, to all Members of this Honourable House and particularly to the people of these Islands.

I trust that we will all have a quiet and peaceful Christmas, bearing in mind the significance of Christmas and why we celebrate it and that our 1990 will be a prosperous year ahead and that we will remember that whatever we do and wherever we are that the all-seeing eye of God observes us. Mr. President, I wish all of us a happy Christmas and a happy New Year. Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT:

The Elected Member for East End.

MR. JOHN B. McLEAN:

Mr. President, I would say that for my time in this office, this is the first session that I have seen such late hours worked. I can think of no other time when we worked into the late hours of the night. However, it is good that we could do so and I would like to thank the staff of the Legislative Assembly and indeed, all Members for their cooperation and I must thank the Financial Secretary for his patience and his usual able guidance to all of us as he assisted in keeping us in line while in Committee and to work along with us in the best interests of these Islands.

I would like to extend to you, Mr. President, and your family, the same Member, the Financial Secretary and his family, and all Members of the Government bench and their families, the Clerk and her staff and their families and my colleagues on this side and most important, to my people, the people of East End, as has been said by one Member, let us strive to have a wonderful Christmas and let us look forward to more harmony in the year before us and indeed, have plans in mind once we return here, to work together as we have proven ourselves at this session.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT:

The Second Elected Member for the Lesser Islands.

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN:

Mr. President, I would like to thank the Great Jehovah first and last for having allowed us, all the Elected Members of this Assembly, and the President and the Official Members the opportunity of serving the Cayman Islands during the past year.

I would like to express Christmas greetings on behalf of myself and my colleague, the First Elected Member for the Lesser Islands, to all of the people of Cayman Brac and Little Cayman and all the people of the Cayman Islands. To the Clerk and staff of the Legislative Assembly, to the President of the Legislative Assembly and his family and to all my colleagues on this side, the 'Backbenchers' as we are so-termed, and to sincerely express best wishes for Christmas and for a very healthy and prosperous New Year to what must be the other side of the House the Front-benchers. Mr. President, I thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT:

The Third Elected Member for West Bay.

MR. JOHN D. JEFFERSON:

Mr. President, I would like to wish you and your wife and all Members, the Clerk and her staff of this House the very best for the holiday season. May we all be reminded of the true meaning of Christmas. To our many supporters in West Bay and to the Churches and the other organisations who stood so faithfully behind us as Legislators over the past year, I say thanks and wish us all a very merry Christmas and a happy New Year. May God continue to bless you all richly. Thank you, Sir.

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON:

Mr. President, I rise to claim my right of reply since I moved the Motion for adjournment. [Members' laughter] I, too, on behalf (I believe I can say this with a great deal of confidence) of the Official Members wish to offer our best wishes to you, Sir, and your family and to the Members of the House and their families and all the people of the Cayman Islands... may you have an enjoyable Christmas and God's richest blessings now and in the new years to come.

MR. PRESIDENT:

The question is that this Honourable House do now adjourn until 10 o'clock, Friday, 16th February, 1990. I shall put the question. Those in favour please say Aye... Those against No.

AYES.

MR. PRESIDENT:

The Ayes have it. The House is accordingly adjourned.

AT 5:27 P.M. THE HOUSE STOOD ADJOURNED UNTIL 10:00 A.M., FRIDAY, 16TH FEBRUARY, 1990.

CAYMAN ISLANDS LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

OFFICIAL HANSARD REPORT 1989 SESSION

INDEX

Abbreviations: 1r, 2r, 3r, first, second, third reading; (A) Amendment; Comm., Committee; PMM, Private Member's Motion; GM, Government Motion; Rpt, Report; SC, Select Committee; S.O., Standing Order.

DATES AND PAGES

VOLUME I

First Meeting - 17th February - 15th March, 1989 (pages 1-430)

February: 17th, 1-28; 20th, 29-58; 21st, 59-91; 22nd, 93-125; 23rd, 127-148; 24th, 149-173; 27th, 175-202; 28th, 203-226.

March: 1st, 227-246; 2nd, 247-266; 3rd, 267-284; 6th, 285-306; 7th, 307-322; 8th, 323-343; 9th, 345-367; 10th, 369-390; 13th, 391-396; 14th, 397-411; 15th, 413-430.

Second Meeting - 22nd-30th May (pages 431-604)

May: 22nd, 431-462; 23rd, 463-494; 24th, 495-518; 25th, 519-538; 26th, 539-560; 29th, 561-581; 30th, 581-604.

VOLUME II

Third Meeting 4th - 15th September (pages 605-862)

September: 4th, 605-630; 5th, 631-660; 6th, 661-688; 7th, 689-712; 8th, 713-736; 11th, 737-760; 12th, 761-784; 13th, 785-812; 14th, 813-836; 15th, 837-862.

Fourth Meeting - 17th November - 22nd December (pages 863-1252)

November: 17th, 863-886; 20th, 887-916; 21st, 917-946; 22nd, 947-974; 23rd, 975-1002; 24th, 1003-1028; 27th, 1029-1050; 28th, 1051-1078; 29th, 1079-1102; 30th, 1103-1122.

December: 1st, 1123-1144; 4th, 1145-1166; 5th, 1167-1186; 6th, 1187-1206; 7th, 1207-1226; 22nd, 1227-1252.