

**TUESDAY
21ST NOVEMBER, 1989
10:08 A.M.**

MR. PRESIDENT: Prayers by the First Elected Member for West Bay.

PRAYERS

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: 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. The Order Paper for today, the second item, Questions: Number 113, the First Elected Member for Bodden Town.

QUESTIONS TO HONOURABLE MEMBERS

THE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR BODDEN TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR EDUCATION, RECREATION AND CULTURE

NO. 113: Can the Honourable Member say how many students, enrolled at the Bodden Town and Savannah Primary Schools respectively, are from outside these areas?

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: The number of students who are presently enrolled at the Bodden Town Primary School from outside that area is 11. In the case of the Savannah Primary School, the number is 54.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. ROY BODDEN: Thank you, Mr. President. Can the Honourable Member say if there currently exists any policy or regulation which governs the enrollment of students: namely, with specific reference to the jurisdiction and their entitlement to enroll in certain primary schools?

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Yes, Mr. President, the Education Law says that students would normally be enrolled in schools from the electoral district in which they live.

MR. ROY BODDEN: Mr. President, may I respectfully ask the Member, why has this situation been allowed to develop?

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Mr. President, this is a long standing practice. It has been done in many instances to accommodate families in which both parents are working. It seems convenient to have them at this school. This is the argument usually put forward.

MR. ROY BODDEN: Thank you, Mr. President.
Does the Member realise that the enrollment of pupils from outside the electoral district seriously hampers Savannah and Bodden Town children's enrollment at the respective schools?

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Mr. President, I certainly realise that in the case of Savannah the

school is under pressure, that is, the number of places there are totally taken up. In fact, additional classrooms are being built.

MR. ROY BODDEN: Can the Honourable Member give this House an undertaking that he will move to remedy this situation as early as possible?

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Mr. President, I mentioned that classrooms are presently being built at Savannah. In the case of Bodden Town, this school is not overcrowded. Maybe if there was a switch between children to Bodden Town proper from the Savannah School the overcrowding would be less, but there seems to be a natural magnet drawing children to the Savannah School.

MR. ROY BODDEN: Mr. President, I wonder if the Honourable Member would also undertake to see that the Regulations are followed more closely, so the situation is not allowed from the very beginning?

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Mr. President, I am not prepared to say that I am going to upset a situation which has been allowed to go on over the years. These are not the only two schools in which this happens, Sir. It would be a total disruption if we were to enforce completely that stipulation within the Law.

MR. ROY BODDEN: Thank you, Mr. President,
Does the Member know that the parents, especially those in the Savannah area, are very disgruntled with the situation? If the Member does not know I would like to suggest that he try to see what their sentiments on the matter are because the responses we have received, as their representatives, does not encourage an orderly situation.

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Mr. President, I do not believe the situation is out of hand. I certainly will see that the school does not develop into any disorganised situation or that children are at a disadvantage. In other words, teachers and materials will be put there to cover whatever children attend. Why we are adding the number of classrooms at Savannah at the moment without taking any other corrective measure is because if you look at the projections for the area, Savannah is going to need those classrooms even if the children for George Town and the other areas were taken out in the very near future.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Second Elected Member for the Lesser Islands.

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Thank you, Mr. President.
As it is clear that there is a problem in the Savannah School which is causing Government expense to create more classrooms, will the Member or the Education Authorities be taking steps to ensure the new class rooms will not be filled with students from outside the area?

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Mr. President, that is inherent to what I said about the prognosis for the area, that the area is a growing area and will need additional classroom space even when, and if, these children are taken out. The other guarantee is that the school will not be allowed to grow beyond a manageable number of pupils. So I do not think the Member has any fear of disadvantage to pupils there.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Second Elected Member for Bodden Town.

MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. President.
I wonder if the Honourable Member could say how many students there will be to each classroom - out of the 54, how many students to one classroom?

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Mr. President, I am sure the 54 are spread throughout the school, but the average number of students per classroom is between 20 and 25.

MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH: In other words, then, you are building two classrooms to accommodate the 54?

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Not really, the numbers change from term to term. The number is fluid.

MR. PRESIDENT: Next question please, No. 114. The First Elected Member for Bodden Town.

THE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR BODDEN TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR EDUCATION, RECREATION AND CULTURE

NO. 114: Would the Honourable Member say if any consideration has been given to the accreditation and integration of the International College of the Cayman Islands into the educational system of the Cayman Islands?

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Because of a perceived lack of infrastructure to assess and monitor the performance of private tertiary educational institutions such as the International College of the Cayman Islands, successive Governments have been unwilling to register them.

As to the question of integration of the International College of the Cayman Islands into the educational system of the Cayman Islands, the College is a privately owned and operated institution, therefore no consideration has been given to this matter.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. ROY BODDEN: Can the Honourable Member say if any students who have graduated from the International College of the Cayman Islands have been or are currently employed in the Government sector?

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: It is my belief they are, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that does go a bit beyond the original question, but the Member responsible for the Civil Service might be able to supply you with the answer in writing.
The Second Elected Member for the Lesser Islands.

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Could the Honourable Member explain what is meant by the first part of the answer, "Because of a perceived lack of infrastructure to assess and monitor the performance of private tertiary educational institutions"? That is not very clear. I wonder if the Member could explain exactly what he is saying there?

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Mr. President, I may have to go into an explanation of the Education Law. No educational institution is permitted to conduct or to carry on without being licensed or registered. If it is registered, as is the case of the International College of the Cayman Islands, which, as I understand, is operated under the American system. The Law says that colleges must maintain standards approximating the best schools (or in this case colleges) in the United States. The Government does not feel it is in a position or that it has the machinery to ensure that.

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Mr. President, is it not true that ICCI (International College of the Cayman Islands) over the years and up until now, does provide a significant amount of meaningful and acceptable standards of education in various subject areas?

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Mr. President, I believe that would be expressing an opinion, and I am not prepared to answer.

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Mr. President, has Government accepted the qualifications of any individuals it has employed in any particular areas granted by ICCI?

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Mr. President, I am advised that degrees from ICCI are not taken into account in assessing employees within the Government Service.

MR. PRESIDENT: I have rather allowed that one to slip by me, I am afraid, but that really was a bit beyond the original question.

The First Elected Member for Bodden Town.

MR. ROY BODDEN: Mr. President, thank you very kindly, Sir. Is the Member saying then that the institution known as the International College of the Cayman Islands is operating in the country with little or no regulation or standards set by the Government?

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: To the degree that it is registered with the Government, it operates within the Government standards.

MR. ROY BODDEN: Mr. President, is the Member saying that while the Government does not recognise the qualifications, or matriculation at the International College of the Cayman Islands, it turns a blind eye to any organisation, institution or office that wished to do so?

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Mr. President, I did not say the Government did not recognise certain qualifications, I said the degrees; because it is not licensed in the Cayman Islands to issue degrees. My understanding is that students who attend the International College of the Cayman Islands receive a degree from an American counterpart or an American branch of ICCI and in that respect it is no different from a degree issued by any other American college.

MR. PRESIDENT: Question No. 115, the Third Elected Member for George Town.

THE THIRD ELECTED MEMBER FOR GEORGE TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR COMMUNICATIONS WORKS AND NATURAL RESOURCES

NO. 115: Would the Honourable Member say which roads in Grand Cayman under which pipes have been laid for water, sewerage, fuel or otherwise, have not been repaired up to the standards required by the agreements with Government and the contractors laying such pipes, and say what the standards under the respective contracts are and were?

DEFERRAL OF QUESTION
(Standing Order 23 (5))

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Because of the length and the complexity of this question I have not been able to get all the answers requested and, with your permission, Sir, I would like to provide the answer to the Member in writing.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Perhaps since this sitting may well be long, he could try to get it and, if possible, answer it orally. If not he can do it in writing.

MR. PRESIDENT: I assume the undertaking is to provide it as quickly as possible?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: That is correct, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: That is in order then, we will accept that.

THE THIRD ELECTED MEMBER FOR GEORGE TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR COMMUNICATIONS WORKS AND NATURAL RESOURCES

NO. 116: Would the Honourable Member say what measures are being taken to ensure that piped central water throughout the Island, including the Government operation and the private operations, is free from contamination?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Two agencies currently supply the Island with piped water for drinking and general domestic use. These are: 1) Central Desal, a subsidiary of Caribbean Utilities Co. Ltd., produces water which is supplied to the Government Water Authority in bulk. The Cayman Water Authority then treat, store and distribute water through a network of distribution lines and also to truckers; 2) Cayman Water Company operates a desal plant, produces water which is treated, stored and distributed to its customers along the Seven Mile Beach area of West Bay Roadway. Truckers also purchase water from this company.

Cayman Water Authority has a fully equipped laboratory which carries out daily testing and monitoring of the quality of water being supplied to the public. Numerous tests are done daily to ensure satisfactory chemical and bacteriological water quality. Sampling points have been established throughout the distribution system at which samples are collected at regular intervals for testing and quality control.

Cayman Water Company also has a small laboratory which conducts tests for monitoring and quality control. Sampling points are also established at their plant and throughout the water distribution system. Samples are collected from these points on a regular basis and analyzed for quality control.

The Government operates a water quality monitoring/surveillance programme through the Health Department. Water samples are collected on a routine basis by Environmental Health staff from the points mentioned at both water producing agencies listed above and analyzed at Government's laboratory at the George Town Hospital. This is done for monitoring and quality assurance.

The Environmental Health section always works in close contact and coordination with water producing agencies in order to ensure the distribution of potable water.

Private truckers purchase water in bulk from the above named producers for distribution to households throughout the Island. Water is also supplied by one company in smaller quantities (bottles) for water coolers in offices and other establishments. Sampling of water is done at random on these bottles and tank trucks by the Environmental Health section, and analyses done at the Government laboratory.

Imported bottled water sold at supermarkets and grocery stores for drinking also receive random tests to determine chemical and bacteriological quality. The Ramada Treasure Island Resort and the Hyatt Regency Hotel operate small water producing plants to satisfy their respective needs. Internal water quality monitoring/quality control is done on a similar basis. Samples are collected at fixed locations by both management and the Environmental Health section for analyses. Again, this is done to ensure safe water for distribution. Smaller water producing plants at condominiums, etcetera, also receive water analyses by the Environmental Health section.

Disinfection is done by the application of chlorine according to water demand.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Mr. President, after that I would think he has been keeping company with the Honourable Financial Secretary, with the scholarly presentation of the answer. [Members' laughter] My question is very simple. Does Government take daily tests on the piped water, or does it not? You

referred to routine basis and regular basis.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, a long question like this deserves a proper answer and this is why I went to the pain to give a proper answer. The question really asked, "Would the Honourable Member please state what measures are being taken to ensure that piped central water throughout the Island, including the Government and the private operations are free from contamination?" I submit this is a proper answer to that question and it covers all aspects of the question.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Mr. President, what I am asking is very simple. In relation to the piped water, does Government take daily testing of that water?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, if that was the answer the Honourable Member required he could have asked that and I would have said yes. That is the simple answer, one word - yes.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Who picked up the diesel contamination in the piped water along the Seven Mile Beach road? Was it Government or was it the suppliers?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: By that supplementary, Mr. President, I believe the Member is referring to the problem the Cayman Water Company had, which really should be distinguished from the Cayman Water Authority on the Seven Mile Beach. I believe from the information I have that the problem was first discovered by the users, then the Environmental Health Department got involved and had it corrected.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Mr. President, supplementary. Would the Member say why if Government is checking this daily they did not pick this up?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, this problem, as I mentioned, occurred with the private company, the Cayman Water Company. They do a regular check on this. It is also monitored by the Environmental Health Department. Unfortunately this was something that happened suddenly and it was beyond the control of any of the people monitoring the problem. I should say it was corrected as speedily as possible.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: I just want to make certain that I have this correct. Government does take tests every day on the Cayman Water Company's water?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, the Environmental Health carries out regular checks on water used on the Island including the water from the Cayman Water Company. The standards are laid down by the World Health Organization and they are followed closely by the Environmental Health Department. The problem which they had down there has been corrected. The cause of the problem has also been corrected. It is one of those things which could not have been avoided. It is not going to serve much purpose for me to try to analyze it any further. It has been corrected and is being monitored very closely.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: One last supplementary on this point. Would the Member please say whether Government takes daily checks of the water from Cayman Water Company, or does it not? He keeps using the word regular, and I do not understand what he means by that.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, simply, the answer is no.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Mr. President, would the Member undertake to ask the Government Department responsible to take daily checks on the Cayman Water Company and the other piped water? I think it is very important.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: My understanding, Mr. President, is that the size of the facility is of normal World Health Organization standard and that this is done two to three times a week on a sample basis. I therefore cannot undertake to have this done daily.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Why not? In the event that the World Health Organization Standards are not complied with, should Government not feel a very heavy responsibility on its shoulders to ensure that the water is free from contamination because you are dealing with the lives of people and children?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, we are dealing with some semantics here. I do not know if the Honourable Member has a better set of standards than the World Health Organization has provided us with, but we have been following the standards provided by the World Health Organization. If we can get some improvements or suggestions from the Member to improve them, I would be happy to accept them.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Mr. President, since he has asked for a bit of advice, yes, you have your Department go down there each day and take a bit of water and test it. That is what I am really asking.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President...

MR. PRESIDENT: You end up asking all the questions.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, we will soon be in Finance Committee, hopefully the Member will be prepared to suggest some ways of providing the funds to have the additional bodies put in place to do this.

MR. PRESIDENT: Now I really think the opinions have been made clear on either side. Let us move on to question 117, please. The Third Elected Member for George Town.

THE THIRD ELECTED MEMBER FOR GEORGE TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR COMMUNICATIONS WORKS AND NATURAL RESOURCES

NO. 117: Would the Honourable Member say what parts of the West Bay Road cannot be widened to fifty (50) feet disregarding the removal of minor structures, such as poles and fences, and give details of which major buildings may be an obstruction, where, what length of road it would obstruct, and what width the road reserve could be at such major buildings?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Inasmuch as it is not clear from the question, I have assumed that the Member is referring to the widening of the paved surface, or carriageway, to 50 feet from its existing 23 feet. Likewise, I have assumed that if the carriageway was to be widened to 50 feet, an additional 12 feet would be required to replace existing sidewalks or to preserve the opportunity to provide sidewalks in the future. Accordingly, a preliminary survey found four buildings along West Bay Road between the fire station and Four T's Esso Station, where the road cannot be widened to 50 feet. The following table shows buildings and the length of road affected:

Building Name	Road Frontage	Reserve	Width
Caribbean Club	310 feet	55 feet	43 feet
Santiago's Restaurant	210 feet	55 feet	43 feet
West Shore Center	310 feet	60 feet	47 feet
De Get Smart Store	30 feet	55 feet	43 feet

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: So there would only be, as I understand it from this, four buildings which may obstruct getting a 50 foot asphalt road and 12 foot reserve? Is that what I understand from the answer?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Yes, Mr. President, that is the position.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Next question, Sir, through you. Is it therefore possible to put four lanes on the West Bay Road except in these four areas?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Yes, Mr. President, the 50 foot of pavement would provide room for four 12 foot travel lanes with all parking prohibited. This type of roadway is not recommended due to the high potential for serious collisions due to right turns and the opportunity for short sections of high speed travel.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Mr. President, this could be a bit wide, so stop me if it is. Would the Member say whether the cost of widening the road would not be considerably less than building a new road through the swamp?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, an analysis by the Master Ground Transportation Plan in 1987 found that the type of road the Member is referring to would only handle traffic until 1992, when the road would again operate at the level found in 1987. It would just be a temporary solution. What we are looking at now is a more long term solution.

MR. PRESIDENT: I may have misunderstood the question. I thought the question was would it be cheaper to do what the Member is suggesting than to go forward with a replacement or new road?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: The answer to the first part is yes. I went on to give the reasons why the answer is yes.

MR. PRESIDENT: Supplementaries continued.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Mr. President, would the Honourable Member say whether he is going to do any improvements with that road prior to 1992 or whether it will remain as it is?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, I believe the Member is aware that improvements are now being carried out on the West Bay Road and other improvements are being considered as funds become available.

MR. PRESIDENT: Next question please, No. 118. The Second Elected Member for the Lesser Islands.

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE LESSER ISLANDS TO ASK THE HONOURABLE ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR TOURISM, AVIATION AND TRADE

NO. 118: Can the Honourable Member say what is being done to replace the roll-up overhead metal door in the arrival baggage section of the terminal building of the Gerrard Smith Airport in Cayman Brac with suitable baggage conveyor equipment similar to that in use at Owen Roberts Airport in Grand Cayman?

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN: The improvement of the overhead metal door in the arrival section of the terminal building at Cayman Brac is being considered along with other improvements necessary to the entire facility, recognising that there are other items of higher priority.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Mr. President, could the Honourable Member say what other items are given so much more priority, seeing that every time that door is rolled up there is an extremely large gust of hot air which is causing an increase in the cost of electricity?

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN: Mr. President, there are several other items which the Civil Aviation has on its programme for improvements there. There is the freight shed, which needs to be built; the resurfacing of certain sections of the runway; the extension of safety areas, including the land which has to be purchased. These are some of the items of priority I am referring to.

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Mr. President, the cost of the items as itemised by the Honourable Member seems to be considerable. I would assume the cost of a conveyor system which is used in airports (such as I have asked about) would be much cheaper. The fact that it is costing money because the air-conditioning is being affected and secondly, the overhead door... could it not be given some immediate priority to have it replaced?

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN: Mr. President, the replacement of the door and the others I mentioned are naturally subject to the availability of funds and I am sure the Member appreciates this. The Civil Aviation Authority is in the process of getting the cost of replacement. That is, the installation of conveyor belts and the other facilities which need to be put in place. I would say that just as soon as we have an exact costing of this, I will undertake to take it back to the Civil Aviation Authority for consideration by them.

MR. PRESIDENT: Question No. 119, the Second Elected Member for the Lesser Islands, please.

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE LESSER ISLANDS TO ASK THE HONOURABLE ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR TOURISM, AVIATION AND TRADE

NO. 119: Would the honourable Member say: a) On how many occasions did Cayman Airways Limited (CAL) lease another aircraft to fly the routes of CAL after it disposed of the first 727 aircraft up to the time the first 737-400 aircraft went into operation; and b) What was the total cost?

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN: The answer: a) Cayman Airways Limited leased an additional aircraft during that period to operate 24 round trip flights; b) The total cost was US\$197,180.00, and the income from those flights totalled approximately US\$358,000.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Mr. President, would the Member say if these were all scheduled flights during this period of time?

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN: Yes, Mr. President, I think they were all scheduled flights. There might have been one or two which were due to maintenance, but I think they were all scheduled flights.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Third Elected Member for George Town.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Mr. President, in fairness, before I ask this question, I want to refresh the Honourable Member's memory of an answer he gave earlier and ask why it differs. Sometime back, in

reply to a supplementary I asked he said "Okay, Mr. President, I have it now Sir. There are no scheduled flights. No flights have been scheduled to operate by Avianca or LAB. It is only in the event that the one 727 remaining has a maintenance problem then those companies, one or the other, will be leased to operate the flight and will be paid for on a per flight basis." I will make this available if you wish.

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN: In my reply to that supplementary to the House was my understanding of what the Company's arrangements were at that time. I will refresh the memory of the Member asking the supplementary as well. The substantive question which he refers to (which was dealt with by the House in September) read as follows; "Would the honourable Member say whether the delivery of Cayman Airways two 727-200 jets to Alaska Air will be done simultaneously with the receipt of two leased 737-400 jets, and will the latter jets go immediately into service? If not, what arrangements have been made for an interim jet aircraft to fly Cayman Airways Limited routes." My reply was; "The delivery to Alaska Air of the two 727-200 aircraft and the receipt of the two 737-400 aircraft is not simultaneous. The 737-400 aircraft will be put into service as soon as possible after delivery to Cayman Airways. As in previous occasions when scheduled maintenance was carried out on one of the 727-200s the airline will operate with one aircraft with back-up arrangements in place for additional aircraft as necessary."

I would like to explain to the House that whenever I have a question that relates to the operation of Cayman Airways I go to the Managing Director for information to bring to this House and I always ensure that it is as accurate as I can establish at the time. My reply in September did not preclude the company from making necessary arrangements as it saw fit.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Mr. President, does he not agree that the answer he has given now is different - totally different from the answer he gave then? If he was not properly briefed I think he could say so, but the two do conflict. I have been fair in putting...

MR. PRESIDENT: You can ask the question whether he agrees that they differ, but you cannot go on and say that they conflict. That is a statement. Would you put the question?

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: That is alright, Sir.

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN: I do not agree that there is a conflict. It depends on the way you look at the information you are seeking. One deals with whether the replacement aircraft operated scheduled flights or whether the aircraft was only used in the event of maintenance on the one aircraft the company had. I maintain that it was my understanding that it was the company's intention at that time to endeavour to conduct their operation with one aircraft and if they had maintenance problems on that one aircraft they would use a substitute aircraft.

However, there was no reason why I also pointed out that the company had backup arrangements for additional aircraft as necessary. I imagine the information given to me in September was correct then. I see no conflict with what I am saying now and nothing precluded the company from changing its plans to what it felt was suitable in order to enable it to conduct a proper operation to provide a service to the travelling public.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Supplementary, Mr. President. Could the Member then say whether the 24 round trip flights which he refers to in this question were done as a result of a maintenance problem we had on the 727?

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN: No, Mr. President. I think to the earlier question I said the majority of them, to the best of my knowledge, were scheduled flights. There might have been one or two which were replacements due to maintenance, but the majority I refer to were scheduled flights.

**SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER 23(7) & (8)
11:00 A.M.**

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, as we are at about 11:00 I would move under Standing Order 83, the suspension of Standing Order 23(7) and (8) to allow the remaining questions and supplementaries to be taken.

MR. PRESIDENT: I shall put the question. Those in favour please say Aye...Those against No.

AYES.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Ayes have it.

AGREED. STANDING ORDER 23(7) & (8) SUSPENDED.

MR. PRESIDENT: Question No. 120, the Second Elected Member for the Lesser Islands.

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE LESSER ISLANDS TO ASK THE HONOURABLE ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR TOURISM, AVIATION AND TRADE

NO. 120: Can the Honourable Member say how freight is being transported by Cayman Airways Limited since the lease of the 737-400 jets?

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN: Freight is currently being transported by Cayman Airways Limited using the excess baggage capacity on the B737-400 aircraft. As is customary this time of year, it is necessary to occasionally supplement this service with a DC6 aircraft, mainly for bulky type cargo.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Mr. President, would the Member say if DC6 aircraft is now supplying cargo service for Cayman Airways?

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN: Mr. President, I refer to the occasional operation of DC6 aircraft for bulky cargo. I think recently, a week or so ago, there was a DC6 cargo flight operated by Cayman Airways. However, in November of last year there were cargo flights operated by a DC6 aircraft for Cayman Airways as well.

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Mr. President, I am trying to establish if: a) Cayman Airways is presently using, or having, scheduled flights by the DC6 aircraft for freight; and b) if this year there are more flights than for the similar period last year?

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN: I do not know if there are any scheduled cargo flights, but I know the airline has a standing arrangement where whenever there is a back-log of cargo that cannot be transported on the passenger aircraft, once they have accumulated a certain amount, they will then charter a DC6 to transport that cargo.

To answer the second part of the supplementary is that there could be more DC6 cargo flights this year for November and December than there were last year simply because there is less available cargo space on the 737-400s.

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Mr. President, would the Honourable Member say if the costs involved and the revenue earnings in this arrangement, if one balances out the other and with it, is it possible to show any kind of profit margin?

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN: If the DC6 cargo operation is taken in isolation, I am sure it is done at a break even or profit margin. In other words, when Cayman Airways charters a DC6 aircraft to transport a full load of cargo it represents profit to the airline on that operation.

MR. PRESIDENT: If there are no more supplementaries we move to Item 3 on today's Order Paper, Government Business.

Bills, First Reading.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

BILLS

FIRST READINGS

THE MUSIC AND DANCING (CONTROL) (1989 AMENDMENT) (REPEAL) BILL, 1989

CLERK: The Music and Dancing (Control) (1989 Amendment) (Repeal) Bill, 1989.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Bill entitled, The Music and Dancing (Control) (1989 Amendment) (Repeal) Bill, 1989, is deemed to have been read its first time and is set down for Second Reading.
Bills, Second Reading.

SECOND READING

THE MUSIC AND DANCING (CONTROL) (1989 AMENDMENT) (REPEAL) BILL, 1989

CLERK: The Music and Dancing (Control) (1989 Amendment) (Repeal) Bill, 1989.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Honourable Third Official Member.

HON. J. LEMUEL HURLSTON: Mr. President, I beg to move the Second Reading of a Bill entitled, A Bill for a Law to Repeal the Music and Dancing (Control) (Amendment) Law of 1989. In so doing I would like to sum up the reasons for this Bill in this manner.

In September 1989 I presented a Bill which was passed by a majority seeking to introduce a new provision in the Music and Dancing Law of 1977 which would provide to delegate to the Liquor Licensing Board enabling powers to prescribe permitted days in addition to the previous discretion of prescribing permitted hours. At that time in presenting the Bill, it was explained to the House that there were odd occasions when it was found necessary to grant, or to consider the granting of short extensions either leading into or out of permitted days. At that time I used as an example the experience we had in 1988 when New Year's Eve fell on a Saturday. Whereas a short extension for the Liquor License hours was permitted and granted, there could be no extension beyond midnight in the case of music and dancing.

It was in an effort to try and rectify that apparent anomaly that the Bill introduced. Following the passage of the Bill the Liquor Licensing Board of Grand Cayman at its annual sitting in September, in anticipation of the Bill being assented to and made Law, passed a notice and gave agreement that on the coming into effect of that amendment in respect to the year 1989 there would be two short exceptions to the normal prohibition of music and dancing on Sundays. Those exceptions were in respect to Christmas Eve, the 24th of December, 1989, and New Year's Eve, the 31st of December, 1989.

Following that decision a notice and press release were issued to inform the public of what had been decided. In response to that the Government received numerous representations from Churches, religious leaders and others sufficient for the Government to realise that it had apparently made an error.

Whereas we have been trying to correct an anomaly we created, an unhappy situation and a situation in which the Government felt that it was only fair that we should reverse from under, this Bill is to reverse and to restore the former position where no music and dancing whatsoever will be permitted on Sundays, beginning midnight Saturday night until midnight Sunday night; complete prohibition of music and dancing in licensed premises during those hours.

I wish I could say that I commend this non-controversial and non-contentious Bill to Honourable Members, but I know that is wishful thinking. I also wish that it had been at the end of a longer day, when Members were perhaps not so well rested, but that again, too, is wishful thinking. Therefore, I will sit down and take all the licks that Members have to give me, but I will simply say that the Government is being very open and honest about this and there is nothing especially (what was the word used yesterday?) 'covert'. There is no strange strategy.

Thank you very much, Sir. I commend this short Bill to the House.

MR. PRESIDENT:

The question is that a Bill entitled, The Music and Dancing (Control) (1989 Amendment) (Repeal) Bill, 1989, be given its Second Reading. The Motion is open for debate. The First Elected Member for West Bay.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:

Mr. President, it seems that this Bill is just as bad as the last one - a wait and see game. Anyway, I have no licks for the Honourable Member, he was only following the instructions of the Elected directorate and they should really take the pounding. I will be kind and very brief.

When this Bill came to me I asked the Government then (as I have been asking for a long time) if they were going to do anything to extend hours from Monday to Friday until after 1:00 A.M. as I believe that was the wish of the majority of the people. I never, ever supported music and dancing in a public place after 12:00 midnight Saturday night. I believe they knew that, although blame has been put on this side of the House that we were the ones wanting that particular amendment.

The Government went ahead and passed the Bill against the objection of a majority of Elected Members. The passage of the Bill in September by a majority of one vote from this side - which thus received the wrath of the public to the extent that Government had to bend and withdraw - highlights one simple fact: the Government must listen to the majority of the people elected. That is a simple fact and that is one that is so often glaring in this House. Seven Members from this side say, "Look, the people do not want this; we cannot support it." But, because they can get a vote from this side more times than not, they go ahead and it seems to be like the grasshopper, hopping here and hopping there, not knowing where to stand.

I am sorry the Government is losing the reputation it had when I supported them. We could sit down and discuss things clearly then and nobody tried to beat anyone over the head with a mortar pestle. That is not what is happening now, and it is one of the reasons why this country is having the problems it is having. They will not listen. More times than once they are going to find the public supports this side of the House in the actions that we have taken.

That Bill highlights a great problem. I hope they understand what that problem is. I am happy the Bill has come. I should say they knew I was planning to bring a Motion to have the amendment withdrawn. They beat me on that one. I can support their move which really should not have any cause to come this route. If only they had listened to reason and good common sense. People do not want to remove those restrictions for those days. I love to dance. I believe most Caymanians do, but we hold dear that day. I can stay out from 8:00 until 2:00 A.M. from Monday to Friday. Saturday I am going home, if I go out at all, simply because I hold Sunday in high regard.

I know now that all the Executive Council Members are going to get up and do what they did the last time - beat me over the head with a stick. But they should remember what this Bill highlights. The people are behind the decision of the seven Elected Members on this side of the House. That they should bear in mind.

MR. PRESIDENT:

The Honourable Member for Communication and Works.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON:

Mr. President, it really was not my intention to speak on what is a very short and straightforward Bill, but having listened to the campaigning being done by the previous speaker, I feel it is only fair we address the Bill before us and we cut out all of the campaigning fluff. I do not know where the previous speaker is getting his information from, but if he is of the impression that his group (or whatever you want to call them) is favoured with the public, then I will tell him he had better keep his ear closer to the ground.

It is a good Government that can recognise when it has made an error. It is nothing to be ashamed of. I am very proud that the Third Official Member brought this Bill back to the House. It is because we are good representatives, good leaders of the people, that we have decided to bring this matter back. We kept our ears to the ground and we realised the public was not pleased with this Bill. We were not stubborn and pigheaded enough to say that we have passed it, therefore it has to stay. No! We try to abide by the wishes of the people who have elected us. We appreciate that this is a God fearing country. Therefore, because of the furor this has brought, we decided this Bill would be brought today to reverse what had caused a bit of a stir with our people. So, for any Member of the Backbench or Opposition to get up in this Honourable House and try to take credit for what we decided to do - and to even state he was going to bring a motion here - is fraudulent.

Mr. President...

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:

Mr. President, on a Point of Order.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. PRESIDENT:

[addressing the Hon. Member for Communication, Works and Natural Resources] I think you are verging on being unparliamentary. I think to refer to other Members as fraudulent is going too far. While we are on Points of Order I would like to say that in an earlier speech it was verging on offensive language to impute decisions of Executive Council being only to the Elected Members. Decisions of Executive Council are made by the whole Council collectively.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:

Can I explain, Mr. President?

MR. PRESIDENT:

Please. Do you know what I am referring to?

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:

Can I explain? What I am explaining is that it is generally acknowledged in this country that the four Elected Members of Executive Council are the people's representatives elected by the people, who hold the majority in Executive Council, therefore any policy put forward in this country has to have their backing.

MR. PRESIDENT:

The Constitution provides what it does provide, which is that Executive Council as a whole advises the Governor and, as a whole, is then responsible. I think the two views can coexist, but I would ask you to be duly careful in the way inferences may be drawn about some Members of the Council as against others. I would not wish there to be a division in this very important Constitutional matter.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON:

Mr. President, if I caused any offense I will withdraw the word 'fraudulent', but I wish I could see some evidence otherwise. I would say...

MR. PRESIDENT:

Please, we must not let ourselves run away with this. You will either withdraw it - and you were doing that, and I think that is the correct and proper thing to do - please do not qualify withdrawal. Either it is, or it is not, withdrawn.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON:

Mr. President, the phrase is withdrawn. It would appear to me to be very impertinent.

There is no question at all, and I am glad you made the point, it was not just the four Elected Members of Council who made the decision on this. The Member is always reminding us on this side of the House how well he knows the Constitution and the Standing Orders. If he knows it that well, I would refer him to section 9 of the Constitution which deals with collective responsibility. He will then understand exactly how Executive Council operates.

What this Bill is doing is correcting an anomaly. I would have thought the Members of this House would have recognised this was a good thing being done for the country. There were no eggs being thrown in the faces of Executive Council because nobody is perfect, although some people assume that position. But nobody is perfect and we realise there was a mistake and because of our interest in the people of this country we have decided to correct this mistake as we will do from time to time, and as we have done in the case of mistakes made in the past - not necessarily in the past five years. This is good Government when one recognises that something is not in the best interest of his country then it is incumbent not only on the Elected Members of Executive Council but on each Elected Member of this House, be they on the Backbench or on Executive Council, and, indeed, on the full membership of this House that we do whatever is in the best interest of this country.

This Bill will show the people of this country the good intentions and the good faith of their duly Elected Members of Executive Council. Indeed I trust this Bill will get the full support of this Honourable House so there is no need for anybody to go outside this House and try to take credit for the situation.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT:
suspended for 15 minutes.

I think at that point we might take the break. Proceedings are

AT 11:25 A.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 11:55 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Proceedings are resumed on the Second Reading of the Music and Dancing Bill. Does any Member wish to speak? The First Elected Member for the Lesser Islands.

CAPT. MABRY S. KIRKCONNELL:
(Control) (Amendment) Law, 1989.

Thank you, Mr. President.
I rise to support a Bill for a Law to repeal the Music and Dancing

I welcome this opportunity to support this Bill. I was one of the eight who supported the amendment which we are now repealing at the Meeting held in September. Therefore, I am glad for the opportunity to correct something which appears not to be in the best interest of the country. I am man enough to stand here and correct my faults, if I know them.

I was under the impression at the time that I was doing what I thought was in the best interest, realising that there are many different religions within the Islands; some who keep Saturdays as well as Sundays, and also that it would be for very limited extensions, where for very short periods of time which, in my opinion, would come on a Sunday morning. Unfortunately the Board in September moved forward that time by four hours to 8:00 on Sunday night which also gave me a lot of dissatisfaction. I welcome this opportunity that it can now be erased and the Law will go back into effect and there will be absolutely no dancing allowed on Sunday, Good Friday, or Christmas Day.

Much is being said about my actions in this House but I am thankful for the training which I received in my home, in schools I attended and at University, and that I know how to conduct myself. At all times I try to be respectful to all whom I deal with. What I do, I do with the interest of the country and for peace and harmony. I am not in this House to do anything that, in my judgment, would be in any way detrimental to the good guidance or law enforcement of this country or to the future preservation of our love for our Maker, or for better and good Government.

I resent the fact that it is always said that I am jumping from side to side. I will support any action that comes before this Honourable House which I feel is in the best interest of the future of the Cayman Islands and its people.

In closing I would like to issue a challenge to all Members of this House, Ministers of the Gospel, lay-preachers and the public at large who have criticised me for my action for voting for this amendment in September to do as I have done, correct what they have done against their country, their Maker and their fellow man, and I ask them to do it with speed.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT:
Member for Bodden Town.

Does any other Member wish to speak? The First Elected

MR. ROY BODDEN:

Thank you, Mr. President.

I would like to say that I rise to support a Bill for a Law to repeal the Music and Dancing (Control) (Amendment) Law, 1989. In doing so I cannot, since I have been given the noble position of poet laureate of this House, let the occasion escape me to quote a little Julius Caesar; "Oh ye hard hearts of Rome, do ye not Pompeii." If only the hearts of some people were not so hard they would not have to suffer this terrible (what the Japanese call) 'loss of face' now in bringing back this Amendment.

As one of the newest Members here, I am continuously baffled by the fact that you pay all kinds of lip service and make calls for cooperation, consultation and dialogue and yet when the people (who are sometimes pejoratively referred to as Backbenchers) find themselves in the position of the majority and offer some sage advice, it is often put down and we are told, or led to believe, "Who are you? You are just a Backbencher."

In spite of what has been said about good Government and recognising that a mistake has been made, it is popular public opinion which has led to the repeal of this - the opinion that was expressly given by the Members on this side of the House when this Bill was first debated. I would like to say that it is also good Opposition that knows what the people want and expect to get. It is the responsibility of those people, be they called Backbenchers or whatever.

By the way, I do not necessarily regard myself as Opposition. I support what I think is in the best interest of the country and constituency. In this case I knew my constituents objected to this.

I am further mystified by the fact that when the shoe is on the other foot - they kick without discretion. But when the position is reversed they are quick to scream foul. I do not think it behooves good representatives to let such an occasion pass to hammer into the Government that it is the responsibility of the people who sit on this side to hold them in line. That is what is expected of us and we are put here as representatives of the people to guide the Government. When the Government does not take cognisance of that, it is our Constitutional right to remind them. So if anyone is expecting any sympathy and expecting the occasion to pass without being reminded that they were told this was an unpopular Bill in the first place... well, I feel sorry for them because this will not be the case.

Having said all that, let me now say that I recognise, respect and appreciate the Government's position and their willingness to go on to right the wrong by bringing this Bill calling for the repeal of the amendment made earlier. Let me also say that we will endeavour - I will endeavour and, certainly, I believe it is the position of my colleagues - to support them in seeking to bring the best for the people of this country. We are not prepared to let them make a mistake (and we told them it was a mistake) then come back make the correction and we sit idly or silently by. That would not be the Roy Bodden that I know. I do not intend to be that way.

Mr. President, I want to say something else, too, because I can see what is happening... and I am not necessarily an advocate in the arena for any adversarial politics, but, despite the frailty, I can give as good as I get. If anyone doubts that let me just say that I am listening.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT:
Member for West Bay.

Does any other Member wish to speak? The Third Elected

MR. JOHN D. JEFFERSON, JR.

Mr. President, I rise to support a Bill for a Law to Repeal the Music and Dancing (Control) (Amendment) Law, 1989. I welcome this piece of legislation and I want to also say that the Churches and the members of the general public who made their opposition known loud and clear to any amendment to the Music and Dancing Law which will allow music and dancing on prohibited days, that is, Christmas Day, Good Friday and Sunday, I say thank you. I urge the public to stay involved and let your Member of the Legislative Assembly know how you feel on such issues.

To the Government and their one Backbencher who supported this piece of Legislation which we are now repealing, I would just like to say, we told you so; and also to suggest that the next time it be checked with the Opposition to see how they are voting on these issues before you take your position because, to date, we have not been wrong on any major issue. I think there is a liability in living in the ivory tower, that is, Executive Council, because...

MR. PRESIDENT:

I think that is being somewhat offensive about Members of the Assembly. I think we ought to be polite to each other.

MR. JOHN D. JEFFERSON, JR.:

I am sorry. I would just like to say I think sometimes when we are in that position we lose touch with the people, their concerns and wishes. That definitely is very evident on this issue.

I am encouraged that there are people in this country who are still prepared to stand by the Christian principles this country was built on. I say, thank God for those who are still not prepared to sell this country for the sake of tourism or other special interest groups. To my colleagues here on this side of the House I would just like to say let us continue to hang together and support those issues which we know are in the best interests of our people.

I want to say it is true that Government recognised they made a mistake and they are trying to correct it now, but this time could have been spent in addressing other issues that we are faced with in this country if they had only listened in September when we told them that such an amendment to allow music and dancing on Christmas, Good Friday and Sundays would not go over very well in this country.

I think it is important for us as Elected Members to address those matters which we feel are in the best interests of our people and this country. It seems very difficult for us to appreciate that, because we had basically the same stance on the issue of abortion. We told them it was not going to work. The public told them it was not going to work and they had to retreat on that one as well.

Now, how much is it going to take to convince Government of the issues the people of this country are concerned with. What are we doing about addressing the issue of drug abuse in this country? What measures are being taken to address the concerns we have with regard to the outnumbering of Caymanians in their own native country?

MR. PRESIDENT:

stick to the Bill.

I am sorry, you are going outside the scope of this Bill. Please

MR. JOHN D. JEFFERSON, JR.:

concerned about.

I am just raising certain issues Sir, that I think the public is

MR. PRESIDENT:

right Bill for those particular matters.

I am not questioning your right to do that, but this is not the

MR. JOHN D. JEFFERSON, JR.:

I will abide by your ruling, Sir.

I would just like to say I support this amendment and, once again, I thank the Churches, the Members of the general public and my colleagues here in the House on this Side, that opposed the original amendment in the first place. Mr. President, I support the Bill.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Member for Tourism.

Does any other Member wish to speak? The Honourable

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN:

Mr. President, I, too, will be very brief. I rise to support a Bill for

a Law to repeal the Music and Dancing Law, 1989. In doing so I have no apology to make to anyone. I do not consider this to be egg on anybody's face. I acknowledge that a mistake was made in September. That is my opinion and I believe it is noble and just that any individual or any Government which recognises that a mistake has been made, has a responsibility to correct that mistake; especially when it is as important an issue as effecting the traditions and the lives of people in the Cayman Islands.

I say in this regard, thank God for democracy, and may it always remain alive in this country of ours. I would remind some of the Backbenchers who spoke before me that I am very appreciative of the fact that just as our constituents are vocal and certainly make their position clear to Government when it takes the wrong action, they are just as observant and vocal to convey to them their concerns when they have made the wrong decision or attempted to do the wrong thing for the country.

I would take this opportunity to say that I trust they will respond in like fashion to how Government is responding today. Surely we cannot have that image of arrogance and high and mighty attitudes and a loss of reputation for doing what is right by the people. I believe the people, the listening audience, and everybody, follows the developments of the debates in this House and, generally speaking, they either support what is done here or they stand against it. I think their stand is a good guide. Nevertheless, there are occasions when decisions have to be taken.

I would like to say that the reason for the repeal was certainly due to representations we received. I received many from the Churches and from many ordinary people who perhaps do not attend Church but who certainly would like to see the traditions of our country respected and upheld. The amendment which was brought in September, as I understood it, was to correct an anomaly which existed between the Music and Dancing Law and the Liquor Licensing Law. I think an attempt was made to regulate that situation. It did not produce what I thought it would have produced and, therefore, I feel the right thing is to repeal that amendment and return the Law to where it stood prior to September. I do not believe that dancing in public places on Sundays should have the backing of this or any other Government.

I would like to say that this Bill is strongly supported by me and I feel we are doing what is right and proper to comply with the wishes of the people. I trust and certainly believe that all Members of this House will support this Bill.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT:

The Honourable Member for Health.

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER:

Mr. President, I rise to support the Bill before this Honourable House. As other Members have expressed, I am not ashamed, nor embarrassed, to say we have made a mistake and are here to correct it. But the Third Elected Member for West Bay insists on challenging other areas. I would just like to assure him that the Government is doing quite a bit about drugs. We are doing as much as resources allow us to deal with the problem. We have tabled a five year plan...

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:

Mr. President, on a Point of Order. The Third Elected Member for West Bay is not in the Chamber. He raised the matter. He was stopped by the Presiding Officer. I wonder how much farther this Member is going to delve into this matter.

MR. PRESIDENT:

I am going to allow him to reply because, in fact, the statements were made then I stopped the speaker from going any further. I think it is reasonable that comments should be made in reply. But I think after that we should stick to the Bill.

Sorry, if I may just go further. The problem about things like this is that the Chair cannot know what a speaker is going to say before he says it. That is the difficulty.

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER:

Mr. President, it is always the truth that bothers people because I believe the Government is doing all that is possible. My question is: What are they doing? I am still waiting for input from him and other Members on the Drug Plan on Reports which were circulated to them seeking their input.

That Member also raised his pet subject of abortion. All I will say is that the Government sought input from the people, accepted the recommendation from the people, and corrected the Legislation. I am still waiting for him to enact and put in place the alternatives he is always suggesting - adoption. We have quite a few kids that need to be adopted.

I am glad that Members have taken such a Christian-like approach to this Bill. I also thank the Churches for their concern and input. I hope those Christian principles are going to be carried forward into the Budget Debate and that this Saturday night at 11:30 we are all going to go home so we will be home before the magic hour of 12:00, and be well rested for Sunday morning worship.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Town.

Do you wish to speak? The Third Elected Member for George

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN:

is now repealing back a few months ago.

Mr. President, I support this Bill the same as I opposed the Bill it

A lot has been said by Members on different aspects of this, but one thing that seems to run through a lot of what has been said - that Cayman is still a God fearing country. It is one in which the principles of Christianity prevail. Therefore any deterioration that comes about within society which we can correct from the social side, I think we have a duty to do.

It has been said that a good Government corrects errors, but the best Government listens to the wishes of its people and avoids errors. This is an example of that.

We, as seven of the Elected Backbenchers, acted and argued against putting this amendment through at a time when we supported five out of six Laws. I think it is very important that this was the only Law in that Session that we did not support. Today it is being reversed.

I would just like to mention briefly all the reference to Opposition... When we support five out of six Laws and the one we opposed is ultimately reversed we are responsible Backbenchers. We are not here opposing for the sake of opposition, as several Members have mentioned. I hope the public does see that we try to constructively approach matters. As I said, in the last Session we supported five out of six Laws and the sixth Law that we did not support was this one which is being reversed.

The position of consultation is very important. We saw yesterday the wishes of the majority of this House pushed out through the window. That is unfortunate because consultation between Members is very important. Regardless of what the Government Members may wish to think of us we, at times, are right. There are instances where the opportunity of getting together on issues which are very difficult and very touchy should be carried out. I think failure to consult fully with Members - and, worse still, failure to consult with the public at large - is a very serious mistake of Members.

I will say this: the Government has acted responsibly in coming back and correcting the error. I give them credit for that. That is one thing I think we all have to do if an error is made. The important example one sees from this is that when one does get into the Executive Council, one gets very busy. There are times one does become more isolated from the people than do Backbenchers. This is a fact of life. Therefore, what I would say to the Government Members is that there are times when you see a majority of seven Elected Members who are arguing points a certain way, you should listen very carefully before you take the decision to go against it. We may be wrong, but as the last year has shown I think we have been right in most instances.

The Bill definitely is unique and one of a kind, at least from what I know about it, in that it is one of the shortest lived Laws this country has seen. It has only been in a few weeks, I think, maybe a month or two. Here we now have the amending Law to repeal it. I would just like to also mention on the question of responsible Backbenchers, despite the fact that (this was mentioned earlier) in relation to the Motorcycle Law where we did consult despite the controversy there, we did vote for the Amendment for that Bill unanimously, as far as I can remember - at least I voted for it. So despite the fact there can be controversy, on whatever is good for the country I think we have to be man enough to vote for. The same as here the Executive Council Members have taken a step to reverse this.

In summary, therefore, I support the Bill, the same as I opposed the Bill when it came in. I believe if Cayman is going to be able to survive the rapid change and development we have to look carefully before we do anything to deteriorate the social and moral values within our society. We spend a lot of time on conservation of physical things, be they coral, fish or whatever, and this is good. But we must also conserve the things which support the moral and social cornerstones within our democracy and our society.

I believe that here is the best example of the wishes of the people coming forth very forcefully and very quickly to reverse a Law which was passed marginally, with an 8 to 7 vote, which was obviously bad for the country. I support the amendment, Sir, and I would hope in the future we would not have to come back to this House so quickly afterwards to reverse a Law which is similar to this or in any other area.

Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT:
Member for the Lesser Islands.

Does any other Member wish to speak? The Second Elected

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN:
(Control) (Amendment) Law, 1989.

Thank you, Mr. President.
I rise to support a Bill for a Law to repeal the Music and Dancing

I was one of the seven people who voted against the change to the Law as it was. Now this amendment seeks to repeal it so it goes back to its original form. At the time I opposed it I stated that while I was not debating or making any statements from any ultra-religious point of view or, for that matter, necessarily a representative of any particular religious denomination, I did not see the need for it and I think the circumstances at hand have proven it has been very unpopular with the public.

Even now, I do not postulate to say this is wrong because dancing was allowed on some particular day, because, as I pointed out then that there are religions who believe Sunday is the day for worship and there are religions that believe Saturday is the day of worship. But from a traditional point of view in this country, I think the Law was fundamentally changing something which did not exist. I did not see the value of so doing and from the feedback I was getting from the public on it, I am not surprised the inevitable has happened where the protest from the public or the reaction has been to the extent it has which has brought Government to rethink its position.

I do pay tribute to the Government for having acted in the manner where it has come back to this Honourable House to repeal the Law because it shows the Government is prepared to respond when the public speaks loudly enough. However, I think a moral can be learned: it is wise to seek the opinion of the people first rather than having to undo what is done.

I also support the views of previous speakers who have pointed out the need for consultation. I think there is only good to be derived from consultation from this House. I believe

that we are all reasonable men and it is not unreasonable to consult. I was one of the, so called, Backbenchers who stood against the change to the Law. I think that time and events have shown that there are some correct thoughts emanating from this side.

I think the Third Elected Member for George Town made a very significant point when he spoke - that the Executive Council tends to be, on a day-to-day basis, more deeply involved in administrative matters (matters which happen in an office in the process of running Government), that they might have less of an opportunity of being in direct touch with the man on the street as those of us who are not confined or subjected to that situation. So it is something we at least need to think about and perhaps actions in the future could be guided so there is more consultation.

Mr. President, I think that it is very important for us in our actions to keep the overall cultural position in these Islands in tact in all ways; not just in the practical day-to-day matters, but also from the religious, spiritual and the social aspects which give us a clear identity. When matters like this come before this House, it is absolutely important that there should be consultation and that Government ensure that what it is doing is in accordance with the wishes of the people. Certainly, in determining priorities this is important. For, indeed, there will be issues and I can think, even now, of certain issues which are to come before this House, where I foresee certain differing views and opinions. I am thinking of one that, from my soundings across the board, I think is highly unpopular with the public. But that will come about in due course.

I voted against the changing of this Law and I am very happy to vote for the change to return it as it was. I am particularly delighted to know that my colleague, the First Elected Member for the Lesser Islands, and I will be voting together on this issue. I look forward to both he and I, perhaps, voting together on an issue to get ourselves a new plane.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT:

The Honourable Member for Education.

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS:

Mr. President, I support the Bill before the House and I do so without any embarrassment or regret. When this Bill which is being repealed was being debated in September, I certainly did not support the position which was taken by some people, that it was the intention of that amendment to permit wide spread music and dancing in public places on Sundays. That is not what I understood the intent of the Law to be.

As the Member for Tourism has said, it was my understanding that we were trying to correct an anomaly that existed between the Music and Dancing Law and the Liquor Licensing Law where when, in particular, New Year's Eve fell on a Saturday that an extension of some minutes could be given to allow festivities to go beyond the magic hour of 12:00 midnight merely to allow celebrators to welcome in the New Year. As it turned out with the application of that amendment it became very clear that it was wide in scope and therefore it was a mistake to have done so and we are here now correcting that mistake.

The mere fact that we are here today repealing that Law shows beyond doubt that it was never the intention of Government to have wide scale music and dancing on Sundays, Christmas Day and Good Friday. I would just like to go on record as saying that it is an accepted fact that Governments do not, or cannot, legislate morals and it is unfortunate, in my view, that dancing does take place on Sundays. But, be that as it may, we have to do what we see as best for the country.

On the question of consultation I could not agree more that that is a good practice. But I believe that one should practice what they preach. I fail to see how Members who brought the unpopular amendment to this House to allow the importation of large cc motorcycles without consultation of the public - without even consulting with Government - can then berate or lecture Government on the virtues of prior consultation. It was done without proper notice being given to the House.

I am not sure what the attempt to say that Executive Council being deeply involved in the day-to-day administration becomes less in touch with the public is intended to mean. If that means Executive Council should lie down and play dead and let the Backbench run the country, then it would seem we are advocating a serious policy.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:

At least we would not have to retract Bills.

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS:
they come.

It is unfortunate that some people cannot take the pangs when they come.

There are only two types of people who do not change their minds. To the best of my knowledge, neither of those are to be found in Government, so we are doing what we consider the responsible thing to have done. I seem to get the inference that if Government were to always take the advice offered from certain other Members in this House all would be well. But I would like to go on record as saying that if Government were to always accept advice and suggestions which are given, the results could not be corrected by a simple amendment such as we are doing today.

I believe that this action today shows the Government is responsible, and I support this Bill without reservation. As I said, I have no remorse about it. It was certainly, in my case, and in the case of Government, a genuine misunderstanding of what the effects of the amendment in September would be. I believe that it is a sign of responsibility and maturity when a Government can admit mistakes.

Thank you very much.

MR. PRESIDENT:

The Second Elected Member for Boddan Town.

MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH: Mr. President, I rise to support a Bill for a Law to repeal the Music and Dancing (Control) (Amendment) Law, 1989.

When this Law came in September I felt that it was a wound that was opened up which needed 15 stitches, but it only got eight that day. Now today it is going to get 15 stitches and it will be healed for a long time.

The Honourable Member for Education, in his speech, talked about consultation and he brought up the issue of the motorcycles. I do not agree with him. We did take it to the Executive Council Members and mention was made of it there. We wanted it to be done. But they do not seem to remember it and that is why the First Elected Member for West Bay took the steps to make an amendment to the motorcycle issue that day, when it was brought here. We wanted to see Caymanians have their rights, the same as any other person who comes to this Island, to ride motorcycles too. That is why we brought it. Having said that I hope it will get its 15 stitches and heal the wound once and for all.

Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Elected Member for East End.

MR. JOHN B. McLEAN: Mr. President, I am pleased to support the Bill which is before the House at present. This Bill seeks to restore a part of our tradition which was taken away by a similar Bill in September. I feel certain that the Churches and, indeed, our Christian community appreciates this Bill which I would term 'The Bill of Repentance'. I am glad to see today that the full Government is prepared to acknowledge their mistake. I do not know if you should call it stitches or whatever, but, whatever we would choose to call it, I am glad they have taken this stand.

I would like to say that I trust by now it has been seen that our opposition here in September has been proven to be right. It has been shown that we were putting forward the views of the majority of the people and, in fact, that we did not have the weight until we received letters or telephone calls to take the stand which we did in this Honourable House. As I mentioned earlier, I am pleased to know we are bringing back some of our tradition which was taken away.

Until a few seconds ago it was not my intention to speak to this Motion, but I believe when the Second Elected Member rose to his feet he changed my views completely. Let me make a proper identification. I am talking about the Second Elected Member of Executive Council and I would not call him by his name, but he is Mr. Benson...

MR. PRESIDENT: There is no need to call him by his name. Just call him the Member for Education.

MR. JOHN B. McLEAN: That is exactly what I said, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: Sorry, I think you said the Second Elected Member - twice, I think.

MR. JOHN B. McLEAN: Proper identification, Sir. Knowing the good intelligence of the Second Elected Member I am certain that he fully understood the far reaching effect of the Bill which was presented here in September.

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Mr. President, is the Member challenging the veracity of what I said, Sir?

MR. JOHN B. McLEAN: Mr. President, I recall when the Hon. Charles Kirkconnell sat in Executive Council and such an interruption was made. He would politely get to his feet and say he would always refer to that Jamaican joke, 'you pelt the stone in a pen of swine and the one that bawled hardest got hurt'. All I am saying is that I am not challenging the Member in anything he said...

POINT OF ORDER

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: On a Point of Order, Mr. President. There was no need for me to assume anything. He called me by name. He identified me by name - not even by district or title. I made the statement I made in all honesty.

MR. JOHN B. McLEAN: Oh, boy. Mr. President, let me go on. Let me say that it is my opinion that the Honourable Member understood exactly what was in the Bill that we presented here in September. I do not see why we should come here today and say that we did not believe certain things would have come about by the amendment. We are all intelligent men. We knew what was in the Bill.

Now to come to the point on the Motorcycle Motion and I trust you will give me the right to reply as I was one Member who was directly involved with the Motion. I have no apologies for bringing that Motion to the House. The same way that Members of Executive Council continually say that they are putting forward the views of the people, that is exactly what I was doing in that Motion. I am certain that, if the truth were told, a Member or Members of Executive Council can say they were also approached because I recall certain individuals who spoke to me about the problems with the larger bikes, mentioned they had also spoken to other Members in Executive Council. So I have no apologies for that.

Let me just say that it is my prayer that we will never, ever have to deal with a matter like the one before us at present. As I said in September, I felt it was uncalled for, however this is one Member who certainly appreciates the action of the Government and for this I say thanks.

MR. PRESIDENT: If no other Member wishes to speak, would the Mover wish to reply?

HON. J. LEMUEL HURLSTON: Mr. President, in the interest of time and in the spirit of Christian maturity I wish not to exercise my right of reply.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question will now be put on the Second Reading of this Bill. Those in favour please say Aye...Those against No.

AYES.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Ayes have it. I do not think we need a division, it is clear on the voice, unless anyone has any doubt.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: I would like a division, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Fine, we will defer lunch for a Division. [Members' Laughter]
Madam Clerk.

CLERK:

DIVISION NO. 28/89

AYES: 14

NOES: 0

Hon. Thomas C. Jefferson
Hon. Richard W. Ground
Hon. J. Lemuel Hurlston
Hon. W. Norman Bodden
Hon. Benson O. Ebanks
Hon. D. Ezzard Miller
Hon. Linford A. Pierson
Mr. W. McKeeva Bush
Mr. Truman M. Bodden
Capt. Mabry S. Kirkconnell
Mr. Gilbert A. McLean
Mr. Roy Bodden
Mr. Franklin R. Smith
Mr. Hon. John B. McLean

MR. PRESIDENT: The result is 14 Ayes and no Noes. The Motion carries unanimously.

AGREED: THE MUSIC AND DANCING (CONTROL) (1989 AMENDMENT)(REPEAL) BILL, 1989 GIVEN A SECOND READING.

MR. PRESIDENT: The House stands suspended until some time after 2:15.

AT 1:00 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 2:29 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Proceeding are resumed. We carry on with Item 3, Government Business, House in Committee. So the House will now go into a Committee to study a Bill entitled, The Music and Dancing Bill, 1989, and other Bills.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

COMMITTEE ON BILLS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please be seated, those of you who are not. The House is in Committee. May I assume that, as is usual, we authorise the Honourable Second Official Member to correct minor printing errors, and such like, in the Bills we shall now study? Thank you.

Would the Clerk please state each Bill and read its clauses?

THE APPROPRIATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1989

CLERK: The Appropriation (Amendment) Bill, 1989.

Clause 1 Short title.

Clause 2 Amendment to section 2.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clauses 1 to 2 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: CLAUSES 1 AND 2 PASSED.

CLERK: A Bill for a Law to amend the Appropriation Law, 1989.

MR. 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. TITLE PASSED.

THE LABOUR (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1989

CLERK:	Clause 1	Short Title.
	Clause 2	Amendment of section 2.
	Clause 3	Amendment of section 6.
	Clause 4	Amendment of section 13.
	Clause 5	Amendment of section 15.
	Clause 6	Amendment of section 18.
	Clause 7	Amendment of section 23.
	Clause 8	Amendment of section 24.
	Clause 9	Amendment of section 25.
	Clause 10	Amendment of section 32.
	Clause 11	Amendment of section 35.
	Clause 12	Amendment of section 69.
	Clause 13	Amendment of section 70.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If no Member wishes to speak on the clauses...

MR. JOHN D. JEFFERSON, JR.: Mr. Chairman, with your permission.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please.

MR. JOHN D. JEFFERSON JR.: I would just like to ask the Honourable Member responsible for Tourism if any decision has been reached with regard to a formula for gratuities?

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN: No, Mr. Chairman. By checking on the establishment of a formula for gratuities the investigation revealed that the Director of Labour was satisfied, in checking with the properties, the employers and the employees each seem to have somewhat of a different formula. Generally speaking it seems to work quite well. The different formulae have been filed with the Director of Labour so I have not really had any specific representations to try to standardise it. It was the feeling of the Association and some of the employees and I spoke to some of the Condominium Managers themselves, like Annie Milton and Betty and different local people who manage properties and it was felt it should be left as it is.

MR. JOHN D. JEFFERSON, JR.: May I ask a supplementary, Mr. Chairman? Are you aware there is a policy at the condos, especially, that they withhold a certain percentage for the establishment itself and then the balance is then distributed to members of staff?

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN: No, I am not aware of that.

MR. JOHN D. JEFFERSON, JR.: This is what I was told by certain employees.

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN: What I will undertake to do for the Member, Mr. Chairman, is

check into this and find out whether there are substantial irregularities or what, I would consider, anomalies in the various formulae which are applied. If it is found that there is dissatisfaction, especially at the condos as he has pointed out, there is provision under the Law for the Director to put in place a formula to be applied to that particular property.

MR. JOHN D. JEFFERSON, JR.: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In that case I will put the question on Clauses 1 through 13 of the Bill. Those in favour please say Aye...Those against No.

AYES.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Ayes have it.

AGREED. CLAUSES 1 THROUGH 13 PASSED.

CLERK: A Bill for a Law to amend the Labour Law.

MR. PRESIDENT: I shall put the question that the Title do stand part of the Bill. Those in favour please say Aye...Those against No.

AYES.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Ayes have it.

AGREED. TITLE PASSED.

THE MUSIC AND DANCING (CONTROL) (1989 AMENDMENT) (REPEAL) BILL, 1989

CLERK: Clause 1 Short Title.
Clause 2 Repeal of Law 11 of 1989.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If there is no debate, I will put the question.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Just to make sure the Government understands what they are doing now, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I cannot answer for the Government, I am afraid.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Thank you, Sir.

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Mr. Chairman, is it just that some people will admit that and others do not?

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: That is because we knew from the beginning what was going to happen. There was no misunderstanding on our part. That we have to make very clear. We told them exactly what was going to happen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In that case I will put the question which is that Clauses 1 and 2 do stand part of the Bill. Those in favour please say Aye...Those against No.

AYES.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Ayes have it.

AGREED. CLAUSES 1 AND 2 PASSED.

CLERK: A Bill for a Law to repeal the Music and Dancing (Control) (Amendment) Law, 1989.

MR. 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. TITLE PASSED.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That concludes proceedings in Committee on a Bill entitled, The

Bill for a Law to Amend the Appropriations Law, 1989, and other Bills. The House will resume.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: The Member for Education is asking something, Mr. Chairman. He has asked me something and I cannot understand. It seems very important though.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Unless it is part of the proceedings of the Committee I feel...

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Sir, I was just asking what had happened to the amendments he had for the Labour Bill.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Mr. Chairman, I said I wanted some amendments and the reason for wanting to put it into Committee was to get the Attorney General to help us because, certainly, he did not know what he was doing. I could not put an amendment because I do not have a legal mind. I needed a legal mind. I asked them and told them that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am sure the Members can draw on the Attorney General and the Legal Department at any time. I hope there is no problem with that.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: No, no, I do not think so. What we needed was everybody together.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Fine. Well, I think we should conclude proceedings in Committee. You have made clear of each other, I think.

HOUSE RESUMED

MR. PRESIDENT: Proceedings are resumed. Reports on Bills. The Honourable Financial Secretary.

REPORTS ON BILLS

THE APPROPRIATION (AMENDMENT) LAW, 1989

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, I have to report that a Bill shortly entitled, The Appropriation (Amendment) Law, 1989, was considered by a Committee of the whole House and passed without amendment.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Bill is accordingly set down for Third Reading. The Honourable Member for Tourism.

THE LABOUR (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1989

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN: Mr. President, I have to report that a Bill entitled, A Bill for a Law to amend the Labour Law, was considered by a Committee of the whole House and passed without amendment.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Bill is accordingly set down for Third Reading. The Honourable Administrative Secretary.

THE MUSIC AND DANCING (AMENDMENT) (REPEAL) BILL, 1989

HON. J. LEMUEL HURLSTON: Mr. President, I have to report that the Music and Dancing (Control) (1989 Amendment) (Repeal) Bill, 1989, was considered by a Committee of the whole House and passed without amendment.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Bill is accordingly set down for Third Reading. Bills Third Reading.

THIRD READINGS

THE APPROPRIATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1989

CLERK: The Appropriation (Amendment) Bill, 1989.

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, I move that a Bill shortly entitled, The Appropriation (Amendment) Law, 1989, be given a Third Reading and passed.

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 (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1989, PASSED.

MR. PRESIDENT: Bills Third Reading.

THE LABOUR (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1989

CLERK: The Labour (Amendment) Bill, 1989.

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN: Mr. President, I move that a Bill entitled, A Bill for a Law to amend the Labour Law be given a Third Reading and passed.

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 LABOUR (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1989, PASSED.

MR. PRESIDENT: We now move to Government Motions. Do you want to suspend Standing Orders to take the Third Reading?

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: It is not on the Order Paper.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think you would have to. We have done the first and second readings today. [pause] We will leave that for tomorrow then.

The Member for Communications and Works who is to move the first Government Motion, is not here so unless he has deputed someone to move it in his place... No? The second and third Government Motions are his too. We seem to have run out of items on the Order Paper.

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER: Mr. President, I am sure the Member is caught up in some official duties. Could I suggest we suspend until he arrives and not take a tea break later on rather than lose the whole afternoon?

MR. PRESIDENT: Are Members agreeable to that? One tea break at a different time, not two tea breaks. We shall suspend for 15 minutes in the first instance.

AT 2:40 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 3:00 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Proceedings of the House are resumed. Government Motion number 7/89. The Honourable Member for Communications and Works.

GOVERNMENT MOTION NO. 7/89

AMENDMENT TO THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN 1977

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Thank you, Mr. President.
First, I wish to apologise for my lateness and the delay in getting here which, as I mentioned to Members of this Honourable House, was due to being on official business.

In accordance with Standing Order 24(1), I beg to move Government Motion number 7/89, the Development and Planning Law (Revised) Amendment to the Development Plan, 1977 which reads as follows:

"BE IT RESOLVED by this honourable Legislative Assembly, pursuant to the powers conferred on it by subsection (2) of section 7 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 amended by inserting immediately after the words "May 1989" in the definition of "prescribed composite map" in section 1.5 of the Planning Statement the following :-

'as amended by the revisions of sheets 3 and 20 dated August 1989 and sheet 2 dated October 1989 approved by the Governor on the 31st day of October, 1989.'".

MR. PRESIDENT:
the Mover wish to speak to it?

Government Motion number 7/89 has been duly moved. Would

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President.

In 1988 Government enacted extensive revisions to the Road Law, 1974, in order to provide a legislative basis for the improvements for the roads system recommended by the Master Ground Transportation Plan (MGTP).

Section 25 of the Law as amended now empowers the Governor and Executive Council to designate proposed road corridors in the development plan. During the May 1989 Meeting of this Honourable House a resolution was passed altering the Development Plan, 1977, by incorporating 30 prescribed composite maps or PCMs into the Development Plan, 1977. These maps show the network of road corridors recommended in the MGTP, with the exception of those in the central business area of downtown George Town.

Central George Town was left blank on the appropriate map, specifically sheet 2 of the 30 prescribed maps. As I explained to this Honourable House during the May presentation the incorporation of the 30 maps into the Development Plan provided the Planning Department and the Central Planning Authority with the legal power to ensure that prohibitive physical development does not occur in the corridors which would result in inconvenience to proprietors and excessive costs to Government. As stated previously, the 30 maps tabled in this honourable House in May did not cover central George Town. During the latter days of the MGTP Study and during detailed examination of the MGTP Report, it became very apparent that the recommendations in respect to central George Town would freeze the development of that area into a particular pattern but would do so having considered one, albeit important, parameter: namely, the efficient movement of road vehicles.

Before taking such a momentous step Government concluded that all aspects of life in the Capital should be examined in a systematic, cohesive manner. Consequently the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was established. As stated yesterday in the laying of the TAC report on the Table of the House Executive Council approved this Committee in February 1989. Mr. President, all Members of the House should be familiar with the contents of the TAC Report as it received very wide publicity including a special presentation to Members of this Honourable House. Therefore, I will not repeat details of the recommendations but I would reiterate that the TAC had the widest possible input during the Committee's deliberations and gave the widest possible exposure in the presentation of their report. In this very important aspect it paralleled the patterns established by the MGTP.

As can be seen from the Report, it does not constitute a detailed plan but consists of a well thought out set of guidelines and concepts for the development of a more detailed plan. Thus, it would be expected that when the various aspects are examined in detail that minor changes will be required. Indeed, this was the case when Government's roads and traffic experts examined the TAC recommendations.

Map 2 of the 30 prescribed composite maps which are presented today incorporates the TAC recommendations but with certain minor changes which have been discussed with the Chairman of TAC. Maps 3 and 20 are adjacent to Map 2 and contain minor revisions resulting from the development of the downtown area. As stated in May, I will again point out for the information of the listening public that the proposed road corridors as shown on the prescribed composite maps are public documents and are therefore available for public inspection and scrutiny.

In 1988 the MGTP was approved and accepted by Government for the implementation in order to ease the present and future congestion of our road systems and to generally provide a more efficient road system. This will cost money but as the saying goes, we cannot have our cake and eat it too. If indeed the people of these Islands want an improved infrastructure then they will have to consider that these improved facilities will cost money.

In order to build the required new road it will be necessary for Government to acquire the land on which to construct the roads. This does not necessarily mean that the acquisition of road corridors at this stage, or even the reservation or preservation of these road corridors will mean the roads will be built tomorrow, this is just as an aid to assist the Central Planning Authority and the Planning Department when they are approving new development that may be built or, perhaps, could be built in those areas, so these can be prevented and also to avoid Government having to pay a lot of money latter down the line when it is crucial to have these roads built.

All landowners affected will be compensated for their loss of land and buildings at the current market value to ensure that all affected individuals will not suffer as a result. The public will also be entitled to make claims for compensation and will be visited by selected officers to discuss the purchase of the required property. Government, where necessary, will also assist in every way possible. Not only in the preparation of compensation claims but, where necessary, also in the relocation of households.

As stated in May's presentation the prescribed composite map, when adopted as part of the Development Plan 1977, will provide the Central Planning Authority with the necessary legal authority to preserve the road corridors free from development. Thus facilitating Government's long term transportation plan. As also stated in the resolution, only minor changes are necessary in section 1.5 of the Planning Statement. Accordingly, I recommend and commend this resolution to this Honourable House and trust

that it will meet with the approval of all Members.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT:

The Third Elected Member for George Town.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN:

Mr. President, this Motion has some very far reaching effects. I would like to deal with some of these and also matters which the Member has mentioned.

While I realise that there are traffic problems in the Islands and I also realise that we have to do everything we can to deal with these problems, however, we have to live within our means. It is that broad objection, together with the lack of input from the public to object or make representations in relation to this that I would like to address this House on, through you.

I am really restating what I said back in the Session when the Master Ground Transportation Plan was dealt with, in May. In the past, provision had been made for roads to go through people's property prior to the coming into operation of the Roads Law, 1988, which was passed in the April 1988 Sitting of the Legislative Assembly, the public was given a right to make objections through a fairly formal process which was set out in the Law relating to the Development Plan (which is still there in the Development and Planning Law) relating to a development plan other than roads.

Very briefly, what would happen is the Central Planning Authority would prepare a plan and before submitting it to the Legislative Assembly notice would be published for two issues in two consecutive weeks. After that there was two months for objections or representations to be given. After that, the objections had to be considered by the authority and also there were rights under that where people could be heard and, from what I can remember, also by appearing. So when property was going to be zoned out under the Development Plan for any reason people had a right to object. That procedure under the new Law that this operates through has been removed and the process of (shall I put it?) detailed consultation with the public has now been removed. A lot of objections are now beginning to come about by people who are suddenly finding that road reserves are either going through their property or possibly right where their house now stands.

My first ground of objection is that I believe the public should be properly apprised. I appreciate the Member for Communications and Works is following the Law. But I feel that where you are going to affect peoples' homes or land - in this country land is still regarded as a substantial part of one's wealth - then people should have a right to follow that detailed democratic right of objecting which has been entrenched in the Development and Planning Law so that people are not suddenly caught by surprise and find out there is a road reserve that could be running through their land or their house.

Linked to this is the fact that (while I accept what the Member has said, and I wrote this down as an understanding) all landowners are going to be compensated at market values, in fairness, I am not certain he means in due course when the road is built or when something else is done or whether that will happen once the road reserve is in, because the provisions are fairly complex as I see it. If we are saying we are going to compensate people for their land, as he mentioned at market value when these corridors are reserved and the Plan goes through, that could be somewhat different from what I understand the position to be. Therefore I would leave that aspect of what he said open.

The two Laws are by no means simple. Whereas, now you need not, when you are zoning these corridors, intend to acquire it within five years, as you did under the older Law, it could be left for a longer period of time, as I understand it. So people's property could, subject to certain provisions in the Roads and also in the Development and Planning Law, be left for a long period without compensation for their property. Naturally Government has every right, if it so wishes, to pay compensation immediately. I will deal with that aspect further down because one of my questions is going to be: Where is the money coming from?

The other under this is that there is a duty when you are zoning under the normal Development Plan under section 6(3) of the Development and Planning Law. Normally there was a period where you zoned out property, after a year the person could serve six months' notice and say to Government, "Please buy it, otherwise please relieve me of the position." I know that was lifted out by the new roads Law. In fairness, the 1988 Roads Law does, however, have much more beneficial provision for compensation under it and that is one good aspect of it. Why I am saying this is that I believe we are getting at this stage the cart before the horse. If we are now going to make these reservations for roads for the future, then we have to provide the money in the Budget to pay these people. This is where I had hoped the Member who is presenting this Motion would have told us today - as I raised back in May, in some depth, where is the money coming from and how is the country going to pay for what is going to be an extremely elaborate and expensive set of roads.

It is all well and good to put in these corridors or road reserves and to say that at some time in the future we are going to build these roads because the Member himself said that some of the roads would not be built tomorrow. It is obvious they cannot be built because of the cost of land and the cost of building the roads. There are other priorities in this country that I think have to be looked at before we spend, what seems to me, is going to be one of the largest amounts of money that this country has ever seen on roads.

I would have hoped that we could have seen more improvements and ability to deal with the repairs on the present roads. The upgrading of these roads in the short term, which would cost very little and perhaps we could afford, rather than attempting at this stage the Master Ground Transportation Plan which is already a very large and expensive set of roads.

What I find difficult to understand, and if the Member wishes to try to get these reserves I can well understand some of the arguments he is putting up, but we come back to the hard fact of life. Can this country afford them? How are we going to pay for the roads when these reserves go

in to building them in George Town alone? I appreciate the fact that the Member is putting this money mainly in the George Town electoral district. I appreciate that aspect. But I have an overall duty to the people of the Cayman Islands to ensure that we are not doing something that is going to get us legally obligated or, as the Member has said, that all landowners are going to be compensated at market value because we know it is a fact that the extent of money which would be necessary to buy this land is not in the Budget. It cannot be put in this Budget unless we have funds raised or borrowed from somewhere to deal with it.

Now, before I get into more details of what I think could be a stop-gap answer to some of this, I want to make my position clear. If this country can afford a more elaborate roads system then I have no objection to dealing with it, once I know where the money is coming from and how we are going to pay it back. That it is a priority after what I regard as other priorities, for example, education, and the money which has to be spent on drugs or matters such as that. Let us not kid ourselves. The amount of \$18 million we were looking at to deal with the first phase of the Master Ground Transportation Plan, excluding the smaller pieces here, is really a drop in the bucket. That estimate, which the Member in another Session referred me to, was really done before we had the Law relating to the extensive compensation. I understand that we are looking at sums excessive of that just for paying the compensation of the land.

What I am saying here is that I believe what the Member should do is get all of his details of cost together. Get the cost of acquiring the property. I agree with him that you can buy the property and not have to build the road, but that, to me, seems to be a worse position than buying part of the property and building part of the road because we could have a large investment tied up over a long period of time and that is not really solving the problem. What I would like to see is some type of slowing down on this project until we really know what the full impact of it is going to be on the lives of Caymanians. One of the things the Government does mention from time to time is, "Well what is the alternative?" Alternatives were looked at under the Master Ground Transportation Plan. Perhaps on a stop-gap basis, as we heard this morning, there could be a widening of the West Bay Road to take four lanes in most places except where the four buildings are. There are other areas of town where we could deal with buying the land and building a few of the roads to ease the congestion.

I could well see from the work which was done by the cemetery in George Town with the light system and the re-routing, the extra road did help considerably and I commend the Member for that. I guess what I am saying here is that we have to crawl before we walk. Therefore, we should try to deal with this on a much smaller basis but, above all, that we would at least know what the full ramifications, the full impact, of bringing these extra roads into a system that is already, in George Town, full of many roads, under the Master Ground Transportation Plan.

I can see the difficulty of the Planning Authority when they have to deal with people's property when they wish to develop it. They are not in a position to say this is a road corridor. But it is the people's land. It is better to zone what we can afford and try to build some of these roads, maybe a bypass from near the traffic lights in George Town to the North Sound to the airport could ease a lot of traffic and not cost very much. Possibly some of the smaller roads within George Town could be widened. We could put in a few extra roads we could afford.

What does worry me is that when we take and pass this Plan now, as I see it we are setting the stage for an expenditure that we really do not have realistic figures on. We are beginning to tie up people's property for roads that, as the Member said, may not be built tomorrow. Quite frankly, we may not be able to build them for another 10 years unless the Government can come up with some realistic way of finding the money because we can only borrow so much and no more. I am not going to see plans like this commit this country beyond approximately 9 per cent of the recurrent normal revenue to service debt. If we go beyond that for something like roads and we also need money to deal with schools, the hospital or a hurricane or relating to drugs, where are we going to get it from if we use up all of our borrowing power?

You are looking at what I think it is going to take - between \$25 million to \$35 million - in George Town alone, because we are dealing with land between \$60 and \$100 odd dollars per square foot. You are looking at a breed of money which could be two or three times what the present borrowings of the country are now. It is a reality that we do not have the money being raised, from looking at the Budget, which is sufficient to put in these large sums of money out of recurrent revenue. So we must borrow. What I am really saying is that we may have to weigh some stop-gap measures to ease the traffic. It may not provide a utopia, nor an absolute solution to the problem, but in the meantime, until the country can get more on its feet to pay for the more expensive roads, or until it can find some way of raising the money without drastically affecting the people, because if it involves very heavy assessments, taxes or duty or whatever, on the people to pay for it, then we are not going to have that many more cars on the Island because cars, up to a point, are a luxury.

I do not want to try to get bogged down into a lot of details on the compensation aspect of the Law, but it seems to me that since the corridors can be tied up for periods longer than five years (that section was removed), that one of the areas of compensation is naturally under the Roads Law and this can be done prior to the road being Gazetted under section 3, I am reading from the Law:

"If having regard to the small size or portion of land held by that person or other physical features of that land, the reservation of the road corridor effecting that land will cause that person undue hardship."

So that is one way of paying much earlier. There are other provisions in the Development and Planning Law that have been specifically preserved, which in part four that does provide compensation for instances where a planning decision is either conditioned or refused. It has approximately a page and one half exceptions to it.

If, in fact, the Member means all the landowners will be compensated at market value by this amendment, we are looking under this one Motion at an extremely large amount of money alone.

I appreciate what the Technical Advisory Committee has done. They have put a lot of work into this. They have obviously produced what is a very ideal series of roads. It deals with much more than that. It deals with parking areas, the Port, the Landing Facilities for tourists. A lot of things. They have done a lot of work. I appreciate that. But they said in one part of this that naturally their findings are subject to the cost of paying for all these things. So they were very mindful of the fact that what they have recommended could be very costly.

Perhaps, further down the line, we may be able to adopt many areas of this but, I think, it has to come at a time when we can afford it. I guess everyone wants for his portfolio to have as much and as good as solution to problems. We all would like to. I would like to drive a Daimler or a Rolls-Royce. Instead, I have a 1985 car, it is really what one can afford. It is a Cadillac and I paid under \$12,000 for it...

MR. PRESIDENT:
the argument. I think you are straying away a bit.

With great respect, I am not quite sure what this has to do with

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN:
are dealing with roads here. What I am saying is that I think this resolution is more than we can afford. We must cut our garment in such a way that we get it within the confines of the cloth. So, while it is an ideal situation I am certain there is not the money to pay for it.

I will go back to dealing with it without the example because we are dealing with roads here. What I am saying is that I think this resolution is more than we can afford. We must cut our garment in such a way that we get it within the confines of the cloth. So, while it is an ideal situation I am certain there is not the money to pay for it.

I opposed the Master Ground Transportation Plan on those broad principles that I have now mentioned here. I will be opposing this on that basis. What I am really saying to the Member for Communications and Works is would he please find some way of going back and doing his sums, telling the House how much this is going to cost, how much the different portions of it are going to cost?
If he can convince me that this country can afford what is being put up, that it is not going to take more than about 9 per cent, because I would not like to go up to 10 per cent of the normal revenue of this country, if he can satisfy me that the other priority areas, such as those relating to drugs, schools, medical and that sort of thing are adequately dealt with, then I would be only too happy to agree with it. I do not think, at least in his formal presentation today, that he has mentioned what the cost would be. I do believe somebody has to do the sums on this before we commit this country to something which is going to bankrupt it, in a very short period of time.

In summary, on the second ground, I feel when you are going to affect... and I appreciate, do not get me wrong, people can live in their houses until Government moves in and builds the roads, it does not affect that aspect, but it does stop any extensive development in these corridors. After all, a man's home and his land is his castle. I think he should be given a right to object and make representations to show alternatives and, perhaps, even to choose between spending and extra 15 minutes in his car rather than losing a home that he might very much cherish. A lot of these people are elderly people. It is not very nice when they have to be moved out at that stage. It is going to affect a lot of homes in George Town. It is going to affect a lot of buildings. I believe we have to go into it more carefully.

What I am asking is that the Member, rather than ending up in this House without any direct confrontation, try to work out sometime between now and when the vote is taken some way of postponing it or moving it into some other type of machinery or something whereby you can try to satisfy us and the public, because I have a lot of people worried out the extent of this. This is something that should be done at this time. I am here, once again, throwing out (as we tried to do on the Labour Law) that, perhaps, the time has come when some consultation is necessary to try to find what is a more acceptable solution publicly on this very important matter.

I will leave it on the basis that I am open to suggestions. But I cannot support this in the form it is in. It is too expensive. The public has not been fully consulted to the extent I would like to see them consulted. The homework has not been done properly. We should know more about this before we can endorse this matter, especially if the Member is talking about starting to compensate people immediately on, what I think is going to be a breed of money that could put us in bankruptcy for the future. I am asking him to look at it in the light of constructive criticism and to come up with a more constructive solution to it.

Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT:

The First Elected Member for Bodden Town.

MR. ROY BODDEN:

Thank you, Mr. President.

This Motion before us is indeed an important one. In short, I would go as far as to describe it as revolutionary because if these Plans and amendments are enacted it is safe to say that life for us would not be the same again.

I would like to begin by commending the Honourable Member for putting together a Committee so illustrious and dedicated as to have produced such an excellent report. Indeed, the only detraction I can find (and although it is only one it is nevertheless a serious one) is the fact that while they say, "while not setting out the financial constraints as its chief concern the TAC felt it had a responsibility to ensure that its recommendations were financially viable." I find that a little contradictory.

However, as a guardian of the public's interest I have to say that based on the number of concerns which were expressed to me, I have to pay a special credence to the fact that

there are many unanswered questions. This movement, this Plan, this proposal is as far reaching and as potentially wide sweeping as the Enclosures Acts were in Britain. Anyone who has studied English history knows of the changes the Enclosures Act brought into Britain. Life indeed has not been the same since.

My questions are very fundamental ones: What is the cost of this? How will these funds be raised? If, as I presume, we will have to borrow them, how will they be repaid? How much land will Government have to expend? How much money will Government have to expend for land purchases? How will relocation be done? The more I study these maps, the more I realise that we will have to be moving many people who have been long time residents in some areas, in their homes, in their yards, in their gardens. This is not only economically disruptive, it is socially disruptive. I would suggest if it is not handled delicately, it could also be politically disruptive.

Now, taking it along its purely economic lines. If we offer these people compensation will that compensation be enough to help them procure a piece of land and build another comfortable habitation? I would suggest in many cases it will not, because, if my knowledge of some of my neighbourhoods are correct, many of these people live in good, old fashioned, humble Caymanian abodes. They will have to be moved - uprooted as I prefer to call it. Where will they go? Will the money be enough to acquire them land in some subdivision? First of all, will they want to go there?

Let me say that I have read a little, travelled a little, and my knowledge and experience suggests that no country in the world has successfully been able to solve its traffic problems. Some years ago I had the opportunity of training in Japan. I believe it is a world leader today in many respects, certainly economically. I have a Japanese friend and we were talking about the traffic problems because Tokyo is, perhaps, the worst city in the world for traffic congestion. They have some severe restrictions on motor cars and motor car owners. My friend told me that all of the traffic movements and the so-called tried improvements to solve the problems in Tokyo have, until this date, been unsuccessful. They have gone underground, in the air, and there still remains serious traffic congestion. What we can successfully do is transfer the problem from one point to the next.

I have a good friend in Caracas, Venezuela, who told me that they have the same problems. So what we are facing in Cayman is a phenomenon which is world wide. While I can see the effort, and I can understand the concern, and I commend the Member for his interest, I think we may be stepping in over our heads because if we realise that the problems that we are faced with now did not just happen over night, then we will also realise that the solution cannot be arrived at overnight. I would strongly suggest we seek out alternatives. A good example of an improvement unanimous by everyone who uses the route now, is what happened down at the Four T's junction by the George Town cemetery. Cosmetically it looks good. It is also very efficient. While I am not familiar with the actual dollars and cents cost of the improvements, it would strike me that it did not cost an arm and a leg.

As the good representative that I am trying to be I have to be concerned about dollars and cents now that we are into the 1990s decade and that we are one of a few developing countries without budget deficits, without sanctions and manacles and handcuffs to the IMF and the other international lending agencies. We have to continue on our present path. We got this far, not by being ostentatious, not by embarking on prestige projects, or not by embarking on ventures that were not thoroughly weighed out and measured, but by cutting our coats according to the cloth we have. I am saying I am prepared, if the Honourable Member is so disposed, to support this venture in a less grandiose, a less ostentatious form. Let us take a look at some other alternatives.

Let us seriously take a look at some other alternatives because the message from many of my constituents is, "While we would like to drive on roads which are by and large hassle free and without traffic jams, we do not wish to do so at costs which we will have to pay and then pass on to our children and their children". I am afraid we did not spend enough time on what are the actual financial implications of this project.

I want to say something else because I believe I am one person in this Assembly singularly equipped to make this observation. The automobile business in this country, by and large, is almost dead. We have reached the saturation point. I would suggest that unless there is some economic miracle, some economic turn around not now perceived by the financial pundits, that automobile sales in the Cayman Islands will not increase substantially over the next decade. My statistics tell me that we are entering the period where automobile sales are grinding slower and slower and slower. That too is reason for us to say, let us make some reassessments; let us look at some alternatives. The demographics of our society suggests as much.

We have to be careful that we are not providing a roads system for no one to drive upon. We have to be careful that we are not saddling ourselves with a white elephant. I would like to remind the Honourable Member that roads (and he might want to take this with a grain of salt seeing as I am only a single entry bookkeeper accountant) are a liability. Once we build them, we have to spend monies to maintain them. Unless we are going into tolls, they will not be revenue earning. That is another reason.

I would like to suggest that my constituents are concerned that they will have to be paying for something they will not be using every day. Then when we launch off into other aspects of it, it is even more frightening when we think of the MGTP as a whole.

The good ship Cayman has been sailing very well, sailing very well. We have a good crew. We can continue to sail well but the captains have to realize that although they may be on the bridge, they need to find out from the people who work down in the engine room how the engines are going because they cannot be on the bridge and in the engine room at the same time. The people down in the engine room are telling them that the old engines are creaking and screaming because they have maximum torque and we do not know how long we can sail at that rate.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT:

At that point we will suspend for 15 minutes.

AT 4:05 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 4:25 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Proceedings are resumed. The debate on Government Motion number 7/89 continuing. The Second Elected Member for the Lesser Islands...

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN:

Thank you, Mr. President.

I rise to speak on the Motion before this Honourable House relating to the insertion of three new plans in the present plan for the roads system in the Cayman Islands as set out as a result of the Master Ground Transportation Plan.

I listened as the Member moving the Bill spoke and lots of thoughts went through my mind. One was precisely where are our priorities? If the Master Ground Transportation Plan is a priority, was it arbitrarily arrived at, or has the Government adopted it as a result of sounding out the public, the people and finding out if this is indeed their thoughts on a priority?

It does seem that the Government of the day is placing extremely high priority on this matter of roads. The development of roads in this island because if one looks in the Estimates which have been presented only last Friday, considerable sums of money are allocated for road construction.

On a whole, I have certain concerns about the Master Ground Transportation Plan because I fail to agree or accept what appears to be the position of the Government of the day that the main priority of the Cayman Islands is a very elaborate roads system. There are so many matters which need attention. The fact that one year ago the present House was elected, I do not recall this particular matter as being banded about too much as a priority or a goal for Members on either side of this House. It simply came to life now. It is being pursued hotly.

I can appreciate the fact that there are technically qualified people in this society who were appointed to a Committee that produced a report. A well documented report, I think. The fact that to produce it, if we were paying those persons, would have cost considerable money. I can also appreciate that the Government prior to this one thought it necessary to have a study done of the roads system of the Cayman Islands to determine precisely where we were at. Which was the Master Ground Transportation Plan which, I think, now is getting about two years old.

I can appreciate and understand all of those things but the present situation and the present pressing priority of this really escapes me. To the best of my knowledge every country of the world has traffic jams at sometime during the day, at peak hours, and they manage. We certainly have ours and we manage. The fact that we have arrived to where we are right now using basically the same roads we have been using for the past 10 or 15 or 20 years, there have been a few side roads and so on done and some improvements to what we had.

I fail to see or subscribe to the idea that the fact that we have good roads in the Cayman Islands are going to attract tourists to come to the Cayman Islands. They do not come simply because a country has good roads, super highways as the case may be. They come there for the element of the country, the people and what the culture has to offer. First of all I have great difficulty in understanding at this time what is the great rush and the great priority of the roads...

MR. PRESIDENT:

Could I just interrupt you for a moment? It is 4:30, I would remind Members that tomorrow the House will begin the debate on the Second Reading of the Appropriations Bill and that may take some days and then Finance Committee. Would you wish to complete the debate on this Motion this evening or how do you feel?

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN:

just as soon come back at it tomorrow then.

Mr. President, I do not know the will of the House, but I would

MR. PRESIDENT:

we not specifically adjourn for that purpose?

Tomorrow? Are we not continuing with the Budget Debate? Did

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON:

up this one and then get into the Budget Debate.

Mr. President, perhaps the Members will concede that we finish

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:

I have a meeting at 7:30.

Mr. President, I would move that we go on until at least 6:00 pm.

MR. PRESIDENT:

was that it will be a long time before resuming this debate if we do not go ahead. Should we continue? Would you move accordingly please?

I am sorry, I do not have the will of the House?

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON:

I am not sure the will of the House has been voiced yet, Sir.

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER:

we would continue the debate on this issue tomorrow morning and complete this before we move into the Budget debate, not complete it this afternoon.

Mr. President, I understood the First Official Member to say that

MR. PRESIDENT:

please?

If you would so prefer. Would you move the adjournment

ADJOURNMENT

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON:

House until 10:00 tomorrow morning, Sir.

I would be happy to 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:

tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock.

The Ayes have it. The House is accordingly adjourned until

AT 4:33 P.M. THE HOUSE STOOD ADJOURNED UNTIL 10:00 A.M., WEDNESDAY, 22ND NOVEMBER, 1989.

**WEDNESDAY
22ND NOVEMBER, 1989
10:08 A.M.**

MR. PRESIDENT:
Services.

Prayers by the Honourable Member for Health and Social

PRAYERS

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER:

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:
Honourable Member for Education.

Proceedings of the Assembly are resumed. Papers. The

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS AND REPORTS

**NATIONAL TRUST FOR THE CAYMAN ISLANDS
ANNUAL REPORT AND AUDITED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31ST JULY, 1989**

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS:

Mr. President, under Standing Order 16, and as required under section 12 of the National Trust for the Cayman Islands (Law 22 of 1987), I beg to lay on the Table of this Honourable House the Report of the National Trust for the Cayman Islands for the year 1988-89, together with the statements for the year ending July 31st, 1989, and the period from inception September 14, 1987, to the 31st of July 1988. These statements have been audited and certified by the auditors.

MR. PRESIDENT:

So ordered.

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS:

Mr. President, the Financial Statements are in the usual form for an organisation such as the National Trust and do not call for any special comment. The Annual Report discloses that the Trust has had a very active and successful year. The Report is very detailed and comprehensive. The activities of the Trust have been given wide coverage in the media, so in the interest of time I do not intend to go into too much detail.

The two most important projects of the Trust during the year have been the Memory Bank project which was undertaken jointly with the Cayman Islands Museum Board and the restoration of Fort George in George Town. The Memory Bank project, as Members will know, involves the interviewing of our older citizens, recording those interviews on tape and transcribing those interviews so that we will have a permanent record of as much of our history and heritage as possible, as told by our senior citizens.

Among the many ambitious projects planned for the coming year is the creation of Botanical Gardens on lands in the Frank Sound Road area, as well as renovation and preservation of the old Savannah school.

I would like to place on record the thanks of Government, and the people of the Cayman Islands, to the Chairman and members of the Trust Council, as well as the Chairman of the District Committees and their members. Also, to the Chairman and the membership of the various Standing Committees of the National Trust. In fact, thanks is due to many people who have given generously of their time and substance to the work of the National Trust.

Of particular note is the work which the Trust has been doing through, and with, the youth of the country. The response of our youth has been most gratifying.

In closing I wish to express our best wishes to the Trust for the

successful carrying out of its planned activities for this year.
Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: Item 3 on today's Order Paper. Questions. Number 121, the Second Elected Member for the Lesser Islands.

QUESTIONS TO HONOURABLE MEMBERS

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE LESSER ISLANDS TO ASK THE HONOURABLE ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR COMMUNICATIONS WORKS AND NATURAL RESOURCES

NO. 121: Would the Honourable Member say what progress is being made to have the feeder roads in Cayman Brac Gazetted for improvements, particulars of which were submitted to the Portfolio of Communications Works and Natural Resources earlier this year?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Concerning the progress to feeder roads in Cayman Brac, the roads in question are as follows:

- (1) Dilberts Ave.: A request has been made to the Chief Surveyor, Lands and Survey, to prepare a boundary plan showing the road as realigned and being 16 feet wide. A boundary plan is necessary in order to provide the technical details for the Legal Department to prepare the Gazette notice. Additionally, a small piece of land necessary for the new road has been valued by the Lands Officer and steps are being taken to acquire the property.
- (2) Cayman Brac West - 94D: A request has been made to the chief surveyor to prepare a boundary plan showing the road as 16 feet wide.
- (3) Access Road at the end of South Coast Road - CBE/82: This road has already been Gazetted.
- (4) Access Road at Spot Bay - CBE 111A/4: That road has already been Gazetted.
- (5) Request to close West end Crossroad at 93C/70: A boundary plan was requested and obtained from the Chief Surveyor. The Gazette notice has been prepared by the Legal Department. At the next sitting of the Executive Council a paper will be presented requesting final approval.
- (6) Access Road at Cayman Brac West - 95C & D: That road has already been Gazetted.
- (7) Ann Tatum Road at Cayman Brac East - 109E: A request has been made to the Chief Surveyor to prepare a boundary plan showing the road as being 16 feet wide.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Mr. President, could the Honourable Member give some indication as to why it has taken the time it has to get these roads Gazetted for works to be undertaken?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, it is mainly due to the tremendous work load, not only in the Portfolio but also in the other departments which deal with this matter: namely, the Lands and Survey Department and the Legal Department.

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Mr. President, in view of the fact that there are only a few days left until the end of the year, and monies in the Budget will normally lapse, have any provisions been made for the amounts which are in the Budget this year to be re-voted next year?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, the answer is yes, funds have been requested for re-voting.

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Mr. President, could the Honourable Member say if there is any hope that the work on some of these roads will start between now and the closing of Public Works Department for Christmas?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: The answer, Mr. President, is that we are certainly trying to get these started as soon as possible.

MR. PRESIDENT: If there are no more supplementaries, question 122, the Second Elected Member for the Lesser Islands.

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE LESSER ISLANDS TO ASK THE Honourable FIRST OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT

NO. 122: Would the Honourable Member say what is the process by which banks in the Cayman Islands set their lending rates?

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Lending in Cayman Islands' dollars is based on the C.I. dollar prime rate. The lending rate is usually C.I. dollar prime, plus 3 per cent or plus 4 per cent. Lending in United States' dollars is based on the New York prime rate, three month or six month LIBOR, depending on the type of loan, customer, size of loan, etcetera.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Mr. President, would the Honourable Member explain the Cayman Islands prime rate?

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, the Cayman Islands dollar prime rate is itself dictated by market conditions. It floats parallel to the U.S. three month LIBOR or New York prime rate and there is a two point differential. The clearing banks get together and agree on the actual C.I. dollar prime rate, depending on the U.S. LIBOR interest rates. The C.I. prime rate presently stands at 10 per cent.

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Mr. President, would the Honourable Member say if any agency in Government gives any indication to the banks in the Cayman Islands about what may be considered a reasonable lending rate?

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, before the clearing banks adjust their interest rate they usually acquaint me with what it is they are about to do. Just for an example, the three month LIBOR rate is a present standing at 8 and 3/8th per cent. The Cayman Islands prime rate is tied to this rate and now stands at 10 per cent. It moves in increments of one half of a per cent. If it did not, it should have been 10 and 3/8th per cent, but it is now 10 per cent.

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Mr. President, would the Honourable Member say it is true that the banks in the Cayman Islands set what rates they choose and that Government does not have any discretion in directing this at all?

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Not quite, Mr. President. There is a formula by which the C.I. prime rate moves. It is tied directly to the three month LIBOR rate, which I have just explained. The free market system that operates in the Cayman Islands does suggest that a bank charges a rate based on the ability of the customer to repay. Depending on the customer, there are levels of risks, and the higher the risks to the bank, the greater the interest charge that the bank will institute.

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Mr. President, based on what the Honourable Member has said, is there any formula by which a bank is guided as to how much they charge for lending the money versus what they pay on deposits?

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: The formula referred to earlier, Mr. President, has an influence both on the lending rate, as well as the fixed deposit rate in Cayman dollars.

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Mr. President, what I am trying to illicit is whether there are any guidelines or rules by which the banks in the Cayman Islands must be guided on the lending rates, as in the case of what they pay someone on deposit and what they charge; is it purely discretionary? For example, if they are paying 10 per cent on a deposit, can they charge 18 per cent if they feel the risk is high enough?

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, I think part of the answer to that is that there is no legislation that governs interest rates, how much it can charge as in some other countries. There is legislation that restricts what is sometimes called usury interest, or usury rates, which sometimes restricts the amount you can charge. There is no legal framework in the Cayman Islands which governs the interest rate in this country. But there is this formula I spoke of earlier which, to some extent, governs at least what the prime rate is and the other rates are based on that prime rate. Either 1 per cent or 2 per cent or 3 per cent or maybe a little bit more, depending on the customer and the customer's ability to repay.

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Last question, Mr. President. I appreciate the point the Honourable Member just made. Could the Honourable Member say if, to his knowledge, there has been any thought given by past Governments, or the Government at this time, with regard to enacting a Law which would bring about a basis for setting some standards or controls prescribing formulas by which the banks operate?

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: My personal view, Mr. President, is that it is better done by market forces than by legislation that, to some extent, may rigidly say what you should charge. If that happens there is this possibility that if you say to the bank they cannot charge more than 11 per cent and the bank finds that 11 per cent is not a profitable rate on which to lend money, the bank will not lend any money in the Cayman Islands. So there are arguments on both sides for this interest rate being legislated.

But there is a discretionary matter in it. I think if you remove that, we are going to have some difficulty locally. There are over 500 banks in the Cayman Islands and if you require financing I am sure it is available, if you have the ability to repay the loan. It is no different than if someone comes to you to borrow \$1,000 and you know he is not working and he has no ability to repay it, your answer is going to be I am sorry.

MR. PRESIDENT: We move to question 123. The First Elected Member for Bodden Town.

THE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR BODDEN TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR COMMUNICATIONS WORKS AND NATURAL RESOURCES

No. 123: Can the Honourable Member say why the Lemon Road, Shirley Towbis Lane and the road off Cumber Avenue in the Bodden Town area have, to date, not yet been repaired?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Road repairs in the Bodden Town area have been carried out in accordance with the funds allocated (\$100,000), the physical resources of the Public Works Department and the time available. The road off Cumber Avenue will be done the Last of November, 1989. Unfortunately, it was not possible to do all the roads requested, and Shirley Towbis Lane and Lemon Road had to be deferred.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. ROY BODDEN: Thank you, Mr. President. Can the Member say when Lemon Road and Shirley Towbis Lane will be repaired?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, it is my understanding that this will be given very urgent attention during the coming year, when funds are available.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Second Elected Member for Bodden Town.

MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. President. I wonder if the Member could give a reason why in the case of Shirley Towbis Lane and Lemon Road, the equipment went in there and work started but not completed?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Again, Mr. President, I am advised that the reason for this was, number 1: funds were not available; and we went in there to effect very minor repairs.

MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH: Supplementary, Mr. President. Can the Member say why a particular piece of road in South Cayman Palms which was not down to be repaired was worked on after these two roads in Northward Subdivision had been started?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, again, my understanding is that this was a part of the Public Works Maintenance Programme for this year.

MR. ROY BODDEN: Can the Member say if the road repair work undertaken was done in consultation and in conjunction with the list of requested repair work submitted by myself and my colleague?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, perhaps the Member is not aware, but Public Works carries out maintenance work as a routine matter without necessarily having to consult with Members directly responsible for the constituency. This has been done for many years. It is not a new thing which has just been started.

MR. FRANKLIN SMITH: Supplementary, Mr. President, the particular road in South Cayman Palms was unusable. This road in particular has just been usable now since they have gone in there. No one was using that road before.

MR. PRESIDENT: That did not appear to be a question, so I do not think the Member has to reply, unless you wish to reply and take it as a question? You could take it as a question being: Why is it that...

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Yes, Mr. President, I will be happy to answer it even though it was a statement. As I said earlier Public Works regarded that area, like many other areas throughout the Islands, as an area requiring maintenance repair in the normal course of doing maintenance repairs to the roads.

MR. ROY BODDEN: Supplementary, Mr. President, can the Member say if the decision to repair these roads early in the new year was made subsequent to my tabling these questions?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, the answer is no.

MR. PRESIDENT: Next question, please.

THE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR BODDEN TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR COMMUNICATIONS WORKS AND NATURAL RESOURCES

No. 124: Can the Honourable Member explain why money is continuously voted for the Beach Bay Road project, yet no work has been done to date?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: The initial survey was done in January 1989 and design work was completed in June 1989. It was determined that certain modifications to the right-of-way are necessary. The Gazetting process in respect of these modifications has not yet been completed. The existing marl road is maintained annually by the Public Works Department.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. PRESIDENT: The Second Elected Member for Bodden Town.

MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH: Supplementary, Mr. President, I wonder if the Member could say whether the money which was voted in 1989 has been re-voted to 1990.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: The answer, Mr. President, is yes, however just so I can give a little more information on that, I would like to point out that within the district of Bodden Town, there were six new roads repaired during this year, at a cost of \$105,500. Twelve roads were requested at a cost of \$225,700. Of these, six new roads have been built.

MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH: Mr. President, supplementary, could the Member name the six new roads please?

MR. PRESIDENT: We will take this supplementary, but we are getting away from the original question.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Yes, Mr. President, we will circulate these names. I am sure the Member should already have this information but we will circulate these to the Members as soon as possible.

MR. ROY BODDEN: Mr. President, thank you. Can the Member say when, exactly, will the Beach Bay Road be repaired to the expected standards.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Gazetting now appears scheduled for early 1990. Preliminary testing of rock removal methods should start before the end of November to determine if blasting will be necessary. The results of these tests will determine the cost of upgrading the road. The construction will then be scheduled according to the availability of funds.

MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH: Supplementary, Mr. President, the Honourable Member said that the two Members should have had the names of the roads. Would he explain why we should have had it?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, with respect, I think that should be quite obvious to the Member. He gave me a list of 12 roads. So he should know the names of the roads.

MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH: Supplementary, Sir. Again, the Honourable Member says I gave him a list of 12 roads. I named one before which was done, which was not given; and I could name another one which was done which was not given. Which list did he go by, Sir?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, I think the Member is confused. We have two issues here, road repairs and new roads. I referred to 12 new roads, there is also the question of road repairs which were also carried out.

MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH: Mr. President, supplementary. Can the Honourable Member say if the list of names I submitted was new roads or roads to be resurfaced and repaired?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, again, it is my understanding that the list was for new roads.

MR. PRESIDENT: Perhaps you can get back to Beach Bay Road. The Second

Elected Member for the Lesser Islands.

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Thank you, Mr. President. Would the Honourable Member say why, since the existing Beach Bay Road has always easily and satisfactorily provided good driving for two cars passing each other, and it appeared that all that was necessary was to fix the surface of the road, why the road is being modified into a width which appears now to be about twice its original size?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, on the question of the road being satisfactory, this is not an opinion being shared by our technical people at Public Works. The reason it is being widened is because there are certain areas which are much too narrow for the development in the area, with the amount of traffic being developed in that area. Also, we had to flatten out the humps which were in the road. This is the reason why this construction work is being carried out.

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Mr. President, would the Member say who decided that road should be widened to the extent it is now, and why is it necessary to take out every single undulation that is very minor on that road?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Very simple, Mr. President. First, because of the necessary traffic standards which are required, and these roads should meet with the minimum engineering standards of the Public Works Department.

MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH: Mr. President, supplementary. I wonder if the Honourable Member could pass a copy of his list of roads to be submitted first, I left my old list at home?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, I would be happy to provide the Member with this list. We do not have it here but we will get it to him as quickly as possible.

MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH: Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT: Question number 125, the First Elected Member for the Lesser Islands.

THE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE LESSER ISLANDS TO ASK THE HONOURABLE ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR TOURISM AVIATION AND TRADE

NO. 125: Would the Honourable Member say whether consideration is being given to extend the runway at Edward Bodden Airport (West End side) in Little Cayman?

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN: Although the situation regarding the airport at Little Cayman has been discussed at Departmental and Portfolio level, no definite decision has been taken to extend the runway. However, by this means, the Portfolio of Tourism, Aviation and Trade will give the undertaking to have a thorough study of this project conducted within the next six months in order to clearly establish an Airport Development Plan for Little Cayman.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

CAPT. MABRY S. KIRKCONNELL: Supplementary, Mr. President. I wonder if the Honourable Member would undertake to have the extension, which was started on the West End completed, as that was only half done and it needs to be completed?

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN: Yes, Mr. President, I could give an undertaking to have that completed. I should draw the attention of the House to the fact that many of the problems surrounding the Little Cayman Airport are due to the fact that the property on which this air strip is situated is privately owned. The Government has to take a decision as to whether to acquire the land and further develop that site, or whether to look at the possibility of relocating it. But I will give the First Elected Member for the Lesser Islands the undertaking to see that work is completed.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Third Elected Member for George Town.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Mr. President, would the Honourable Member say whether the Government has not in the immediate past looked at an alternative site for this? I wonder what the results may have been for this airport?

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN: My understanding, Mr. President, is that some time ago alternate sites were looked at, but I do not think any decision was reached. My understanding is that Government owns property further inland which could possibly be used. After discussing this with the Director of Civil Aviation I understand it is quite costly to develop. There is another site north of the present location (and that property is preferred) but that is privately owned and would have to be purchased by Government. I have given an

undertaking... and I intend to come to grips with this because it is a matter I do feel cannot be postponed any longer.

MR. PRESIDENT: Question number 126. The First Elected Member for the Lesser Islands.

THE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE LESSER ISLANDS TO ASK THE HONOURABLE ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR TOURISM AVIATION AND TRADE

NO. 126: Would the Honourable Member say whether Cayman Airways Limited plans to upgrade the air service between Grand Cayman/Cayman Brac/Little Cayman with a commuter type aircraft?

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN: The Board of Directors of Cayman Airways Limited is still awaiting the report of the in-house study on the inter-island route before making a recommendation to the portfolio.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

CAPT. MABRY S. KIRKCONNELL: Supplementary, Mr. President. I wonder if the Honourable Member would have any idea when this in-house survey or study will be completed?

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN: Mr. President, I would say within the next two to three months. A question similar to this was tabled in September and not a great deal of progress has been made regarding this study for various reasons, which I explained to the House at that meeting in September. However, the Directors have taken a decision just recently, at one of their meetings, that if they are not able to have this in-house study completed on the inter-island service they will have to make alternative arrangements and have somebody from the outside prepare the study. Their first preference is to have the in-house study completed.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Mr. President, can the Honourable Member say why this is taking so long, since it only took a short period to sell the two 727s and lease the two 737s...

MR. PRESIDENT: Sorry, that has nothing to do with the question. Will you please stick to the line of thought?

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: May I ask further, then, why is it taking so long, and what is the difference in the make-up of this team that is studying it as compared to the in-house team that did the previous study on the jets?

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN: The 737 study took six months. The study that was commissioned for the inter-island service, the Board requested two of their pilots and two members from their operations staff to conduct this study. For various reasons some of them resigned and it ended up with only one of the original appointees remaining on the study team. Replacements had to be found, and I think I explained that at another meeting as well. Hopefully better progress will be made within the next couple of months to have the study completed.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: How long, then, does the Honourable Member estimate that the study has taken from the time it began to when he proposes to end it? You said in a couple of months. Could you tell us when it started and when you propose it will end?

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN: I would probably have to do some thorough research on that to give him the exact time, Mr. President. I would estimate it was probably about six months too.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER 23(7)&(8)

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, under Standing Order 83 I move the suspension of Standing Order 23(7) and (8) to allow the other questions and supplementaries to be taken.

MR. PRESIDENT: I shall put the question. Those in favour please say Aye...Those against No.

AYES.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Ayes have it.

AGREED. STANDING ORDER 23(7)&(8) SUSPENDED.

MR. PRESIDENT: No further supplementaries? Question number 127, the First Elected Member for the Lesser Islands.

undertaking... and I intend to come to grips with this because it is a matter I do feel cannot be postponed any longer.

MR. PRESIDENT: Question number 126. The First Elected Member for the Lesser Islands.

THE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE LESSER ISLANDS TO ASK THE HONOURABLE ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR TOURISM AVIATION AND TRADE

NO. 126: Would the Honourable Member say whether Cayman Airways Limited plans to upgrade the air service between Grand Cayman/Cayman Brac/Little Cayman with a commuter type aircraft?

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN: The Board of Directors of Cayman Airways Limited is still awaiting the report of the in-house study on the Inter-island route before making a recommendation to the portfolio.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

CAPT. MABRY S. KIRKCONNELL: Supplementary, Mr. President. I wonder if the Honourable Member would have any idea when this in-house survey or study will be completed?

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN: Mr. President, I would say within the next two to three months. A question similar to this was tabled in September and not a great deal of progress has been made regarding this study for various reasons, which I explained to the House at that meeting in September. However, the Directors have taken a decision just recently, at one of their meetings, that if they are not able to have this in-house study completed on the inter-Island service they will have to make alternative arrangements and have somebody from the outside prepare the study. Their first preference is to have the in-house study completed.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Mr. President, can the Honourable Member say why this is taking so long, since it only took a short period to sell the two 727s and lease the two 737s...

MR. PRESIDENT: Sorry, that has nothing to do with the question. Will you please stick to the line of thought?

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: May I ask further, then, why is it taking so long, and what is the difference in the make-up of this team that is studying it as compared to the in-house team that did the previous study on the jets?

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN: The 737 study took six months. The study that was commissioned for the inter-Island service, the Board requested two of their pilots and two members from their operations staff to conduct this study. For various reasons some of them resigned and it ended up with only one of the original appointees remaining on the study team. Replacements had to be found, and I think I explained that at another meeting as well. Hopefully better progress will be made within the next couple of months to have the study completed.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: How long, then, does the Honourable Member estimate that the study has taken from the time it began to when he proposes to end it? You said in a couple of months. Could you tell us when it started and when you propose it will end?

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN: I would probably have to do some thorough research on that to give him the exact time, Mr. President. I would estimate it was probably about six months too.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER 23(7)&(8)

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, under Standing Order 83 I move the suspension of Standing Order 23(7) and (8) to allow the other questions and supplementaries to be taken.

MR. PRESIDENT: I shall put the question. Those in favour please say Aye...Those against No.

AYES.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Ayes have it.

AGREED. STANDING ORDER 23(7)&(8) SUSPENDED.

MR. PRESIDENT: No further supplementaries?
Question number 127, the First Elected Member for the Lesser Islands.

THE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE LESSER ISLANDS TO ASK THE HONOURABLE ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR TOURISM AVIATION AND TRADE

NO. 127: Would the Honourable Member say whether any consideration is being given to make available for aircraft in Cayman Brac aviation gas and jet fuel?

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN: Over the past year several discussions have been held between Cayman Airways Limited and Texaco for the provision of jet fuel in Cayman Brac, but very little has been accomplished to date. However, a proposal is under consideration by the Portfolio of Communications Works and Natural Resources for bulk storage fuel facilities in Cayman Brac which, it is understood, if approved, would include the provision of aviation gas and jet fuel in Cayman Brac.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

CAPT. MABRY S. KIRKCONNELL: Supplementary, Mr. President. Does the Honourable Member agree that the availability of jet fuel for the Shorts Aircraft in Cayman Brac would add to her efficiency, in particular, to air service to Little Cayman?

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN: Very definitely, Mr. President. That has been one of the needs that the company has been trying to meet through an arrangement with Texaco because if fuel were available in Cayman Brac the pay load in and out of Little Cayman would be substantially higher.

CAPT. MABRY S. KIRKCONNELL: Supplementary, Mr. President. I wonder if the Honourable Member would undertake for some arrangements to be made prior to this major terminal? We have heard about getting bulk storage for the last 15 years in Cayman Brac and to date we have none. I am afraid that old age will take me out of here before that is completed. If some other arrangements could be made where small quantities of this type of fuel could be made available, then the efficiency of the Shorts aircraft, since it appears that we will have her for quite some time, would be improved.

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN: Mr. President, the company did discuss this with Texaco. They looked at some fuel tank storage facilities there, but the question of quality control comes into play and it was felt that the risk in aviation would be higher unless the proper facilities were in place. I understand from the Portfolio of Communications and Works that renewed efforts have been made and it is seriously under consideration and the new facility referred to should be in place by the middle of next year.

MR. PRESIDENT: Question number 128, the Third Elected Member for George Town.

THE THIRD ELECTED MEMBER FOR GEORGE TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR COMMUNICATIONS WORKS AND NATURAL RESOURCES

NO. 128: Can the Honourable Member say whether fluoride for the preservation of good teeth, especially for children, is being added to the piped water and, if not, can he give an undertaking to consider putting or having this product put into all the piped water?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Fluoride is not added to any of the Islands' piped water supply. I will give an undertaking to investigate the possibilities and practicalities of having this chemical added to the piped water supply.

That is the written answer, Mr. President, but I would like to elaborate on this. The Public Health Department has instituted a programme for dispensing fluoride tablets to children at primary school and the dental clinics. Also, there are many areas of the Islands that do not have piped water. Therefore this is the reason why the Public Health Department has taken this into the schools.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Mr. President, would the Honourable Member say that it is a fact, now we are getting piped water going to a very large amount of children, that this fluoride in the water to supplement the fluoride tablet programme that I began (I should mention it because I do know about it) would perhaps improve the distribution of the fluoride to children?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, I am glad the Member admitted having introduced this and I am glad he does not have it under his control now because for him to put fluoride in water in addition to the tablets being used, plus the amount of fluoride you get in toothpaste, could cause damage to the teeth of children. It has been known to give an effect of discoloration in the teeth of children if they get an overdose of fluoride. So it is felt that sufficient amounts of fluoride are now available from the tablets being given plus the amount they get in toothpaste.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Mr. President, would the Honourable Member undertake to look at the amount of fluoride in the distribution because I do understand there is a double system rather than the single system which has existed.

Despite this, in schools in George Town, West Bay areas where piped water is being run, would he please have a look to see if this, which is a much simpler alternative to the tablets, could be looked at? Would he ensure that there is no duplication as he has mentioned?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, as stated, I will give an undertaking to investigate the possibilities and practicalities of the matter being questioned.

MR. PRESIDENT: The last question on today's Order Paper, number 129. The Third Elected Member for West Bay.

THE THIRD ELECTED MEMBER FOR WEST BAY TO ASK THE HONOURABLE ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES

NO. 129: Would the Honourable Member say: a) How many persons in 1989 have applied to Government for assistance to attend the drug rehabilitation programme at Hazelden in Minnesota; b) How many persons were actually sent to the facility; and c) What was the cost to Government for the services?

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER: Mr. President, a) Seven persons have applied to Government to attend the drug rehabilitation programme at Hazelden in 1989; b) six persons were sent to this facility; and c) the total cost of these services is C.I. dollar48,080.46.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. JOHN D. JEFFERSON, JR.: Taking into consideration the cost, which according to my calculations works out to be about C.I. dollar8,000 per person, I wonder if the Honourable Member has considered changing his position about a local facility to which more persons would have access?

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER: No, Sir, I have not changed my position. My position still is that the demand, cost of construction of such a facility, and recurrent expenditure to run such a facility, the fact we would be developing the programme from scratch whereas the programme we are now using has 40 years experience does not warrant the development of such a programme at this time. It would be much more costly to do it locally.

MR. JOHN D. JEFFERSON, JR.: Supplementary, Mr. President. Taking into consideration the fact that only seven persons applied, I think we all recognise that we have a serious drug problem in this country. Does the Honourable Member feel that if we had a local facility more people would take advantage of the service?

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER: No, Sir. I guess I should point out that these people really do not apply to go to Hazelden or anywhere else. The process is that they go to the Community Counselling Centre here and are assessed by the Drug Councillor. If he thinks that in-house detoxification (which is available at Hazelden) is necessary and the candidate is willing and he would benefit from such a programme, it is recommended by the Drug Councillor that he go. It is not a thing where people come in and ask to go. They have to do certain tests and assessments to determine whether the person would benefit from such a programme because not all people benefit from it.

MR. JOHN D. JEFFERSON, JR.: Supplementary, Mr. President. I would like to thank the Honourable Member for the information, but taking that into consideration, does he have any idea how many persons are now being counselled by the local Drug Council office?

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER: Mr. President, I do not have accurate figures before me but I would undertake to get the exact number that are being treated locally and circulate to Members as soon as possible.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Third Elected Member for George Town.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Mr. President, would the Honourable Member say whether (having regard to the fact that in one of the two reports which were produced for you on drugs, that the demand was well in excess of this amount) it could be dealt with privately or not?

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER: Mr. President, I believe the report the Member is referring to was largely based on speculation and verbal comment by people interviewed. I think the experience at the Drug Counselling (having been set up for close to two years) will reveal that while there may be, and it is estimated that there are, several addicts, unless they come forward and are willing and ready to accept treatment the facility would not provide them with anything.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Through you, Sir. Does the Honourable Member feel that his programme is reaching a large amount of these people or not?

MR. PRESIDENT: We are getting a long way from the question. Would you like to take that one?

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER: Yes, Sir. I think the programme is successful. I think it is reaching a lot of people. There are quite a few patients at the centre and I think all those who the centre determines can benefit from treatment overseas, in terms of intensive rehab and detox, are presently being provided for.

MR. PRESIDENT: Questions are concluded.
Item 4 on today's Order Paper, continuation of the debate on Government Motion number 7/89. The Second Elected Member for the Lesser Islands.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

MOTIONS

GOVERNMENT MOTION NO. 7/89

AMENDMENT TO THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN 1977

(Continuation of debate thereon)

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Thank you, Mr. President.
When we adjourned yesterday afternoon I was making the point that I found it difficult to appreciate the priority which is being given to the Master Ground Transportation Plan; indeed, the request that is before the House to insert three new maps and replace three which have already been approved for the George Town section. Mr. President...

[Hon. Linford A. Pierson rose]

MR. PRESIDENT: Is this a point of clarification or a point of order? The speaker has given way, so you have the floor.

POINT OF CLARIFICATION

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, just to clarify one point. The three maps that are being presented as the prescribed composite maps for George Town are not replacing any previous maps which were laid on the Table of this House. In May when the prescribed composite maps were laid on the Table of the House, there was a gap in those maps for the area of Central George Town. It was explained at that time that those maps would be presented at a later sitting of the House. The maps which are now being laid, or being requested for adoption, will just fill the gap which was left open by those maps at that time.

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Mr. President, whether the space is being filled or whether it is replacing, I make the point that George Town is certainly being filled with a massive number of roads. I am not aware that there have been any people polled about whether they would wish roads to be placed in George Town as proposed. There is no indication of the financing for these roads. Certainly, there is no indication of how the Government proposes to pay if, indeed, there is such financing.

I have heard that one of the ideas in this proposal is to assist the Central Planning Authority (CPA) in its decision-making process, because people are regularly applying to the CPA for approvals for various buildings, be it commercial or residential. These would fall into corridors or areas where it is proposed to put these roads. Unless these corridors have been identified in Law and in the maps, the CPA is at a disadvantage to say no. I also understand that the CPA has expressed concern that if they approve buildings in a certain area, that at a later date for Government to purchase them they will cost much more. Be that as it may, that is surely a political worry and I do not see that as really falling within the function or requirements of the CPA.

The land which exists in the George Town area is owned by someone, somewhere. I have serious concerns that this land is owned in several instances by persons in the lower income bracket, and that they have that particular parcel of land and little more for themselves as an asset. Of course where that land is situated is significant because we know that in Central George Town that there are extremely high prices placed on land, per square foot. But then there are also sections within the George Town perimeters that would attract very little money, simply because of where it is and the purpose for which it is presently zoned.

So far, in George Town there have been some improvements at junctions in the road. These have helped. Monies were allocated this year for it and it has assisted traffic flow. I think all Members of this House have looked at the situation and they approved the funds because they thought it would help. It has. The monies which were voted were within the ability of the Government to repay as far as the estimates showed us for this year. If I am not mistaken, however, there was an increase in the supplementary to have some of these works taken care of - if I am wrong, I am sure the Member will correct me on that - so, even

though initially (and certainly this is something to be taken into account) a certain amount is voted and estimated to cost so much in the beginning, there is always the chance of overruns.

It is also well for us to realise quite clearly that the rapid and immense development in this country that has taken place over the past 10 years, if you will, that the present road system, including the road system in George Town, has provided the means for whatever traffic that has to move over it, for whatever purpose. Right at this moment there are hundreds of cars moving around the streets of George Town and, like everywhere else, there are certain times of the day when there is traffic congestion. That is a normal thing. It is to be expected where there are motor cars and that people move from one place to the other at different times, such as going to work in the morning, lunch hours and going back home, which causes congestion. I do not think there are persons in this country (in George Town, or West Bay or elsewhere) raising alarms and lamenting the situation that they cannot drive at the pace they would like to drive at, or that the country is being hurt because of the pace that traffic now moves on the roads. I think this matter has been arrived at as a result of projections done in the Master Ground Transportation Plan. Those projections can only be meaningful if the trend continues. I know of no guarantee on that.

We have spent a prescribed amount of money so far on the plan and on correcting certain intersections here in George Town. The monies, as I said previously, have been realistically provided for that particular aspect. In my opinion, it falls in line with the revenue that is coming in and what we are able to afford for that particular aspect of expenditure. Costs are involved. This is one inescapable aspect of this whole Master Ground Transportation Plan. As I said, to date I have not heard the populace, the business populace for that matter, saying that for their business to survive or to create business for themselves there has to be such a road system on this Island. In fact, I have heard very many people express concern about the great priority that is being given to this particular aspect of development in the country at this time. I do not mean just the little man on the street, because, for one reason or another, in some instances they tend to be less concerned. I am talking about business people. The thing I hear constantly is: 'But where is Government going to get the money? How are we going to pay for it?' I have heard that expressed by persons well placed in high financial circles, including banks and bank managers.

For this to be done it is going to cost millions of dollars. That much keeps cropping up and popping up. If I remember correctly, in the Budget presentation it was said that the present first phase aspect (which would take into account at least part of George Town) would be in the region of \$22 million. But there were no precise figures on it. There is no costing which has been presented to the House immediately available or precise. Yet the House is being asked to agree and accept certain plans which, it is my understanding that once they are accepted, will create corridors in the George Town area. Those corridors, in effect, will become reserved - another word is 'condemned' - because then it appears the Central Planning Authority will advise persons who own the land that they cannot build, be it their house or commercial building or whatever. That is condemning land and buildings which are legally owned by citizens of this country. So it cannot be a slight or small request which is now before this House.

I have heard that there are already persons in the George Town area who have been advised that their houses and their land falls within these corridors. Yesterday I was approached by a person of substance in George Town who said if this present plan is implemented it could put a 50 foot road between his house and his grandfather's house and it has always been one property. These are real considerations that we should take into account. It is not just a matter of approving plans for roads in George Town, it has much deeper implications.

The Estimates for this year clearly identify in the capital works a very large percentage (or slice) of money that is going towards this undertaking. Certainly, it is something that I thought about, but I have learned since I have been in this House that there is hardly any real thing called a balanced budget because the amount asked for at budget time, whatever it is, by the time you add to that amount the amount of supplementaries which are added to that budget it leaves a wide scope not to believe there is such a thing as a balanced budget. And this year is no exception because we have had very heavy supplementary expenditures.

MR. PRESIDENT: Would it be convenient for you to break there for you?

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Yes, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Proceedings are suspended for 15 minutes.

AT 11:32 A.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 11:59 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Proceedings of the House are resumed. The Second Elected Member for the Lesser Islands continuing.

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Thank you, Mr. President.
Before we went to break I was speaking on the matter of costs involved with the proposed road development in George Town. I would like to add that to the best of my understanding roads comprise an expenditure but they are hardly revenue earning unless persons who drive on them are going to be charged for doing so through tolls or some other means or methods. If that is to be done, it is incumbent upon this Government to say so. The public ought to know. The people who might expect to be using

them ought to know and either agree or disagree that they are prepared to do so or not. So, in my opinion it is crucial to the whole process that we know what costs are involved.

There is also the matter of compensation. If we put in corridors and these corridors become reserved (or condemned) properties to the extent that people cannot develop them or sell for any purpose except to Government for roads, then the question of compensation has to be taken into account. If we have to compensate now it means we do not have the money now and perhaps this should not be done until such time that there is such money available to compensate the people. Compensation will undoubtedly be in the millions. Apparently we do not have the cost.

One of the things that bothers me about the map which has been given to us and which we are being asked to approve is that these new roads will pass through certain areas in which our people in the lower income brackets reside. I notice that it will pass by and affect a number of parcels in Watlers Road. It will also affect land in the Rock Hole area. It will affect land right at the junction by the Flowers Block Factory. I wonder if the lady who owns the house opposite that junction agrees or wants the road to go through her house? These are all very real and practical concerns that should be addressed.

If we take any low income area of the George Town district and say it will not cost much to purchase the land in any given, particular spot, that is true. So it will not cost Government a lot. But what is it going to cost the person who is being displaced? Irrespective of how bad the housing may be, that person is living in a house - the only one he or she has. Are they going to get enough money through compensation to go to some subdivision somewhere else on this Island and buy a parcel of land and build a house on it? In my opinion there are going to be a number of instances where that will not happen. What is Government going to do about things like that? It is also the case that although the land in the areas identified may initially be cheap when they are purchased, once they are rezoned (as they most likely will be) it will become valuable. Will it provide an opportunity for speculators, both foreign and Caymanian, to simply buy up the land that is going to be affected and use it purely for their own gain?

There is reason for serious concern. If the people are to be paid now, where does the money come from? If they are to be paid down the line, where is the money coming from? How will the displacement of people and buildings be effected? Has the Government taken into account that socially there are persons who do not want to leave the area where they have been living for generations and move somewhere else? Or does Government not pay very much priority to that?

Another aspect of this matter is that this development in George Town does not assist other district needs for roads. It does not assist Bodden Town, it does not assist North Side, it does not assist East End, it does not assist West Bay; and it would hardly seem to be necessary to say that it could not assist Cayman Brac and Little Cayman. Roads are needed in all of these districts, not just one. Although I have heard one argument that there will be so much development here in George Town, that the Government will earn so much money the revenue will be improved so much, thus the other districts will be helped. My question is when? Why not right now? I expect I will hear a differing view by word or vote later on.

I believe the matter of roads has to be taken in the perspective of how roads help improve the quality of life for people in neighbourhoods and areas of these Islands. A side road could be improved that helps 50 people from just having a dusty track there, the aged being able to access the main road better. These are areas that need to be taken into account. Roads need resurfacing. The eastern districts in Grand Cayman, certainly the south side roads in Cayman Brac and the south side roads in Little Cayman - all of these needs are seeking priorities and I cannot see the one priority to commit this country to being the one for George Town.

I have been told today in this House that the provisions in the Estimates for this year will be re-voted for some side roads in Cayman Brac. I do look forward to seeing these roads worked on and improved because the requests for these roads were done with the idea that it would improve the quality of life and make things a little easier for the people in Cayman Brac. I do look forward to seeing those worked on because in next year's Estimates I do not see any money for those roads there.

The talk that is emanating from the Government side, as I have heard, is that the country is going to develop around these roads and there is going to be revenue. I continually ask the question: Development for whom? What kind of development are we talking about? Is it going to be development that requires more people to work? Where are those people coming from? They surely cannot be Caymanians because everything the Government says to us about the labour force is that we do not have enough and where we have enough, they say we are not qualified.

I believe that if Government is going to expend large amounts of money it has to have some sort of meaningful assistance to the people's social, financial and economic lives. The road which is proposed will serve in a limited way those who choose to get off on those particular roads to zip about speedily, as that seems to be the idea. It will surely be meaningful for those who get the contract for the works. I personally have heard much speculation about that aspect of it, as to who and why and all the rest of it.

Another matter I think will not be served by this road are certain businesses. We have businesses already located in certain areas in George Town and those businesses can be affected by a road being placed at a location where it does not bring cars past those businesses as it did before. They can lose patronage. They can lose business because of it. On the other hand, it brings about a wide market for speculators who will want to buy along the road corridors to set up new businesses. I have had some representation from some business people who are concerned about what these roads will do to their businesses.

Having said what I have said, Mr. President, I think alternatives to the proposal would be in order. I think it is possible if the idea is to lighten up traffic pouring in from West Bay and going into West Bay, and getting to the airport and so on, that some of those dyke roads that are already in existence could be developed. Some of them now move through major parts of this area. I believe the West Bay

Road which, again, has been ascertained in this House during this meeting can be widened to where it is four lanes of traffic. Right now two lanes are providing the wherewithal for traffic to move. If it goes to four, it would seem to me like a 100 per cent increase. I believe resurfacing of roads in the various districts which need it would help immediately people who travel on them because there is as much need for people in any of the other districts to have suitable roads to move quickly on, as there is in George Town.

I believe if we have plans on a yearly basis, as we do, the Government can provide a certain amount of money to do a certain piece of work. The country at this stage does not have to enter a large debt undertaking to produce the situation which is requested. We will be able to afford what we spend if we take it timely and year by year, step by step.

Lastly, I do not believe this country sees the development of a road system in George Town as a priority. I believe it is only the Government that sees it as a priority. Certainly, it has been known for them to have their priorities wrong. I do not believe it is wise to impose an expense and an indebtedness on this country to the tune that is being considered at this time. Thirdly, I think the people of this country need to be clearly and totally informed about the implications of the whole Master Ground Transportation Plan and the plan for George Town.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT:

The Honourable Member for Health.

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER:

Mr. President, I rise to support the Government Motion, which is to amend the Development and Planning Law and basically to add sheets 3 and 20 to those composite maps which were tabled and approved by this Honourable House in May of this year.

These maps are a result of a very thorough and complete planning process, conducted by Government during 1987 and completed and accepted by tabling in this Honourable House in March 1988. The reason for that study and detailed planning approach was to ascertain what the transportation needs in terms of road networks were for basically the western half of Grand Cayman. I do not believe anybody proposed that Plan was going to solve or prevent in the future having a traffic jam because some Members have alluded to the fact that since other countries have not successfully solved the event of traffic jams during peak hours, there is some doubt as to whether this Plan could be effective at all and worth the effort.

I believe the Plan was intended to provide a comprehensive network of roads. Roads which did not simply do what has been done in the past by ad hoc planning - to build a road here, there and tither - and simply move the problem from one junction to another. It was done as a complete project in a very integrated form to provide a smoother, faster flow and to give a greater capacity to existing and future roads for some while in the future in this country. There was much public discussion. There was much public input into the development of these Plans during the years 1987 and the early part of 1988. One Member said he did not see the urgency in passing these Plans because it was not a campaign issue in the last Election. That is true. It was not a campaign issue, but I believe that was due to the fact that the Plans had been accepted by Government prior to the campaign and they were so good and the people wanted them that they would not hazard, at that time, to criticise the Plans publicly.

Members have postulated that alternatives have not been adequately looked at. That leads me to wonder if Members have really studied the Master Ground Transportation Plan because most, if not all, of the alternatives - which could lead to comprehensive and integrated traffic flow in the western half of Grand Cayman - were looked at in some detail. I believe at one time there was up to five different routes being looked at for the new north/south arterial way which will eventually wind up in West Bay. Suffice it to say that what Members are now suggesting (that the West Bay Road be widened to four lanes can solve the problem)... I would like to quote from the Master Ground Transportation Plan which was tabled in March, 1988. One of the alternatives is the West Bay Road corridor:

"The first option, one lane in each direction with a centre turn lane, required closing of many existing private entrances to West Bay Road in favour of new access roads serving the rear of severed properties. The cost of improvements to West Bay Road, including access roads, was estimated to be CI \$4 million. Additional capacity gained by the work would be approximately 6,000 vehicles per day (VPD), not sufficient to serve 1992 traffic."

Now, is it a better investment to invest the funds in areas that are going to give you a longer service time than if we started it today? One year for \$4 million? I would consider that a total waste of public funds, to spend \$4 million to upgrade something that is only going to defer the problem for 12 months.

Much has been made by Members speaking in opposition to these Plans, of the effects it is going to have on the public and the owners of land. It would be good if we could build roads in the air and we would not have to deal with people's land at all because anywhere, anyhow, anyplace, any time you build a road in the Cayman Islands it is going to affect someone's land.

I believe the Government took a reasonable position in 1988 when it changed the Law prior to which only allowed compensation for agricultural purposes or damage beyond use to where you will be compensated in a much more equitable fashion for these new roads. That has probably contributed to half of the cost of paying people for the land we are going to put this road on. Would Members prefer that we acquire it and not pay them to reduce the cost? That is not a position I believe the Government would take.

Again, I believe the public is being unnecessarily riled about the effects of passing this Government Motion here today. Passing this - which reserves the corridors in which roads will be built - does not mean that Government has to compensate every one affected tomorrow. I believe it is fair to say compensation will only arise when Planning permission is denied because it is a road corridor, or when the road is actually going to be built. I believe there is an area where some persons can come forward and claim some of the minor damages. But it is not the case of where we have to find this money tomorrow.

I have a question: How are we supposed to determine what these roads are going to cost if we do not first decide where they are going to go? All we are deciding today is where the experts who did the study believe is the best location to put these roads to get the maximum benefit for the invested public dollar. That is what the composite maps will do - it will reserve the areas in which the roads can be built. If we do not do that and we allow development to continue in these areas... People are concerned about speculation, part of this document is already public knowledge. Most of it is public knowledge. I believe the public knows where most of these corridors are likely to go.

If we do not pass this Government Motion (which gives the Planning Authority the legal framework to deny permission to develop in these road corridors) it means then that when we put the corridors in place, when we want to build the road, we will not only have to pay for the land but also for the development that has taken place on that land since. I believe that once we have decided where the corridors are going we can then ascertain much more accurately what the cost is going to be. Until these Plans are approved and these corridors are reserved, it is basically speculation and guesstimation as to what it is going to cost.

As far as cost is concerned, I think the Government is being very prudent not to guesstimate and speculate as to what the cost is going to be. But once we have the corridors reserved we can then determine fairly, accurately, at present market value the cost in those areas for people claiming compensation now (because we are likely to build a road in the very near future or because they have had Planning permission granted which will have to be rescinded). Then we can determine what that compensation is going to be. That is the time, once you know what you need; then you decide on the funding package you need to produce the revenue to produce that money.

So when one Member spoke about putting the cart before the horse, if we tried to determine what funding was needed to produce a revenue which would fund the Plan without knowing what it is going to cost, then you have neither horse nor cart. I believe that the track record of the Government is such - and the people have the confidence in the Government - that they will take their usual prudent cost effective and cost efficient way to deliver this Plan and design the revenue measures to fit such a Plan when it is necessary. The Government is not known for its inability to make decisions as to what is needed based on proper input.

Again, a lot has been said about the disruption of the political and social harmony in the areas where these roads are going to go and the fact that people being compensated at market value might be worse off. It was postulated that this was going to create even more hardship in the less financially well off areas where this road will go. I believe it will have the complete opposite effect to that because in several of those areas those people have very valuable land but poor structural accommodations. They cannot raise funds to improve their structural inhabitable environment because they do not have any income on which to borrow funds or to get money to improve their house where they are living.

Here is an example where in some areas, because they are going to paid market value for their house and land, they will have cash in hand which they could never get under any other circumstances because of age or income and other restrictions when they cannot raise these funds from financial institutions. They will then have the opportunity to improve the facilities and the environment in which they live at no cost to them. In fact, if they move to a less costly area by purchasing land they might wind up with a cash balance in the bank, and from the interest they could have a monthly income.

Much has been made that this is a George Town project and these roads are all going to George Town and the West Bay peninsula. Most mornings when I am coming into work I get in a traffic jam in some parts of Savannah. If and when we get the east-west arterial way designed to move traffic (because there are going to be limited access highways, there is not going to be an entrance and an exit every 100 feet off somebody's property on these new roads) the traffic from East End, North Side and Bodden Town will be able to avoid the congested downtown areas of these districts in the morning and not be held up unnecessarily. So they are going to benefit.

I would agree with the Second Elected Member for the Lesser Islands that it might not seem any real benefit for them. But I have to question his argument that it should be based on the needs of the people it is going to serve because if we apply that need, certain districts should not have the level of capital expenditure in roads and other programmes that they have had for the past several years, and in the 1990 Budget - if we deliver it strictly on numbers of people affected. But that is not the intent.

It was said that the tourists do not come here to drive on fancy roads and highways. That is true, but neither do they come here to spend half of their vacation in traffic jams. If we are talking about the quality of life and the quality of service we can offer these people, part of it is being able to get to our few tourist attractions that we have on this Island while they are here and not spend days in traffic jams trying to get there.

I believe the Plan and the Motion before this Honourable House is a good one. I believe there is great need for it. One Member speculated that because of the declining sales in the car industry (I have no way of arguing with him I will accept what he says), therefore the traffic problem is going to lessen in the future. Now I do not know what is happening with local sales, I have reasons why I believe local sales may be falling off, but according to statistics I have, since the 1st of August, 1989, to the 21st of November,

1989, we have had 769 arrive in this country. I have no way of knowing. I believe it is fair to assume that ownership of cars might slow down... but it is going to increase. It is not going to slow down to where it is going to solve the traffic problem.

If we are going to just keep pace with the quality of life that we have in this country then we have to accept that something needs to be done about the road networks in this country. Let us take an example of rebuilding the roads. Most of the roads, West Bay Road, the Bodden Town to George Town Road, are roads that are very, very old. When the hot mix was applied to those roads, that was not designed or engineered in any way to extend their life. That was simply laid down on the top of what was there. In some places the hot mix might be an inch thick; in some places it might be a foot because the only leveling used was the machine which is applying the hot mix. Any person who drives on those roads realises that those roads are beginning to crumble and are going to need some serious work in the near future.

We do not provide alternate routes. Imagine the nightmare if Government has to rebuild Crewe Road for those in the eastern districts with no alternative route to George Town. Imagine if we had to completely reconstruct the West Bay Road. Some months ago there was an accident on the Queen's Highway and the road was blocked for about five hours. What happens if we have an accident on the West Bay Road and it is blocked for four or five hours? There is no alternate route to West Bay. Somebody would have a cardiac arrest.

All of these things were taken into consideration in the development of these comprehensive Plans for a road network. Nobody is saying that all of these roads are going to be started tomorrow and built in the next financial year. Once the cost is more accurately ascertained the Government will make a decision for phased development. That has been the plan all along for these roads. In that light there is some \$4 million in this year's Estimates that has been funded from present revenue sources. Those are immediate projects that will be done. Everybody is praising the improvements at the 4 T's. That was done from ordinary revenue. I believe it is fair to say that Government is getting some \$6 million dollars in revenue from charges to road users in various related forms and fees. In fact the duty collected on those 769 cars was \$1.6 million.

I support the Plan. I believe it is a fair Plan. I think the Government has to act now because we are faced with another situation that we have to correct where we had 15 and 20 years in place for the Health Services which should have taken us up to 100 beds this year. Plans were squashed, put in the cellar and allowed to develop piecemeal and ad hoc, and it is going to cost us several million dollars to correct it; whereas, if we had kept up with the Plan gradually we would not be faced with that kind of expenditure today. That is what we are trying to put forward here - a Plan which will take us into the future for the road network for this country. That is what this is all about.

Mr. President, I support the Plan.

MR. PRESIDENT:

The Second Elected Member for Bodden Town.

MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH:

Thank you, Mr. President.

I rise to oppose a Bill for a Law to amend the Development and Planning Law, revised. This Motion is seeking to add the three composite maps to the previous maps which were approved by this House. The Government is asking for my support in this Motion, but to date they have not told us where they are going to get the money to pay for the road corridors, or how it is going to pay the money back.

If we look at what would happen if these road corridors were approved... the argument is that Government will not have to pay for the road corridors unless someone comes up with a Plan to have a new building put on it and they are refused by the Planning Department. All it would take is half a dozen smart lawyers and a good architect looking to make a killing, to contact all the property owners who will be affected. They would then make a proposal to the landowners to represent them for a fee and have plans for buildings drawn up and presented for approval and then turned down by the Planning Department to force Government into paying for the property. Where is the money going to come from?

I have travelled quite a bit during my years of going to sea. I believe I am very fortunate to have been paid to travel the world, a lot of people have to pay. My recent visit to Barbados is what convinced me that the Master Ground Transportation Plan will be a waste of public funds. It will be a cost to this country, to tax the people. I am saying that Grand Cayman has roads that are 10 times better than those in Barbados. Our road from West Bay to George Town is perhaps two and one half times wider than most roads in Barbados and for the amount of traffic that travels those roads, I see no reason why our roads cannot be widened to the full width with three or four lanes put in.

When we look at the cost we would find that the people of this country will have to be heavily taxed. According to the Budget, I see where \$1 million has been allocated for the "Jennett T", for the purchase of land in that area. Something like \$300 or \$400 thousand to build the road. That is just one area. For a small little piece of road like that, what will the rest of the roads cost this country?

I have had a lot of telephone calls and various people from different areas, the Rock Hole area especially (even though they say I am not their representative but they still would like to talk to me) they are concerned because they have been living there a great part of their life and where will they be moved to. While I agree that we may need some roads in the future, I still do not believe that we need these expressways.

I, too, have run into traffic jams in the Savannah area. But you know it is because a lot of the motorists refuse to use an alternate route because when you arrive in the Red Bay area of the South Sound Road, if the motorist would just divert on that road even though it may take a few minutes longer to drive on. I have tried it many times. While I could see the road ahead was nothing but bumper to bumper

traffic I diverted onto the South Sound Road and found it very light with traffic. We have alternatives.

After you reach the junction of Walkers Road and South Sound Road, you have many alternatives there the same way. I believe that if the drivers were to look at those alternatives they would not have as many problems. I still believe we could alleviate traffic if some businesses were to open earlier or later. School could start later so children would not have to get up at 6:00 in the morning to catch the bus. That is half of the problem. All the traffic is going at one time.

I stand to be corrected, but we also have the dyke roads in Cayman which, although some of them may be private, might be some alternate roads. The problem is that a lot of motorists are not willing to take a little less time, instead of speeding ahead they could divert and go on a slower road for a few minutes longer. That is all.

Are the people in this country willing to pay tax or to leave home a few minutes earlier? If they are willing to pay a tax then go ahead with the road. I cannot see this network of roads being built in this country and Government not having to put tax on the people. As I said, looking back to 1976 to 1978, if we look at the areas opposite the Governor's house, Lime Tree Bay and the Governors Sound subdivision, you will find they have a road corridor left there. In many areas, if something happens and you need to divert, there are plenty of areas that could be diverted. I heard the Honourable Member for Health and Social Services mention in his speech about the accident on the Queens Highway. While I would tend to agree with him that the road was blocked, the problem there is that there was an alternative. Turn around and take the route back. They did not have to sit there parked for five hours, they had two other ways to go. While it might have been a little longer, the route was there.

I cannot agree that we do not have alternative roads in Cayman. It only takes a little common sense. As I looked in the papers this morning I saw West Bay Expressway alternatives. I support that. As I said, if we have to buy some of that dyke road and improve it, well let us do that. We can reroute. Having said that, I cannot support the Motion.

Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Proceedings are suspended until 2:15 P.M.

AT 12:55 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 2:15 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Proceedings of the House are resumed. Continuation on the debate on Government Motion number 7/89. Does any Member wish to speak? The First Elected Member for West Bay.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:

Mr. President, I, too, would like to offer my appreciation to the Committee who developed this Plan for George Town, who laboured to produce the report. In opposing this resolution before the House I must make the point that I supported the study for the Master Ground Transportation Plan in order to get a better view of our roads network and traffic problems. I now feel, since the Plans have been completed, we must plan our roads in accordance with our land that is available without disrupting this territory. I supported the study. Not that I agreed with the study in its entirety, as I feel that the study, or a certain idea or thought was being pushed in that study, so I did not support the entire proposition.

First and foremost is the consideration of cost and funding. That matter has not yet been addressed. Are Members speaking as yet from the Government bench, or in talking to Members, listening to their lobbying, they have said nothing as to where the money is going to come from to fund the building of the roads and to buy people's property at its true value.

One Member from the Government side has said that it does not mean (if we pass this Motion) that Government is going to pay right away. It is not going to compensate right away. I believe he used the words that it could take up to six years. Another Member of Government contends it could take longer. Well, if compensation could run you into years, and years, and years, how are we now going to put a value on people's land and come six or 10 years down the road and say, "here is your \$100,000 that you valued your land at six years ago"? We must be careful what kind of ideas are pushed around in this country. We do not...

Sorry, a Member is speaking to me. I will give way.

[Hon. Second Official Member rose]

POINT OF CLARIFICATION

HON. RICHARD W. GROUND:

Mr. President, I was shaking my head at the Member because the compensation for the acquisition of land is not 'assess now - pay later'. The assessment is done at the time the land is taken. The land is not taken by the declaration of the road corridors. It is merely a declaration of intent which enables the Planning Department to not grant Planning permission in the corridor that is designated. But people do not assess compensation now then pay in 10 years' time. Compensation is assessed and paid when, and if, the land is actually taken for a road.

MR. PRESIDENT:

It really was.

That was good of the Member to give way on that explanation.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:
it will boil down to the same thing.

Mr. President, as far as I am concerned, in old true Cayman talk

Members have said that the Master Ground Transportation Plan has reached the public. True. Some people have heard about it, there have been discussions on it. This particular matter has not reached the public. Yet I see where they already have brought people from the outside to value land. I do not know what that is costing us. We have not been told that. We have not had any requests for supplementary expenditure so we have no idea, on this side of the House, what that is costing. There again, that will cost over and above what the Master Ground Transportation Plan envisages. I certainly never thought we would have to bring someone from the outside to do these evaluations. So there are known costs. It is a very important factor.

Repayment. Where will the money come from? Even if you can get it to borrow, how long is it going to take to repay? How long will this country be able to sustain the kind of payment that will come with loans that carry high interest rates? Certainly there is no such things as soft loans anymore.

The Members must be realistic and tell the public the truth. Then they must act as a Government and put their policy on the table. That policy, if they carry out this Road Plan they have, if we pass this Motion today, that policy cannot go through unless this country is taxed. I am not talking about the little items that we usually tax. I am talking about direct taxation. The country cannot afford this kind of luxury without direct taxation, property taxation, income taxation. We are not looking at \$10 million. We are talking about hundreds of millions, at least. It is all good and well to dream dreams. But at some point we must come down to earth and be realistic. Why in the world do we need super-highways? I would like that to sink in because we are only 27 or 21 miles long, what ever it is, by seven miles wide. Where are these grandiose schemes coming from? If we approve this Government resolution we would be agreeing to expenditures which we do not have figures for.

The Executive Council presented last Friday a Budget that is supposedly balanced and a Budget that talks about constraints of further expansion of the economy. If, on the one hand there are going to be restraints in expansion and, on the other hand there is going to be the kind of expenditure as is now being proposed, plus hospitals that we heard the Member for Health talk about, and other grandiose schemes we hear about, where will the money come from? There is no use of Government getting up in this House and making headlines, talking about hospitals, talking about super-expressways and all the other things they have to put plaques on just before nomination day 1992, where will the money come from? I am an Elected Member! I want know! There is such a thing in this country as accountability. They must tell us which areas they will tax.

I believe the success of this country is due in great part to the fact that we have lived according to our means over the years. Large expenditures were considered carefully. There was always a good, sound, fiscal policy. If we are going to get into contract arrangements for vast sums of money to which end, as I say, we do not know, and slow down development we are headed for big problems. It is simple. This country at some stage must reach a saturation point with the areas we are presently getting large Sums of money from. Let us face it, we all like to think the Cayman Islands is the best country in this hemisphere. We believe that. But there is a point that we come to where we can do so much and no more.

We must take those countries who are today managed by the International Monetary Fund and by the World Bank, we must look at their frustration; the escalating inflation and the resulting crime that large expenditure and grandiose schemes have brought those countries to. This is where it ends. Extensive borrowing for a country our size with limited resources, an announced policy on top of that of restraints in development can only bring a ping-pong existence in the future of insecurity, uncertainty, unhappiness, desperation, want, neglect and fear. We have good examples around us. It must be our basic purpose to mobilise and direct this country's economy so to head off those conditions, not to perpetuate it.

Now, in examining the relevant maps I see areas that are going to be bulldozed. We take the area known as Watlers Road and the area known as Rock Hole. Where are we going to put those people? Are we going to put them in Windsor Park? Are we going to put them in South Sound? Are we going to relocate these people on Crewe Road? Are we going to put them in Tropical Gardens? Walkers Road? Webster Estates?

I heard some sort of theory being expounded on this morning by the Member of Health talking about if we take the man's land, we can pay him a lot of money for it, it seems, and he can go to another nice neighbourhood and live. I would suggest to that Member responsible for Social Services and Housing that he better have a careful look at that type of situation and see what comes about because of disruption and removal of certain areas to the next area. The social disruption that takes place. I do not know what kind of theory that is, but I suggest to that Member for Housing that he be careful with that.

In looking at the maps I have also pinpointed certain businesses; Byron Ebanks' garage in the Industrial Park/North Sound area. You also have Industrial Services and Equipment. We have one on Eastern Avenue, it is Edies Decor, Serv-U-Well, Waltons Square and we have one here in Central George Town, Anderson Square, which would also be affected. The Member is saying no, Mr. President, if he can correct me I will give way.

Those are just some of the areas that will be affected. I will give another one according to the map. Right in the area of the Member for Tourism, off Walkers Road, an area called Palm Crescent. The road goes directly through them and they dare bring a Motion putting a thousand dollars or a few million dollars, whatever the figure is in the Budget, for me to give them a go ahead on this? Shame on them. They must bring us their policy and tell us which area is going to be taxed. Whether it is going to be done over a period of years or what have you. If it is going to be done over a period of years come to this House and say that is

the position.

We must have priorities. I am here to tell this House and this country those grandiose schemes - road schemes and hospital schemes - are not the priority of the First Elected Member for West Bay.

Traffic jams. While it is a pest I would rather get up in the morning 25 or 30 minutes earlier and get into town than to put taxation on my children's children the end of which we will never know. Priority is what this country needs right now and I daresay (no matter who is going to come behind me with a mortar and pestle as they usually do) that this country is not getting the right leadership putting forward the right priority in this country. All the roads which they claim will enhance development, this is all it is, will not help one of the most important factors which affects development; that is attitudes.

They can build all the roads they want but if crime escalates and our young people are constantly afflicted with drugs and there is the constant growing of a rift between expatriates and Caymanians, we are headed hell bent for trouble. I dare say a priority in this country is to try to change attitudes towards work and that sort of thing. There is no use of you talking about a super highway between West Bay and George Town; an expressway if you may.

I have a small business and I cannot keep my own local people employed because of drugs and the attitude towards work. We must use our resources in this country to try to change that kind of attitude. We must use our radio station, not only our schools to educate the public and the newspapers can help do a good job of it...

MR. PRESIDENT: I hesitate to interrupt but I think you are going beyond the bounds of the Motion.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Well, Mr. President, I will try to stick within the bounds but we have certainly had a very wide ranging debate and the Motion is certainly going to affect every avenue in this country. It will affect development, people's lives, social disruption. All those things but I will be brief in that area because I have a lot of scope in the Budget Address and I am making preparation for that. But I will bow to your ruling for now.

MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Suffice it to say that traffic jams are not my priority. Education, education, education!

Just to answer my good friend the Member for Health (and to be careful that I am not breaking any camel's back) I would say that the aspect of the hospital is not my priority either. That is a grandiose scheme in itself, and I am not prepared to put one red cent of the public's money into a scheme which I know nothing about, as yet. All I can see are big headlines in the paper but nothing has come to me. They have a good reason, or they say it is a good reason, but I am not going to vote one red cent.

I believe this country must cut its coat according to its cloth. My grandmother used to say, "Let us not hang our hat any higher than we can reach it." You can believe me a \$20 million hospital (with the attitudes not changed and the management not any better) will not help us because buildings do not produce good facilities. Services, that is what is needed in this country. So, they can get that through their heads. Not one red cent.

There are alternatives. In order for them to say that I am not giving them an alternative (since the matter was raised by him), there is a lot of room for expansion at that hospital. The hospital is only 15 years old...

MR. PRESIDENT: I really think that is enough about the hospital. Please come back to the Motion.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Well, Mr. President...

MR. PRESIDENT: You have covered it very satisfactorily.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Sorry?

MR. PRESIDENT: You have covered the subject of the hospital, I think, quite completely. Please come back to the Motion.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Well, I do not agree that I have covered it satisfactorily, but I will bow to your ruling. I will take the matter up in the Budget debate.

In the news lately it was said there was a recession in the motor car industry in the United States. We know that we are experiencing a reduction in sales in this country. I must make the point again! Are we not reaching a saturation point? Have we not reached the saturation point?

I can only ask the question: How much do they expect to put into one George Town? I feel that we should allow the town to expand, rather than keeping everything into this one little area which results in a contraction in itself. It is rather a fallacy of development strategy in developing countries to develop the centre or main city, at the expense of the outlying areas or periphery. That is exactly the policy being pushed by this resolution and by other policies that have come forward by the Government.

All that is going to happen with these proposed roads is to bring more traffic into this one area of George Town. Is that solving our problem? Consider what we are going to do if we are going to vote this resolution into safe passage. It is really not solving the position and I have to wonder why we are hell bent on putting this policy through. Let us improve some of the roads we have that can be improved, and there is a lot of improvement that can be made. Let us open up the West Bay Road to four lanes, wherever that is possible. I have been in cities of the United States where I have seen four lanes merging into three, merging into two. That is because they did not have land. They had to build around it. If the great United States, who has millions of people and can raise all sorts of money because they are used to taking home 35 cents out of every dollar, has to take those kinds of actions, can we not follow their example? This little two by four country that really does not have any resources; tourism and banking. Think of it. Think of where we are going.

According to what I see for West Bay I have no guarantee that any roads are going to come there because the country, as far as some of the people believe, begins just about at the Governor's Residence and ends just outside of Red Bay. Let me use an old Caymanian adage again, "Let's not hang our hat where we cannot reach it." Let us not put the hat up there and when trying to get it we tear off the brim.

This Motion needs to go to the public to get their input. Let us hear what the public has to say on it. Let us hear what the public has to say on this gigantic expenditure and the wholesale destruction of people's heritage; their land. I am going to vote a resounding no from over in this corner, Mr. President. Only one man, as I understand it, can save them and I hope to God he will do the same.

Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT:

The Third Elected Member for West Bay.

MR. JOHN D. JEFFERSON, JR.:

Thank you, Mr. President.

I rise to offer my contribution on the Government Motion entitled the Development and Planning Law (Revised) Amendment to the Development Plan, 1977, calling for approval of additional maps in order to enlarge the Master Ground Transportation corridors.

This programme is far reaching and will prove to be a very expensive exercise. I would like to say I am as concerned as any Member in this House about the traffic problems we are faced with in this country, but we should not feel we are unique in this respect. Traffic is a world wide phenomenon. Even in countries with massive highways, which are even much more elaborate than what is being proposed here today, traffic remains a serious problem.

When we are talking about traffic, we talk about sitting in line from West Bay to George Town for 15 minutes; that is not traffic. What some of these Members should experience is going from New Jersey to New York City on a Friday afternoon after 5:00 P.M. We are talking about sitting in line for one hour, two hours, three hours, four hours at a time. You move two feet and you stop. They would not be faced with the problem if they do what I do in the morning - get up early, get on the road at 7:30, there is no traffic. Traffic runs in peaks. It seems we always have a problem when people are trying to get to work in the mornings. Then we have a slight problem when people are circulating for lunch and in the afternoon when people are ready to go home. This is universal. If we have to throw another \$100 million into that little problem and you could still be faced with the same problem, that, to me, does not make good economic sense.

This programme is going to have far reaching effects. First of all, it will legalise a corridor for the road, even if funds are not available for construction for the next 10 years. What happens to the peoples' property in the meantime? I have seen people who have already been affected by this. They purchased a piece of property with the intention of developing it, only to learn recently that they cannot get Planning approval for it because it is going to be affected by the Master Ground Transportation Plan. Homes that fall within that corridor are being condemned. Construction which has already commenced in this area has been stopped, even though individuals have invested their life savings in some of these projects. You are talking about compensating these people for the loss of their property. Is it possible? I think the saddest part of this whole exercise is the fact that certain home owners who have probably occupied those premises for several decades will be forced to relocate into another area which they probably are not comfortable in or might not even be welcomed into. This has to have far reaching social effects.

I do not buy the argument that it is going to encourage development or tourism because if you talk to any tourist coming to this Island today, the thing they are concerned about is the rate of growth and development in this country. We are losing our uniqueness as an Island. If they wanted to go to a concrete jungle they would go to Miami Beach. So this will have no effect on increasing tourism. Tourists come here because of our environment and our people, not because of massive programmes like this.

I do not agree with the argument put forward by the Member for Health when he said that Government has to first designate, or set aside, a corridor for the road then go back and determine what the road is going to cost. What happens after the corridor is legalised and it is determined we cannot afford it? Are we going to reverse our decision? That does not set well with good management.

I think we have to pay serious attention to one fact, and I raised this last year in my Budget contribution, we are a country that has limited economic or financial resources. You know you can get... and I have had this happen to me, you decide you want to build a home, you can get an architect to draw you something which is massive and cost \$350,000 or \$400,000. You look at it and say yes, that looks good but you cannot afford it so you put it back on the drawing board and come up with something you can afford. I think this is exactly the approach we have to take with regard to any issue or programme we deal with in this country.

I also do not buy the argument that we cannot develop West

Bay Road further to accommodate our traffic needs for some time to come. Even if we only have space for one additional lane along Seven Mile Beach. As I said, traffic runs in peaks. In the morning all you would have to do is designate two lanes coming into town and in the afternoon reverse it; two lanes going out of town, and you would have resolved a majority of the problems.

Taking into consideration the reality of limited financial resources we have to determine what our priorities are. Are our priorities in a massive road system which we cannot afford? What about the road needs of our districts? I had a quick look through the Budget the other night and I was very discouraged. Based on what I see designated or allocated for our district in West Bay (I am not sure if the First Elected Member for West Bay and I are going to be re-elected) but there is not much there to give our people. I am not concerned about the other ones.

I feel this is where we have a tremendous advantage - we are in touch with the people. We know what the people want. I have not heard anybody mention as a priority this Master Ground Transportation Programme. They want roads but not of this magnitude. You know what they are concerned about? Education. They are concerned about what we are doing to address our social problems; drugs, crime and the other things we are affected with in this country. They are concerned about training our native Caymanians, and I emphasise native Caymanians, to take responsible positions in this country. If we spend all our money on the roads programme what are we going to have left for proper sporting facilities for our youth, which our districts (especially mine) have been deprived of for so many, many years? There is always the argument that Government has limited resources, we do not have the money.

From the time we saw the first presentation on this programme we asked the question: where are the funds coming from to pay for this programme? A year later we are still asking the same question. The only way this could be accomplished is through massive borrowings, which I oppose vehemently because I think one of the secrets to our success so far, as a country, is because we have been prudent in managing our resources. We are independent financially. We do not have our hands out to any organisation looking for funds.

I would hate to see the day when we get into the position with the INF, or the World Bank, that I see some of our Caribbean neighbours are in, when they dictate to you what to do, devalue your dollar, cut imports and encourage exports, which are not realistic in most cases. We are unique in that we always had proper fiscal management. We have always boasted of Budget surpluses and I agree with the approach of the Budget. When you put them together you get \$13 million short on the expenditure side, you cut expenditure. You do not go and borrow it to finance the Budget. I think we would be very prudent to continue this approach. But this would not be possible if we start encouraging the funding of projects of this magnitude.

The traffic problem is not what concerns me in this country. What concerns me, like my colleague the First Elected Member for West Bay mentioned, is the training or the changing attitudes in this country; all brought about by pressures. We can stand here all day talking, but if we do not want to address those issues we will not, in the future, be able to boast of all the accomplishments we have done in the past. Let us get out there and address the real issues.

I would like to say that I appreciate the effort that has gone into developing this programme. I think it was a good thing. I am not saying you had to bring in an expert and pay him whatever you paid him to do it. Public Works could have done the same thing at much less expense. But I agree with the approach of looking at the overall picture. Throw out some solutions and if those solutions are feasible and practical then we adopt the best one and implement it. This is not a solution and I am afraid that I cannot support this programme.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT:

The Honourable Member for Tourism.

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN:

Mr. President, I had decided not to say anything in regards to this debate of Government Motion number 7/89 but since so much has been said regarding the Central George Town area, the Rock Hole area, and the Watler Road area and where those people can stay and not stay, I believe that as one of the Elected Members for George Town, I have a responsibility to add my contribution to this debate, although the points I have to make will be very brief.

I would daresay that a reasonably high standard of debate has continued and I certainly will not do anything in my brief contribution to detract from that. I would like to believe the standard of debate has been set by the Honourable First Official Member when he presented his Budget Address last Friday. I, as a Member of this House, would certainly like to see that continue.

Much discussion centres around the Master Ground Transportation Plan. I accept that there is always an element of controversy surrounding any change, especially in a small community such as ours. The Master Ground Transportation Plan is bound to change the face of George Town and, indeed, the entire Island. Much that has been put forward regarding the traffic problems and the solutions, I believe in much that has been said. I share the concern with regards to costs as well as any Member.

But it must be borne in mind that we are looking at a situation as it exists today. What will we be faced with 10 years down the line? I think we have to look at the changes that will come and decide whether they will be for the betterment of our country or not. It is my view that the changes that will have to be made, as recommended by the Master Ground Transportation Plan, are in the best interests of this country. I accept very well an experience like everyone else, that what you like to have and what you need and what you can afford are quite rightly two or three different things.

Suggestions were made as to what could be done with the George Town to West Bay road. It is my recollection that this was examined. What was said was that, based on

the rate and volume of cars that are being imported into this Island and put into service on our roads, any improvement made in that section of the road would be short lived and would not be a good investment.

In regards to the map covering the road reserves that have to be made for central George Town, it is my understanding that there are approximately six structures, which, incidentally are not all homes, which will have to be relocated once a decision has been made to use the land which is being reserved for the road corridors.

I do not believe this Motion, if passed today, will create the tremendous upheaval and place the tremendous burden on this country that is being claimed. I understand Government, some two years ago, decided that the time had come for a proper study to be made in regards to the needs of a proper roads system to cope with the volume of traffic. The decision was taken, it was commissioned. Money was spent on the Master Ground Transportation Plan and it was accepted. The intersection by Dixie Cemetery, which has been referred to, is a good example of the improvements that can be experienced by following this Plan. Funds, as they were available, were allocated to that project. It was completed. There was a home in Dixie that had to be removed, a home that had been there for 30 years or more. I believe the people accepted this and this will be the case as time moves on with other changes that will come about.

I know there is an amount put in the Budget to continue the recommendations made in the Master Ground Transportation Plan and the point I am attempting to make is that this cannot be implemented overnight. It cannot become a reality overnight. It has to be spaced out over a reasonable period of time and, based on the availability of funds, these changes and improvements will be made. This, as I understand it, is the position and the intention of Government. Unless we have a plan to work towards I do not believe we can solve the problems we have with traffic by adding a road here and a road there in an ad hoc fashion. I think the Master Ground Transportation Plan is a good idea and once we understand that, it can only be implemented over a period of time. Funds will have to be found, but certainly not all at once.

This affects tourism and, perhaps even more importantly, it also affects the quality of life for the people who live in this country. It has a direct bearing on them and unless we are prepared to address those problems and work towards a plan I certainly believe that down the line some Government and some generations in this country will be faced with far more serious problems than we have at the present time. There can be no doubt that it will certainly cost more as time goes on.

These road reserves are necessary. They have been put forward by the Member for Communications and Works. It is certainly my view that the programme will be taken to the public again, even though a lot of ground work has been done. I understand from the Member that there is a P.R. programme planned where meetings will be held in different districts so members of the public will have an opportunity to voice their opinion.

I believe that once this Motion is passed and there are changes to be made which are sensible and reasonable, the changes can be made in due course if they are seen to be absolutely necessary. But I do not believe we should attempt to spread alarm or give the impression that this is a job that Government will have to find the funds within any given year to complete or that the work can also be completed in a short time. I see this as one segment of that overall plan that is necessary and I maintain that we have to have a Plan to work with because good planning will produce good results. We cannot meet the needs that this country will be continually faced with from a traffic point of view unless we follow a Plan which has been accepted by this Government. Quite clearly it will have to be paid for. This will have to be accepted by the people of this country because we all accept and acknowledge there are no free lunches around. It is a matter as to how it will be paid for, and at what pace the development takes place.

So with those few words, I give my support to Government Motion number 7/89.

Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Proceedings are suspended for 15 minutes.

AT 3:40 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 4:00 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Proceedings of the House are resumed. Continuation of the debate of Government Motion number 7/89. Does any Member wish now to speak? [pause] If no Member wishes to speak... The First Elected Member for the Lesser Islands.

CAPT. MABRY S. KIRKCONNELL:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Government Motion number 7/89, the Development and Planning (Revised) Amendment to the Development Plan of 1977, is a far reaching amendment. I think we have had a very high level of debate here today. I compliment all Members on the way they have conducted themselves in this debate.

I, too, have great concerns. I have had a lot of contact from members of the community. I have asked Government to consider deferring this for additional input from the public. I am still hoping they would give that consideration. The concern I share with other Members here today is that we have situations existing here today that did not exist when we started the Master Ground Transportation Plan. From our Budget Address we see that we have a declining birthrate and an aging population. Tourism may have reached its peak. We have our neighbours to the north which are investing very heavily in tourism. They are now making overtures to the United States of America and in the event that the republic of Cuba was to open its

doors to tourism, I think we would face a dramatic downturn in the amount of visitors from North America coming to our shores.

I am not trying to cry doom or gloom here today, but I am trying to face realities. I feel that we must have our priorities in the right place. Having some background in the health field, I feel that health is our number one priority here, along with education. Transportation would come in third or fourth. I would ask that we realise that we are a very small place, and when we employ professionals from metropolitan areas, and when they provide traffic structures, they provide for people coming from other cities into that territory. We know exactly the number of vehicles that are on the Island of Grand Cayman. There is no chance for that to increase. We have a definite number that we are working with. Where they will be at any one particular time is an unknown factor, but the total quantity we are dealing with is certainly there.

The Honourable Member for Health made reference to the number of cars which were imported, and the \$1.6 million that was earned in import duty. When we think of the import duty of \$1.6 million, that is not going to go very far towards the Master Ground Transportation Plan, not even in securing the rights-of-way.

This country has many needs. We have a problem with our youth. I think we should take a look at what Bermuda is doing, having had the opportunity to speak with a Minister from Bermuda here a few days ago. He mentioned the emphasis Bermuda is putting on their youth. I think it would be well for us to consider that. We need to get our priorities straight and I say today if we can establish these corridors without major expenditures to this Government, I then could support this Motion. But I do feel the people whose property will be taken should have input into this matter.

Neither I, nor the other 14 Members who will be voting on this are going to be saddled with the expense which we create here today alone. We are saddling not only the generations of today, but future generations to come with expenses. So I ask the Honourable Member moving this to give serious consideration in his reply to taking this to the public once again, let us be sure that we are moving in the direction that the people of the Cayman Islands want us to go.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Does any other Member wish to speak on Government Motion number 7/89? [pause] In that case would the Mover wish to reply? The Honourable Member for Communications and Works replying.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President.

I wish to thank the Members who spoke in support of this Motion and those who, indeed, expressed an opinion at all regarding Government Motion number 7/89.

This Motion is quite a straight forward Motion. It seeks to incorporate three maps that were omitted when the prescribed composite maps were adopted here in the May sitting of this House. Listening to the debates here today I wonder whether Members speaking against this Motion are really considering the basic and fundamental interests of this country. I say this on the basis of the Master Ground Transportation Plan having been laid on the Table of this Honourable House as far back as March 1988. There is therefore no excuse for any Member of this House not to be fully equipped with all the details comprised in that study.

I sat and listened to a number of points raised by various Members on the Backbench, but I believe one of the most startling was the suggestion made by the Third Elected Member for George Town when he suggested that the laying of these composite maps on the table of this House would have been putting the cart before the horse. I am aware that this country has developed over the years in a fairly ad hoc manner without proper physical and economic planning. We have reached a stage in our development when planning is necessary for our very survival. This is the reason why a proper Plan, albeit, a conceptual Plan, of George Town was prepared. This is also the reason why these Plans were refined by the Technical Experts at the Public Works Department and today we have before us a well considered Plan for George Town, with the ring road and the different roads, with the whole plan of easing congestion in the years to come. We are following the proper procedure. There is no question that the cart is being put before the horse. This Government has given a lot of thought to the necessity of providing the necessary infrastructure for this country over the years.

The Third Elected Member for George Town also mentioned that an answer to the problem is the widening of West Bay Road. That would only be a temporary solution. The Master Ground Transportation Plan shows us that by the year 1992 the problem will have worsened, and by 1997, it would have reached a crucial point. This is why forward planning is necessary. We cannot wait until the very hour that we have reached that crucial point.

Some Members remarked, and the same Member remarked, that the work done on the Four T's junction improved the traffic flow. What that Member omitted to say to this Honourable House was, that was the first immediate stage of this Master Ground Transportation Plan. It just goes to show that the Plan is an effective one. Above all, I feel the listening public may have been misled to believe that the necessary adoption of these Maps will mean that this Government must commit itself to enormous expenditure. This is not the case. We, in the Government, have the interests of our people at heart. We realise that, as leaders, as Members of Executive Council, we cannot hide behind our responsibilities. It would be easy if we were sitting on the Backbench to criticise what was being done. But, we have been given a role and responsibility and regardless of how many licks we receive, or how bad we may be treated, in trying to carry out these responsibilities, we have the right to carry out these responsibilities and we will do just that.

The Third Elected Member for George Town referred to cars as

a luxury, not a necessity. I would like him to tell his people in George Town that they do not need their cars, it is just a luxury when, in fact, there is no proper and systematic public transportation system in this country. Cars are not a luxury in Grand Cayman, or in any of the Cayman Islands. They are a necessity. Until such time as they can be replaced by a public transportation system, then that is a fact of life in this country.

The question was raised about the payment to the proprietors of property where it was necessary that the reservation of these road corridors would have to be made. The Roads (Amendment) Law of 1988, Law 6 of 1988, is quite specific on the procedures that have to be followed. Section 3 of this Law states:

"3.(1) Whenever it appears to the Governor that any particular portion of land is needed for the layout of a new public road or the widening or diverting of an existing public road, a declaration to that effect shall be:-

- (a) gazetted;
- (b) sent by registered post to the registered proprietor of the land at his address on the register; and
- (c) published twice per week for three consecutive weeks in a daily newspaper published and circulating in the Islands."

"(2) The declaration shall state-

- (a) the intention of the Government to construct a road or portion of road over the portion of land;
- (b) the locality in which the portion of land is situated, ...".

The Law is quite specific so there should be no misinterpretation, or no misunderstanding on this particular Law and on the procedures which are to be followed. Further, there was mention made by a number of speakers on this Motion regarding the right to compensation. There is no question at all that where the proprietor of any property is going to be affected by a road corridor, that there are provisions within the Law to protect him. It spells out the procedure to be followed. It states in section 7 of the Roads (Amendment) Law, 1988:

"Any person having an interest in any portion of land to which a declaration under section 3 relates or which has been taken by the Governor under this Law and who has suffered a net loss by reason thereof, may make a claim within the time limited by, and other wise in accordance with, this law, and compensation for that loss shall, subject to the provisions of this Law, be payable by the Governor to the person making the claim (hereinafter referred to as "the claimant")."

No impression should be given to the public that they will suffer unduly because of the adoption of these prescribed composite maps now being laid on the table of the House. They will be compensated, where necessary, for loss of any standing crop or trees on the portion of land. The severance of such portion of land from the claimant of the land, the injurious effect on the claimant's other land of the dispossession of such portion of, and the loss of such portion of, the land assessed at its market value. Also, under schedule 2 dealing with Assessment and Payment of Compensation, paragraph 6 of schedule 2, which deals with the assessment of compensation states, and the Member for George Town raised this point yesterday:

"6.(2) In determining the amount of compensation to be awarded in respect of any portion of land under this Law the Committee shall take into consideration -

- (a) the market value of the land at the declared day;"

There is no question that those people affected by any road corridor would suffer. They will be compensated at the current market value in applicable cases. There were other Members who spoke against this Motion. The First Elected Member for Bodden Town, quite rightly described it as an important Motion. It is an important Motion. Revolutionary? I do not know about that.

On the question of economic and social instability in this country, there is nothing that would cause such social and economic instability like a situation described by the Third Elected Member for West Bay when he related to the House his experience of driving from New Jersey to New York City where it could sometimes take up to four hours to get to your destination. I wonder whether Members are advocating that the situation in this country should deteriorate to such an extent before we, the representatives of this country, decide to take urgent action.

The First Elected Member for Bodden Town also related to us his experience in Japan, how there were severe restrictions on motor cars. But during his debate I noted that all he was doing in giving his example of his visit to Japan was highlighting the need for us to learn from their mistakes.

We have not yet reached the stage where we are going to advocate car controls for our people in Cayman. I guess the next move will be for some Members to get up in this House and suggest that a family can only have one car.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Benson said that. [Members' laughter]

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Whether Mr. Benson said that or not, I am sure he can take care of himself. I will not comment on that.

[Hon. Benson O. Ebanks rose]

MR. PRESIDENT: Is this a Point of Clarification?

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Yes, Mr. President. I did not speak on it. When I want to put anything in the record I am capable of doing it myself, Sir.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Thank you, Mr. Benson. I knew you could clear it up. The Second Elected Member for the Lesser Islands stated that he could not see the pressing priorities for roads in Grand Cayman. I wonder whether that same philosophy extends to Cayman Brac when, in fact, it has been shown from a very technical study that the necessity is, indeed, present in Grand Cayman.

Some Members are saying that the MGTP was done before they heard the Financial Secretary's Budget Address where it was suggested we may need to look at the growth in this country. I believe that in the Financial Secretary's Budget Address he also stated that there are also possible adverse consequences that could uproot people of this country if we decide to slow down the economy. This is a matter our representatives better take to the people to find out whether they are prepared to have any Member of this House advocate a cutting of their standard of living. Our people have been accustomed to a certain standard of living and I will have much more to say about this later on. But they have been accustomed to a certain standard of living so whatever is done, we feel that this should be done with the people in mind.

I forgot to mention, with regards to Japan, that they have a huge and quite efficient, and heavily subsidised, public transportation system. These are some of the facts which were, perhaps, inadvertently omitted by the First Elected Member for Bodden Town.

After having heard the comments from the Honourable Member for Health, I felt it would not have been necessary for me to comment in my closing remarks, because I believe he was quite explicit and he explained the situation quite clearly, but, long may democracy reign in this country, any Member of this House that feels he, on principle, must oppose any matter before the House should have that right and that privilege. But with the right and privilege comes a certain level of responsibility to the people whom we represent.

It was even suggested or implied, intimated by two Members that perhaps the displaced people in Rock Hole and off Watlers Road would be uncomfortable in some of the bigger residential areas. My people would be comfortable in any area of Grand Cayman, and I resent any Member implying that they would be otherwise in any area.

[The First Elected Member for West Bay rose]

Mr. President, I see the First Elected Member for West Bay getting up. If he is stopping me on a point of order I would like him to state it.

MR. PRESIDENT: Do you have a point of order?

POINT OF ORDER

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Mr. President, I draw the attention of the House to the Standing Order 34.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think you should draw the Chair's attention to it, but I include myself in the House for this purpose.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: I do, too, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: Fine. That is an interruption, but is it a point of order, or a point of clarification?

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Well, Mr. President, Standing Order 34 says: "A Member shall not interrupt another Member except - (a) by rising to a point of order when the Member speaking shall resume his seat and the Member interrupting shall direct attention to the point which he wishes to submit to the Presiding Officer for decision;". That is what I was about to do if he had done the right thing.

MR. PRESIDENT: Now, I am sorry, this is not a matter to go into. If you are on a point of order, fine, let us have it.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: I was reading the Standing Order because I was accused of not doing the right thing. Standing Order 34(b).

MR. PRESIDENT: Sorry? Standing Order 34(b)? What is the point you wish to elucidate?

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Well, if it is under 34(b) the Honourable Member who is speaking has given way to you - which he has done, I think... He does not wish to?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Unless it is a point of order, Mr. President, time is getting short. I do not wish to give way, Sir.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Mr. President, Standing Order 34(b) is very clear.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Do I have to give way, Mr. President?

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Then I reserve my right, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: *[addressing the Hon. Linford A. Pierson]* Please continue.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, I heard one Member in this House refer to a phrase that was always used in this House by a past Member of Executive Council, Capt. Charles Kirkconnell. This phrase was; 'If you throw a stone in a pen, the animal that squeals is the one you hit.' I did not refer to any Member when I said that.

The First Elected Member for West Bay referred to direct taxation. I was confused. I do not know if this is an idea he has in mind for this country when he was thinking of direct taxation, but I do not know any Member of Executive Council who is considering direct taxation. Whether he is doing it or not is another question.

I have heard that there has been talk around the country, in meetings, about 40 per cent duty on cars and 10 per cent land tax. No Member of Executive Council has gotten up at any public meeting and advocated that. Neither have we brought it forward to this Honourable House...

[The First Elected Member for West Bay rose]

MR. PRESIDENT: Is it a point of order?

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Mr. President, Standing Order 34 is very clear - I rise, the Member shall sit down, and I direct my point of order to the Presiding Officer, which I would like to do.

MR. PRESIDENT: I am sorry, it says if the Member speaking is willing to give way. I had written a circular memorandum to Members about this rather tricky Standing Order in, I think, November 1987. It is not an easy one, but there are two points here. One is a point of order which you are entitled to stand up and take, the other is a point of elucidation which the speaker must give way for. But he has the right to not give way. That is the point.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: He is not prepared to give way. But he could probably tell the House about the paper they passed around about the 40 per cent ...

MR. PRESIDENT: No, no!
[addressing the Hon. Linford A. Pierson] Please, carry on.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Thank you, Sir. The Member also referred to super highways. I do not know which Master Ground Transportation Plan he has been reading, maybe I can lend him my copy. I did not see that in my Master Ground Transportation Plan. It is easy to criticise. This Government is an accountable Government and we are a responsible Government.

MOMENT OF INTERRUPTION

MR. PRESIDENT: Excuse me, you are just coming to 4:30. Does the House wish to continue and try to finish this piece of business if we can?

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER 10(2)

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, I am going to be bold enough to move that Standing Order 10(2) be suspended so that we can finish this debate, take the vote and finish this exercise.

MR. PRESIDENT: I might suggest you extend that to take the Third Reading of the

remaining Bill on the Order Paper, which will only take a minute. I shall put the question. Those in favour please say Aye...Those against No.

AYES.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Ayes have it.

AGREED. STANDING ORDER 10(2) SUSPENDED.

MR. PRESIDENT: Please continue.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Thank you, Mr. President.
The First Elected Member for West Bay also stated that enough thought was not given to the preparation of the programme before us today. This is not correct. I would have thought that since Members have decided that they accepted suspending the Standing Orders, I will have to continue what I have got up to say. I am not going to cut this short because of that suspension, as I did not ask for it.

The Master Ground Transportation Plan under the subheading 'Traffic Forecasting and Capacity Analysis' is quite specific. The recommendations in the Master Ground Transportation Plan were based on actual traffic counts and predictions by traffic models. This was not guessed at. This was scientifically done. This was laid on the table of the House as far back as March, 1988. In Estimating future traffic, it states:

"For this study, mathematical models were developed to simulate existing traffic patterns and to forecast future trips on the existing road network. The same process was used later in the study to forecast travel on both new and improved road links. This process has been accepted worldwide as one of the most reliable and comprehensive procedures for use in transportation planning..."

The Master Ground Transportation Plan also shows that in 1992 the situation will become, by then, unbearable. By 1997 the situation will be crucial or chaotic. As late as last week the model on this was run, and the traffic today is within 3 per cent of the prediction. So those Members who believe that these figures are just being pulled out of a hat are much mistaken. The model was run as late as last week and the traffic today is within 3 per cent of the prediction. The predictions are standing up.

Between 1987 and 1992 it is expected that the traffic will be something like 30,000 vehicles per day. I heard remarks made about a cost benefit analysis. This was done on several different cost models. A lot of detail was given to the preparation of the Master Ground Transportation Plan.

Several Members, including the Third Elected Member for West Bay and the Third Elected Member for George Town, and others, mentioned that widening the West Bay Road is the way to go. No, this is not what our technical experts at the Public Works Department are telling us. The situation by that time will become intolerable. I wonder whether the First Elected Member for West Bay and the Third Elected Member for West Bay want a situation where their constituents are held up in traffic for 45 minutes, one hour, one and one half hours, or even four hours, as was suggested is the situation in some other countries. We do not want that type of a situation in this country. This is why we are unique. We do not want to be compared to Barbados or St. Lucia or some other country. The Cayman Islands is a leading country within the Caribbean.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Where is the money coming from?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: It is because of this we have a lot of bankers and other people coming to this country. It is because of this why we cater to the middle to upper class tourists that travel around the world. If we take a reduction in our services that we provide through our infrastructure facilities, we will certainly suffer a drop in our standard of living and the facilities that the tourists and developers so much enjoy in this country. We cannot have our cake and eat it too.

MR. PRESIDENT: If I could interrupt you for a moment. Would Members make sure that their microphones are off except for the speaking Member, please.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Thank you, Mr. President.
Not only will the people of West Bay suffer but what about the people from other areas wanting to move around to West Bay and back to George Town. They will also suffer. Widening the West Bay Road is a stop gap and it would be foolish for this Government to put \$5 million into widening a road that could only last until 1992. That would be very bad fiscal planning and very bad fiscal policy. Therefore, we could not accept that as very prudent men.

What about the people from Bodden Town and East End and North Side and other areas wanting to get into town. One only has to drive in at the peak hour in the morning and one will see the major traffic congestion that is caused. But one Member suggested that maybe his constituents would be happy to go through the dyke roads. Those dyke roads are not built to carry heavy traffic. If this country is going to remain number one, we have to provide a number one service. As stated, alternative analysis were done. Of course the Committee looked at the possibility of widening the West Bay Road. This was one of the first

things we looked at. But we realised it would have been very poor fiscal planning for us to have dumped the money of our people into such a short term project; five million dollars, or more, that would last us until 1992.

Also, we have a lot of congestion right in central George Town. One has only to drive on Walkers Road in the morning or South Church Street or any of the corridors coming into George Town and one can experience the amount of difficulty that is now being experienced in those areas. But, above all, is the misunderstanding that I have heard expressed that the adoption of these prescribed composite maps is equivalent, or tantamount, to putting this country into a loss of financial difficulties. This is not the case. What is shortsighted is that if we do not take action at this stage to reserve those corridors that we will have to pay a lot more later on; in 1997 or 1995 when we reach that crucial point at which stage a lot of expensive development may have been built in those road corridors.

I live in Websterville, pretty close to town, less than half a mile. I can walk to work. I can ride a bicycle to work. I could be selfish and say look if you guys do not want the roads, so be it. But I have the interests of this country at heart. I am interested in the people coming from East End, North Side, Bodden Town and West Bay. We cannot be shortsighted and say that no provision was made in the Estimates for our particular district, therefore we cannot support the MGTP because some of the roads happen to be in George Town. I know there are those who feel that there are several Capitals, but it happens that George Town is the capital. This is where we have our financial and commercial centre and the hub of our financial operations. So this why it is necessary for us to improve the road corridor in these areas.

The people of this country expect that we, as their representatives, will make wise decisions. The suggestion has been made that maybe we should delay the adoption of these maps. I cannot accept the view that the people have not had the opportunity to be well versed or given a lot of information on the MGTP. It got a lot of wide publicity from the Chamber of Commerce right back to the man on the street. So, any suggestion to delay this matter would be delaying the inevitable.

I want to say to my people that we, the Elected Members of Executive Council, all the Members of Council, support the MGTP and the laying of these prescribed composite maps on the table of this House. So, if Members of this House see fit to reject the adoption of these plans today, reluctantly, I will probably have to put a rubber band around them and put them on a shelf. But it will be a sad day in the history of this country if it happens to this country. Because if there is an infrastructure facility that is needed it is one to ease the congestion caused by the growing amount of traffic in this country.

There is not much more we can do. We have done our part for our constituents. We feel that we are giving them very good representation. If we do not get sufficient to carry this through, it will be no fault of ours. But before taking my seat, I want to make it quite clear that those people, many of whom have gone into areas in George Town and given misinformation - which both Mr. Norman Bodden and I, the Honourable Member for Tourism and myself, will correct because one point they forgot to mention is that a lot of the property that the road may have to go through in areas like Rock Hole and the Watler Road area is commercial property. Those people, as a result, may be much better off. They might be able to build better homes and also put a little money in the bank. Are they trying to deprive the poorer people of this country from that benefit? I hope this is not the case.

We are not only looking at Grand Cayman as an area that requires development. Some Members suggested that the tourists coming here are very happy to have a second class situation. This is not so. We need to travel more and see the facilities that are being provided by many of the countries that provide a destination for tourists; to see the facilities they are providing.

I was fortunate to go to both Freeport and Nassau. I was amazed. I said to Donnie Ebanks, the Chief Engineer, that having seen the level of facilities being provided for the tourists in those countries that I felt depressed. We are burying our heads in the sand. Many of us feel the tourists have nowhere else to go. This is a big mistake, a very big mistake that we are making.

We have done all we can. We have brought these maps for adoption because we feel that these maps form, a mechanism for the Planning Department so they can prohibit any further major developments in the road corridors. We realise that if they put these major developments, like a hotel costing \$35 million, and an office block costing \$20 million, in a road corridor, in 1995 or 1997 when the point becomes very crucial, then I want to know where that kind of money will come from.

I leave this matter in the hands of the Members of this House, but before sitting I would like to say that we feel, especially the Elected Members of Executive Council, and all Executive Council Members, that we have done our part.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT:

7/89. Those in favour please say Aye...Those against No.

The question will now be put on Government Motion number

AYES AND NOES

MR. PRESIDENT:

Madam Clerk, would you take a division please?

CLERK:

DIVISION NO. 29/89

AYES: 7

NOES: 8

Hon. Thomas C. Jefferson

Mr. W. McKeeva Bush

Hon. Richard W. Ground
Hon. J. Lemuel Hurlston
Hon. W. Norman Bodden
Hon. Benson O. Ebanks
Hon. D. Ezzard Miller
Hon. Linford A. Pierson

Mr. John D. Jefferson, Jr.
Mr. Truman M. Bodden
Capt. Mabry S. Kirkconnell
Mr. Gilbert A. McLean
Mr. Roy Bodden
Mr. Franklin R. Smith
Mr. John B. McLean

MR. PRESIDENT: The result of the division is seven Ayes, eight Noes. The Motion fails.

GOVERNMENT MOTION NO. 7/89 NEGATIVED.

MR. PRESIDENT: The next item on today's business is Bills Third Reading.

BILLS

THIRD READING

THE MUSIC AND DANCING (CONTROL) (1989 AMENDMENT) (REPEAL) BILL, 1989

CLERK: The Music and Dancing (Control) (1989 Amendment) (Repeal) Bill, 1989.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that a Bill entitled, The Music and Dancing (Control) (1989 Amendment) (Repeal) Bill, 1989, be given its Third Reading and do pass.

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, the Honourable Member has not moved the Third Reading as yet.

MR. PRESIDENT: I do beg your pardon. Cancel from where I started a minute ago.

HON. J. LEMUEL HURLSTON: Mr. President, I beg to move that the Music and Dancing (Control) (1989 Amendment) (Repeal) Bill, 1989, be given a Third Reading and passed.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that a Bill entitled, The Music and Dancing (Control) (1989 Amendment) (Repeal) Bill, 1989, be given its Third Reading and do pass. I shall put the question. Those in favour please say Aye...Those against No.

AYES.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Ayes have it.

AGREED. THE MUSIC AND DANCING (CONTROL) (1989 AMENDMENT) (REPEAL) BILL, 1989, PASSED.

ADJOURNMENT

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

MR. PRESIDENT: I hope the House will forgive my lapse. I was attempting to get the business finished a moment ago. The question is that the House do stand adjourned until 10:00 A.M. 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 stands adjourned until 10 o'clock Thursday morning.

AT 4:55 P.M. THE HOUSE STOOD ADJOURNED UNTIL 10:00 A.M., THURSDAY, 23RD NOVEMBER, 1989.

**THURSDAY
23RD NOVEMBER, 1989
10:15 A.M.**

MR. PRESIDENT: Prayers by the Elected Member for East End.

PRAYERS

MR. JOHN B. McLEAN:

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. Item 2 on today's Order Paper - Papers. The Honourable First Official Member.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS AND REPORTS

**REPORT OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL ON THE AUDITED ACCOUNTS OF
THE CAYMAN ISLANDS GOVERNMENT FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31ST DECEMBER, 1988
TOGETHER WITH THE AUDITED ACCOUNTS OF THE CAYMAN ISLANDS GOVERNMENT
FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31ST DECEMBER, 1988**

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, I beg to lay on the Table of this Honourable House the Report of the Auditor General on the Financial Statements of the Government of the Cayman Islands for the year ended the 31st of December, 1988.

MR. PRESIDENT: So ordered.
Papers, continued. The First Elected Member for Bodden Town as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE
ON THE AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT ON THE AUDITED ACCOUNTS OF THE
CAYMAN ISLANDS GOVERNMENT FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31ST DECEMBER, 1988**

MR. ROY BODDEN: Mr. President, I beg to lay on the Table of this Honourable House the Report of the Public Accounts Committee on the accounts of the Cayman Islands Government for the year ended the 31st of December, 1988.

MR. PRESIDENT: So ordered.

MR. ROY BODDEN: On the 20th of November, 1988, the following Elected Members were nominated to that Committee: Chairman: Mr. Roy Bodden. Members: Mr. W. McKeever Bush, Capt. Mabry Kirkconnell, Mr. John D. Jefferson, Jr., Mr. Franklin R. Smith. I would like to take this opportunity to publicly thank these Members of the Committee for the devotion, dedication and their guidance during our many meetings and deliberations.

The Committee held thirteen (13) meetings:

3rd August, 1989	26th September, 1989
8th August, 1989	28th September, 1989
10th August, 1989	24th October, 1989

22nd August, 1989
24th August, 1989
29th August, 1989

31st October, 1989
2nd November, 1989
7th November, 1989
14th November, 1989

WITNESSES

There were many witnesses and in the interests of time I will not list them in detail. They are contained on page 2 of the Report.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Committee wishes to place on record its appreciation of the cooperative approach adopted by all officers who appeared before the Committee. Further, the Committee is particularly grateful for the assistance and constructive advice given throughout by the Administrative Officers, the support, advice and information provided by the Acting Deputy Financial Secretary and the Accountant General during its deliberations. The Committee regards the assistance provided by the Auditor General and his staff as invaluable to its effective working, and for this it was thankful. The Committee also wishes to thank the Committee Clerk and her staff for the many services provided. It also wishes especially to record its appreciation and thanks for the services by Mr. George McCarthy, the former Deputy Financial Secretary, for the assistance rendered to the Committee over the years; and for his contributions towards good public accountability in our Islands. Over the years he has made a special contribution to the effective working of this Committee and we will miss his sage advice and comments. In particular the Committee recognises and appreciates his outstanding contribution in organising and producing in a timely and responsible fashion the Government Minute responding to the Committee's conclusion and recommendation on the 1987 Accounts. We wish him well in his secondment to the wild world of commercial audit.

INTRODUCTION

On the basis of the Report from the Auditor General on the financial Statements of the Government of the Cayman Islands for the year ended December 31st, 1988, the Public Accounts Committee took evidence from various Government Departments and Agencies. The Committee's conclusions and recommendations arising from the examination of the Auditor General's Report, arranged in numerical sequence corresponding to the paragraphs in that Report, are as follows :-

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

PARAGRAPH 2 - NEW FORMAT

The Committee welcomes and appreciates the new format and style of the Auditor General's Report. We hope that this Report will focus the keen attention of the Committee to matters affecting the value for money derived from the use of public resources and assets.

PARAGRAPH 2 - 3

The improvements to the Government's Financial Statements are noted and the efforts made by the Accountant General and the Auditor General in presenting the accounts more clearly and concisely are fully appreciated by the Committee. We wish to emphasize the importance attached to being able to see clearly that payments have not exceeded approved appropriations. The Committee is encouraging the Accountant General to continue to seek ways to improve the format and presentation of the Government's Financial Statements.

The Committee takes cognizance that in Note 6 - Advance Accounts of the Government's Financial Statements - there is a recorded balance of some \$5.3 million, of which some \$3.4 million concerned deferred payments not brought to account in 1988.

The Committee strongly discourages the use of Advance Accounts to record payments on the grounds that if a department is not authorised to charge a payment to a Head, the presumption is that it has no adequate authority to make the payment at all. The Committee suggests that the policy regarding deferred payments should be reconsidered and such payments, as required, be charged to the appropriate Head as it arises. It is the Committee's studied suggestion that greater effort should be made to reduce balances on all Advance Accounts to a more reasonable level.

The Committee notes with some concern the adverse effects of exchange rate fluctuations on those loans held by the Government and the related agencies in favour of the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB). The Committee's observations are that, while the CDB has served the Government well and will continue to be an important source of finance, consideration must be given to minimising the risk which arises from adverse movements in the foreign exchange value of other currencies against the Cayman Islands' dollar. The Committee expects Government to take the necessary steps to achieve the best and cheapest arrangements for the country's debt.

The Committee notes with concern that an Escrow Account of \$3.3 million has only this year been properly accounted for and we welcome the prompt action of the Treasury Department following the identification of the error in the 1988 Financial Statements. It is gratifying to report that this step now improves the balance in the Surplus and Deficit Account.

PARAGRAPH 4 - LOSSES

The Committee is pleased to see that for the first time information on losses, etcetera, are presented in the Financial Statements. Losses, write-offs, special payments, waivers, deferments, etcetera, are in the nature of special transactions which the Legislative Assembly cannot justifiably be expected to contemplate when the year's appropriations were granted. The Committee would wish to see great care exercised in the ensuring that the Note of Losses, etcetera, is complete and accurate and that such transactions have been properly authorised.

The Committee is especially pleased to note that no frauds, embezzlements and misappropriation have been discovered in the Financial Statements. The Committee accepts this as a good indication of the general honesty and integrity of Government personnel and wishes to record its commendations on such honesty and integrity.

EXCESS EXPENDITURE - PARA. 5 - 15

It is the important duty of Controlling Officers to plan, control and watch their spending in such a way as to not exceed the sum appropriated by the Legislative Assembly. In this regard, the Committee notes with some concern that overspending occurred in 20 (51 per cent) of the 39 authorised Heads of Expenditure and also under Statutory Expenditures. Many of the excess expenditures were due to the effects of the January 1988 Civil Service pay award. This made it difficult to establish whether excesses were caused by other factors. In future, Controlling Officers should be allocated the Supplementary Funds for such expenditures so that they may be held accountable for them. It is the Committee's view that this will not hinder its critical appraisal and review of excess expenditures.

The Committee took evidence from several Controlling Officers regarding the reasons for overspending and was satisfied that excess expenditures were reasonable and justified. However, the Committee expects Controlling Officers to make themselves fully aware of their responsibilities and duties under the Public Finance and Audit Law, 1985. In the past, the PAC has reminded and chastised public officers for neglect of their duties and responsibilities under this Law and also under the Financial and Stores Regulations 1986. Unauthorised expenditures may occur only in the most exceptional circumstances and the Committee may not be disposed to deal leniently with overspending in future years. To this extent, and while holding Controlling Officers directly accountable, we wish to remind the Financial Secretary and the Accountant General of their responsibilities and duties for the management and Finances of the Government and the supervision, control and direction of all matters relating to the financial affairs of the Government.

EXPENDITURE CONTROL - PARA. 16 - 17

The Committee notes that Vote Control was only seriously deficient under two Heads at the end of 1988. The Controlling Officers concerned explained the special circumstances which caused these problems. Proper control and accounting of public monies is not a matter the Committee treats lightly and it is gravely concerned to have had reported to it any deficiencies in accounting control. The Committee reminds Controlling Officers that with the significant financial responsibilities delegated to them, there are few valid excuses for the lack of accounting control. It is apparent to the Committee that more effort is required to educate and train public officers in this area and that careful monitoring and assistance is required from the Treasury Department in order to achieve the high standards which this Committee requires.

SPENDING PATTERN PARA. 18 - 21

The Committee notes with some alarm the development trends to use up expenditure allocations at the year's end. It wishes to be assured that public funds be spent only when necessary and then only in accordance with developed plans and approved budgets. The Committee understands that there is reason to believe that certain departments spend up their vote allocations to ensure a repeat amount in the next year's budget. The Public Accounts Committee does not believe that opportunity spending is necessarily in the public's interest and we wish to record our strong discouragement of such practices.

The Finance and Treasury Departments have an important and central role to play in the management of Government's financial affairs. The Committee notes that Controlling Officers are directly responsible and accountable for all expenditures for which they have been given responsibility. It is important to underscore that any mismanagement of these public funds will involve appropriate sanctions and penalties against the responsible parties. To this extent, Controlling Officers are accountable to the Financial Secretary, as well as to the Public Accounts Committee. It is therefore important that the Finance Department and the Treasury Department satisfy themselves that they have developed adequate and appropriate systems and procedures to monitor public finances in order to satisfy their control requirements and to ensure that Controlling Officers are made fully accountable for their actions.

The Committee agrees with the Finance Department that better budgeting would be helpful in the planning and control of expenditures. The linking of plans, programmes and

policies more closely to the budget system is certainly a recommended, beneficial system. To this context, the Committee was interested to hear from the Auditor General about his office's development of a Mission Statement and Functional Goals. The Committee considers that as an initial step it would be interesting to have similar information presented with the Annual Estimates for all Government Departments.

The Committee suggests that there is a requirement for better training in budget management and control.

REVENUE

ARREARS OF REVENUE (PARA. 27 - 29)

The Committee recognises the importance of sound and effective systems of collection and control of Government's revenues. It reviewed the situation regarding arrears of revenue and welcomed the efforts of the Accountant General to provide a Schedule of Arrears of Revenue Outstanding. In this regard, the Committee deems it necessary to express alarm over the Statement of Debts owed to the Government by the Ramada Treasure Island Resort. The Committee has included this Statement of debts in our Report as we wish to underscore certain important points with regard to arrears of revenue in this and similar cases.

STATEMENT OF DEBTS - TREASURE ISLANDS RESORT

1. Loan re deferred stamp duty (repayable 31.12.1991)	\$ 592,768.00
2. Customs Duty deferred (March '86 to June '87 - repayable 1989)	178,345.32
3. Tourism Accommodation Tax Arrears (January '87 to July '88)	731,707.32
20% Surcharge on arrears	146,341.46
4. Tourism Accommodation Tax Arrears (May '89 to July '89)	90,000.00*
20% Surcharge on arrears	18,000.00*
5. Additional Surcharge on payments for August '88 to April '89 (9 months @ \$33,000 p.m. x 20%)	59,400.00*
6. Hotel Reservation Fees - 1988	1,675.00
- 1989	1,672.00
Total	<u>\$1,819,919.10</u>

* Estimated Figures

(Signed) Accountant General

9.8.1989"

The Committee regards the arrears of revenue as being of crucial importance and suggests that attempts must be made immediately to remedy this grave situation. Additionally, the Committee wishes to remind the Government that -

- a) there can be no difference in policy between an individual or an organisation;
- b) that property managers understand that where Government funds have been collected but not deposited to the Treasury results in misappropriation of Government's funds. The Committee wishes to record its serious concern with this disturbing situation and it is its' studied recommendation that the Government consider the following measures:-
 - (i) appoint an audit firm at the Resort's expense to ascertain current amount of outstanding revenue and to advise Government on a recovery policy;
 - (ii) that Government register a caution against the property of the Ramada

Treasure Island Resort so as to protect the Government's interest until such time as the arrears of revenue owed to Government is settled.

- (iii) That Government institute a registered invoice or voucher system to be mandatorily used by all resorts to account for all of the Tourism Accommodation Tax receipts.

ARREARS OF REVENUE - HEALTH SERVICES

The Committee also notes with some concern the large amounts owed to the Government Hospital. Some \$1.5 million was owed at the end of 1988 for overseas medical expenses alone. It was concerned to find that this excludes approximately \$0.9 million written off earlier in 1988 for similar expenses. Of significance also is the fact that nearly \$1.5 million was owed in Hospital Fees. The Committee welcomes the expressed determination by the Hospital Administrator to make every effort to see significant improvement in future collection of hospital fees. The weaknesses in the control over collection of these fees aroused the Committee's concern and we suggest that a collection officer be on duty at the hospital during the early to late evening hours.

The Committee was surprised and concerned to learn that private practitioners using the Hospital's facilities were not being charged the full cost for their use of such facilities. It strongly recommends that charges for the use of such facilities be urgently reviewed so that the full economic cost of their use may be covered in the future. The Committee is disturbed to find that the rates, fees, and prescription charges for hospital services which are laid down by law in the Personal Health Services Fee Structure of May 1984, are not regularly reviewed and updated. The Committee regards this as an aberration, and suggests an annual review which reflects the full costs of the services provided.

In the evidence received from the Chief Medical Officer, the Committee noted that a large percentage of the population is under the age of fourteen (14) years of age. The Committee is aware that this group makes a high demand on the Health Services and hopes that its suggested improved fee collection will assist in the funding of this service. The Committee notes that some \$45,000 worth of drugs were discarded because of the expiry of the shelf life. It wishes to alert the relevant authorities of its concern in the matter and trusts that in future, they will try to avoid such losses.

The Committee deliberated at length on the issue of outstanding hospital fees and has concluded that under the present system, there is no easy remedy for this situation. It is the Committee's recommendations that Government investigate the feasibility of some form of Health Insurance Scheme.

ARREARS OF REVENUE - MOTOR VEHICLE TAX

The Committee observed that no entry for Motor Vehicle Tax was made in the schedule of Arrears of Revenue Outstanding. It was informed that there were no figures of arrears of this tax because there is some difficulty with enforcement and collection which has been triggered by an unworkable Law. The Traffic Law requires payment of an annual licence fee for a vehicle unless the registration on such a vehicle is suspended or terminated by handing in the plates, coupon and the log book.

The Committee understands that at present there are about eight thousand (8,000) motor vehicles on record which are not correctly licensed. It is not known whether these vehicles are presently on the island, have been scrapped or are still in use. It is estimated that this represents, at the very least, approximately \$1.5 million in delayed or lost tax income. The Committee recognises the difficulties faced in collecting this tax, importantly too, it realises that despite inadequate resources, efforts have been made to deal with this problem. To this extent, the Committee gives its unanimous support to the continuation of periodic road checks. The matter of arrears in motor vehicle tax is of such a magnitude that it is the Committee's observation that this situation, if not addressed quickly, will bring the Traffic Law into disrepute. A follow up observation is that this inability seriously limits the efficiency of the computerised vehicle licensing system.

The Committee recommends that consideration be given to revising the Traffic Law to require licensing only those vehicles which are being used. As a corollary, the Government may wish to consider more realistic penalties for tax evasion in these cases. Finally, the Committee suggests that lists of licences and registered owners in arrears be published and an 'amnesty' declared to enable long standing overdue licence plates to be returned without penalty. In due course, the Committee expects Finance Committee to approve the waiver of any taxes foregone and to approve 'write-offs' for any tax ultimately deemed uncollectible.

CUSTOMS DUTY PARA. 30 - 43

The Committee recognises that Customs Duty is by far the largest and therefore the most important source of Government revenue. In 1988, some \$34.3 million, representing 37 per cent of total Government Revenues was collected by this Department. The Committee attaches great importance on the collection of revenue and we are impressed with the Custom Department's recent efforts to improve its performance. The Committee wishes to emphasise its expectation that comparable amounts for duty based on values of imports be collected immediately upon arrival or soon thereafter. It does not seem unreasonable for the Committee to expect that all duty is collected within a maximum of twenty-one (21) days of entry.

The Committee is pleased to note that arrangements for obtaining bonds or deposits from large importers have been improved. It notes however, that there is a preference towards providing bonds rather than deposits. Importers providing such bonds should be informed that duty will be required to be paid as soon as possible after arrival of goods. The Committee recommends that the Customs Department ensure that those importers who provide bonds or deposits do so in accordance with regulations.

The Committee wishes to record that the inspection or reservation of the right to inspect imported goods by Customs Officers is a key deterrent in control of the smuggling and evasion of Custom Duty. It recommends that all imports continue to be subject to the threat of inspection and examination. The Committee wishes to express satisfaction with the effectiveness of the Task Force. It saw this as a key element in the Department's efforts and considers it important that sufficient resources be devoted to its activity.

MANPOWER CONTROL PARAGRAPHS 44 - 64

The Committee views with considerable concerns the evidence taken on this most important subject. The cost of the Government's human resources are by far the most significant element of its expenditures. The effectiveness, efficiency and economy with which these vital resources are used and controlled is an important determinant of the Government's ability to achieve good value for money. Established posts have increased considerably in this decade and may be expected to grow in coming years. We are surprised and disturbed to see that significant controls over manpower are not in place or working correctly. The Committee emphasises the importance of regular and systematic staffing reviews and inspections; job descriptions and well thought out organisational structures; searching reviews and the justification of existing staffing levels during the budget process; and the critical involvement of the Personnel Department in the establishment of new posts and all other matters relating to staffing (including overtime).

The Committee is pleased that the Personnel Department recognises the importance of these controls and procedures. It welcomes and supports the departments initiatives in creating a Management Services Unit and it hopes that this will quickly be established with sufficient and appropriately qualified personnel. It also hopes that urgent action will be taken to correct control weaknesses and establish appropriate systems and procedures to ensure that staffing levels are adequate, but not excessive, to achieve the Government's objectives.

The Committee is impressed with the care and thought that witnesses took in presenting evidence on Overtime. It is pleased to note that department Heads actively review their procedures regarding the levels of overtime used. The Committee agrees that overtime should be required only in exceptional circumstances and that every effort should be made to ensure that large amounts of overtime do not become a regular feature of an officer's pay. In this regard, the Committee welcomes the Customs Department's initiative to not allow staff to work overtime every month. It believes that every effort should be made to devise flexible rostering and flexible working arrangements to minimise the need for overtime. This is a priority area for review by the Management Services Unit. Where the lack of staff is a factor in the need for overtime, departments should endeavour to increase their recruitment efforts.

LAND EXCHANGES Paragraphs 65 - 72

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 infrastructures 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 two cases 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. Additionally, it is the Committee's strong recommendations that: a) Regulations governing such exchanges be drafted for future transactions; and b) That such regulations be strictly adhered to where Government's interest can best be served. The Committee takes a dim view of the glaring disparity between the cash contribution made by the companies (in the aforementioned transactions) as compared to the actual selling price of the lands. A final recommendation with regard to Land Exchanges is that in future, any monetary contributions made by developers must be based on the actual selling price of the land.

We were pleased to see that, following previous Committees' interests, an extensive enquiry on marl mining and dredging will soon be undertaken. We support the swift preparation of Rules and Regulations to govern and control marl mining and dredging. It is important that Government continue to improve their control in monitoring of mining and dredging operations. We note with displeasure that previous lapses in controls have now unavoidably led to the proposed write-off claims by the Government for marl removed from the North Sound barcadere. The Committee trusts that similar write-off action will not be required in future.

NEW COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Paragraphs 73 - 78

With regard to the Community College building project, the Committee wishes to record its disappointment and dissatisfaction with the handling of the project. It was not satisfied that the proper communications necessary for the smooth development of such a project existed between the relevant departments. It is of some concern to the Committee that initial surveys of the site for the New Community College did not reveal a large limestone cliff bisecting the site. Whilst we have been assured that plans for the new college have been altered, at a cost of not more than \$7,000 to take account of the cliff as a landscaping feature, we are concerned about the thoroughness of the site survey procedures. We hope that in future, no building projects will commence without thorough investigations of the proposed site by competent professionals.

It is our recommendation that all future construction projects in the public sector be subject to documented standards and procedures of project management and control. It is the Committee's recommendation that in future, where a project involves several departments it is absolutely essential to have one officer assume responsibility for interdepartmental cooperation and consultation.

INTERNAL AUDIT Paragraphs 79 - 85

It is the Committee's opinion that an effective internal audit function within the Government will assist in obtaining good, sound and effective systems of financial and internal control. It is our view that it will help with the introduction and implementation of the Financial and Stores Regulations. We hope to see the establishment of a small internal audit function as soon as possible. Unlike the Financial and Stores Regulations, the Committee sees that it would be more effective and practical for Government's internal audit to be a central function for all departments falling directly under the control of the Financial Secretary.

The Committee sees the role of the Internal Audit and the Auditor General (Government's external auditor) as clearly separate and distinct. Internal audit is a managerial control which functions by assessing the effectiveness of other controls and reports to senior management. The Auditor General is independent of Government management and is responsible to the Legislative Assembly for the certification of the Government's Financial Statements. Unlike internal audits, the Auditor General is not part of the controls of Government and may not be relied on by management as an internal control. The Committee would expect, however, that in due course the Auditor General will be able to take account of the work carried out by internal audit in reaching his formal audit opinion.

STATUTORY BODIES Paragraphs 86 - 95

The Committee is most displeased to see further delays in the production of the annual financial statements for the Civil Aviation Authority, the Water Authority and the Community College. The annual production of financial statements is an essential requirement for the Committee's scrutiny of this significant area of public finances. Laws providing for statutory body status for these three agencies were enacted some time ago and impatience grows with the delays in producing legally required information which will help provide these agencies with public accountability.

AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BOARD

The Committee also notes that the Agricultural and Industrial Development Board is again late with its annual financial statements. Whilst the Committee is content that there is, at present, no deliberate intention to avoid accountability, it will not countenance any further delays in preparing annual financial statements.

CIVIL AVIATION AUTHORITY

The Committee is deeply concerned that the Civil Aviation Authority is still disputing the Executive Council's decision made in January 1989 regarding the vesting to it and valuation of certain properties owned by the Government through the Cayman Islands Corporation. It is unacceptable that this dispute has not yet been settled and the Committee expects a resolution to this problem to be reached quickly.

WATER AUTHORITY

The Committee is very concerned to note that the Water Authority faces a significant claim of some \$7.0 million from a contractor to cover alleged additional costs. It is content that the Water Authority is dealing with this claim in a responsible manner but it bears in mind that claims such as these, which may lead to Court or arbitration, are very costly and time consuming. 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. The Committee notes that the assets and liabilities have not yet been vested in the Authority. It is hoped that when the vesting of assets and liabilities is

undertaken that the process and decisions are in complete agreement with the relevant parties.

CAYMAN AIRWAYS LTD.
Paragraphs 96 - 97

Cayman Airways Ltd. is a company incorporated in the Cayman Islands and wholly owned by the Cayman Islands Government who has invested US\$16 million in the company. Over the years, Cayman Airways Ltd. has incurred substantial losses and is dependant upon the financial support of the Government to maintain itself as a going concern. Government's cash subsidy to Cayman Airways in 1988 was some \$1 million. The Committee feels that this cash subsidy would provide the shareholders with more security and be better business sense if it were treated as an injection of fresh capital and go towards the Government's holding in the company.

MR. PRESIDENT: May we interrupt you to take the suspension of Standing Orders?

MR. ROY BODDEN: Yes, Sir.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER 23(7) & (8)
11:00 A.M.

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, my apologies for interrupting the Member but I rise to suspend Standing Order 23(7) and (8) under Standing Order 83, to allow the questions to be taken today.

THE PRESIDENT: The question is that Standing Order 23(7) & (8) be suspended in order to allow the questions on today's Order Paper. I shall put the question. Those in favour please say Aye... Those against, No.

AYES.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Ayes have it.

AGREED. STANDING ORDER 23(7)&(8) SUSPENDED.

THE PRESIDENT: Please continue.

MR. ROY BODDEN: Thank you, sir.

The Committee recognises the strategic importance of a national airline. However, it is concerned with the costs of operating the company, particularly now that following the leasing of the new Boeing 737 aircraft, leasing costs will increase by some \$4.7 million per year and introduce a liability of over \$111 million to be repaid over the next 15 years. The Committee is pleased to hear that because of the extra revenues resulting from the Eastern Airline strike, that Cayman Airways expects to make a small profit in 1989. It notes however that a fall in revenue is forecast now that Pan Am and American Airlines have commenced operation and when Eastern recovers from strike action.

The Committee was told that expenditures in 1990 will be about \$44 million which is some \$8 million (22%) above expenses incurred in 1988. This continues the increase in costs seen in the last three years and the Committee is disturbed by this trend. The Committee recommends that every effort must be made to contain costs to a reasonable level and to maximise income.

It is with surprise and concern that the Committee notes that the Government has not carried out the review of Cayman Airways as promised to this Committee in the 1987 Government Minute. The Committee expects Government's promises to be met in timely fashion and that this review be carried out by independent experts as soon as possible in 1990. The review should cover areas such as organisation, management, operational targets and any other matters relating to ensuring the achievement of good economy, efficiency and effectiveness in the running of the national airline.

OTHER MATTERS
Paragraph 98 - Government Minute

In general, the Committee is pleased with the response provided in the Government Minute replying to the conclusions and recommendations made previously in the Report of the Auditor General on the Government's 1987 Financial Statements. It expects and appreciates that the Government consider its views with proper seriousness. Where the Committee has followed up or commented on any matters in that Government Minute details are contained under the appropriate subject sections of this Report.

ESTIMATES OF REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE
Paragraph 99

The Committee notes with concern that the Estimates do not comply with the Public Finance and Audit Law or the Financial and Stores Regulations and provide ambits which

outlines the purposes of expenditure under each Head. It will expect greater endeavour by the Finance Department in obtaining this information from the relevant departments. The Committee trusts that this important and necessary information will be available in the 1991 Estimates. The Committee is concerned at the slow progress in following the Committee's recommendations concerning the presentation of information on Capital Expenditures in the Budget Estimates. It is hoped that a solution to the problems with the present computerised Budgetary Programme will be solved so that this information may be presented in the 1991 Estimates. The Committee wishes to see information included in the Estimates on the number of staff employed overseas and the approximate numbers of staff expected to be employed on weekly wages.

Paragraphs 100 - 109

The Committee read with interest the Auditor General's Mission Statement and Function Goals. It gives its strongest support to the Auditor General and his role in providing public accountability. It recognises his importance to this Committee in enhancing our ability to scrutinise effectively public finances. It particularly supports his aims to provide more report on value for money matters. The Committee hopes that all Government Agencies will prepare similar statements on their roles, missions and goals.

The Committee agrees with and supports the Auditor General's Development Plans. It is most important that he has the resources he considers necessary to fulfill his role and to provide the Cayman Islands with a modern and effective Audit Office. In this context, the Committee is concerned to see that only 7 of 11 audit posts were filled in 1988. It hopes that every effort will be made to bring the Audit Office up to full complement with appropriate staff in future.

VOTE CONTROL - ELECTIONS

In taking evidence from the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly the Committee noted that the control of the account for Elections was that Officer's responsibility. Bills were being incurred by the Elections Supervisor and the account administered by the Administrative Secretary. The Committee sees this as an injustice to the current Controlling Officer whom the Committee holds responsibility for the funds if overspent. The Committee recommends that consideration be given to relocate the responsibility of the account to the Portfolio of Internal and External Affairs.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

The Committee takes the matter of public accountability seriously and has deliberately set high standards and lofty objectives. It has been austere in its examination and deliberations and was guided by impartiality, professionalism and objectiveness which Members were reminded had to be the *sine qua non* of a critical, yet fair and informative Report. While Members saw it as their duty to be courteous, polite and non-political in attitudes towards those appearing before the Committee, it was felt that there was no need to be accommodating and easy when safeguarding the public and, by inference, our national interests.

The Committee takes pride in producing a fair, thorough and professional Report, which it expects will be interpreted as a measure of its dedication to the good government of our country. From a point of comparison with previous year's Reports, the Committee wishes to record its observation that there have been significant improvements as a result of past PAC recommendations. It wishes to compliment and congratulate the responsible departments and encourages them to continue their efficient methods.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE TO THE HOUSE

The Committee notes the solid achievements made in response to its recommendations in earlier reports and expresses the hope that such progress can be maintained. The Committee agrees that this be the Report of the Public Accounts Committee, to be laid on the Table at the Fourth Meeting of the 1989 Session of the Legislative Assembly, commencing the 17th of November, 1989, and that the attached Minutes of meetings do form part of the Report.

Mr. President, there is but one footnote that I would like to add, Sir. This Report has been prepared by a bunch of single entry accountants and, let me say, we think it is an excellent report.

Thank you.

QUESTIONS TO HONOURABLE MEMBERS

MR. PRESIDENT:
Lesser Islands.

Questions, number 130, the Second Elected Member for the

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE LESSER ISLANDS TO ASK THE HONOURABLE OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT

NO. 130: Would the Honourable Member say: a) Whether any vessels have ceased to be registered on the Cayman Islands' Shipping Registry since the implementation of the marine division; and (b) If the answer is in the affirmative, say how many and the reasons why?

ANSWER: Mr. President, the answer to part a) is, yes; and b) Mr. President, since the implementation of the marine division, 218 vessels have ceased to be registered on the Cayman Islands' Shipping Register; the reason being that as a result of the new powers given to the Registrar of Ships under the Merchant Shipping Act 1988 (Cayman Islands) Order 1988, a general clean-up exercise of the register was undertaken in early 1989. As a result of this clean-up exercise, many of the 218 ships were removed from the register for one or more of the following reasons:

- (i) Vessel sold to foreign;
- (ii) Owner no longer qualified;
- (iii) Vessel transferred out;
- (iv) Vessel a total constructive loss, i.e., vessel sunk, burned up, scrapped, abandoned;
- (v) No contact with the owners, as vessel either seized by the United States' Coast Guard or disposed of by a competent Court;
- (vi) Register closed voluntarily.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Mr. President, would the Honourable Member say if the new regulations and requirements are of the standard that it places many vessels in a position that they cannot easily meet the requirements now set?

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, I would try to answer that in this way. Two hundred and eighteen vessels sounds like a lot, but the type of vessels which were removed from the Register were 26 fishing vessels, 83 cargo vessels and 109 pleasure craft. Then a further breakdown of those that were removed from the Register. The number of vessels that were sold to foreigners was 71. The number of vessels where the owner no longer qualified was 115. Maybe an explanation of that as well, where owners no longer qualified it is the case where the company was struck off from the Companies Register. Therefore it could not legally own any ships. That total is 115. Number three, where vessels transferred out were 19, where vessels were a total constructive loss is five, and there were 6 cases where no contact could be made with the owner. Of those who closed their register voluntarily is a much smaller number - two.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Third Elected Member for George Town.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Mr. President, would the Honourable Member please, if he has these statistics, mention how many ships we do have on the Register?

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, the total number of ships on the Register to date is 513.

MR. PRESIDENT: The First Elected Member for Bodden Town.

MR. ROY BODDEN: Mr. President, I wonder if the Honourable Member can say if during this time there were any additions of ships to the Register?

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Yes, Mr. President, I am happy to. New ship registrations from January to October 1989 was 32 and for 1988 was 65.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Third Elected Member for West Bay.

MR. JOHN D. JEFFERSON, JR: Supplementary, Mr. President. I would like to ask the honourable Member if registration is going according to projections?

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, as far as I am concerned the registration is going along the lines of what we expected. I think even in the Budget Address when talking about the Marine Division I indicated that it will not be a major revenue earner overnight. I am still of that view.

MR. PRESIDENT: Next question, please, 131. The Second Elected Member for the Lesser Islands.

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE LESSER ISLANDS TO ASK THE HONOURABLE OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT

NO. 131: Would the Honourable Member say: a) How many persons are presently employed in the Cayman Islands' marine division of the Ships' Registry; and b) What is the total cost computed at present

rates of salaries?

ANSWER: a) Mr. President, at present there are 6 persons employed in the Cayman Islands' marine division of the Ships' Registry. b) The total cost of salaries computed at present rates is CI\$131,906.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Mr. President, would the Honourable Member say if any of the persons employed in this section are Caymanians, or are they all contracted, recruited officers?

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, the six officers who are in the Marine Survey Department are: 1 Chief Surveyor from the U.K.; 1 Principal Surveyor from the U.K.; a Marine Surveyor for Nautical, also from the U.K.; a Marine Surveyor for the Engineers section of the Survey Department, also from the U.K.; the Executive Officer is from the U.K., and the Clerical Officer, I cannot say, I am not sure.

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Mr. President, it seems that the answer is that there are no Caymanian officers in that case.

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: I think my answer, Mr. President, said that I was unsure of one of the six.

MR. PRESIDENT: Question number 132, please, the Second Elected Member for the Lesser Islands.

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE LESSER ISLANDS TO ASK THE HONOURABLE OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT

NO. 132: Would the Honourable Member say: a) What has been the cost to establish the marine division of the Ships' Registry; b) What has been the revenue earned from the date of its establishment to the end of October, 1989; and c) What was the expenditure for the said period?

ANSWER: (a) Mr. President, the cost of establishing the marine division of the Ships' Registry is CI\$26,544.54 plus legal cost of \$226,277.27. This legal cost is not completely up to date, it is the figure which we gave earlier in this House and may be subject to addition. But, I did not have sufficient time to check it. I thought since the three questions were all related, it would not be fair to ask for this particular question to be deferred.

(b) Mr. President, the revenue earned from the date of the establishment of the Marine Division to the end of October 1989 is CI\$30,121.57, which forms part of a deposit for CI\$101,801.96, which has been received from the Marine Division. It is estimated that on resolution of various outstanding survey matters that, of the remaining CI\$71,680.39 being held on deposit, a further sum of CI\$45,000 will shortly be transferred to revenue.

(c) Mr. President, the expenditure for the Marine and Survey Department from the date of its establishment to the end of October 1989, is CI\$149,019.08. This amount excludes the sum of CI\$26,544.54 which represents the initial cost of establishing the Marine Division.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. GILBERT McLEAN: Mr. President, could the Member explain what is meant in the answer that \$30,121.57 forms part of a deposit for the CI\$101,801.96?

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Yes, Mr. President, the system that is used at the Marine Survey Department is, when an owner wishes to have, in accordance to the Marine Legislation, his ship surveyed, he has to make a deposit before the survey is undertaken by the members of the Survey Department. In this way, Government is always in a position to have its money before the work is actually done. But when all matters have actually been done, then that portion of the deposit is cleared and placed to revenue.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Second Elected Member for Bodden Town.

MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH: Supplementary, Mr. President. In the Honourable Member's answer to salaries earned, \$131,960, would that indicate there was not enough money made by the Registry to pay those salaries?

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: I think we are looking specifically at the Marine Survey section, Mr. President. The real answer, if we are going to make a decision about it, is that the revenue that is earned by ship registration is earned in two forms. First, the funds earned from the registry of the ship itself. Secondly, from

the survey of the ship as well. So there is sufficient funds if you take the two revenue heads to pay the Marine Department.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Third Elected Member for George Town.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Mr. President, would the Honourable Member say whether he would, perhaps, while doing the review of the Survey Department, have a look at seeing in what ways the cost of surveys and other matters could be reduced in an effort to make the register more competitive with other countries where surveys can be done by others, such as Lloyds?

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, I have no difficulty with that matter. We have been looking at the competitive edge, if there is one, of Cayman Register versus other jurisdictions. We do know the registration fees charged by the Cayman Islands is probably the lowest that you can find throughout the world, including Liberia and Panama and some of the others. We also know that the survey fees which are being charged by the Survey Department is not equally as competitive but certainly within reasonable bounds of everybody else. But certainly, we will look at it.

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Mr. President, the Honourable Member confirmed that to set up the Marine Survey Register, the cost was over one quarter of a million dollars to date, and, as asked in the question, there has only been \$30,000 collected, and if the projections are that under these circumstances the Registry would continue to pay for itself?

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: I think, Mr. President, when you establish a department in Government, it is really no different than establishing a business in the Cayman Islands. The first year of expenses are always very substantial, simply because it involves, among other things, legal costs. That cost is generally written off over a period of years, whether it is three years or five years, in order to arrive at a reasonable average of what the department is costing Government. But if we were to take that approach to the one quarter of a million dollars being referred to by the Member, then I think the Registry and the Marine section is holding its own with the other various departments of Government.

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Mr. President, seeing that the Registry does not provide an essential local service to the populace, as such, of these Islands, then if it does not show a profit or a break even would the Government then take the view that it might be necessary to close the Registry?

MR. PRESIDENT: That is a long way from the original question but the Honourable First Official Member may wish to reply to it.

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: I am happy to answer that Mr. President because I have heard a lot about this on the marl road. I think one of the things we have to pay attention to is not just the earning of revenue that is important from the work which is being carried out by the Marine Survey Department, it is also responsible for, not just the ships that are registered on the Cayman Islands' register, but any other ship that enters the three mile jurisdiction of our territorial waters. Any ship that enters those territorial waters have also to comply with the same requirements that the Marine section is administering to ships registered in Cayman. We know about some of the matters which happen in the harbour here in George Town. So from that point of view, the Marine section is carrying out a very responsible function to the people of this country.

MR. PRESIDENT: I suggest we take the break now. Proceedings suspended for 15 minutes.

AT 11:40 A.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 12:05 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Proceedings are resumed. Questions, number 133, The First Elected Member for West Bay, please.

THE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR WEST BAY TO ASK THE HONOURABLE ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES

NO. 133: Can the Honourable Member say where the funding will come from for the proposed new hospital?

ANSWER: Government has not yet made a decision to build a new hospital so the question of funding has not been examined and determined.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Mr. President, has the Member made a decision to build a new hospital?

- MR. PRESIDENT:** That question has already been answered.
- MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:** Well, Mr. President somebody must have made...
- MR. PRESIDENT:** You are making a statement. Please ask a question.
- MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:** Give me a chance to ask it, Sir.
- MR. PRESIDENT:** I beg your pardon.
- MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:** Well, give me a chance to ask it. I would like to preface it with a statement: In the newspapers recently there was an announcement of a new hospital. The Honourable Member is now saying Government has made no decision. That announcement talked about an opening date in 1992. Who has made the decision?
- HON. D. EZZARD MILLER:** Mr. President, I believe the Member is obviously referring to an Interim Report by the consultants, International Health Care Corporation, which have been retained to make recommendations to Government. Part of that interim Report was the consideration of a new 100 bed in-patient hospital. The final Report is not going to be presented until the 18th of December and Government, as a body, will make a decision after getting the final report as to whether to accept or reject all, some, or none of their recommendations.
- MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:** Did the Honourable Member say, Mr. President, there was an opening date for 1992 for the hospital?
- HON. D. EZZARD MILLER:** Mr. President, that also was part of the recommendations of the interim report. They suggested a time-frame for implementation of their interim report, which any good consultants would do.
- MR. PRESIDENT:** The Third Elected Member for George Town.
- MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN:** Mr. President, would the Honourable Member please state what amount of money the interim report had suggested would be the cost?
- HON. D. EZZARD MILLER:** The interim report makes no suggestions as to the amount of money.
- MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:** They cannot be good consultants then.
- MR. PRESIDENT:** Kindly address the Chair.
The Third Elected Member for George Town.
- MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN:** Could the Member say how the amount of \$20 million got to be reported?
- HON. D. EZZARD MILLER:** Mr. President, that was in answer to a question by somebody at the Interim Report where I suggested that the total project would probably cost about \$20 million.
- MR. PRESIDENT:** There appear to be no more supplementaries.
Question number 134, the First Elected Member for West Bay.

THE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR WEST BAY TO ASK THE HONOURABLE ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES

NO. 134: The Honourable Member has visited several areas in the United States to observe or examine health or social policies - can the Member say whether any policy to effect changes in social services were made or is being contemplated for these Islands? If affirmative, what are they and when will implementation take effect?

ANSWER: Yes. Various changes in Social Services' policy are presently being contemplated. This is as a result of reviews of the Social Services Department which have been, or are presently being carried out.

As a result of a review of Frances Bodden Girls' Home and the Bonaventure Boys' Home, recommendations have been made to place these homes under a Board of Management to be established in January 1990.

It is also being recommended that the Homes are operated under the teaching parent model, where

the House Parents live in the Homes. The Homes will return to the concept of "caring homes" which was established when they were given to Government by the Rotary Club.

The move will create the necessity of establishing Residential Treatment Centres for adolescents who are offenders, or who are on Court Orders as "beyond control"; in other words, adolescents who might normally be sent to an approved school.

Following my visit to Boston in September, valuable experience was gained as to the type of facility which might be appropriate for this group of adolescents. I would also add that the Portfolio and Department of Social Services are committed to bringing home all Caymanian children presently in approved schools in Jamaica.

With regard to other Social Services' programmes, Government is presently negotiating with the Pines to contract out the Sunrise Cottage for the elderly in East End.

A full review of the Department of Social Services, done by an outside consultant, has been completed and is expected by the end of the month. It would be premature for me to comment on any internal changes in the Department at this point. However, I believe that it is not too early to say that increased emphasis will be placed on preventative programmes.

This Honourable House voted \$100,000 in the 1989 Budget to assist the Churches with youth work. The Portfolio and the Department of Social Services intends to mount a Youth Worker Training Programme early in the new year. In the meantime, funds have been made available to several Churches (under established criteria) to assist them with new and on-going programmes.

These are the major changes anticipated in Social Services' policy and programmes. My Portfolio has followed the process of identification, assessment and review; and will now move into a planning stage where various goals are set and a time frame established. I cannot, therefore, give the Member a definite deadline for the completion of these changes, but envisaged that changes will commence the first quarter of 1990.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Supplementary, Mr. President, can the Member say which area of the United States he went where he could determine to mount a Youth Worker Training Programme early in the new year?

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER: Mr. President, I do not think the answer says I made that decision based on a trip to the United States. The answer says based on a trip to Boston to gain insight into handling the adolescent youth problem, in particular those certified by the Court as being beyond control.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: The original question asked or stated he had visited several areas to observe or examine health or social policies. If that is not derived by him going to an area in the United States, how did it arrive in the question?

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER: Mr. President, with the greatest of respect, I cannot be responsible for assumptions made by the Member asking the question. The fact is that I only went to one area to review social policies, that was Boston, Massachusetts. It also says, and that answer (which he is referring to) is part of the overall development of the changes envisaged for Social Services.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Elected Member for East End.

MR. JOHN B. McLEAN: Mr. President, a supplementary. I wonder if the Honourable Member could say, with regard to the Sunrise Cottage and its being contracted to the Pines, would this in any way hinder the residents of the district of East End from their continued assistance with the cottage?

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER: No, Sir. In fact, we hope that when they get under the Pines it will give them greater opportunity and more latitude to assist.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Did the Member visit Minnesota recently?

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER: I do not know what the Member considers recently, I went to Minnesota in January of 1989. But the purpose of that was to look at drug programmes.

MR. JOHN B. McLEAN: Mr. President, a final supplementary. Am I to understand then that within the contract between the Pines and the Sunrise Cottage, it will be stipulated that the residents of that district will be able to participate as usual?

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER: Yes, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Third Elected Member for George Town.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Mr. President, can the Member say whether, from these visits, he has been able to come up with any better policies relating to housing for the poorer people and increased benefits to them?

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER: I cannot say that as a result of these visits, but it is a fact that the Board of the HDC has in fact reviewed all of the criteria established for loans under HDC and we have included in that review, which will be tabled later on in the Assembly as soon as the Auditor General certifies the accounts, that provisions where HDC will build houses and mortgage them to clients of Social Services and where the mortgagee will be the Cayman Islands Government through the Social Services Department and the Social Services Department will, if fact, have a separate agreement with the person living in so that whatever contribution they can make towards the mortgage, as a percentage of rent, will contribute to ownership in the long run.

MR. PRESIDENT: Take the next question, please. Number 135, the First Elected Member for West Bay.

THE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR WEST BAY TO ASK THE HONOURABLE ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES

NO. 135: Can the Honourable Member say whether any homes or locations have been identified for the proposed half-way houses, and if so, in what areas?

ANSWER: Mr. President, under Standing Order 25, with the leave of the Chair, I would ask that this question be deferred to another Order Paper.

QUESTION NO. 135 DEFERRED

MR. PRESIDENT: The question is that Question No. 135 be deferred. I shall put the question. Those in favour please say Aye...Those against No.

AYES.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Ayes have it.

AGREED. QUESTION NO. 135 DEFERRED.

MR. PRESIDENT: Question Number 136, the First Elected Member for the Lesser Islands

THE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE LESSER ISLANDS TO ASK THE HONOURABLE ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR COMMUNICATIONS, WORKS AND NATURAL RESOURCES

NO. 136: Would the Honourable Member outline the plans for a bulk fuel storage and distribution service on Cayman Brac?

ANSWER: Further to recent meetings and telephone conversations between the Portfolio of Communications, Works and Natural Resources and Texaco Caribbean Inc., regarding the development of a fuel terminal on Cayman Brac, Texaco has outlined the following potential fuel supply plans:

- In order to deliver fuels safely to Cayman Brac it should be transported in vessels designed for safe transport of flammable liquids. The arrangement envisaged would benefit from minimal freight rates by balancing the quantities needed and the amount which can be shipped economically.

- Texaco plans would also include obtaining a suitable parcel of land near the existing port facility on the north coast of the Brac. The site would need to be of adequate size to hold five tanks for storage of diesel, leaded and unleaded motor gasoline, aviation jet fuel, aviation gasoline, a warehouse, office, loading rack and fire prevention system while allowing for regulation setbacks from the road, adjoining properties and coast line. It is estimated that a lot of 3.0 acres would be adequate for the present and future needs of the Lesser Islands.

- The tanks would be sized to hold four months supply of fuel. They would be constructed within containment walls in accordance with the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) Codes. Fire fighting and drainage

systems consistent with current safety and environmental protection programmes would be installed. Fuel from the tanker will be pumped through a ship board hose to a single pipeline located near the Creek dock.

- The terminal would include a small office, laboratory and warehouse for storage of lubricants, tools, spares and other equipment related to terminal operations.

Subject to the financial viability of the project and obtaining Planning approval, Texaco would be willing to work with the Cayman Islands' Government to accelerate the programme and have assembled a project development team to evaluate the various terminal development alternatives.

Texaco advised on 14th November, 1989, that they have identified sites for evaluation and made formal approaches to the various owners to determine availability and cost.

An engineering team is working on preliminary estimates and preparing an economic evaluation for each site. Proposals are due for submission to management on 5th December, 1989. A management decision on the project is expected by year's end.

Pending Texaco's approval of the project, final engineering documents will be prepared for Planning approval. This will be followed by preparation of bid invitations for contract work. Given a favourable management decision, it is expected that work can be started on the terminal by the end of the first quarter of 1990.

Government has given approval in principle to Texaco Caribbean, Inc. to proceed with the project.

MR. PRESIDENT: There appear to be no supplementaries. Question number 137, the First Elected Member for the Lesser Islands.

THE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE LESSER ISLANDS TO ASK THE HONOURABLE ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR COMMUNICATIONS, WORKS AND NATURAL RESOURCES

NO. 137: Would the Honourable member give an update of the progress of the proposed deepening of the entrance channel at South Coast in Cayman Brac?

ANSWER: A detailed hydrographic investigation was carried out in September 1989 to determine the exact nature and dimensions of the channel.

Based on the investigation, a plan was formulated by a local company to improve the conditions that exist in the channel. Four different proposals have been submitted for analysis based on the extent of the proposed works.

It is being recommended to Government to clear the seaward 200 feet of this channel at a cost of approximately \$212,000.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

CAPT. MABRY S. KIRKCONNELL: Supplementary, Mr. President. I wonder if the Honourable Member would give his consideration to approaching it on a smaller scale? Basically the main concern is getting the pleasure crafts that come up from Grand Cayman into the Channel and if that could be done to facilitate prior to Million Dollar Month, then the larger project could be done at a later date.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, the answer to that supplementary is (and the second part of my answer says) that based on the investigation a plan was formulated by a local company to improve the conditions and four different proposals have been submitted. Among those proposals, the cheapest one was \$133,976.00. There were other considerations that perhaps just the rocks could be blown out of the way so boats could be brought into harbour, but these were not feasible. So the best and cheapest engineering study that was produced suggested a price of \$212,000.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Supplementary, Mr. President. Can the Honourable Member say who carried out the investigation?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Tomlinson Engineering Limited carried out the hydrographic investigation.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Third Elected Member for George Town.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Could the Honourable Member please say, Sir, what is the major part of this very large cost of \$212,000?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: My understanding, Mr. President, is that the major part of the cost has to do with the drilling and blasting out of very hard rocks in the channel.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Would the Member please say, Sir, what depth and width he would be going to with this channel, if he has those figures?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, I have a string of statistics here on that which I will be happy to share with the Member. The average depth is 8 feet and the area is 80 by 200.

MR. PRESIDENT: The First Elected Member for Bodden Town.

MR. ROY BODDEN: Thank you, Mr. President. Supplementary. The Honourable Member mentioned that four bids were submitted and of those four, one was chosen. I wonder if the Member could inform the House as to who the other three bids were received from?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, I do not think I said bid. I said engineering proposals and these were submitted for the drilling and the blasting part by Mr. Dick Christiansen, a licensed blaster.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Is that all four proposals?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Yes, Mr. President, the hydrographic survey was submitted by Tomlinson Engineers, as I said earlier but the four proposals for blasting were submitted by Mr. Dick Christiansen, who is a licensed blaster.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: If possible, would the Member say, in very general terms, how the low bid of one hundred and something dollars differed from this \$212,000?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, I hope this is going to get us somewhere and we will get an undertaking to get some funds for this, but the smallest area is 80 by 100, and that is an average depth of 8 feet.

Would you like to know how many holes they are going to bore and all that sort of thing? I could give you all that information if you like? But that is a total of \$133,976.80 or an average of \$375.29 cost per hole.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Mr. President, would the Member undertake that he would have someone from the Marine Department give opinions on this, because it seems that the doubling of the price is for the further widening and perhaps a well marked channel that is 80 feet wide might be sufficient and we could save a hundred and odd thousand dollars?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, I think by implication the Member is, perhaps, inadvertently saying that Marine Department expertise was not invited in the study of this. This is not the case, Sir. We consulted on a wide basis with available marine expertise on the Island.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Can the Member say if he consulted on a wide basis, who are these marine experts?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, I believe the I had not really completed the question that was asked by the Third Elected Member for George Town because he had asked me to give a cost of the four different submissions made on this, but to answer the First Elected Member for West Bay, I would say they were people who had a lot of experience in the use of the channel in Cayman Brac. With your permission I could go on and answer the Third Elected Member for George Town and his question.

The question from the Third Elected Member For George Town was to give a comparison of the different submissions. The first one was the 80 by 100, with an average depth of 8 feet with 357 bore holes. The second one was an area of 80 by 200 feet, an average depth of 8 feet, with 697 bore holes. This was a cost of \$211,217.87, or \$303.04 average cost per bore hole. The third was an area of 80 feet by 400 feet, an average depth of 8 feet, with 1,377 bore holes at a cost of \$363,638.40, or an average cost of \$264.08 per hole. The fourth one was an area of 80 by 600 feet, an average depth of 8 feet. The number of holes being 2,057 holes at a cost of \$515,158.93, or an average cost of \$250.44 per hole.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Mr. President, a supplementary that I asked a while ago the Member replied that there were people. I know if they were marine experts, they must have been people - it certainly could not have been cows - but who are these people? Who are the companies, if there are companies, and what was the cost?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, it is not too often I make mistakes between

people and cows, only once and awhile. But with your permission I will indeed provide the answer in writing to the Member.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Mr. President, could the Member say whether the additional feet, for example between the 100 feet and the 200 feet, whether this is an extension inland for a mooring area or whether it is an extension outside of the channel? I am a bit confused there - not confused, I just do not know, I should say.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: The answer, Mr. President, is that the extension is outwards from the channel.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: One last question, Mr. President. So is there an area beyond what is now taking in the 80 to 200 feet which is going to be shallower than 8 feet on the outward side? That seems to be totally wrong because you need to go over that area to get to 8 feet you are dredging, so it must be on the inside.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Perhaps, Mr. President, it would be much easier for the Member if he could meet with us and let us just go over this with him. This is why it took four proposals and a lot of statistics and much time for us to come and reach our decision. It is not very easy to give him a technical answer like this in just giving a straight forward answer, so I would be happy to give it. I would also like to say that the whole idea of cleaning this channel was one that was brought up in the Portfolio and we are trying to assist the Members in Cayman Brac with this project.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think we have dug that question out pretty thoroughly. Perhaps we could go on to the last question today, 138, the First Elected Member for the Lesser Islands.

THE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE LESSER ISLANDS TO ASK THE HONOURABLE ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR COMMUNICATIONS, WORKS AND NATURAL RESOURCES

NO. 138: Would the Honourable Member say whether Government is considering assisting with the installation of a reverse osmosis plant in Cayman Brac for the supply of potable water?

ANSWER: The answer, Mr. President, is yes, the Water Authority is actively investigating the possibility of installing in Cayman Brac the 60,000 gallon per day reverse osmosis plant that is presently being utilised in George Town to provide water on a temporary basis until such time as the larger 350,000 gallon per day is commissioned.

A recent fact finding visit by the Chairman and Director of the Water Authority revealed that it might be very feasible to relocate the plant on the south west end of the Island, construct a limited distribution to provide water to the west end of the Island and a 500,000 gallon reservoir to provide a supply to be trucked to other areas of the Island. Discussions have been held with the District Commissioner to encourage the Government to carry out the trucking of water which will ensure that the cost to the consumer is reasonable, as it appears that the Government could provide this service and meet its cost with the minimum of overhead.

If all proceeds according to plan, the temporary reverse osmosis plant will be available early in 1990. The Water Authority has the option to return it to the manufacturer or to relocate it in any other part of the Islands. It is the opinion that Cayman Brac has the greatest need as no alternative supply of water exists. If agreement with Government is reached, the plant could be commissioned by the end of the first half of 1990 and the distribution and reservoir completed by the dry season of 1990.

Again, Mr. President, while this is not a written part of the answer, we wish to point out that the initiative in looking into the water needs of Cayman Brac was also made through the Water Authority.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

CAPT. MABRY S. KIRKCONNELL: Supplementary, Mr. President. Could I ask the Honourable Member if this would then include a pressure system piped water in the west end district? Is that what I understand this answer to read?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: The answer, Mr. President, is yes.

MR. PRESIDENT: That appears to conclude Question Time. I wonder if Members would agree that it might be sensible to take the Lunch Break now, rather than resume the Second Reading of the Appropriations Bill? Proceedings are suspended, then, until 2:15.

AT 12:40 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 2:29 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Proceedings of the House are resumed. Before the House continues with the Second Reading debate on the Appropriations Bill, I should like, with due regard and due respect for the freedom of debate, to bring to Members' attention Standing Order 63(2), which says:

"On the motion for the second reading of an appropriation bill debate shall be confined to the financial and economic state of the Islands and the general principles of Government policy and administration as indicated by the bill and the estimates."

What this Standing Order does is state in form specific the Appropriation Bill, the provisions of Standing Order 48 on other Bills. In bringing this to Members' attention I repeat the Chair does not in any way wish to limit the scope of debate, but simply to see that we try to follow Standing Orders. The Standing Finance Committee is the place where the details should be debated.

The Second Reading has been moved. The Motion is, therefore, open for debate.

The First Elected Member for Bodden Town.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Bills

SECOND READING DEBATE ON THE APPROPRIATION (1990) BILL, 1989 (BUDGET ADDRESS)

MR. ROY BODDEN:

Thank you, Mr. President.

I suppose that it is in order to say that to attempt to lead off in a forum such as this with such a timely and important subject, one must be a little brave and a little foolhardy at the same time. I have never lacked either of those qualities, sir. So this time is no different. I would like to commend the Honourable Financial Secretary for an excellent presentation of the Budget of the Government. His speech was delivered with his usual eloquence and we take note of his sage advice, of which commentary will be offered later.

There are several levels at which that presentation can be interpreted, and I would add as a precautionary remark that I am not an economist, preferring, instead, to study man in society, but there are several levels and the only drawback in the presentation is that I would have expected that we would have had more of the actual financial statements and accounting of the various departments. Nevertheless, that is not a major detraction and I am sure that Members on this side of this House are ably equipped to deal with that. Having established that, I would like to suggest that for the second time in the recent parliamentary history of this country, we are approaching a Rubicon, a dividing line: The first time being when our representatives took the decision at the breakup of the Federation in the late 1950s/early 1960s, that we would go our separate ways and take our chance as a Crown Colony rather than following Jamaica into independence.

Might I suggest that the second Rubicon, the second dividing line which we are facing now as legislators on the eve of the 1990s decade, is no less important or challenging. Like our Honourable Financial Secretary I, too, have some (even if I describe it that way myself) sage advice that I would like to pass on. It is important that we continue to locate ourselves within the matrix of the world economy so that we can remain a locomotive rather than become a mule- or an ox-drawn cart. I would like to put that another way: The challenge is for us to continue to manage our financial resources so that we can remain free from the inhibitions, dictates, the sanctions of the bodies which loan monies, like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. But I am not entirely convinced that the Government, if they have their way, would keep us this way.

I remember some years ago, when I was at school and we studied development strategies. One of the instructors said that a common fallacy among developing countries is to get caught up in prestige projects at the expense of developing the human resources of the country. Throughout the Budget Address given by the Honourable Financial Secretary I read his insinuations, his sage advice, his calling for some guidance and reminding us that we have a question: Should we get carried away or should we pay attention to declining birthrates with the fact that less than one per cent of our students are equipped to deal with the middle and higher level jobs in our community? Or, should we embark on projects which should, perhaps, take a lesser precedence? That will be the theme of my delivery.

I want to say that without historical analysis, political and economic strategies are like a doctor practicing medicine without a diagnosis - dangerous and intolerable. We can learn a lot from historical analysis. I say this, full well realising that the historian has the advantage on his side because he knows in due course some directions will emerge which will help him in his interpretations of the events, while the politician and the economist may not necessarily have that advantage. However, at this time, on the eve of 1990, we in Cayman have the advantage of being able to examine the path taken by several countries around us seeing the economic and political muck they are mired into. So if we are smart, intelligent and have the so-called good old Caymanian common sense that I think we have, we will look long and hesitate many moments before taking the step that will plunge us head long into the abyss of debt and unbalanced budgets.

The Government has an obligation to leave this country in no less of a financial position than they found it in whenever the time comes for them to give an accounting of their stewardship. Excuse me, I would like to reiterate that. The Government has an overriding obligation to leave this country in no less of a financial position than the one in which they found it. The people on this side of the House - and I trust that each will exercise his duty to speak for himself individually, and some may want to express it collectively - also have an obligation to guide the Government, to usher the Government or, if it is necessary, to whip the Government into realistic policies. So that together (and I stress this) together we can effect what is best for country and nation.

As one surveys the largely wrecked hopes of many of the developing countries, one is confronted by an image of stagnating economies; of debt to the international lending agencies; reemerging famine and malnutrition; a disgruntlement and disenchantment with political directorates; societies which are suffering socially, economically and, in many instances, morally because of chaotic fiscal policies, because of wrong priorities, because of Governments following divisions of grandiose prestige projects. Is this what we want for Cayman? Is this what we want for our beloved country? If it is not, then let us (Government and Backbench) rise to the challenge and work together; and instead of Master Ground Transportation Plans, and instead of new hospitals and instead of other prestige projects, let us together and declare the 1990s the decade of youth! [*Some Members: Hear, hear!*]

Take the sage advice offered last year (if my memory serves me correctly) by our Honourable Financial Secretary and invest in the development of our human resources, and invest in the education and training of our young people, and invest in better social services and a medical health insurance plan and a pension plan for our people. Then, and only then, can we continue to move forward comfortably; move forward easily without disruption, upheaval and discontent.

I often wonder how in a small country (because this country is small in every sense of the word)... I was reflecting just this morning that some universities have larger student populations than we have as a nation. I often wonder how we cannot work together to arrive at what is in the best interest. How is it that 12 people, elected by the populous of this country, cannot find a common ground to arrive at a course which is best suited for our continued development? You know why that is baffling? Because we come from a nation of seafarers. In the old days it was of critical importance on the schooners that we cooperated to beat the storm, to beat the rough weather, to make it back home to our loved ones. We had to cooperate when we went to Mosquito Cay and all the other places we went to, like the argonauts we were.

Now on the eve of 1990, in the last decade of the 20th century, we cannot find enough common ground to say, "We would like to present a Budget, Backbenchers, what do you think should be some priorities? Backbenchers, we want you to have a little say." Instead, we are drifting into the arena of adversarial politics again. We are coming with 'one-up-manship' and we will not back off because, "this is my plan and I want to push it through because I think I have the power and the influence and the prestige and because I might be a Government Member." Mr. President, it makes no sense.

I have to talk about something that happened here yesterday afternoon. If the Member had only done what the Opposition requested and withdrawn that the results would have been entirely different. Upon my sacred word of honour. It happened before. But you know what? We are determined never to learn. Politics is the art of compromise and the Government had better realise that. Backbenchers are responsible. Backbenchers are cooperative. Backbenchers are working in the best interests of Cayman, and we want to work with the Government and we want to start with this Budget. I am laying the challenge down. Let us, when we get to the Committee say we want what is best for Cayman. We will declare this the decade of youth. We will try to put emphasis on education and training and all the other areas where we need to develop our people. It will be interesting to see if that advice is given any credence, or maybe they will say, "throw it out the window, that only comes from an old single-entry bookkeeper."

You can have all the money in the world - you can have \$110 million, you can have \$220 million - but if you do not have a sensible plan, it will come and go. It is easy to go. We are involved with a struggle for the very survival of this small country. It is incumbent upon every Member of this Assembly, now that we have been given the baton by our Honourable Financial Secretary, it is incumbent upon Government and Backbench to take this baton. If we are to win the race, if we are to win the relay, each man must run his lap to the best of his ability, bearing in mind that it has to be a team effort. I want to stress that. It has to be a team effort because under our system it cannot be any other way.

The Budget Address was precedent setting. The behaviour of the representatives should also be precedent setting. We should be prepared to come and work in a spirit of cooperation. But in order to do that it means that we may have to re-orient and change some priorities. Let us not worry about loss of face, we are working for the betterment of the Cayman Islands and our country. There is no such thing as losing. We want to work in a spirit of cooperation. I will tell you something, I am at my best in such an atmosphere because I cannot tolerate arrogance and effrontery. When I see that I am inclined to lash out and discipline that sort of behaviour and bring it down a peg or two. I would not have been a good school teacher if I did not have that kind of disposition. So, Mr. President, one could say that is a veiled warning.

I would like to spend some time trying to tie in some of the observations made by the Honourable Financial Secretary. Our economy and how well we do is inextricably linked to what happens in the wider world, especially North America and the North American economy. I would respectfully suggest that it may be time for us to take a broader view in light of some anticipated developments, especially with the single market in Europe in 1992, and in light of the fact that the far East, especially Japan, will be expected to rise and play a more prominent role in the manufacturing and financial market. We have a fragile economy. Based as it is on banking and tourism, we have to remain watchful as was underscored by the Financial Secretary in his Address. We are affected by many international trends both positively and negatively - inflation; the

prime lending rate; interest rates, generally; the desire of people to travel for leisure and, since we are predominantly an importer rather than an exporter, we are especially vulnerable to inflationary trends. All this we were told in the Budget Address.

That is why the challenge is all that greater for us to pool our resources and ideas. That is why we have to be careful how we launch off on prestige projects which some people think important and other not so important. That is why it would be much wiser to develop our human resources, rather than going after intangibles like roads, which should definitely have a lessor priority. That is why we should take good stock. Maybe taking stock only comes from single entry accountants and bookkeepers, because the other people do not have to take stock. But any good manager must realise that he or she will have to account to the Board of Directors.

When the time comes for that accounting one should reasonably expect to be in the black. In the Black - show a profit or at least break even, and that is the way it is with the running of a country. It then follows that if we have a Budget, we must sit down and iron out what is important, what is not so important, what is urgent and what can wait. So it is a *team* effort, and while some are more equal than others, the manager could not make it without the janitor, without the secretary and without the stenographer. That is why I like the Japanese system because they stress team work. If a company does well, the team does well. If a company does not do well, the team does not do well. Mr. President, if a country does well, the Government does well. If the Government does poorly, the country does poorly. How can we then free ourselves from the umbilical cord which binds us to the wider world which has us woven into what happens in London, New York, Tokyo and Zurich. We cannot.

What we can do is choose if we would like to continue to manage our fiscal resources soundly, as we have been doing or, if we want to take a diversion full of the mirage and overdevelop and build expressways and super highways and launch off on all the other things that might not be so necessary at the expense of our youth, at the expense of our social services, at the expense of our housing, and at the expense of our old age pension. Before this Session is over, we, the Elected Members of this country's Parliament will have to make that decision. As for me and my household... I know where my decision is going to lie. I endeavour to make a sound one. We can do it if we work together. We can come out here smelling like roses comforted by the fact that the future is in good hands, as we have good hands. Or we could also mess up, and the tendency is that we could mess up easier than we can do good.

Our economy, as laid out in the Budget debate, is inextricably tied to what happens in the world. We have to set our course and we were on a course that was a good course. Now it seems some Members of the Government want to change it, want to turn the wheel a couple of degrees to the starboard, or to the port for that matter. They want to take us off course whatever way. It is bad either way. I say that full well realising that although the Budget was presented by the Honourable Financial Secretary it is not his Budget. It is the Government's Budget. So I am talking to the Government. They can sleep, they have a long time because I have the watch and I know my limits, and I know that if I wander you will give me a little tap. But I am not prone to wandering.

Mr. President, permit me, sir, page 9: "The Cayman Islands are a very open and dependent economy." The Government should realise that it must be prudent to manage our resources in such a way that our dependency can rise to no greater a level than it is now. It is true that we have some reserves. Let me suggest that an excellent position to be in would be the position where our reserves in any given year are equal or not far from equal to our recurrent expenditure. That is an ideal to which we should strive. That is the ideal to which we should work together to accomplish, and it is not impossible to have \$35 million in reserves. That is fine. That is much better than not having any reserves. But to have \$70 million in the reserves is an even better position. The kind of Caymanian I am, and the kind of Cayman I would like to see is one that continues to be the envy of the world, be it the developed world or the developing world. I am confident that we have the people. Only, Mr. President, we have to screen our ideas.

I know that politicians want the best. Heaven knows I am one. It is basic human nature, but sometimes the bigger things seem the more attractive. We cannot forget important changes that were laid out by the Financial Secretary in his Address that our society is undergoing, like population growth and demographic changes. I was even more startled than I had been to realise that soon we will be faced with some very serious decisions. I can remember other countries with declining birth rates and falls in native population or, as in the case of the Cayman Islands, I prefer to call them established Caymanians. I can remember some other countries having to take controversial steps to remedy this kind of situation because, believe you me, it is not easy nor a good feeling when you realise that in a few years' time you (as an entity or as a people) will be outnumbered. We have to view that situation very carefully.

I would like to state here and now, as I have always stated (and I can vividly recall stating when debating the Throne Speech and Budget debate in the previous Parliament) I am not one of those people who says outsiders are not welcome. I have a broad mind and I would not use this or any forum to promote prejudice. But I am saying that we, as Caymanians, must prepare ourselves to compete in the arena for jobs. We must equip ourselves with that training in those skills which are in demand in our country. We must also realise that we cannot make it alone. No man is an Island unto himself. We have to be interdependent. We have to so regulate and so structure our development so that while we are in control as Caymanians, we still accept and tolerate people from outside because, like Topsy, we did not just grow up - it took us many years to reach this point and we had help from many people from many nationalities.

So while as politicians and as Caymanians we have an overriding obligation to protect our own people, we cannot be as xenophobic, insular and ignorant as to suggest that we shut out anyone else. I do not like that. It does not spell good sense. We could not survive and it is highly impractical. What we have to do (and what the Government is obligated to do) is to look at these problems -

declining birthrates, a fall in the population, an increase in elderly Caymanians - and see how best it can be addressed or redressed without seriously affecting our standard of living and the economic progress we have made to date: A grave challenge and one I am suggesting that cannot be successfully accomplished without the help of the people from this side of the House. We are prepared to help.

I believe that is what my constituents in Bodden Town elected myself and my colleague to do. We, on this side of the House, are willing to help. I go as far as to say we want to help, and we can help. But every time we make a suggestion which is contrary to what the Government wants to do, they find a way to put us down - sometimes with a slap, sometimes with a kick. But I am afraid we are like "rock 'n roll" - here to stay. At least until 1992, I cannot speak beyond that. We will continue to remind them, when we think they are veering to the port or the starboard, and although we may be down in the engine room, some of us have loud voices and we can reach them on the bridge - we reached them yesterday.

I believe it is safe to say that this is a frontier society. This is a society which attracts many people because it is vibrant, booming and because there are many prospects for economic improvements in this society. It is a frontier society also in the sense that we are sparsely populated. Demographically, people argue that we can accommodate many more people. It is true that we have the capabilities, a basic infrastructure which can accommodate that, but we have to be prudent. We in this country have an environment that is so desirable that we can afford to lay down stringent and strict screening procedures. That we can say "O.T.B." - Only The Best: Only the best minds, only the best characters, and only the best money. We have said only the best money already, now we have to get around to saying only the best other two things - characters and minds. We can say, "When you come and take up a position, do us a favour: train a Caymanian, take a Caymanian understudy. Take a young Caymanian mind and help us to help you and together we can make it." That is what I want the Government to establish, instead of MGTPs and all the other things. I want them to establish a sound and sensible economic growth policy.

I was a hard school master - austere and demanding - and just like my whipping and cajoling and teaching produced some good students eventually, if I am here long enough, I am going to produce a good Government. I am going to help them along when they need help. Although corporal punishment is outlawed in the schools and not allowed in our Parliament, I am going to lash them with the tongue until they do what is sensible, if they need that. I can be a little irreverent, and I am giving licks now full well knowing when they rise I am going to take some licks. Suffice it to say I have plenty of help down here.

We are saying that the Government should take into account all these things. We are depending on them to see that our overall course of economic growth is sensible. We are depending on them now that we have entered the Rubicon, the dividing line, to say, "Since we are first among equals come, Backbenchers, let us lead the way. Let us sit down and work it out." Let us take the sage advice of our Honourable Financial Secretary and decide whether it be the development of human resources or whether it be prestigious projects.

Allow me to pause a little to interject a relevant story. The 19th century author, Gustave Flaubert wrote a story about a nice, provincial french young lady, *Madame Bovary*, who was fortunate enough to have met and married a successful Parisian surgeon. When she moved to Paris, the sights of the city distracted her and seduced her from her values and morals, and she got carried away by the bright lights of Paris and got distracted and lost her provincial qualities and ruined herself. Let us, on the good ship Cayman, not get distracted by the bright lights, the prestigious projects, the fame that can follow, the back-slapping by the people who come to the frontier. Because when all the back-slappers have gone and all is quiet on the streets, and all the consultants have vanished, we will have a populace with open arms, open mouths and glaring eyes, and guilty politicians who mismanaged the affairs of a once vibrant nation.

The decade of youth beckon us. Let us take the challenge as a Government. That is a good investment - investing in the young Caymanian minds that I see congregated by the Elizabethan Square, by Faces nightclub, by Monkey Business, on the streets of Bodden Town and those I see on the football field. Those are the people I want when I am hobbling about and my beard is fully white; they are the ones I want to slap me on my back. I am suggesting they are the only ones that are going to be around because the others will have made it and put it in the carpet bags and be long gone.

My model is old John G. Diefenbaker, a man who used to get up in the House of Commons and point his finger. That is what I am doing at the Government. I am saying youth it is, and youth it should be. I want to say again that I am giving licks because I can take them. My shoulders are broad, I have plenty of help. I am not worried. If they could kill me, I would be dead. I have had enough of them growing up.

I want to say again, all that glitters is not gold. Everyone that comes with an idea is not a friend, is not in the best interests of the country. We have to work it out. We know what is best. We grew up here. We live here everyday. We have homes to go to. We have young people who call us affectionate names. We have young people to whom we must be role models. If we were not given a chance by those people who approached the Rubicon in 1959, we would not have been at this point now. If we were not given a chance when they decided they would take their chances on their own, by remaining a Crown Colony if we had gone the other route as a people, we would have been long outnumbered and extinct.

So now, on the eve of 1990, we have to sit down and say we are obligated to give the young people of this country a chance. So you know what we are going to do? We will try to the best of our ability to use our financial resources so that we may have *reasonable* streets, so that we can have some left over for education and training. Education is like what James Brown says, "That's my bag", and any money that we invest in that is like what my old grandfather (my brother and I use to call him the 'patriarch') used to tell me. That is not even like money in the bank that you can go and draw out one day and spend. Any investment in education is a lasting investment and one that can only be in the best interest of the individual and country and

that is the way we have to go!

The Caymanian mind... I saw a presentation the other night by Cayman Against Substance Abuse (CASA), called the Cayman Crack Attack, or something, in the Church hall in Bodden Town. Mr. President, I am an emotional person and I was moved close to tears to see the young, vibrant, handsome Caymanian faces that are two and three time offenders in Northward Prison, to hear their stories about crack; faces that bespeak an intelligence, but faces which are hopeless. And you want to tell me that our priorities in this country should be the MGTP? Well, the Government better look at that video too - soon, real soon. How can we as a country survive if our progeny is reduced to a prison? If their minds are vegetables because of crack? How can we, as Legislators, say that we are working for our country when we turn a blind eye to that and talk about alleviating traffic jams? I have never heard such nonsense.

But you see, it is one thing to be given advice, it is an entirely different thing to take it. I know that efforts are being made and I commend those efforts. We have a young Member under whose responsibility much, if not all, of our social programmes fall, and he is doing a good job. But what I want to stress is that it has to be interdependent and interwoven with other departments of Government. Above all, when it comes to the general revenue, somebody must take responsibility for working out where the priorities are going to lie because it does not make sense to try to plug the hole in the dike with the drug problem if the majority of the money is spent in ways where there can be no follow up and no corollary policies.

I am sensible enough to know that, and I am sensible enough and honest enough and decent enough to give credit where credit is due, and the Government deserves much credit, in spite of what I am saying. But I am saying that does not exonerate them from the overall responsibility. Today, Roy Bodden, is laying the challenge down for them to make 1990 the decade of youth in this country and to re-orient their fiscal policies and to down play the prestige project developments and to down play the overheating of the economy and to down play the consultancies. Instead launch off on what is practical and develop what we have in the greatest numbers - our human resources. Is that too great a challenge? It makes no sense to commit a stop-gap policy. Every time you push a finger in the dike and you plug one hole, it is going to break out somewhere else because the world is weak. If we put in \$10 here and a vote for this programme or \$10 and a vote for the other programme, that is a token effort - an exercise in tokenism.

What we want to do is to look at this Budget Address and find out how, when we get around the table to working, how best we can take the sage advice given by the presenter and come up with something decent and sensible. How nice it would be if we from the Backbench could be able to shove the Government forward to meet the press and tell them we have set off on a course that we believe will make Cayman proud because what we think is important are the young people of this country and we want to spend more money to develop them and to provide for them education and training to the fullest extent.

I have to voice some disappointment. I have to really voice some very serious disappointment about some things. As regards the development of young Caymanians, with all the money we have and all the money we are spending, I remain to be convinced that we are getting the best value. I have to say this again because it astounds me how we in the Cayman Islands have not yet even produced a majority of our teachers. Tsk, tsk, tsk. Can someone not see that something is seriously wrong? Quite frankly, I was disappointed at some of the answers I received to some of the questions I asked concerning education. In the Budget itself, I think the monies allocated could be better spent in many, many areas. I think what we need to realise is that we have to take a comprehensive view of education in Caymanian society. We have to take the view that we have to become self sufficient in the Civil Service for the most part.

Sure, we are providing scholarships. Sure, we are providing training, but read the sage advice and the observations of the Honourable Financial Secretary. Less than 1 per cent of our students are being prepared and, even those who are being prepared, are going to second rate institutions. Who is responsible? Is it not the Government? That shocked me. How in the world can we allow our students to go abroad to less than recognised institutions? Does that not say that someone needs to take a serious view of the system? It tells me that someone should be called to account. Is it also not saying that 1 per cent is not good enough? We should up the percentage so more should go. We will always be behind at this rate.

I was chagrined to learn that in the foyer we have a plan for a dental clinic. Another one of those prestige projects. Consultants from yonder, people who come to the frontier who call for six dentists, and we do not even have one who is going to be a Caymanian? I have to say these people are really lucky they do not have to account to Roy Bodden, because they would not get off so easily. They would not get off so easily.

Are the priorities in the building, in the physical structure? Or should the priorities be in the mind of the individual, in the Caymanian? Are the priorities the consultants? Or are the priorities the people who are going to be using the services, who are going to be manning the services? I remind the Government that charity begins at home. Caymanians must get the best that Cayman has to offer. In education and training, we are decades behind. But this is no different from what happens in other developing countries. That is why I am so distraught, because we always like to pride ourselves and to pat ourselves on the shoulders and say that we are different, we are unique. It is true. Sometimes we are different and unique - for the wrong reasons.

Any investment made in education is an investment which will yield returns many times over in a more socially stable, politically sound and economically feasible Cayman. The amount of money we spend on education for a small country is the envy of much larger countries. The result we get is not in direct proportion to the monies we are spending. I am suggesting that it is time we re-orient, that we take a serious look and seek better value for money and give our students better advice - up the percentage of those being prepared from 1 to 5. Let us set a plan or target and then, those that we have being prepared, let us insist that they have the tools and skills necessary to be accepted only in first rate institutions abroad. And when

we have done all that, let us not forget that we should also begin looking at developing some of these educational and training institutions on our own soil.

I must say that I was disappointed at what the Public Accounts Committee was told about the progress of the Community College. I would have expressed it more harshly - we are lagging behind. We are years, soon we will be a full decade, behind. How can we catch up? In the meantime we are losing more poor souls. What I cannot understand, as a political neophyte, is the fact that since I have been here motions and motions have been brought concerning education and training and, while they are accepted, they do not seem to have any priority. I want to emphasise again that the best investment we can make for the future of this country is an investment in our youth, our young people. We must move to the point where we are self-sufficient in our teachers - first at the primary level, then we can move on and up.

I would like to say that I have given much thought, but I refrain because I do not wish to overload this Honourable House with committee work, nor do I wish to bring any motion which is going to be accepted but never worked upon. I would like to see, in the Cayman Islands, because I realise it is necessary, and when I heard the Honourable Financial Secretary's Budget Address I realised it was absolutely essential for us to have in this country some kind of national certification which is accepted by our business community and the Government so those Caymanian students who do not desire tertiary education can have some kind of national qualification and accreditation recognised by the banks, the captive insurance companies, by the Chamber of Commerce and by the private sector generally, that will help them to get jobs without necessarily having to produce GCSE.

That should be a challenge of the Government. That should be a challenge for the decade of youth for the Government to accomplish, to work with the Chamber of Commerce in tandem with the Bankers Association and the Insurance Brokers Association to arrive at a high school matriculation exam recognised in the Cayman Islands that our students can use to get jobs when they leave school. A sensible, national school-leaving exam, common to the Cayman Islands. But, you know something? That calls for too much cooperation, that demands too much consultation. That is out of the realms of expectations and tolerance of some people.

While I am at this point, I want to make note of something that I read in the November 17th issue of the *Daily Gleaner* concerning a confrontation between what they described as the Government and the Chamber of Commerce, in which they said the Government was revengeful in revoking the work permit of someone who was formally employed by the Chamber of Commerce. It is incumbent upon the Government not to project those kinds of images because that goes abroad like the song says about 'slide mongoose'. Issues like that you have to handle with kid gloves.

I want to suggest that the Chamber of Commerce (like rock 'n roll) also is here to stay and the sooner the Government realises that they should be utilised... In sociology we have a term called co-opt. The Government should seriously think about that - co-opting the Chamber of Commerce where and when necessary and down play and cease from the adversarial relationship and try to work together. We are too small for this faction to be against this faction, and this faction uptight with that faction. Cooperation is the name of the game. That disturbed me because that is how countries lose their reputation.

The people went on to talk about press censorship because they said the story was not aired. The *Daily Gleaner* of November the 17th, 1989. I have the article right here like a good soldier - *semper paratus* - always prepared. So they can get it from me if they wish.

MR. PRESIDENT: Perhaps we might take the break.

MR. ROY BODDEN: Thank you, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: Proceedings suspended for 15 minutes.

AT 3:30 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 3:40 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Proceedings of the House are resumed. The First Elected Member for Bodden Town, continuing.

MR. ROY BODDEN: Thank you, Mr. President.

Moving on, I would like to spend some time addressing the part of the Budget Address dealing with the pace of socioeconomic transformation. I would suggest that there is no clearer section in the Budget Address which demonstrates that we have entered the Rubicon, the dividing line, than this.

The question is: Should we continue to develop at our present pace or should we seek to slow our pace of development? My knowledge of development strategies tells me that the ideal pace of development, percentage wise, is from 3 to 4 per cent. When we develop beyond that it does not mean it is not good, but then we run the risk of attracting inflation, of development galloping away with us, of creating social problems because development is only good if it trickles down to all strata in the society proportionately. So to develop at the pace of double figures is not necessarily in the best interests of the country. But the reverse is also true. Not to develop or to curtail development is also not in the best interest of the country.

Hence, the Rubicon. Which way will we go? Should we stop development? Should we continue at our present pace? If we continue at our present pace, for whom are we developing, since Caymanian peoples realise full employment? My motto is one which I would like to put forward as a partnership in development; a partnership between those of us who are, as I term it, established Caymanians, and the partnership between those people whom we allow in here - be they Status holders, Work Permit holders, Permanent Residents with the right to work, or whatever, because we can only survive if we are interdependent. If we accept that, then we have to move from that point to ascertain what is the best pace of development.

Some people argue that we should continue. I am frightened at the continuation with its present rapid pace. This is motivated by the realisation that we are in a position of declining birth rates and an aging population. So, quite rightly, our fears of being outnumbered are not groundless. I am frightened at the continued rate at its present pace because where are we going to put the hotels? Who is going to work in them? Who is going to work on the construction projects? I guess it is a catch-22 situation because I am also frightened by the prospect that every day we have to take in more people. If we do not have hotels, and if we do not have developments, where are we going to find work for these people and for our people? What I am saying is that the solution to the problem demands dialogue, cooperation, consultation, a team effort. I believe if we are to embark on an effective and sensible strategy to solve this crucial challenge on the eve of the decade of the 1990s, the Government, the Backbench, the private sector, all will have to work together. Each will have to state their concerns and then see if we can find some common ground and strategy.

We have for many years now been experiencing some social strain. If only we could take warnings sometimes. If only we could heed advice. A little over 10 years ago I suggested that we were on a track for problems. I stated why in a popular publication in this country, only to be put down and castigated. As a result, what we have now are people complaining about their inability to procure affordable land on which to put their houses; an inability and a difficulty to afford mortgage loans in the realms where they can afford to pay while, at the same time, buying food and other daily necessities. We made the initial mistake, although we had the precedence set by the Government in the 1950s of selling lease-holds instead of absolute titles. We back tracked and now many Caymanians are complaining that they will not be able to own land in their own country. But we have to live with that because we cannot go back on our word. Let us move on from that point because it is not irreparable yet. Let us move to correct it. We have started and I commend the Government, the Housing Development Corporation. However, we have to ensure that that is so well funded that it covers the broad spectrum of Caymanian peoples, particularly those in the middle-lower and lower-lower income brackets. We can alleviate it if we have, as we have started, an effective Housing Development Corporation. That is one way.

But I am concerned too that we have to now begin working on attitudes. It strikes me (and I said this in this forum before) as I move around I get the impression from many people, especially young people, that the country owes them a living because they are Caymanians. I am sympathetic, but the young people should realise that there is no free ride and we expect them to work as we have worked and as others have worked for us. So we need to change our attitudes towards ourselves, towards outsiders and above all towards work. We need to create a good and sensible work ethic. It is incumbent upon us, as politicians, and upon the Government especially, to promote that. I say that because as politicians, many of us are approached with the expectation that we can arbitrarily circumvent the rules and change the regulations.

I am a Moses, God knows I am, but my people must realise that I am also a legislator. I cannot break the Laws I make. I expect to serve them well, but I expect them to realise they must play their part. I would like to see a change in attitudes. There is dignity in labour, even if we are sweeping the streets. That is an important job because if the streets are not swept we will be walking over rubble and rubbish and we will be affected by odors. They are just as important as the bank manager, as the car salesman and as the school teacher. It takes many different types of labour for the society to function and to work perfectly. We are all cogs in a big wheel.

I want to underscore that economically we are in a fortunate position in this country. Our dollar has a high value. Many people, even young people just leaving school, have the good fortune to work in jobs where they take home from \$200 to \$250 per week. That is a good start and that is not white collar work either. Some of these people earn more money than people who work in offices. So Caymanians, let us realise that there is dignity in labour and that any work done honestly and diligently is noble and productive. Let us change the attitude that because we are Caymanian the country owes us a living and the employer is obligated to put up with us. I was told there is no free ride. You, Roy Bodden, have to earn your way. You have to burn the midnight oil. You have to sweat and toil. I did that. All of us inside here had to do that. Some of us had to do more than that. There is nothing wrong with that, fellow Caymanians. But when we get opportunities we must make the best of them. We must not be distracted by drugs, the fast life, by the fact that we can tell someone I am here to stay but you are here to go. We each must do our part.

I want to further lay the challenge at the foot of the Government and ask them when they will push these kinds of programmes in the schools, in youth groups? I want to say it is time for the Portfolios of Education and Social Services to get together to create some constructive programmes for our young people, so we can catch them before we have to take them to court for the first offence, before they go to Northward. There are several programmes we can adopt. Outward Bound is one. We can start, although we do not have armed forces, per se, some kind of Cadet Corp in conjunction and in cooperation with the Police, teaching and inculcating in our youngsters the responsibilities of good citizenship, respect for others, respect for self and respect for property and above all, self discipline. Why do the Honourable Members not get together and come up with something like that for the 1990s, the decade of youth? Why are we waiting? Why are we wasting all this time?

I do not want to hear them get up and say they agree with me,

but the initiative must come from over here or it must come from there. The initiative must come from them, that is why they are on that side; that is why they are called the Government. The support will come from here, but the initiative must come from them. I will tell them they can rely on me for whatever humble efforts I can give, in whatever capacity as a legislator or as a private citizen. They can rely on me, and if they need help feel free, do not feel too big to ask. They can take the credit because I know their conscience about that. They can get their pictures in the papers, I can stand behind.

It is good to be able to say we are doing well economically, but are we doing well socially? Are we doing well culturally? I had the opportunity recently of attending the 35th Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference and the 9th Small Countries Conference in Barbados along with two colleagues - Mr. Bush, and my colleague from Bodden Town Mr. Franklin Smith. We were invited to some of the most exciting, gripping and interesting cultural presentations that I have seen put on by Barbadian people who have no greater resources than we have in the Cayman Islands. No greater ingenuity. I was especially interested to know that one presentation one evening revolved around the theme of piracy, presented most grippingly in tandem with their local music. Ask my colleagues, it was worth the invitation. I was moved at the level of cultural development. What, may I ask, has happened to ours? Who are the responsible parties?

Entering the decade of the 1990s it is not good enough to say one Member cannot do everything, one Portfolio cannot do everything. One Portfolio cannot do anything if they do not try, if there is no start, if there is no beginning. We must be the catalyst. That is what the Members must be. That is what the Government must be - the Catalyst! They must provoke the action. As we talk about colloquialism, they must rope in the rest of the people. We are falling behind culturally. I was astounded to find that the reputation of Caymanian people in the eastern Caribbean is that they are rich, red and foolish. (Red is skin colour.) It was a little embarrassing to speak with some of these politicians and other people to find out the impressions they have of us - that we have lots of money down here but not much sense. They asked us, "Where do you guys come from?" That is not a good reputation to bear. And they tell us that we do not think we are part of the West Indies. I really, really was astounded and I had to be defensive. They were not putting us down. They told us that they regarded us being backward, culturally. That reminds me of something that I was told at home: It is not the amount of money you have in your pocket that makes you a man, but rather how you conduct yourself and the impression that you leave with other people.

I have never been that far before, I had never been on that side of the world. Although I went to school with some people from that country, the exchanges we had were altogether different. What I am saying is that our development strategies must be modified. We have to develop more of the kinds of cultural activities that I see spawning now. It is not good enough to say yes, we have the highest standard of living in the Caribbean if we act like we do not belong. It does not make good sense to say that we have developed economically if we have a society full of cultural and social misfits. What is the Government waiting for?

We do not want all our young people in Northward. We do not want to have to send all of them to rehab centres in Minnesota, or wherever, or put all of them in caring homes. We want to equip them so that when we are gone, when we have passed on, we can go upstairs and look down at some of them doing what I am doing now - delivering. Not only delivering, but making sensible deliveries that we can shake our heads and nod at it, like I used to see some politicians do and say, "See that youngster down there, he used to come to my political meetings, you know. I use to see him at the tail end there." That is what I want to be able to say. When I come here 20 years from now, I want to see a Bodden Towner making this kind of delivery, and I am up there. When I hobble down I want to be able to meet him and shake his hand, however feebly, and say, "Sonny, you are just like me when I was there, you know."

I want to say, here and now, that it is stupid to talk about writing off a generation. What do you think people are, old cars, old automobiles? They are human beings, they are salvageable. They have to be saved. We have to find a way, and we can save them by proclaiming 1990 the decade of youth and the responsibility is yours! Right over there! Take it. It belongs to you. I will tell you something here this evening, posterity will not be kind too you if you do not handle it right. Can we afford to mortgage the future? Can we afford to write people off? What is this, some kind of dumping ground? Or is it a country with people who care, with people who want to do well? When we have a document that says we have a \$110 million to spend, why should we have to write off anyone, let alone a whole generation? That is plenty of money. A lot of developing countries, bigger than we, are not so fortunate to find themselves in such a position.

But we cannot do it if we do not launch into human capital investments, enhanced by education, social projects, by leadership problems, by youth organisations which inculcate in the young self discipline, self esteem, respect for others, respect for property, respect for the country and respect for self. That is where we have to start, not on massive highways, not on dental clinics. Maybe not even on some other things. On the youth, on the youth, on the youth. Learn that. Learn that because if we write them off, they will come back one of these years to write us off - not with a pen, maybe with a weapon.

Gentlemen, if you find it humorous, I am astounded. I am challenging you - but I do not expect any better because the result of the record so far is not good. You are measuring your progress on a faulty report card. Do you hear what I am saying to you this evening? You are measuring your progress on a faulty report card. I will say, again, I know I am going to take licks, but I am giving some too. He who laughs last, laughs best and posterity will be the judge. Many people who have taken a similar stance and have been laughed at before me and their words have come back to haunt. I made my mark. I am moving through this forum. I am going to greater heights.

If you do not believe what I am saying, check it out a couple hence. Check it out! But while I am here, I am pledged to the bone to represent my country and constituency to the best of my ability and if that means putting you in line, by Jove, I will do that. Someone else will do it, so I am telling you again it is time we take a good look. The sage advice is that we have to diversify, we have to change

attitudes, we have to prepare. I am telling you the record of the past is not good enough. The past political directorates have failed. We now have a chance to begin to set the pages right, but we have to be prepared and serious. So, maybe we have to stop the sneering. I might tell you that while you are laughing at me, the public may be laughing at you. We have to take these things seriously because I believe certain industries and certain developments are not attracted to the Cayman Islands because we do not have the luxury of a large semi-educated cheap labour pool. So we cannot become a manufacturing country or a large assembling plant, like Taiwan or Singapore or Hong Kong, because that is predicated upon a large semi-educated, semi-skilled, inexpensive labour pool.

We have to take another development path. We are a tax haven, we are a banking centre. So we have to teach our children and inculcate qualities like honesty, diligence, loyalty, and disciplines like accounting and bookkeeping, proper English and etiquette and interpersonal relations. We have to teach them skills like auto mechanics, air conditioning and refrigeration, and that sort of thing. We have to develop programmes so that they can appreciate that they have a responsibility to the society and to themselves. We have to teach them values like respect for the elderly, respect for those in authority... and while I say these things, we have people who laugh. "What fools these mortals be?"

I am not a long speaker. I am not a rambler. I think too much of this Honourable House. I believe, sir, I have made my point. I want to say that when a policy is unsound it is the responsibility of the Backbench to inform the people. We are pragmatic but we will not sacrifice a principle to obtain a result. Our pragmatism is based on soundness.

I would like to think of myself as an optimist, and I have painted a picture of the Cayman Islands and my picture begins with a question. Why should we (26,000 people by popular estimates) believe we can survive where others much larger in numbers and larger in physical size have failed? Do you know why? We have certain advantages. We have a political stability which is almost guaranteed by our affinity to the metropolitan country. We have a people who over the years have been blessed with prudence and common sense. We have a people who have been tolerant to outsiders who have not been xenophobic and who have had the opportunity, many of them, especially the men, of being paid to travel to see the world, to see how it is done in other countries.

Since the 1950s... and, remarkably, since the 1970s we have been experiencing an economic boom which is unprecedented in the annals of many developing countries. I want to say and stress this, and I hope the Honourable Member can take it for what it is worth. We have at the helm of our Finance Ministry one of the ablest, I believe Miss Annie used to call them, "6 footers" in any part of the Caribbean who has given us a baton and said go with it. The only stipulation I am making is that you run the race in the right direction because you have in your hands \$110 million and the fate of a nation. Not only for today but for the years to come. I am saying I have run the first leg and, when I put the baton down, I am saying let us say our challenge is to make 1990 the decade of youth, of youth in the Cayman Islands.

I want to now say take some time to deal on the constituency level. I have been disappointed, grossly disappointed, in what was allocated to our constituency. I believe that we were shafted - but such is the process of learning, my boy Roy. People have a way of teaching lessons. While you are not young, you have a lot to learn. I would like to reassure my constituents that their representatives are working. We know our projects, we know what they need. By the help of the good Lord and Master, and with the cooperation of the other Backbenchers and the Government, we have informed the Government in enough time that we could have gotten our requests in the Budget. It seems we are no longer important. We are no longer needed. We are reduced to what is pejoratively termed, Backbenchers. I have always gloried in a good struggle. My constituents can rest assured that I am fighting for them. We know what they need and we are struggling even against odds to deliver it. The completed road works, the boat launching ramps, the perennially requested back road. I believe there are hopes now that we have jolted a part of the MGTP. Maybe there can be a little redistribution.

I feel good. This, Mr. President, is a good note to close on.

Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT:

I think we might move the adjournment.

ADJOURNMENT

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON:
House until 10:00 A.M. tomorrow morning.

Mr. President, I move the adjournment of this Honourable

THE PRESIDENT:
put the question. Those in favour please say Aye...Those against No.

The question is that the House do now stand adjourned. I shall

AYES.

MR. PRESIDENT:
morning at 10:00.

The Ayes have it. The House stands adjourned until tomorrow

AT 4:28 P.M. THE HOUSE STOOD ADJOURNED UNTIL 10:00 A.M., FRIDAY, 24TH NOVEMBER, 1989.

**FRIDAY
24TH NOVEMBER, 1989
10:15 A.M.**

MR. PRESIDENT:
Trade.

Prayers by the Honourable Member for Tourism, Aviation and

PRAYERS

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS:

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:
Honourable First Official Member.

Proceedings of the House are resumed. Papers. The

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS AND REPORTS

REPORT OF THE STANDING FINANCE COMMITTEE
(Meetings held 30 & 31st August, 1989 and 18th & 25th October, 1989)

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, I beg to lay on the Table of this Honourable House the Report of the Standing Finance Committee, for meetings held on Wednesday the 30th of August, 31st of August, 18th of October and the 25th of October, 1989.

MR. PRESIDENT:

So ordered.

MR. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON:

Mr. President, I do not propose to read the Minutes of all these meetings, otherwise we are likely to be here until the lunch hour, but I think it is fair and reasonable to speak to the Report that deals with the meeting of the 18th and the 25th of October when Finance Committee approved a sum of supplementary expenditure of \$4,460,506.00.

**FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT
SUB-HEAD 01-005 - WAGES**

A sum of CI\$102,146.00 for wages to cover the 4 per cent award to weekly paid workers for the year 1989. A further sum of \$54,320.00 was sought for the same Head to meet the cost of publications which had not been budgeted for. This was for exposure in the Euro-money supplement in May of this year.

A further sum of \$6,500.00 for the same Head was approved to increase the allocation for telexes and telegrams. The sum of \$70,000.00 was also approved to increase the allocation for telephone expenses. A supplementary for the Commonwealth Fund for Technical Cooperation of \$20,952.00 requested to pay for the CFTC for a six month provision of the services of the Education Adviser who is now on the established post at the Community College for a period of one year until the Acting Principal, Mr. Sam Basdeo, returns from study leave. A sum of \$150,000 for gratuities to contracted officers was also approved. A sum of \$950.00 for office equipment, these are all under the same Head.

Supplementary request of CI\$195,000.00 for public officers' pensions gratuities and \$26,000.00 for MLA pensions.

HEAD 08 - LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Three Thousand dollars was approved to increase the allocation for subsistence. One thousand dollars was also approved to meet the additional expense for dietary and food supplies.

HEAD 15 - INTERNAL & EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

A sum of CI\$52,000.00 was requested to cover over-expenditure to the end of the year, arising out of higher rental payments and fluctuation of the (Sterling) exchange rates.

A further sum of \$220,081.00 was approved to cover the operating expenses of the London office. This amount was on an advance account and the supplementary was to allow us to write it off to expenses. This was caused by the fire that ravaged the building in London and the need to find temporary accommodation and ultimately to lease new accommodations and to deal with the essential refurbishing of new property and the acquisition of a new lease.

HEAD 16 - BROADCASTING

A supplement request for \$10,000.00 was approved for Government offices to enable Public Works Department to proceed with the project, that is the extension of the Broadcasting building or the possible construction of a second floor on the building to allow the Public Works Department to proceed with the project up to the acceptance of tender, finalisation of working drawings, commencement of contract documents (bill of quantities) and prepare the tender stage.

HEAD 18 - THE POLICE DEPARTMENT

The sum of \$10,000.00 was also approved for Head 18 - The Police Department - for subsistence resulting from increased crime. The Criminal Branch and Criminal Investigation Division are required to travel abroad. General investigations requiring statements from witnesses overseas, also continuity of toxicology services.

The sum of CI\$12,380.00 also for the Police Department was requested to construct two dog kennels for the recently acquired drug dogs.

HEAD 20 - PERSONNEL

A sum of \$445,200.00 was requested and approved to the housing allowance allocation. A sum of CI\$25,000.00 was also approved to increase the allocation for freight on personal goods, meaning the recruitment of staff and the freighting of their personal effects. The amount of \$85,000.00 was also approved to increase the allocation of other passages. A sum of \$11,200.00 was also approved to increase the allocation for other training.

HEAD 21 - DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION CONSTRUCTION OF ROADS

A supplementary sum of CI\$300,000.00 was requested to complete 6.3 miles of road in the South Coast of Little Cayman damaged by hurricane Gilbert. Finance Committee granted its approval.

HEAD 23 - FIRE SERVICES

A sum of CI\$135,000.00 was approved as a supplementary expenditure to cover the cost of overtime for firemen who have accumulated a number of hours and could not be awarded time off in lieu of overtime due to the limited number of shifts and the very dry season. Additionally, the airport station has to be fully manned at all times due to the regular touchdown and takeoff of aircraft.

HEAD 26 - ADMINISTRATION EDUCATION, RECREATION AND CULTURE

A supplementary sum of CI\$110,000.00 requested to cover expenditure for the rest of the year for the Cayman National Museum.

HEAD 27 - EDUCATION

A sum of \$294,592.00 was requested and approved for wages. A sum of CI\$93,801.00 approved for school equipment and \$19,942.00 for school furniture.

HEAD 28 - ADMINISTRATION-HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES

A sum of \$4,497.00 approved for subsistence and \$3,973.00 approved to increase the allocation for overseas travel. A sum of \$4,502.00 was approved as requested by the Portfolio for the Advisory Council on the Misuse of Drugs.

HEAD 29 - MEDICAL HEALTH SERVICES

The sum of \$2,096.00 was approved to increase the allocation for drugs requested by the Chief Medical Officer.

HEAD 31 - ADMINISTRATION - COMMUNICATIONS, WORKS AND NATURAL RESOURCES

A supplementary sum of \$36,000.00 was approved. It was requested due to considerable shortfall under this vote, that is the wages vote. A sum of \$12,459.00 for the same head to increase the Budgetary allocation for subsistence and \$4,403.00 to official travel.

Under Fees Consultancy under the same head a sum of \$73,750.00 were requested to cover the following schedule of items:

- (a) Estimated cost of the written comprehensive Five Year Agricultural Development Action Plan for the Cayman Islands. \$ 60,000.00
- (b) Specialist and Consultant in Horticulture re Mr. Otto Watler's Hydroponics Unit. Professional Fees \$8,450.00 and housing for the 2 consultants \$2,550.00. Car rental \$2,750.00

Making the total I referred to earlier of \$73,750.00.

A sum of \$16,000.00 was also requested to replace two of the Water Authority vehicles this year. The Authority has a fleet of nine vehicles, four of which are in poor condition and are being taken off the road as the licences expire.

Supplementary expenditure of \$112,000.00 for immediate acquisition of Block 15B, Parcels 75, 76, 77 and 78. The sum of \$84,000.00 requested to purchase Block 44B, Parcel 33 - Bodden Town was deferred. To be considered another day. Parcel 45, Block 37A, the sum of \$66,500.00 to purchase Block 37A, Parcel 45.

STAMP DUTY

To cover the cost of registering charges with respect to Government Medical Loads granted, \$2,562.00. The sum of \$77,000.00 was also approved for Block 25C, Parcel 11 and part of Parcel 12, which is the Spotts Jetty area. Block 21B - Parcel 17 to block 21c - parcel 38 rem1, that was also deferred.

Block 14BH - Parcel 4, a sum of the sum of \$165,000.00 was approved for the acquisition of that parcel of land for an extension to the Police Headquarters site.

The sum of \$26,000.00 was also approved for the acquisition of properties listed as:

- (i) Cayman Brac Central Block 98D, Parcel 4, and
- (ii) Cayman Brac East Block 111E, Parcel 252

Supplementary expenditure of \$61,850.00 was also approved to deal with the stamp duty on all of these purchases.

HEAD 32 - AGRICULTURE

A supplementary request of \$101,995.00 to cover the operating costs of the Farmers' Market to the end of the year. Finance Committee had placed a block on this vote of \$100,000.00, and the vote has been considerably overspent.

HEAD 33 - MOSQUITO RESEARCH & CONTROL UNIT

Equipment, the sum of \$17,486.00 was requested for sampling equipment for the research of Black Bank Disease on local corals.

HEAD 36 - POSTAL OFFICE EQUIPMENT

The sum of \$4,915.00 was approved for the purchase of a new photocopying machine.

HEAD 37 - PUBLIC WORKS

The sum of \$6,881.00 was approved to meet payments for leave and \$12,915.00 was approved to increase the allocation for temporary relief. The sum of \$77,298.00 was also approved to deal with workers' benefits and \$15,900.00 was approved to increase the allocation for the maintenance of public buildings.

Further \$143,000.00 was approved to cover increase the allocation for maintenance of school buildings and \$48,078.00 approved to increase the allocation for maintenance of roads.

The sum of \$151,900.00 to increase the allocation for maintenance of staff houses. Two hundred thousand and fifty five dollars was also approved to deal with disaster preparedness. This \$200,055 is broken down in this way:

18 generators	\$	92,000.00
Installation cost		5,000.00
Storage facilities - 8 locations		127,000.00
Immediate repair work to remaining locations		13,355.00
Misc/other works		<u>12,700.00</u>
SUB TOTAL:	\$	250,055.00
LESS: sum provided:		<u>-50,000.00</u>
TOTAL:		\$200,055.00

Supplementary request for CI\$4,337.00 approved to increase the allocation for the Fire Service building to carry out repair work resulting from hurricane Gilbert. Supplementary request for CI\$12,503.00 was also approved to increase the allocation for harbours and docks, also repairs resulting from hurricane Gilbert.

The sum of \$10,680.00 which was approved to carry out repair work necessary on the Medical Facilities as a result of hurricane Gilbert. The sum of \$31,451.00 approved to deal with repair work on public buildings, again as a result of hurricane Gilbert. The sum of \$12,356.00 approved to carry out repair work resulting from hurricane Gilbert on the playing fields, centres and parks.

HEAD 4 - FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT

Head 4, Finance and Development, the sum of \$6,000 was approved to increase the allocation for water in order to meet the bills of the Craft Market.

HEAD 8 - LEGISLATIVE

The request of \$2,500.00 under grants and contributions to the CPA.

HEAD 18 - POLICE DEPARTMENT

The sum of \$7,000.00 to increase their application for official travel.

HEAD 29 - MEDICAL HEALTH SERVICES

The sum of \$50,000.00 for operations landfill which is necessary to enable the continuation of garbage disposal operations.

HEAD 41 - LOCAL CONSTRUCTION

The sum of CI\$109,000 for local construction of harbours and docks was approved to carry out necessary alteration work at the cruise ship landing. The Port Authority has undertaken to do the repairs and the constructive facilities and this is Governments contribution to the cause.

HEAD 4 - FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT EMERGENCY RELIEF

The approval of US\$50,000.00 as a contribution to Montserrat for hurricane relief aid and US\$25,000 contributed to the British Virgin Islands as a result of hurricane Hugo and to help them with the necessary repairs, the result thereof.

HEAD 40 - CAPITAL EXPENDITURE MEDICAL EQUIPMENT

A sum of \$100,000.00 was approved and \$15,000.00 was also approved for Head 5 - the Banking Inspectorate - as the contribution necessary to the International Monetary Fund.

HEAD 31 - ADMINISTRATION CW&NR

The supplementary request of \$37,500 was also approved for the purchase of Block 95C, Parcel 136, in Cayman Brac. That brings us to a total of \$4,456,306. Finance Committee dealt with some other matters, the write off in-patient hospital fees, of \$512,205.49.

Also, approved professionals fees for the design, etcetera, of the dental clinic. It was also approved a variation of the funds for civil service mortgage loans to enable further loans be given during 1989.

The purchase of land, Block 49A, parcel 24, that matter was deferred.

The Cayman Islands guarantee was requested that the guarantee be increased from \$200,000.00 to \$300,000.00 to enable the work to be completed. Finance Committee approved that also.

On other matters such as Head 41 - Local Construction, Sports playing fields and parks regarding the West Bay Sports Complex, the Committee agreed that the Chairman be authorised to expend the necessary funds for the project and that he present the Committee with an estimate at a subsequent meeting.

The purchase of land, Block 14B, parcel 304 was deferred. Then on the 25th, these deferred supplementary requests, in respect of Block 44B, Parcel 33 in Bodden Town, that matter was further deferred as the First Elected Member for Bodden Town submitted an additional facility which the Portfolio of Health and Social Services was asked to look at for the purpose.

Also Block 21B, parcel 17, Block 21C, parcel 38rem 1, that item was agreed to be deferred and that the Attorney General be asked to look whether the legislation, in this case, could not be amended to provide a similar objective. This is dealing with the scenic coastline.

Block 49A, parcel 24 in Northside. It was agreed that the Government should provide a sum of \$80,000.00 to the Agricultural Development Board and the Board should look at this request.

A further supplementary of \$4,200.00 was requested to Head 1 - Subsistence in overseas travel and the Finance Committee granted its approval.
Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Papers continued.
The Honourable Member for Health.

REPORT OF THE CARING HOMES COMMITTEE

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER: Mr. President, in accordance with Standing Orders I beg to lay the Report of the Caring Homes Review Committee on the Table of this Honourable House.

MR. PRESIDENT: So ordered.

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER: Mr. President, in May, 1989, I invited certain leaders of the community to participate in a comprehensive review of the two Caring Homes - the Bonaventure House and the Frances Bodden Girls' Home. The members of the Committee were as follows:

- Mr. Larry Chormyn - representing the Rotary Club of Grand Cayman
- Dr. Roy Claire - Rotary Club of Grand Cayman central
- Dr. Ed Fields - Psychologist
- Mr. Fred Hanson - N.C.S.S. and Kiwanis
- Mrs. Sybil McLaughlin - Juvenile Court and Justice of the Peace
- Mrs. Olive Miller - N.C.S.S., Juvenile Court and Justice of the Peace
- Mrs. Daphne Orrett - Community Service and Development

Mrs. Joy Basdeo, Principal Secretary for Health and Social Services, presided as Chairman, and Ms. Barbara Rauch served as Secretary.

The terms of reference established for the workings of the Caring Homes Review Committee were as follows:

TO REVIEW THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE CARING HOMES

- a. By identifying the roles of various persons who work with the children in the Caring Homes,
- b. By delineating the responsibilities of each of the above groups as they relate to each other, the children in the care, the childrens' families, schools, hospitals and clinics and various support groups.
- c. By defining the staffing model used in the Caring Homes.
- d. By identifying areas of need such as staffing.
- e. By identifying the existing infrastructure of the Caring Homes, such as internal operations.

TO REVIEW THE NEEDS OF RESIDENTS OF THE CARING HOMES

- a. By identifying the criteria for admission into and discharge from the Caring Homes.
- b. By identifying types or categories of children eligible for admission.
- c. By delineating services and resources needed by each group of children identified above.
- d. By identifying those services and resources available on the island and those which are not.
- e. By identifying short-term and long-term needs of each group of children listed above such as their educational, emotional, physical, and social needs.

TO REVIEW THE PROGRAMME STRUCTURE OF THE CARING HOMES

- a. By defining the purpose and philosophy of the Caring Homes
- b. By identifying the programmes utilised in the Homes.
- c. By delineating areas where the programme do and do not correlate with the purpose of philosophy.
- d. By identifying areas where the programmes do and or do not correlate with the needs of the children in care and or the types/categories of children eligible to be in care.

TO REVIEW THE PHYSICAL PLANT:

- a. By touring each facility.
- b. By identifying areas of need.

- c. By identifying and presenting problems for each facility.

**TO EVALUATE AND MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS
RE: ADMINISTRATION, NEEDS OF RESIDENTS, PROGRAMME STRUCTURE
AND PHYSICAL FACILITIES TO THE HONOURABLE MEMBER OF HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES.**

To this end, the Caring Home Review Committee held regular meetings each Thursday afternoon during the months of June and July 1989, for a total of eight sessions. Further, the Committee made site visits to both Bonaventure House and Frances Bodden Girls' Home in June and had lunch with children and staff at both Homes in July. A Consensus Meeting was held on August 3, 1989, and a meeting to consider the report was held on September 1, 1989. In all the Committee held 14 sessions.

The Committee interviewed a total of 25 individuals. They were:

- Mrs. Angela Martins - Director Department of Social Services
- Mr. and Mrs. Rob Wilvert - Houseparents Frances Bodden Girls' Home
- Mr. and Mrs. Ken Romans - Houseparents Bonaventure
- Mrs. Georgina Darkens - Crisis Intervention Therapist Department of Social Services (formerly Acting Administrator of Bonaventure)
- Mrs. Lou Jones - Administrator, CASA (formerly Caring Homes Supervisor, Department of Social Services)
- Mr. and Mrs. Denny Tomsu - Former Houseparents, Bonaventure
- Miss Patricia Bell - Social Worker, Department of Social Services
- Mr. Bruce Burbank - Social Worker, Department of Social Services
- Mrs. Christine Devoy - Social Worker, Department of Social Services
- Mr. Mark Price - Social Worker, Department of Social Services
- Ms. Pauline Samuels - Social Worker, Department of Social Services (Acting Administrator Frances Bodden Girls' Home)
- Ms. Doreen Booth - Child Care Worker, Frances Bodden Girls Home
- Mr. Denham Brooks - Child Care Worker, Bonaventure
- Ms. Patsy Wint - Foster Child Care Worker, Bonaventure
- Mr. Norma Johnson - Child Care Worker, Bonaventure (recently transferred to Frances Bodden Girls' Home)
- Mrs. Elrita Seymour - Child Care Worker, Frances Bodden Girls' Home
- Ms. Carol Thomas - Child Care Worker, Frances Bodden Girls' Home
- Mr. Astley McLarn - Assistant Houseparent, Bonaventure
- Mr. Sinley Simpson - Assistant Houseparent, Frances Bodden Girls' Home
- Mrs. Mary Lawrence - Former Houseparent, Frances Bodden Girls' Home
- Mr. and Mrs. John Crowley - Foster Parents

Mr. President, after considerable deliberations, the Caring Homes Committee made the following recommendations.

1. That the caring homes be governed by a Board of Management which shall be responsible to the Portfolio of Health and Social Services.
2. That this Board be established by law as a statutory Board with specific terms of reference.
3. That this Board manages both Caring Homes.
4. That the Board be comprised of persons with expertise in specific areas such as mental health, social services, medical, legal, psychology, education, the private sector, civic/service groups so that the homes can benefit from the experience of Board Members.
5. The Portfolio of Health and Social Services Establish a written purpose and philosophy of the Caring Homes.
6. That the "teaching-family" model, a specific residential parent programme, be implemented at both Caring Homes.
7. That an operations manual appropriate to the model chosen be adopted as a matter of priority.
8. That administrative support staff appropriate to the teaching family model be appointed.
9. That interaction amongst the homes and the community on an informal basis be re-established.
10. That treatment plans for children presently in care be developed.
11. That houseparents be actively involved in the decision making process relative to admission, treatment, and discharge of the children in care.
12. That existing services, resources and facilities at the hospital, such as the psychiatric social worker, psychologist, psychiatrist, drug counsellors, medical doctors, be utilised to develop multi-disciplinary treatment plans for children presently in care.
13. That regular reviews be carried out to evaluate and track the progress of

- 14. children in care once they are discharged from the Caring Homes.
- 15. That emphasis be placed on preventive programmes in the community.
- 16. That serious juvenile offenders continue to be sent to approved schools in Jamaica until such time as a secure facility is built in the Cayman Islands.
- 17. That a secure facility be built for serious juvenile offenders as a matter of urgency.
- 18. That juvenile offenders sentenced to approved schools in Jamaica be regularly visited.
- 19. That a juvenile Justice Magistrate be appointed to regularly sit on Juvenile Court with two Justices of the Peace. That a Justice of the Peace be specifically trained for this position.

The members of the Caring Homes Review Committee wish to extend their gratitude and appreciation to all those who participated in this review by providing information to the committee through personal interviews and written submissions.

The Portfolio wishes to put on record its grateful thanks, gratitude and appreciation for these members who gave willingly and freely of their valuable time to conduct this review and their recommendations are currently under review and decisions will be taken in the very near future on all of them, as to what will be implemented and what will not.

Thank you very much, Sir.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER 23 (7) and (8)

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, under Standing Order 83 I move the suspension of Standing Order 23(7) and (8) to allow the questions to be taken.

MR. PRESIDENT: I shall put the question. Those in favour please say Aye...Those against No.

AYES.

The Ayes have it.

MR. PRESIDENT:

AGREED. STANDING ORDER 23(7) & (8) SUSPENDED.

MR. PRESIDENT: Questions, number 135, the First Elected Member for West Bay.

QUESTIONS TO HONOURABLE MEMBERS

THE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR WEST BAY TO ASK THE HONOURABLE ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES

NO. 135: Can the Honourable Member say whether any homes or locations have been identified for the proposed Half-way Houses and, if so, in what areas?

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER: It has been tentatively determined to have a residential Half-way House in West Bay and a non-residential drop-in centre in Bodden Town. No house has as yet been identified in West Bay. Negotiations on an existing house in the Bodden Town area fell through because Finance Committee deferred the funds. Another Bodden Town property has been recommended by the First Elected Member for Bodden Town and investigations as to its suitability are ongoing.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Mr. President, can the Honourable Member say whether the Portfolio was approached by anyone in the West Bay district as to the possibility of a home for the purpose of this Half-way House?

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER: Mr. President, I think the Portfolio received a letter from a individual in West Bay offering the sale of their house to Government.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Can the Member say what progress has taken place on that offer?

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER: Mr. President, the offer was replied to stating that when the criteria and the needs for the house had been established, an advertisement would be placed in the daily *Caymanian Compass* and he was invited to resubmit his offer, if he thought his house met the criteria.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Supplementary, Mr. President. Was that the same procedure

you used for the proposed house is Bodden Town?

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER: No, Sir, but it has to be understood that the houses are for two entirely different purposes. The one for West Bay is a residential facility. The one for Bodden Town is just a drop-in centre to be opened certain hours of the day. The procedure followed for the one in Bodden Town was that the Second Elected Member for Bodden Town first approached me about the purchase of the piece of beach between the dental clinic and the house in Bodden Town because they wanted to develop a beach bar. I told him I would support it and we could probably include the purchase of the house for the drop-in centre in Bodden Town because we would also increase the area of beach they would be able to use. Because it was only a drop-in centre, the house would serve well for that function in Bodden Town.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Is the Portfolio considering a drop-in centre for West Bay or in another part of the Island?

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER: No, Sir. The National Drug Plan, as tabled in this House, calls for two pilot projects. One - a residential type half-way house in West Bay, and a drop-in centre in Bodden Town.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Third Elected Member for George Town.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Mr. President, could the Honourable Member give us some time frame by which he foresees having the half-way house in operation?

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER: For the one in West Bay, Sir, it was hoped that the programme, and then the criteria, will be developed by the end of December and then adverts can be placed in the paper for sometime in January.

For the one in Bodden Town, there has been an interesting and favourable turn of events because I have a letter in my possession which was delivered to me through discussions I had with Mr. Winston Rose, the Minister for the Chapel Church in Bodden Town, and they have offered to repair and restore their old Church in Bodden Town as long as Government is willing to help them meet the cost of adding on bathrooms. They are also willing to provide a schedule of volunteers to help with the drop-in programme under the guidance of the Community Counselling Services at the direction of Mr. Bob Jones.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Supplementary, Mr. President. Has the Portfolio determined any criteria with regards to property?

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER: Is the Member referring to the residential half-way house?

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: That is the one.

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER: I thought I had made it explicitly clear to a question asked by the Third Elected Member for George Town is that we hope to have the programme to be used in the half-way residential house in West Bay completed sometime in December and by the end of December to develop the criteria for the type and kind of house needed based on the programme we intend to put in place.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: It was not that explicit. It is now.

MR. PRESIDENT: Are there no more supplementaries on that question? Number 139, the Second Elected Member for the Lesser Islands.

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE LESSER ISLANDS TO ASK THE HONOURABLE OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT

NO. 139: Would the Honourable Member say: a) What is the annual cost of renting accommodation for the Legal Department in the First Home Building; and b) What are the terms of the contract?

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, the annual cost of renting accommodations for the Legal Department in the First Home Building is as follows: a) Annual rent payable quarterly in advance on the 1st day of October, January, April and July in each year - US\$61,350, or C\$51,534.00; electricity (approx) per annum \$5,000.00; cleaning (approx) per annum \$3,000.00. Total: C\$59,534.00.

b) The terms of the contract are set out in the lease agreement and contains the standard clauses found in such documents. In addition to the information provided in (a) above, the other important clause in the contract is the duration of the lease which will be from 1st October, 1989 to 30th September, 1993, the Landlord under the lease is International Financial Group whose address is P.O. Box 1062, George Town, Grand Cayman, with Bramer Properties Limited as the head Lessor.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

you used for the proposed house is Bodden Town?

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER: No, Sir, but it has to be understood that the houses are for two entirely different purposes. The one for West Bay is a residential facility. The one for Bodden Town is just a drop-in centre to be opened certain hours of the day. The procedure followed for the one in Bodden Town was that the Second Elected Member for Bodden Town first approached me about the purchase of the piece of beach between the dental clinic and the house in Bodden Town because they wanted to develop a beach bar. I told him I would support it and we could probably include the purchase of the house for the drop-in centre in Bodden Town because we would also increase the area of beach they would be able to use. Because it was only a drop-in centre, the house would serve well for that function in Bodden Town.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Is the Portfolio considering a drop-in centre for West Bay or in another part of the Island?

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER: No, Sir. The National Drug Plan, as tabled in this House, calls for two pilot projects. One - a residential type half-way house in West Bay, and a drop-in centre in Bodden Town.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Third Elected Member for George Town.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Mr. President, could the Honourable Member give us some time frame by which he foresees having the half-way house in operation?

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER: For the one in West Bay, Sir, it was hoped that the programme, and then the criteria, will be developed by the end of December and then adverts can be placed in the paper for sometime in January.

For the one in Bodden Town, there has been an interesting and favourable turn of events because I have a letter in my possession which was delivered to me through discussions I had with Mr. Winston Rose, the Minister for the Chapel Church in Bodden Town, and they have offered to repair and restore their old Church in Bodden Town as long as Government is willing to help them meet the cost of adding on bathrooms. They are also willing to provide a schedule of volunteers to help with the drop-in programme under the guidance of the Community Counselling Services at the direction of Mr. Bob Jones.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Supplementary, Mr. President. Has the Portfolio determined any criteria with regards to property?

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER: Is the Member referring to the residential half-way house?

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: That is the one.

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER: I thought I had made it explicitly clear to a question asked by the Third Elected Member for George Town is that we hope to have the programme to be used in the half-way residential house in West Bay completed sometime in December and by the end of December to develop the criteria for the type and kind of house needed based on the programme we intend to put in place.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: It was not that explicit. It is now.

MR. PRESIDENT: Are there no more supplementaries on that question?
Number 139, the Second Elected Member for the Lesser Islands.

THE SECOND ELECTED MEMBER FOR THE LESSER ISLANDS TO ASK THE HONOURABLE OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT

NO. 139: Would the Honourable Member say: a) What is the annual cost of renting accommodation for the Legal Department in the First Home Building; and b) What are the terms of the contract?

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, the annual cost of renting accommodations for the Legal Department in the First Home Building is as follows: a) Annual rent payable quarterly in advance on the 1st day of October, January, April and July in each year - US\$61,350, or CI\$51,534.00; electricity (approx) per annum \$5,000.00; cleaning (approx) per annum \$3,000.00. Total: CI\$59,534.00

b) The terms of the contract are set out in the lease agreement and contains the standard clauses found in such documents. In addition to the information provided in (a) above, the other important clause in the contract is the duration of the lease which will be from 1st October, 1989 to 30th September, 1993, the Landlord under the lease is International Financial Group whose address is P.O. Box 1062, George Town, Grand Cayman, with Bramer Properties Limited as the head Lessor.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Mr. President, could the Honourable Member say if Government has considered taking a loan to construct more space in the Government Administration building which could be repaid with the amount that is being annually paid in this contract for this space?

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, yes we have considered taking a loan. There is a loan agreement negotiated and agreed with a local bank which provides for the Post Office building and in that building there is 32,000 square feet of office accommodation.

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Mr. President, is the Member saying that this 32,000 square feet, that part of that then would be used for the Legal Department or would the whole space be available for that?

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, I did not give a good indication of what I was trying to say. The 32,000 square feet is additional space which we hope would be sufficient to meet the needs of the Government at the moment, for office accommodation. Not just the Legal Department. All departments.

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Mr. President, has any thought been given to creating space by constructing more accommodation at the present Police Headquarters and freeing the space they now occupy at the Tower Building, where the Legal Department could be accommodated?

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, I do not think that one has come up. At least I am not aware of it. We had, as Members will recall, some years ago thought about constructing a building for the Computer Department which, I think at the end of the day, came up to an estimated figure of \$3.2 million or \$3 million. We decided, after careful review, that perhaps it was not good value for the money. We began to think about the possibility of constructing a building adjacent to the Glass House, starting at one story above the car park, thus reserving the car park and going up two stories after that. We thought we could work it straight off between this \$3.2 million on that building. But that building turned out to cost something in the range of \$5.2 million so we put it on the shelf for a while.

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Mr. President, could the Honourable Member say who, under the contract, is responsible for the security of the building in which the Legal Department is residing? That is, if something goes wrong, gets broken, who would be responsible?

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Mr. President, I am unable to answer that question but I will get the answer and let the Member have it in writing.

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Mr. President, could the Member say if, at this time, and particularly considering that the Legal Department has been called upon to entail itself in various increased duties and so on by Private Members' Motions here and what not, if it has done a projection of its needs for space for office equipment and staff?

MR. PRESIDENT: I think that goes rather beyond the original question. The Second Official Member may care to insert a reply?

HON. RICHARD W. GROUND: Thank you, Mr. President.
All I can say at the moment is that the new accommodation is likely to provide adequate space for the Crown Counsel for quite short of the three year period of the lease. We have not done a projection beyond that. Frankly, it is very difficult doing projections because the demand for legal services is driven by factors quite beyond their control, whether it be the demands from the Courts, the proviso of fallen crime rate, the amount of work the Assembly requires and the amount of work Government Departments require. So we have looked ahead for about three years for this lease and we feel we can manage with this space for that. Beyond that I have not a projection.

MR. PRESIDENT: We move to the next question. number 140. The First Elected Member for Bodden Town.

THE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR BODDEN TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR COMMUNICATIONS, WORKS AND NATURAL RESOURCES

NO. 140: Can the Honourable Member say what provision is being made for the requested back-road to the interior of Bodden Town?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: There has been one road requested that extends from Belford Estates to North Sound Estates. Several routes are available, but all require the purchase of lands, with a preliminary estimate of \$800,000 for land and construction. Any road along this route will cross the future east/west arterial that is part of the Master Ground Transportation Plan. It may be possible to plan the new road as part of the east/west arterial.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

- MR. ROY BODDEN:** Has the Member given any consideration to alternate routes?
- HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON:** Mr. President, there are a number of alternate routes which could be considered and the Portfolio would be happy to take the advice of the Members for Bodden Town as to the most appropriate route.
- MR. PRESIDENT:** The Second Elected Member for Bodden Town.
- MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH:** Supplementary, Mr. President.
The Honourable Member said in his answer that all he requires is the purchase of land. Can he say if he has approached any of the land owners in those areas, who may be willing to give up land for the use of the road?
- HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON:** The answer, Mr. President, is no.
- MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH:** Mr. President, could the Honourable Member say why not?
- HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON:** Mr. President, in considering the requests made, a very preliminary guess is that the road will carry a low traffic volume and that there are existing roads with much higher traffic volume which would have higher priority for construction.
- MR. ROY BODDEN:** May I ask the Honourable Member to explain how he arrived at the figure of \$800,000?
- HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON:** This was calculated estimates from the Public Works Department based on the MGTP preliminary cost, Mr. President.
- MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH:** Mr. President, supplementary.
Could the Member say if the road had been based on another estimate besides the MTGP, if it would have cost less?
- HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON:** Mr. President, it is my understanding, and my belief, that if the Member can come up with some names of people who would be willing to donate land free of cost, it definitely would cost less.
- MR. ROY BODDEN:** Is it the responsibility of the Member or is it the responsibility of the Backbenchers from Bodden Town to find out about the road?
- HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON:** Mr. President, in answer to that it is a joint responsibility because as the representatives for Bodden Town they have a direct interest in that constituency, but we, mainly from a Portfolio and Departmental point of view, respond to those roads that are of highest priority and most needed.
- MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH:** Mr. President, can the Honourable Member say if this back-road through Bodden Town is planned to be the width of the Master Ground Transportation road?
- HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON:** There has been no design work done, Mr. President.
- MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH:** Then, how can they come up with such a high figure?
- HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON:** The answer, Mr. President, as I said earlier, this was the *preliminary* estimates for land and construction - very preliminary estimates.
- MR. ROY BODDEN:** Can the Honourable Member give the undertaking that his Portfolio will seek out alternate routes?
- HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON:** Mr. President, as is the custom within the Portfolio, we will be looking into this matter very objectively and seriously, and any recommendations made will be done on a priority basis.
- MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH:** Mr. President, for the Member to know, the back-road in Bodden Town is a priority for years.
- HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON:** Mr. President, the only properly conducted road study which has been done in this country has been the Master Ground Transportation Plan, that took a very serious look at the road needs in this country. When that plan was conducted and the report concluded, it did not show this particular piece of road as being a priority.
- MR. PRESIDENT:** The First Elected Member for Bodden Town.

- MR. ROY BODDEN:** Thank you, Mr. President.
Bodden Town is inextricably linked to your Master Ground Transportation Plan? Are we then to understand that our requested back-road to Ground Transportation Plan?
- MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:** Maybe he could also answer whether this is another promise not kept?
- HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON:** Mr. President, how many answers am I suppose to give? Which Member am I answering at this point?
- MR. PRESIDENT:** The First Elected Member for Bodden Town. The other was an interjection, not a question.
- HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON:** Mr. President, as I said in my answer, we will look at the necessity of this road and this will be based on a priority basis. The Priority will be determined on the amount of use this road will be put to and not necessarily on a political request.
- MR. PRESIDENT:** The Third Elected Member for George Town has been signalling for quite a moment.
- MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN:** Mr. President, what is the length and with width of this road?
- HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON:** Mr. President, this will depend on which alignment is decided on.
- MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN:** The alignment that you used for your estimate?
- HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON:** Mr. President, I do not know where this is getting us, but that was, as I said earlier, the preliminary estimate based on the costing of the MTGB.
- MR. PRESIDENT:** I hate to interject, but the original answer does say several routes are available but all require the purchase of land, etcetera.
The Second Elected Member for Bodden Town.
- MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH:** Mr. President, for the Member's benefit, the road which is planned for the Master Ground Transportation Plan is different from this altogether. The people of Bodden Town do not want that road because it will cause all traffic to bypass Bodden Town and virtually wipe out any businesses.
- MR. PRESIDENT:** If you would rephrase that... "is the Member aware that?", so it becomes a question. Fine, no need to...
- MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH:** Is the Member aware of that, sir?
- HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON:** Mr. President, would the Member repeat the question, please?
- MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH:** Mr. President, for the Member's benefit, is he aware that the road that is planned for the Master Ground Transportation Plan is not wanted by the residents of Bodden Town because it will by-pass all the businesses?
- HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON:** Mr. President, I am not aware of this, and I would be happy, if the Members for Bodden Town are privy to this sort of information, if they would let the Portfolio know this.
- MR. ROY BODDEN:** Mr. President, I wonder if the Member is saying that he does not recall a briefing he had with the Members for Bodden Town in his office, with his Principal Secretary and with the Chief Engineer of Public Works, where we specifically laid down the sentiments for our constituents in this regard?
- HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON:** Mr. President, regarding the meeting, which was called by me, I invited the two Members to discuss matters relating to their district, their constituency. I am still awaiting certain information which I requested them to bring back to me, but regarding that particular piece of road they did, in fact, ask us to look into this possibility.
At that time I distinctly recall, and I think the Principal Secretary here with me, the Chief Engineer, not being to enamored with that idea, also pointing out on the map to the two Members exactly where the Master Ground Transportation alignment was proposed to run in Bodden Town. I do not at that stage recall either one of those Members stating that their constituents were opposed to the MTGP.
- MR. PRESIDENT:** The Third Elected Member for George Town.
- MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN:** Mr. President, to shed some better light on this estimate, could I ask, then, what is the length and the width of the several routes? Even if it is an approximate width. Are we talking

about a mile of road, 10 miles of road, what?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, I do not have that information readily available but I would be happy to provide this to the Member in writing.

MR. ROY BODDEN: Mr. President, I wonder if the Honourable Member can say if he has in his possession, now, a letter from my colleague and myself dated September 27th, 1989, in which at paragraph five we specifically laid out the parameters for our back-roads?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, I do not have that letter here. But if the Member said that it is in my possession I believe it is. But as far as we can recall, that letter did not - and he may care to read it, to refresh our memory - I do not recall any definite opposition to the MTGP road that would go through Bodden Town.

MR. PRESIDENT: There seems to be a feeling that question has been thoroughly flogged. We move to number 141.

THE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR BODDEN TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR COMMUNICATIONS, WORKS AND NATURAL RESOURCES

NO. 141: Can the Honourable Member indicate when the MLA constituency office at the Bodden Town Civic Centre will be ready for occupancy?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: My Portfolio is not aware of any request for a constituency office to be provided at the Bodden Town Civic Centre. Consideration is being given to the possibility of incorporating such an office into the physical works required at the Bodden Town Town Hall as part of the upgrading of hurricane shelters. This concept has been discussed with the Bodden Town Members. I would like to repeat that, Mr. President, this concept has been discussed with the Bodden Town Members. They will be further appraised as the preliminary plans become available.

If this concept does not prove feasible, consideration can be given to the Bodden Town Civic Centre as an alternative site.

Subject to the availability of funding, an office at the selected site could be available by mid-1990.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH: Mr. President, I wonder if the Honourable Member could say what happened to the \$40,000.00 which was voted for in the Budget in 1989 for the constituency offices for MLAs?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, if the relevance of that question is relating to the initial question, then the question asks me initially, and it reads; "Can the Honourable Member indicate when the MLA's constituency office at the Bodden Town Civic Centre will be ready for occupancy?" I think I have cleared that up. In answer to the supplementary, whatever works are not possible to be carried out this year will be re-voted in the Estimates for 1990.

MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH: Mr. President, I wonder if the Member could say if that money has been placed in the 1990 Estimates?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, as far as I am aware of, yes.

MR. PRESIDENT: Take the next question, then, Number 142, the First Elected Member for Bodden Town.

THE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR BODDEN TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR COMMUNICATIONS, WORKS AND NATURAL RESOURCES

NO. 142: Can the Honourable Member say what are Government's plans to remedy the traffic problem at the Tall Tree junction in Bodden Town where many accidents have taken place?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, I do not have any such asked question directed to me. The question that I have here is, "Can the Honourable Member say what are the Government's plans to remedy the potentially dangerous traffic problem at the Tall Tree Junction?" Perhaps the Member could clarify that.

MR. PRESIDENT: This question has been reworded at least twice and the final form is as on the Order Paper at present which is what the Member read out. I think, looking at the two, there is not a great deal of difference.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, there was some change on this and I will be happy to provide the answer, sir.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: There are no plans at this time. However, the Government recognises the need for improvements at this location. Any improvements will require some considerable study and expense, including possible land purchases and relocation of buildings. Alternative proposals are under development and MLAs for the district will be kept informed.

I wish to further clarify my answer by saying that the two Members for Bodden Town will recall that at my invitation they visited my office to discuss, among other matters relating to their district, the question of the most ideal alternative or solution to the problem at the Tall Tree junction. At that meeting they had agreed to consult with Mr. Lee Jackson, the owner of the building at the road junction, with the view to seeking Mr. Jackson's agreement to a proposal to possibly relocate his business in order to efficiently and effectively address the problem.

Mr. President, I am still awaiting a report from the two Members.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH: Mr. President, I will agree that we had a meeting with the Member, but we had taken this issue up with him long before that. What did he do?

MR. PRESIDENT: The question I think is, what is the Honourable Member doing about previous requests, if I may paraphrase?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, the Members' previous request culminated in my calling them to my office to discuss, having discussed this matter with the Public Works Department, I called them into my office with the Chief Engineer to go over the pros and cons of their suggestions.

What they were suggesting was a traffic sensitive signal at that area and it was explained to them that a traffic signal is only but one alternative. While it might introduce some amount of easement with the problem, it may also require a total ban on parking on the road right of way. It could also create a higher accident potential than was there at the present time. This is why we had the two Members into the office and explained this to them. They were convinced at that point, or we felt that they were, that our reasoning was a feasible one and they agreed to go and discuss this matter with Mr. Lee Jackson and return to us with their views. We are still awaiting that report from them.

MR. PRESIDENT: The First Elected Member for Bodden Town.

MR. ROY BODDEN: Thank you, Mr. President.
Mr. President, I would like the Honourable Member to say if he considers this matter serious enough to warrant the attention it is due, firstly. Secondly, I would like him to tell this Honourable House if the First and Second Elected Members for Bodden Town are being paid to do his work?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, I will deal with the seemingly facetious question first, the second one.

No, the Members are not being paid to do my work and I think, by all accounts, I am trying my best to carry that out. But with the most substantial supplementary question as to whether we consider the request serious enough, if we did not consider the request serious enough I would not have taken the Chief Engineer away from his duties and my Principal Secretary and other members of the Public Works Department and spend almost two hours with the two Members discussing this if it had not been given very serious consideration by the Portfolio.

MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH: Mr. President, perhaps I could refresh the Honourable Member's memory. He did not call us to his office to discuss those particular lights...

MR. PRESIDENT: I am sorry to interrupt you, but it has to be put as a question. Perhaps, "would the Member agree that", and then.

MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH: Mr. President, could the Member say whether I called him to discuss another matter, when he took the opportunity to discuss this matter with us?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, I am trying to get the sense of that question. I think the safest way to answer that is, probably, yes. The answer is, yes.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think at that point we should take the break, proceedings are suspended...

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER: I have a supplementary, sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: I beg your pardon. Proceedings are resumed, momentarily.

Please be seated. Standing Orders do provide that any Member may ask a question.

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER: Yes, sir. Can the Honourable Member state whether he has any proposal for funding, where the funds are coming from and what we are going to do about the social, economical and political upheaval in this junction?

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, no funds are available and the answer to the other part of the Honourable Member's question is, no.

MR. PRESIDENT: I think the junction referred to is the Tall Tree junction. Just so that I understand it. Thank you.

Proceedings suspended for 15 minutes...just a minute.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Mr. President...

MR. PRESIDENT: A Point of Order...

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: No, it is not a point of Order

MR. PRESIDENT: Supplementary?

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: No, it is a matter of privilege. For the whole morning a person in the gallery has been carrying on all sorts of things, making obscene projections I would say, to this side of the House. I would ask the Chair to pay careful attention to him or I am going to move the relevant Standing Order to have him removed.

MR. PRESIDENT: I would be grateful if you would come to see me during the break and explain this further. Thank you. Proceedings are suspended for 15 minutes.

AT 11:43 A.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 12:05 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Proceedings are resumed.
The House will now continue the second reading of the Appropriation Bill. Does any Member wish to speak?
The Second Elected Member for Bodden Town.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

BILLS

SECOND READING

THE APPROPRIATION (1990) BILL, 1989

(Debate continues thereon)

MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. President.
I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Honourable First Official Member for the way in which his Budget Speech was presented. Although it is a complete change from the February 1989 Budget Speech that he gave, I will, nevertheless, try to debate it to the best of my ability so the common people will be able to understand it better because this Budget Speech is mostly compiled of fiscal data, not all of the people can understand it. Not that I am complaining about it, but I, too, was looking to be told about each Department Head as to how they were performing or what was expected of them.
The Budget Address, because of its nature, had to be long and detailed. I must say that this one was extra long this time. I must say that I will not be as long as that.
Manpower Resources: I will read page 20 of the Budget. It says:

"This pattern of growth between the rate of new job creation and the rate of supply of Caymanian workers reflects the growth of the labour market's dependence on expatriate labour to fill the vacancies that Caymanians were not available in sufficient numbers and quantity to fill."

We failed to have a manpower survey done years ago. Had that been done we would have known where we were going, and trained our people. We would have been able to look at the areas where the jobs were coming from. The Community College would have been able to be developed. That was needed 10 years ago. If, when our young boys and girls leaving school could have been directed to the College with the right courses available to them, we would not have all the problems that we have today. We are

faced with the demand of the economy, in which we have not been able to generate the quantity and quality of Caymanians. I feel that while we may not be able to meet the quantity, we should have been able to meet the quality - if they had been given the right training from day one from which the manpower survey I spoke of before would have shown.

But I feel that there is a large percentage of the quantity still out there who have been deserted and discouraged by the evil that is out there and so evident among us - drugs. I mean drugs of all kinds. I believe if we could get all those that are on drugs back to the real world we would find it quite possible to not have enough jobs to meet their demand. But because of drugs they have not been trained. I must say, in all fairness, that I do not feel enough attention was given to attract them in the right direction so they could take in their rightful place among us today.

I brought a Private Member's Motion to this Honourable House earlier this year calling for Government to start up a training fund for Caymanians so they would be able to find more money to help them with their training and to help fill the posts that expatriate labour is now holding. I do not know when this will be implemented, if it is at all. I suggested that Government could raise these funds by raising the work permit fees in this country and put it towards educating the young men and women of tomorrow. We have to help them first so they can then help themselves. I do not deny it, whether Caymanians or not, a higher work permit fee should not hurt anyone. That is a privilege that is given to them and they should, in turn, start contributing towards our future; the young men and women of tomorrow.

I must congratulate our own Caymanian, Miss Brooks, on her appointment as Legal Draftsman. I wish her all the success in life. There are many more Caymanians out there that could do as well as Miss Brooks, if only they had a chance to do it.

The Banking and Insurance sector: The banking and insurance companies have continued to grow. That is good news but what I was not pleased to learn from one banker was that the bank, which he manages, could not afford to invest in the training of Caymanians to fill any positions they needed. Yet I feel that it is perhaps only one out of every 100 this happens with, yet they are getting the benefit of Cayman.

The insurance industry has continued to do well here, but I will again make an appeal to the Insurance Superintendent, or the Honourable Financial Secretary, to help the farmers find an insurance company that insures crops. While I was in England in July, attending the Royal Agricultural Show, I talked to a number of farm insurance agents there. There are a great many of them. The only answer I could get from them was that British Law does not allow them to do insurance business outside of England. Perhaps, the Financial Secretary or the Superintendent of Insurance could help set up a local insurance company among the farmers here.

Tourism: Yes, it is true that the Cayman Islands' tourism trade was down this year for a number of reasons. While I was in Barbados this year I made it my business to talk to a number of guests staying at the same hotel. Nine out of 10 English visitors to Barbados did not know, or had never even heard of the Cayman Islands. Even the American tourists from the New Jersey area had not heard about Cayman. I wonder if we are advertising the right way, or do we need to do more?

The Customs Department has continued to be the main and the highest revenue earner. I am also happy to know that the Customs Department Task Force works along with the Drugs Squad in an effort to combat drugs with the help of the dogs. I will repeat it again in this Budget debate, it is time for the Government to look seriously at investing in a larger patrol boat or a helicopter or plane to help combat drugs. If we really want to help our young boys and girls, again, they are the future of tomorrow.

Immigration: The Immigration Department has performed well and continues to do a good job but sometimes I know that they really have it hard due to the late flights. I feel they should continue to earn extra overtime for these late hours. The Caymanian Protection Board and Law is up for review. I am happy about that. As a Member of the Committee I feel that we will get what is best for this country in the near future.

Broadcasting: I would like to say that it is time for the Government to look seriously at either allowing political advertisements to take place at Radio Cayman or to free Radio I.C.C.I., the FM station of the International College of the Cayman Islands, so they can do advertising. I must congratulate the International College of the Cayman Islands radio station for the variety of music they play. A much greater choice than Radio Cayman.

Civil Service: I would like to say that I wish the civil service of this country every success but would like to sound a warning that we have to take stock, or something in the near future may slip completely out of control.

Fire Service: Again, I say congratulations to Mr. Kirkland Nixon and his staff for the fine job that they have done in 1989 and I feel they will continue to do in the years ahead.

Cayman Airways: Cayman Airways has been a very controversial issue since the debate in March of this year. I can only wish them all the success in the future with their new 737 jets and hope the Government will not have to continue subsidising the airline. I would like to ask the Honourable Member responsible for Tourism, Aviation and Trade, to consider using, or accepting, the credit card 'Signature' which we now have in Grand Cayman. I have heard a lot of people who now have the 'Signature' card would find it more convenient to use than American Express. I am not crying down the American Express card but when you go and charge to American Express, you have to pay it off in full. The 'Signature' you pay a certain amount. This may be good for our national carrier. It may help to create business, where someone wants to go on a trip and have credit with the 'Signature' card and could use it to get their ticket and pay it off bit by bit. The one advantage the 'Signature' card has is that the Cayman Airways' charge gives a credit on that card and they submit their claim, the next day (within 24 hours) Cayman Airways would receive the payment. You have to wait for a long

time for reimbursement with other cards. I would like to say that now that we have the 'Signature' card, it is Caymanian. Let us support it.

I would like to move on to Education, Recreation and Culture. In March of this year, when I debated the Budget, I felt we would have been better off with education but I am not at all impressed at what has taken place. We passed a Motion here in February or March to extend the school leaving age and to this date we have not heard anything about it. I consider that a shame.

I have had numerous calls from parents and have been approached on many occasions by the young people who were interested in going back to school and remaining there for a further year. They were happy when they heard the Motion had passed. But, they have all been saddened because nothing has been done to help them along in their journey to success. I say that is not good enough. We are therefore discouraging our young boys and girls to turn to other things.

Through a question to the Honourable Member a few mornings ago brought by my colleague the First Elected Member for Bodden Town, it was shown that the Savannah School is badly overcrowded. Two new classrooms should have been built since the beginning of the year. The money was there for it. If my memory serves me right, 54 students from other districts are enrolled at Savannah and the Honourable Member gave me an answer that there were approximately 25 students to a class. I would like to make it abundantly clear, less it be misconstrued, that I am against these children. No, Sir, in no way am I against them attending the school. I am only saying that the Education Department should have known this in advance.

I believe it is fair to say that the Savannah - Newlands area, which I represent, is one of the fastest developing districts in the Islands. The two classrooms having to be built would tell you right there if it was not for the additional 54 children from other districts we would be able to meet the need and still have space but because of the 54 children two new classrooms have to be built. I wonder what is happening to the classrooms in the other districts where these students should have been going to. Are they vacant? It is time for us to wake up and look at the little things. Every so often the little things are overlooked. I have always heard it is the little things that make a house a home.

The hospital: Let me say to the Honourable Member that I feel he has been doing a good job, so far. I would like to express my personal feelings on the building of a new hospital. I will not deny that additional facilities may be needed. But really, what worries me is that we are having problems with collecting large sums of money, which have to be written off, from our small hospital at this time. It frightens me to think what will happen to the new hospital knowing that we cannot refuse medical services. It will be the same way with the new one. I say that the time has come for the Government to look seriously at a National Medical Health Insurance Plan for the people of this country. Also, I have heard that a number of doctors in the private sector are considering building a new hospital in Cayman. I say that the private sector should do it and have Government do everything possible to help them.

I am also happy to know that the drug counselling which is available on the Island has been having some success and wish them all the best in the coming year.

I feel the sooner we get the new Pension Plan going the better off the people of Cayman will be. The Pension Plan should have been implemented years and years ago and I congratulate the Member for his stand taken on it.

I would like to say that, while I am speaking about the hospital, that the Honourable Member has not said he would be building a hospital, definitely. He only had plans drawn up. I believe it is also time for us to give young Caymanians a chance and encourage them to train in the medical profession. They are capable, they only need to be given a chance.

Housing Development: The news that the Housing Development Corporation has been able to raise some \$2 million or so to lend to the people to build homes is very good. What concerns me is that there is no use of getting money that you will have to pay interest on if you do not lend it out as fast as you take it in. Having to pay interest on it from day one...

MR. PRESIDENT: Could I interrupt you for a moment? Do you think you are likely to complete your speech before lunch time? No? In that case I think we should take the break. Proceedings are suspended until 2:15.

AT 12:45 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 2:19 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Proceedings of the House are resumed. Continuing his speech, the Second Elected Member for Bodden Town.

MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. President. Before we took the break I was dealing with the Housing Development Corporation. I would now like to turn to Community and Social Development. I would like to see a special court which could be termed a Family Court in this country. Such a Court would deal strictly with; a) child abuse cases; b) divorce or other family matters; c) custody cases. In a system which is becoming increasingly congested, this would be a logical separation. Additionally, such a system would further enhance the confidentiality and privacy necessary in many sensitive family matters.

I understand that some time previously this Honourable House rejected a Motion calling for the establishment of a Juvenile Court. The Portfolio responsible needs to consider this request again. I believe if the Government accepts my colleague's, the First Elected Member for Bodden Town,

suggestion to declare the 1990s the decade of Caymanian youth, we need to take this step. I stress that our youth are our future and we must be prepared to take good care of them.

I will move on to Agriculture. I would like to read from the Budget which the Honourable Financial Secretary delivered last Friday. He said:

"Years of strongest growth of visible imports were between 1985 and 1987, with which import demands expanded from \$125.0 million to \$166.9 million. An expansion of 34 per cent compared to a 14 per cent expansion between 1983 and 1985. The growth in visible imports was due to the growth in import demands in consumer goods, 21 per cent, Capital goods, 73 per cent and transported goods, 14 per cent. As a percentage of GDP overall imports, visible and invisible, grew from 63 per cent of the GDP in 1983, 73.2 per cent in 1987. This suggests that nearly three quarters of the economies total income goes back out of the economy in terms of expenditure on imports. It also suggests that although the economies productive capacity may have expanded, the expansion may not have been in those areas that would allow the economy to reduce its dependency on imports. Nevertheless, it is the capacity to generate income which is translated into the capacity to import."

The Honourable Financial Secretary said: "The problem comes however, when the capacity to generate income falls." That is exactly what I have been saying for years. While I might not have been saying it in here, I have been saying it outside. He goes on to say:

"On the other hand the emphasis on tourism and off-shore financial services has created a booming sector effect which in turn, tends to create and perpetuate structural biases against agricultural development."

Again, I say that because the emphasis was put on tourism and off-shore financial services, agriculture was left in the dark. I am happy to now air that Government has finally agreed that agriculture could play a very important part in our little Island. I would like to see Government look at the development of agriculture in the same light that the Government some 20 odd years ago looked at the Mosquito Research and Control Unit. When Government considered starting that unit they knew it was going to cost money but they were willing to spend that money because they knew they would reap the benefits in one day. They spent that, not looking for cash to come back in, but for what the Islands could benefit from the eradication of mosquito and sandflies.

As I said before, here some 20 years later, they are still pumping \$1 million plus into the Mosquito Research and Control Unit (MRCU). I have no objections to that because the tourists that come here, and the natives alike, are able to be almost free from mosquitoes. That has proven to be a good investment in this country compared to how this Island was before the MRCU started. I am saying that that is the same direction that Government needs to look after when it comes to agriculture. Accept that, if agriculture is done the right way, while Government may not see any cash return for a while for what they are spending, the Island itself will benefit from it by keeping the money in this country. Yes, I will agree with what the Honourable First Official Member said where we will never reach a stage where we could export but we could become self-sufficient in certain areas.

He also mentioned that the demand for fresh fruits and vegetables, meats, eggs and root crops has steadily grown. When we, in the Cayman Islands, could be producing enough tomatoes, sweet peppers, cassava, yams, nearly all our meat (beef or pork), eggs and fresh fruits like mangoes, avocados plus a good percentage of citrus: namely, lemons, limes, grapefruits, tangerines and oranges. If we went at this the right way, we would not have to import very much of those items.

The Honourable Member said that information from the Farmers Market suggests that there has always been an untapped local demand for fresh on-farm and off-farm local agricultural produce. Since the Market has been wholesaling and retailing local farm produce, the demand for fresh fruits and vegetables, meats, eggs and root crops has steadily grown. This demand has come from both local consumers and tourists who prefer locally grown fruit and vegetables to imported farm produce. I said in March of this year when I debated the Budget that we should be in the production line of mango jam, mango jelly and guava because each year hundreds of thousands of mangoes go to waste in this country. We already have the market, if we start to produce it, especially, the visitors to our Island would like it. You can go into the supermarket here and that is perhaps the two items that we do not import. That is the mango jam and jelly. We have no competition from anyone in that line. A small factory to produce it, very small, would do. All someone needs is a little financial help to buy the bottles or jars and have nice labels made up. When we have 500,000 tourists alone coming here per year we could have a thriving business because over the years visitors to this Island are constantly look for something native. Something they have never had before.

Each year the large supply of sea grapes goes to waste when they could be collected and nice sea grape jelly made from them. We also have the nicest Cayman apples, known as the cocoplum that go down the drain. That is slowly, but surely, being destroyed by the development of condos and other buildings. In a few years time we will probably import them but they spoil on us over the years. We have a lot of the Cayman Almonds, not the foreign almonds, the Cayman Almonds that make such good candies and are so nice to eat go to waste in this country. These are the things that, with a little help to establish a light cottage industry in Cayman, that we could market to visitors and natives alike.

The Honourable First Official Member went on. He said: "This information suggests that there is the underlying potential for agriculture to play a more significant role in the economy." I agree with him. While I will admit further on down the line he mentions he will be looking forward to agriculture development plans, I am saying until that plan comes out we need to take steps to still help in the right direction for farmers. He said: "Some tangible progress in this direction in the form of the establishments of an agriculture credit institution (AIDB)." I have already said that stands for 'All Interest Discouragement Board' because I would like to read from the Agriculture and Industrial Aid Law, 1978, Law 24 of 1978, dealing with security:

"6 (1) A long term loan shall not be made except upon the security of a first charge on the land owned by the borrower. In addition the Board may require such further security as it considers necessary.

(2) The Board shall require as security for medium and short term loans one or more of the following:

- (a) a charge on land;
- (b) the assignment of an insurance policy on the life of the borrower with the estate of the insured borrower named as beneficiary;
- (c) such other security as the Board may consider necessary.

7(1) Where required by the Bank (Caribbean Development Bank), the Board shall not make any loan financed from the Bank -

- (a) to a member of the Board or to a member of the Executive Council or the Legislative Assembly or a corporation controlled by any such member of the Board or the Executive Council or the Legislative Assembly or to their close relatives;.....".

That is what the Board says.

Now back in 1988 after hurricane Gilbert destroyed farms on this Island, the Government then came out with a notice to the public, and farmers in particular, saying that they had put aside some \$200,000 to \$300,000 to be loaned to farmers who had suffered as a result of Hurricane Gilbert. The news release said it would be interest free and from 10 to 15 year loans, with a two year moratorium on interest and principle repayment.

I had a question regarding this. Unfortunately it was taken off. I was really hoping for an answer this morning. The reason why I asked that question was to ascertain whether the Government had committed to pay the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB) any interest on that money that would have been lent to farmers, to some extent, because I learned the Government had not taken the money from the Treasury and said to the AIDB Board of Directors we want you to manage this. As far as I understand it, the money has only been authorised to be used by the Caribbean Development Fund that the AIDB has to loan from. Since Government was so generous, I needed to know whether they had committed themselves to paying back the interest to the CDB on the money loaned to the farmers because the policy of the AIDB and the CDB is to make a charge at very high interest rates, whether it be for agriculture or industrial. I do not see how the Government authorised the Government to loan this money at no interest.

When the farmers were interviewed a couple of weeks after the storm all the farmers who were looking for help had suggested to me, as Chairman of the Cayman Islands Cooperative Society, and had agreed that we were not asking for Government to give us this money. We were prepared to pay 5 or 6 per cent interest, but we needed it for a long term and we also needed it for two years before we would have to start repayment. Within that two years we could have gotten back on our feet.

It was not until recently that I learned that Government had not put any money in the AIDB to be loaned to the farmers. It was the AIDB's money...

POINT OF ELUCIDATION

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON:

Mr. President, under Standing Order 34(b), a Point of Elucidation.

Mr. President, I am not sure what particular point the Member is making but the Government has provided funds to AIDB of something in the range of \$137,000.00. The funds that are with the AIDB from this Government have no CDB requirement whatsoever. I just say that in the hope that I have enlightened some particular area of his contribution.

MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH:

Thank you, Sir.

Mr. President, I can only say what I learned from a meeting. I know what has happened in the past and I believe it will continue to happen in the future unless Government really and truly looks at the stipulations of the Board because if the Board loans money to myself or a company of mine the Law is there, from what I read.

In March of this year, I recommended to the Honourable Member for Communications, Works and Natural Resources that what the Government needs to do is to try and open up a few new roads to the interior of East End, Northside and Bodden Town so the farmers could get to the

better farmland much easier. No attempt was made at this. Just a few days ago I was being asked for the expressways for George Town. I wrote two letters to the Member suggesting how he could help improve agriculture in the Cayman Islands. With your permission, Sir, I would like to read these into the Hansard of this House so the people of these Islands, the farmers and the Members of this House will know that I have been trying to help with agriculture. They read:

"Dear Mr. Pierson,

I must apologise for not writing to you since my return to Cayman from the Royal Agriculture Show in England. I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for giving me the privilege to attend such a valuable international symposium. I have to admit that I learned a lot about new farming techniques on that trip.

I would like to submit my name as a possible representative to attend the RASE on July 5, 1990.

I would also, through you, recommend to the Honourable Member, Mr. Benson Ebanks, who has the responsibility of the turtle Farm that he may want to explore the possibility of sending Dr. Wood of the Turtle Farm as a speaker at the RASE symposium on agriculture or mariculture.

I could see the Islands benefiting from the exposure which we need so badly. With the Cayman Islands having an officer in England already, I feel it would be a golden opportunity for the farmers to get needed exposure worldwide, as it is time we looked at inviting professional agriculture technology to the Cayman Islands, to invest here.

I strongly recommend that space should be requested as early as possible for the Cayman Islands Government to have a speaker and slide show at the 8th International Show. It would give us tremendous publicity, as this show is attended and supported by almost every nation in the world.

Mr. Pierson, we need to look strongly at shrimp, fish and possibly lobster farming to encourage it and, if possible, help set up a commercial fishing boat fleet for our Islands.

As the Budget time is fast approaching, I would like to take this opportunity to offer my personal views on how your Portfolio could greatly assist to improve agriculture by 100 per cent in these Islands if these following suggestions could be taken into consideration and put into the Budget for 1990.

I can only see agriculture improve if you continue the policy you have already started. I must say I am very happy with the action and attitude you have taken towards it."

This letter was written September 6th, 1989;

"As the Island starts to develop in beef cattle and the possibility that we could do some dairy cattle, a very good market exists for good meat. I see the Agriculture Department playing its rightful role in farming by assisting the potential landowners and farmers who want to provide more grass for grazing of these animals, but who do not have the necessary funds to clear the land and fence it with barbed wire and plant it with grass.

I feel if the Portfolio, in conjunction with the Agriculture Department, was to provide that service to the farmers by having the bulldozer with all the necessary attachments for it, an experienced operator to handle it, guidelines of work to be done, and proper finance arrangement and guarantee of repayment plan schedule worked out with the land owners, or farmers, this Island, within a couple of years, could be on the road to self-sufficiency.

This would require the Department acquiring a new D6 Caterpillar Dozer and a qualified operator. I can think of only two persons who are well suited for the job. They are Gerald Ebanks and Carlos Whittaker. They are the top farmers in Grand Cayman.

You may wish to have more information on this. If so, I would be glad to have a meeting with you, your Principal Secretary and Dr. Benjamin on this matter."

I went on to outline the costs of the bulldozers and the cost of the operator for the first year. That is all Government would have to put out, if they loaned that money over a 15 year period. I also said:

"If your Portfolio hired a qualified person to do budding and grafting in these Islands and one who has had at least 40 to 50 years experience in this type of work in these Islands,

then you would not have to ask, this Island could be well on the road to success in two to three years.

I personally feel that this could be a service the Government could undertake to do for these Islands for little or no cost to the people.

Again I will try to justify to cost of the service to the country. A total of \$46,952.00."

I mentioned that Government when doing this would have a little more expense when the person who was qualified to do this had to go to Cayman Brac and Little Cayman. Had Government undertaken to do budding and grafting in this country 15 to 20 years ago, these Islands would be self-sufficient in hybrid mangoes, avocados, lemons, limes, oranges and grapefruit. Almost every person who owns a house or land has plants in their yard such as the common mango tree which is very hairy, the common avocado tree, which has very thin flesh and a large seed or simple orange plants. All those could be grafted with hybrid fruits.

One only has to visit an area in Northside called the Hutland Road and they would see how a gentleman by the name of Mr. William Ebanks has turned an orchard of common mango trees into a beautiful orchard of hybrid mangoes. The root stock was there and now he has almost reached the reaping point, within a short two to three years. This is the kind of business and work that Government needs to help with. I know that we have to look at other areas. While I was in England in July attending the symposium, I learned at that show that what those countries are faced with today, Cayman had not entered into yet.

Yes, we were about to enter and start a green feeding system, but today most countries who are developed in the world today are fighting hard now to take the fat back from the beef because of the high cholesterol it has. I spoke to the speakers after the presentation and he suggested that this may be a good advertising point for the farmers in Cayman against the imported beef. When we are advertising, advertise that the imported beef is full of cholesterol, the local beef has very little.

As the Honourable Member said in his Budget Address, he mentioned eggs. At the symposium there was a speaker on eggs. Then they took us to the show grounds, that is a 650 acre parcel of land. But, with the exception of the five to 10 days of the year when they are preparing for the show and the actual show days, the majority of students in agricultural schools are trained there. I was impressed to see the egg production houses where they demonstrated to us two houses; one with 13,500 laying hens, with most of work done manually. Then they showed us the fully automated house with 15,500 birds; a two man operation. The house that housed the 15,500 was only half the size of the one that had the 13,500 birds. It took one lady two hours to collect every egg from 15,500 birds each day. That was all the time required of her. When she enters the computer room, she stays there and every egg is collected on conveyor belts. Two hour's wages are all it takes to pack the eggs from 15,500 chickens.

Having said that, I would like to emphasise that is the kind of technology that we have to look after here in the Cayman Islands because we are constantly faced with the shortage of labour or manpower. If we look at that type of equipment and technology there is no reason why we could not produce all the eggs that this country could use.

The Honourable Member said in his Budget Address:

"Nevertheless, the efforts to stimulate the agriculture development as a more dynamic sector of growth have been constrained by a number of structural factors.

One obvious factor, and the one which we are unable to change, is the limitedness of the Islands' natural resources. Land suitable for large-scale commercial agriculture is clearly limited, tending to be scattered and interspersed with uncultivated tracks and rocks."

While I have to agree with him to a certain extent, the real problem is there are not too many interior lands on this Islands. I will also agree with his Address where he said land use competition for residential and commercial purposes is severe. The purposes which the land is being used for, commercial and residential, is what is against the farmer in this country because all the good land for farming was left to be developed, as the Honourable Member has said, for residential and commercial purposes. Yet areas that are nothing but pinnacle cliff is zoned as agriculture land in this country.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Would it be convenient to take the break now. Before the break could I advise Members the First Official Member will take the Chair as I am going to the Police Passing Out Parade.

Proceedings suspended for 15 Minutes.

AT 3:20 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 3:49 P.M.

[Hon. First Official Member presiding]

ACTING PRESIDENT:

Proceedings are resumed.

MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH:

Thank you, Mr. President.

When we took the break I was dealing with Agriculture. Sir, I asked a question a few days earlier to the Member responsible for Communications, Works and Natural Resources regarding the abattoir. I find it very hard to believe that money for the abattoir was not put in the Budget as it is so desperately needed. The facilities at the Farmers Market was, I have to say, not good enough from day one. Again, we are having the same problem of no storage space, the supermarkets are saying they want the beef slaughtered in the most hygienic way or they are not willing to take the local beef.

The farm has done some upgrading to the little slaughter house is Newlands. The Public Health Department inspected it and they gave us the okay on it, as it is the best we can possibly do right now. Some of the big cattle owners in this country have quite a number of cattle, ranging from 50 to 100 head of marketable beef cattle per person. I have even tried to get the Prison Department to take meat from the farmers but with no success. I had one of the big local supermarkets agree to take two quarter cows and test it to see how it went in the supermarkets. They called me and told me that they want me to come and look at the display of meat they had from the cuts of beef they had taken from the Farmers Market as a trial. I must say it was beautiful beef. They got the weight and size they wanted to do the test with and after having it packaged they put it along side, cut per cut, with the imported U.S. meat.

They put the local beef out at 8:00 at night and by 11:00 the next morning, every ounce of local beef had sold. The American beef was still sitting there. They had it priced the same as the imported beef, yet they will not continue to take the beef. I do not know what else we can do now because with the abattoir having been removed from the Budget again this year, I do not know when we will ever get it again.

Also, the farmers in the Lower Valley area are constantly asking what is happening about the cattle dip that was to be put in Lower Valley, the area where most of the beef cattle are run in the pasture. If my memory serves me correctly, when I was Elected last year in November, shortly after when I saw the Budget they told me the money had been taken out for the abattoir but the money for the cattle dip was still there. Now one year later, we have not accomplished that.

I understood that a few weeks ago they were going to start it by using the machine they use to trench the roads. I knew from the time I heard it that it was a waste of time, especially in the East End area. I am saying that Quarry Products Limited would probably have used dynamite and cut those holes which were needed in the ground for little or nothing, since it was for agriculture. I wonder how much longer we will have to wait and how many more cows will die on the roads from vehicle accidents?

The Honourable Member said there are two areas where a diversification strategy would be feasibly pursued. One is the development of agriculture into a more profitable form of economic activity for practicing farmers. As indicated earlier, agriculture appears to have the potential to meet a greater portion of the growing demand by local consumers for fresh farm produce as well as to meet the demands of tourists for locally grown fruit and vegetables. I have to agree with you, Sir.

The Honourable Member also said that agriculture development results in the first place, in growth from local demand for farm produce, but the ability of agriculture to meet growth and the local demand for farm produce depends partly on policies designed to raise the productive capacity of farms, and partly on policies to improve the productive efficiency of farmers in their allocation and use of farm resources. On that, too, I agree with you. But as I said before, after reading this... and I am not saying we will not get a good Agriculture Plan, but I saw this as a dire need and necessity for the farmers. I would venture to say that had those two recommendations come from a consultant group they would have been placed in the Budget. But that is because Caymanians would have been able to fill those two jobs and because Caymanians in that field do not need consultants to tell them what to do.

The time has come... and you said that I have indicated that the available information suggests that there is a growing demand for fresh on-farm agriculture produce, therefore the formulation of policies to assist farmers to achieve productive capacity and productive efficiency to take advantage of this demand appears to be a priority consideration. Yes, Sir, I would venture to say it should be a priority consideration.

The Honourable Financial Secretary went on to say:

"It seems as a priority almost from the point of view that assisting farmers to develop the capability to meet a proportion of the local demand for fresh agriculture produce will help reduce the economy's inflationary dependence on imported goods.

In this respect, Mr. President, I wish to inform this House that the Portfolio responsible for agriculture development is currently in the process of developing appropriate policies and programmes."

Yes, I have to agree. I know about those plans. But I am left to wonder now why some money was not voted for in the Budget because, I stand to be corrected, but if that development plan, when it arrives to the Honourable Member, has to wait another year for money to start implementing it, then that will mean you are two to three years behind again. I do hope that we can get started a lot earlier. I felt that had the Honourable Member followed, or taken the suggestion I made, as I said, in two to three years' time the Islands would be well underway in becoming self sufficient in fruits.

As I said before, one of the pressing needs for farmers is to be

able to get to the better lands where they can really do some farming. The farmers do not have the means to push a road through. The one thing I see when Government pushes through some of these roads, is it is not only the farmers that would benefit from it, eventually Government gets stamp duty when land starts to sell in the areas where roads have been put.

Government stands to gain from all this because I believe when we produce our crops and are able to sell them here it stops money from going abroad. Money in return is spent and helps the economy. As the Honourable Financial Secretary said it is sound economic policy for Government to refrain with competing in the economic arena with the private sector with capital works. When the economy is stimulated into performing at capacity and to enter into private sector activity in a decline thus maintaining a buoyant economy. As I said before, we may not be able to produce everything but certainly there is a lot we can produce. Again, we keep our dollars working when we buy Caymanian produce.

As I said before, some of the better lands are tied up. There are lots of people who have good land. Almost none of them will let you use it, they will not sell it or lease it so the farmer has no choice, no way to produce for this country. Even if you found one that would sell and you do not have the cash when it comes to buying land for agriculture you have to have money to back you from a commercial bank because (and this is where I disagree with the AIDB), their policy is not to loan money to buy land for farming.

The only step I see is for Government to take the initiative and buy up some of the better land that is now destined to go into subdivisions and in turn lease purchase it back to the farmers who are qualified and who have the ability to use it for the betterment of the country. Until we find a Government that is willing to help in that way, we will not have very much success with farming because one supermarket alone has offered to contract for bananas with me, in the area of 600,000 pounds per year. Just to meet the demand of that one store alone one has to have 25 acres of land so that he can continually have bananas. In the area of Newlands and West Bay you could find no better land for bananas in those two areas. The land in Newlands is for sale and they are asking \$16,000 per acre. Some of the committee members who are doing the plan for agriculture visited the area and it is zoned as low residential. They suggested that the only way to get that land for farming would be for Government to buy it and then sell it back to the farmers on a long term basis.

Having dealt with that, I do hope that in the very near future Government will put some money towards projects like those because if one goes to the bank, then again you cannot turn to the AIDB because it is not their policy to loan money for that. There is no commercial bank that is going to give you a year or two moratorium. That is exactly what one needs when you are going into a purchase like that. So, all I can do is sit and wait and see what the end result of the Agriculture Plan will bring for us.

I will now turn to the area of the district of Bodden Town which my Colleague, the First Elected Member for Bodden Town, and I represent. For the benefit of the listening public and, in particular, the constituency of Bodden Town I would like to read (so it can be put into the *Hansard* of this Honourable House) a letter that was written to the Honourable Member for Communications, Works and Natural Resources, regarding what we needed to have included in the Budget for our district. Mr. President, again, I want to say that it is the little things that make a house a home. It is the little things we have put in for, that the people of the constituency of Bodden Town are looking forward to. One street light means a lot to them and that is a little thing. Maybe I have learned a lesson. If my life is spared to see next year's Budget, maybe I will have to look at the big things or perhaps I may have to submit a Master Ground Transportation Plan for Bodden Town and get something done then. This is a letter that was written to the Honourable Member from myself and my colleague. It reads:

"Dear Mr. Pierson;

We write this letter to you as the two Bodden Town MLAs. Since the November Budget for 1990 is fast approaching and we are concerned about our district and the safety with respect of the residents, we feel that since street lights are installed along the West Bay Road on every light pole on the main highway, it has helped the general public. We humbly ask that when you are submitting your Portfolios' expenditure, that you include the following for the Bodden Town district. We also ask that your Portfolio please forward letters to the different departments responsible for the different areas of work to be done."

I made a survey of all the light poles starting from Spotts to Frank Sound on the main highway. There were 250 light poles and out of the 250 we had 82 street lights. I submitted that we therefore needed 168 more lights. I made it my business to visit all the subdivisions in Bodden Town from Spotts-Newlands to Frank Sound. I inquired from the homeowners if they wished to have street lights for their safety. Many of the subdivisions throughout the Bodden Town district do not have one single light. I submitted that 187 lights are needed for these subdivisions. In addition, Mr. Arnold Scott, from Birch Tree Heights subdivision, has asked us to help to install two floodlights in that area, as they have a fenced playground there for the children to play at night and if switches could be installed so the lights could be turned on and off.

We would also like to have a number of lights removed from private residences and the reason is because many have had to put the lights there themselves and pay the bills for their and other neighbours' safety because they had asked repeatedly and got nothing, so they took the initiative themselves. One road at the back of Bodden Town to lead to the North Sound Estates east canal so residents can get to the North Sound is urgently needed, and we are asking you to please take the necessary steps to help us obtain some money from the Budget to have this road surveyed during 1990.

I believe I was being very generous in asking for a few dollars to do the survey during 1990 but maybe if I had thought of it I would have put in, because according to the question this morning the road would cost some \$800,000, maybe I should have put in for the road instead of the survey. Would you consider, if possible, to have some money put into the Budget to have a study done on how we can stop sea water from coming in the area of Pedro. I use it because it is right next to Mr. and Mrs. Richard Harris' home in the Savannah-Pedro area, lots of times...

ACTING PRESIDENT: I think we are at 4:30, but if you would like to take a few minutes to finish up this point we will allow you to do so.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Mr. President, perhaps you need to move the Suspension of Standing Orders to allow him to complete his speech, I think he said he will be finished shortly.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Will you?

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER 10(2)

HON. RICHARD W. GROUND: In that case, Mr. President, I will move the suspension of Standing Orders to allow the Member to finish up.

ACTING PRESIDENT: I shall put the question. Those in favour please say Aye...Those against No.

AYES.

ACTING PRESIDENT: The Ayes have it.

AGREED: STANDING ORDER 10(2) SUSPENDED.

ACTING PRESIDENT: The Second Elected Member for Bodden Town, continuing.

MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. President.
As I was saying, during heavy weather water comes into that area, not only during hurricane time but when it comes in it ends up across the road from the Tall Tree and into Newlands. All I was asking for was perhaps a couple of dollars to have a study done on which way would be the best to try to stop it. I went on to say: "Most of the roads on the attached page, except for the back roads of Bodden Town need only to be resurfaced.". We also mentioned that we could not give a cost to him at the time but we were sending a copy of the roads needed to the Chief Engineer of the Public Works Department.
I would like to read (since there is a limited amount of time left) the reply we received from the Communications, Works and Natural Resources office. It reads:

"Dear Sirs;

Re: Work in Savannah and Bodden Town.

I refer to your letter of September the 27th, 1989 regarding the above.

1. The street lights above every pole on West Bay Road are intended specifically for the high density of people and tourists in that area. A similar situation does not exist for a great portion of the road between Newlands and Frank Sound. Hence the parallel cannot be drawn. I believe it would be sufficient to provide adequate street lighting for the populated areas along that road."

That road is also used by the people of Northside and East End. There are many dark areas along that route. "2. All subdivision roads that are private roads are not eligible for street lights at Government's expense." I find that very hard to believe when after the Elections we were given 36 street lights, there were no restrictions put as to where they could or must be put. I find it very, very strange...

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: They were paying off the votes.

MR. FRANKLIN R. SMITH: Continuing:

"Can you provide information as to whether or not the road in Birch Tree Heights that Mr. Arnold Scott has requested flood lights for is private or public?"

I read the letter before, it was not a road, it was a playing field. They had it fenced in and it is private but they have done it out of good will for the community and the children in that subdivision. Regardless of whether it is private or public our young children, boys and girls, are enjoying themselves in that playing field. I find it very hard to know someone in that area is trying to help the children and

the Member refuses to put the two flood lights as requested.

"The lights mentioned, if they are on private property and are there by private arrangement, cannot be removed by Government. A better suggestion would be to have the private party contact the Caribbean Utility Company and have the lights removed, especially as some residents complain that the lights bother them."

This is not a case of lights being on private property. They are along the main roads whether it is a subdivision or not. They have received no help in the past. So they need help now and if people are putting lights up for themselves, then we should take them off and put them up at Government's expense. I could certainly go and ask for it to be cut off but if I made a submission back for lights, would it not be the same thing?

"With regards to the road from Bodden Town to the North Sound Estates canal, such a road would only be considered if there is sufficient demand and projected use to justify the costs. In such a case let us have further discussions."

I would like to ask the Honourable Member if he would like me to bring a delegation. If this road we are requesting does not warrant it then, certainly, if the people of Bodden Town, including I myself, if I have to block that Master Ground Transportation Plan, I will do it. That Master Ground Transportation Road. The people of Bodden Town do not want to be by-passed. There are a certain amount of businesses in the area and the only way a by-pass road would be put there is after November 1992 if I am not returned to this House.

On the subject of trying to prevent water from coming in the an area next to Mr. and Mrs. Harris' home during times of hurricanes:

"At first glance such a request would seem unreasonable. Entire areas of this Island are low lying and as such are prone to flooding during times of hurricanes. If such a precedence is set, we could have people who live close to the sea all around the Island requesting Government to investigate how to stop water from coming into the area."

While the Member may have some facts for that, I know he has not seen the particular area. I do not think he visited Savannah during the hurricane, where the water was pouring across the main Savannah road over one and one half feet deep, like a river.

With regards to the list of roads which need resurfacing: "When the costing is received from the Public Works Department, these matters can be addressed." I had also asked him if he could shed any light about the public beach at Spotts. We had discussed this before with the four Members of Executive Council about having the public beach at Spotts replaced as close to the original space as possible. His reply was, "could you please elaborate more on your query concerning the public beach at Spotts?"

Since we are overtime, I will close by saying that I will support any good policy that is brought to this House which I believe will be for the betterment of this country. But I will not support issues that are to its detriment. Again, I would like to congratulate you, Sir, on your Budget Address and hope that the Government could see fit to build the abattoir during 1990. I believe that since the Master Ground Transportation Plan is not approved, some additional money should be there now. I hope I will get support from other Members in this House to have it built in 1990.

Thank you, Sir.

ADJOURNMENT

HON. RICHARD W. GROUND:
House until 10:00 A.M. on Monday morning.

Mr. President, I move the adjournment of this Honourable

ACTING PRESIDENT:
question. Those in favour please say Aye...Those against No.

The question is that the House do now adjourn. I shall put the

AYES.

ACTING PRESIDENT:

The Ayes have it.

AT 4:50 P.M. THE HOUSE STOOD ADJOURNED UNTIL 10:00 A.M., MONDAY, 27TH OF NOVEMBER, 1989.

**MONDAY
27TH NOVEMBER, 1989
10:00 A.M.**

MR. PRESIDENT: Prayers by the First Elected Member for Bodden Town.

PRAYERS

MR. ROY 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. Order paper, item 2, Papers - the Honourable Third Official Member.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS AND REPORTS

INTERIM REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION

HON. J. LEMUEL HURLSTON: Mr. President, I beg to lay on the Table of this Honourable House an interim Report of the Select Committee on Immigration Legislation.

MR. PRESIDENT: So ordered.

HON. J. LEMUEL HURLSTON: Mr. President, the Select Committee on Immigration Legislation was established on the 22nd of February, 1989, pursuant to amended Government Motion number 2 of 1989 which reads:

"WHEREAS it has been four years since the Caymanian Protection Law, 1984, was comprehensively reviewed; and

WHEREAS the Trade and Business Licensing Law (Revised) and the Local Companies Control Law (Revised) are related to the Caymanian Protection Law and should be reviewed also;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT this Honourable House, in accordance with Standing Orders 24(1) and 69(1), do appoint a Select Committee of the whole House to review the Caymanian Protection Law, 1984, the Trade and Businesses Licensing Law (Revised) and the Local Companies Control Law (Revised); to consider whether any amendments to the said Laws are necessary or desirable; and to make recommendations as to the terms of any such amendments."

The membership of the Select Committee is comprised of the whole House. At the same sitting of the Legislature the President, in accordance with the provisions of Standing Orders 69(2), nominated Lemuel Hurlston, Administrative Secretary, the Third Official Member responsible for Internal and External Affairs, to be the Chairman of the Select Committee. The quorum of the Select Committee was deemed to have been set at seven Members, in accordance with Standing Orders 72(1) the Select Committee wished to report that it has met in relation to the matters referred to it by Amended Government Motion number 2/89, but that it finds itself unable to conclude its deliberations prior to the end of the 1989 session of the

Legislature.

Since the Select Committee's establishment, it has thus far held seven meetings. These were held on the 2nd, 9th and 30th of August, 11th and 25th of October, 1st and 8th of November, 1989. The Committee's work would be inconclusive without public input, so on the 8th of August, 1989, through the Government Information Services the Committee published media releases inviting persons and organisations to make representations. We also considered the fact that members of the public may wish to make to the Committee oral representations and so such invitations, together with invitations for written submissions, were extended. The closing date for representations was set for the 31st of October, 1989.

To assist in its deliberations the Select Committee is reviewing the following Legislation and papers which are currently before it:

- The Caymanian Protection Law, 1984,
- The Trade and Business Licensing Law (Revised),
- The Local Companies Control Law (Revised),
- A fact sheet about British Nationality,
- A brief history on immigration legislation by the Chairman,
- Submissions from the Chief Immigration Officer and papers on Swiss Immigration Policies.

A total of 14 written submissions and six requests for meetings have been received from individuals, businesses and professional organisations. To all persons and organisations, we wish to place on record our deep appreciation of their submissions. The Committee took the opportunity of meeting with Mr. Allan Carter, CBE, ISO, Overseas Immigration Advisor, at the close of his 3 month assignment with this Government to review the administration and aspects of immigration within these Islands. We wish to place on record that we are grateful for having to had the opportunity of meeting him during his stay and for sharing with us his knowledge of the subject and his general overview. The Committee has also met with the Chief Immigration Officer and we would also like to record our grateful appreciation for the submissions which he made.

Prior to the Select Committee tabling its recommendations in this Honourable House, a Draft Paper containing its proposals will be published for public consideration and further representation. In the meantime, the Committee is to continue its work of considering the representations and papers currently before it and of meeting with persons.

Mr. President, the Select Committee agrees that this interim report be the Interim Report to be laid on the Table of this Honourable House at the fourth meeting of the 1989 Session.

Thank you.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Papers, continuing. The Honourable First Official Member.

INTERIM REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON CODE OF ETHICS AND CONDUCT FOR LEGISLATORS

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON:

Mr. President, I beg to lay on the table of this honourable House the Interim Report of the Select Committee on the Code of Ethics and Conduct for Legislators.

MR. PRESIDENT:

So ordered.

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON:

Mr. President, the Select Committee on Code of Ethics and Conduct for Legislators was established on the 12th day of September, 1989, pursuant to the passing of a Private Member's Motion number 19/89 and the Motion reads:

"WHEREAS many countries have prescribed guidelines to which legislators are requested to conform;

AND WHEREAS there is no written code of ethics and conduct for Members of the Legislative Assembly of the Cayman Islands;

AND WHEREAS it is considered desirable to establish such a written code for the preservation of the integrity of those who conduct public office;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT a Select Committee of the whole House be established to examine these matters and to recommend an appropriate written code of ethics and conduct for Members of this Honourable House."

The quorum of the Committee was set at seven, being the quorum for the whole House as well. The nomination of Chairman by the President in accordance with Standing Orders 69(2), the First Official Member was nominated by the President to be the Chairman of this Select Committee. The Committee held a meeting on the 2nd of November, and in its deliberations the decision was that it would be reviewing various legislation and documents of other federal and state parliaments in the region and abroad. When those are available the Committee is to reconvene meetings following the fourth Budget Meeting of

the 1989 Session of the Legislative Assembly.

This is the Report of the Select Committee to this House.

MR. PRESIDENT:

First Elected Member for Bodden Town, number 143.

We pass to item 3 of the agenda this morning. Questions, the

QUESTIONS TO HONOURABLE MEMBERS

THE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR BODDEN TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE ELECTED MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR COMMUNICATIONS, WORKS AND NATURAL RESOURCES

NO: 143: Can the Honourable Member say what is the current position with regards to the proposed launching ramps in the Bodden Town and Newlands area, provisions for which were included in the 1989 Estimates?

ANSWER: The 1989 Capital Budget makes appropriation for a launching ramp and channel in both areas. Unfortunately, no suitable government-owned property could be identified in either area and the appropriation (\$20,000) did not provide for land acquisition as well as construction. It was decided, therefore, between my Portfolio, Communications, Works and Natural Resources, and the two Elected Members for Bodden Town to: a) aim to provide a launching ramp and jetty in each area, as done in recent years in other areas, and b) concentrate on acquiring adequate property in the Newlands area where a suitable channel has been realised at no cost to Government. This acquisition is currently in progress and it is anticipated that construction will be able to commence in January 1990.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. ROY BODDEN:

Member that the problem with the Bodden Town launching ramp development is the acquisition of suitable land?

Mr. President, am I to understand then from the Honourable

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON:

That is correct, Mr. President.

MR. ROY BODDEN:

the two representatives for Bodden Town, can procure a piece of land, would the Honourable Member commit his Portfolio to examine the feasibility of such a site for a proposed launching ramp?

I would like to ask the Honourable Member in the event that we,

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON:

The answer, Mr. President, is certainly we would.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Town, number 145. I am sorry I have jumped a question, number 144, the First Elected Member for Bodden Town.

Next question please, the Second Elected Member for Bodden

THE FIRST ELECTED MEMBER FOR BODDEN TOWN TO ASK THE HONOURABLE OFFICIAL MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NO. 144: Can the Honourable Member say when does Government plan to introduce voluntary identification cards?

ANSWER: Government has not yet determined the most suitable and acceptable method or form of national identification, or if such should be voluntary or otherwise. It is not expected that a decision will be reached before the middle of 1990.

SUPPLEMENTARIES:

MR. PRESIDENT:

Member for George Town.

There appear to be no supplementaries. The Third Elected

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN:

explain what the delay in making the decision is?

Mr. President, I am wondering if the Honourable Member could

HON. J. LEMUEL HURLSTON:

the delay is that consideration has to be given to the form, style, extent of coverage and the administration, as well as the legal implications of a national identification. A number of these areas are being worked on by various portfolios of Government and when a coordinated conclusion has been reached, it would then be appropriate to arrive at a conclusion.

MR. PRESIDENT:

asked? Thank you. Item 4 on today's Paper Government Business. Bills, First Reading.

Did I understand correctly that the next question will not be

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

BILLS

FIRST READINGS

THE TOWNS AND COMMUNITIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1989

CLERK: The Towns and Communities (Amendment) Bill, 1989.

MR. PRESIDENT: A Bill entitled, The Towns and Communities (Amendment) Bill, 1989, is deemed to have been read a first time and is set down for Second Reading. Bills First Reading.

THE DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING (AMENDMENT) (NO.3) BILL, 1989

CLERK: The Development and Planning (Amendment) (No. 3) Bill, 1989.

MR. PRESIDENT: A Bill entitled, The Development and Planning (Amendment) (No. 3) Bill, 1989, is deemed to have been read a first time and is set down for Second Reading.

The House will now resume the debate on the Second Reading of the Appropriation (1990) Bill, 1989. Does any Member wish to speak? (pause) I do not know if the First Official Member is, as yet, ready to reply to the debate. Does any Member wish to speak? (pause) The Second Elected Member for the Lesser Islands.

SECOND READING

SECOND READING DEBATE ON THE APPROPRIATION (1990) BILL, 1989 BUDGET ADDRESS

(continuation of debate thereon)

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN:

Thank you, Mr. President.

I rise to speak on the Budget Address and to make reference to the various departments, the Heads and sub-heads, as appearing in the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure. I would like to say that the Budget Address which the Honourable Financial Secretary has given was most comprehensive. Particularly from the point of view of a statistical presentation I agree it was the first its kind, and I think it will be used in the future as a useful resource document. Personally, I think it would be good if it could be bound rather than just remaining in the form it is now, and be made available as might be necessary to persons wishing to have the kind of statistical information and data which it contains. I compliment him on his report and the very valuable information which it has put forward. I would like to commence with relevant comments on departments with reference to the Budget debate.

Finance and Development: This is one of the largest Portfolios in the Government, and one of great significance. Finance is the means by which this Government (or any Government for that matter) operates. Without money, nothing happens. I believe the Finance Department is in capable hands and the type of guidance and management over the past several years has been a mainstay in keeping the Government functioning in place.

The Banking Inspectorate: Banking is one of the most important areas in the Cayman Islands. We have hundreds of banks registered here and it is one of the main sources of revenue to these Islands. I believe that banking, as such, in the Cayman Islands, could do more in terms of assisting the people of these Islands, being cash favourable in terms of their daily needs - particularly in terms of persons being able to purchase homes and land. I believe that if this country is to continue as a banking centre one of the things that the country needs to look carefully at is how well the banks, while serving their international functions, provide banking and finance for projects locally. Not to say that this is not happening now to a degree; but I believe that banking in terms of availability of money for land and property in this country can be increased.

The Inspectorate itself, I am told (and to the best of my knowledge and the information I have), is carrying on the job satisfactorily for which it has been established. What I would like to know - and it has not been necessarily specifically brought forward in the report of the Financial Secretary - is the extent, in terms of staffing within that Inspectorate, to which there are persons able to do on-the-job training, or how many Caymanian persons there are slated for training in this specific Department.

Customs: It is well known that the Customs Department is the largest revenue-earner in this country. That can be easily understood because there is the unfortunate situation where just about all the goods that we use in the Cayman Islands are imported. That being the case, the Customs Duty on these goods shows large revenue. It should be borne in mind, however, that the monies which we collect in this particular case are Cayman Islands dollars, and that the out flow of monies from this country is in hard currency. Outflow is an area that I think Government needs to take a very careful look at.

The Customs Department: From the last meeting of Finance Committee we were told is functioning in terms of costs and staff is at an extremely viable position. If I remember correctly it virtually worked out to cents per person over the year for the collection of the large sums of money which were collected by that particular Department. I am personally heartened to know that the Customs

Department is training its people and that except for an advisor, to the best of my knowledge, all other persons in this Department are Caymanians. A large percentage have had formal training.

One of the areas which we need to be constantly aware of within the Customs Department is the area where illegal drugs may be brought into these Islands. I, for one, am very pleased to know that there is a unit within that Department that is functioning quite well, to the extent that we have gotten highly trained sniffer dogs that have helped in the surveillance and interdiction of drugs coming into the Islands. Monies are provided in this year's Estimates for the handlers of these dogs, and in this respect I would like to know that there is no question or any doubt about whether the amount provided there is sufficient and, for that matter, that this particular unit within the Customs Department should be graced, perhaps, with another dog.

Customs operates at the Port of George Town, the Harbour; it operates at the Airport, and I am told that there are also Customs functions carried out in the Postal Department here in George Town, where revenues are collected on parcel post. In recent times I had occasion to speak to someone connected with the Postal Services. I was quite surprised as to the extent of the amount of Customs Duties collected in this particular area and the little that is collected in terms of the postal services, while the postal services are required to provide space for the various goods which come in and pass through the Parcel Post Services. I think this is something that could be looked at. If I remember correctly, there is the Customs Duty and there is fifty cents on every package in the Postal Department, although for this particular function they are doing as much work and only collecting ten cents. It is all going into the Government's revenue, but perhaps a more realistic situation could be taken where there is enough money collected to justify the amount of time spent by officers in the postal section as well as the expense to Government for providing space.

The Legislative Assembly: I have had the impression for a long time that the business of the Legislative Assembly was largely confined to the times when the House was in session, such as now. But I can honestly say that I have found that not to be the case. The work of this Department is much larger than that, and it extends each working day of the year as do other Departments. I recall when the predecessor in the office of the present Governor, during the time a review of staffing and salaries was going on, took the position to create the post or to allow the post in this section to become largely specialised and that promotions for persons working here was more or less within this Department. I was then in the civil service and associated with the Civil Service Staff Association...

MR. PRESIDENT: Could I interrupt you for one moment? I am not quite clear of the relevance of this to general administration. I am quoting from the Standing Orders: "The general principles of Government policy and administration..." It appears to be getting into detail. I did not have to interrupt the first two Members who spoke, I prefer not to interrupt anybody else.

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Mr. President, I am not quite clear as to what you said. Could you repeat that please?

MR. PRESIDENT: Certainly. Before the debate began I did read out Standing Order 63(2), which I do not suppose I need you to remind you of. Your present subject does appear to be rather detailed. I am simply asking its relevance to the general principles of Government policy and administration.

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Mr. President, I am attempting to show the relevance to Government policy and administration in that I was about to develop the fact that the staff in the Legislative Assembly perform specialised duties, and in so doing there should be opportunity for proper training and that, with reference to the finances, there should be significant financial consideration given. On a whole I intended to tie into the expenditure that is before the House the functioning of the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. President, having said what I did to clarify what I was trying to say, I believe that Government needs to have a policy whereby the persons working in this Legislative Assembly should be sufficient in terms of staffing, and there should be some degree of specialised, legal training, as I am aware there are areas within legal concepts which the staff here need to deal with. And the fact that some years ago it was a policy whereby the staff within this Department would continue to look for promotion within this Department, it is necessary for that policy to entail a significant enough financial contribution, financial wherewithal to attract persons to this Department, to pay them for the more specialised duties which they perform. Indeed, I would hope in that in the forthcoming report from the Salaries Commissioner this particular aspect is taken into account.

It also becomes clear to anyone who looks at the business going on in this Legislative Assembly that there is the need for an increase of space. That is going to grow more critical as time goes by. Some thought should be given to ways and means of providing space in terms of storage area for the large volumes of Laws. I am aware that there is some difficulty with finding storage for them and they are stored on the second level, which makes it difficult for staff to move them down to the first floor having to walk the stairs.

Overall, I believe that it would be wise for Government in the functioning of this Legislative Assembly (which has grown to the extent that it has in terms of days of sittings and the various committee meetings), to take into account areas such as this in future expansion and projected needs.

The Marine Survey: Government took a policy decision some years ago that it would set up a Marine Survey Department. Since that time a considerable sum of money has been spent in the setting up of the Ships Register and in the actual Survey Department. In fact, from questions asked by myself in this sitting of the House it shows that there is much, much more money spent than has come in through this particular area. The public is asking lots of questions about the Marine Survey because in recent times there

has been controversy regarding registration of ships. The feeling of the general public is: Why is there such a department and what is the department doing? Is the requirement such that it is causing ships to leave our register, and the Cayman Islands are losing revenue in this particular respect?

The Member responsible for this subject spoke to it and explained to some degree the necessity of this particular department. If I understand the requirements correctly they are extremely stringent and apparently they affect all sizes and categories of ships registered in the Cayman Islands. I am wondering if it is not possible for Government, in its administration and in its policy making, to lessen the requirements in some categories of boats, such as the smaller boats, ships, vessels, whatever one terms them, which operate here in our waters - the dive boats and the like. I have had complaints from people who operate the smaller vessels saying that the surveys and the requirements are extremely costly and they argued that it could be lessened, that their boats are safe and could be safe without having to meet some of the stringent requirements which are now in place. This is an area that I trust Government would look into to determine if the best policies are in place and whether this particular area is now being administered in the way that assists all categories of vessels.

Registration: Again from what the Financial Secretary has told the House this seems to continue to be carried on here. What I do believe is necessary is that Government in its policy of administering this particular department could do a bit of public relations to better explain what is happening at this time with the Ships Registration, that it is not as bleak as many seem to believe. I have certainly had many people express that fear to me. Included in this could also be some information on the registration of companies, which, again, others say has fallen off because of the various Treaties and the like which have come into force in recent times.

Any organisation that is worth its salt must have some statistical information with which to proceed in its particular business. Thus, statistics in this country are extremely important. I am very pleased to see that there has been quite a lot of up-to-date statistics coming out of the Statistics Department. This is necessary if there is to be good Government and if Government is to be run from a position of knowledge rather than crisis-to-crisis, or on an "ad hoc" basis. Statistics in the country are necessary to the extent that every single department should have statistics which evolve from its function. Not just on population or imports, as the case may be, but overall statistics on immigration, on the movement of postal parcels, letters. There are statistics available for every single department of Government and I should hope that in the process of the development of the Statistics Department, it will be producing statistics for all Government departments which, once available, should be a very valuable tool for management.

The Judicial Department in this country operates from one building which has become very crowded to say the least. While there has been a look at this particular area of Government, I am not sure that it has been to the extent it should be. I recall that in Finance Committee, in February, sums were approved to employ stenographers for every single one of the Courts that operates, and I am not too sure this has taken place. I have heard that one more person has been employed and I wonder what has happened with that particular aspect in the Judicial System. I am sure Members here will know the reasoning and the arguments put forward for that and why it was felt it was necessary. I will not go into those details now, but I certainly wonder why this particular thing has not been done.

There is growing crime in the country which is calling upon the Courts, the Judiciary, more than before. In the actual physical management of the Courts I have heard of at least two instances where I understand prisoners have been left locked in the cells when the Courts have been closed. One of them was a juvenile, so I was told. These are the things where I believe proper management dictates that those types of incidents should not occur and there could be in place a system with proper checks to ensure that this type of a situation does not occur. It is good for the overall management and administration of the judiciary system that these matters should be taken care of.

Legal Administration: Again, with the increase of legal business, with crimes, vast increases and complex cases that are calling upon the services of the Legal Department, one needs to look ahead at the pace with which things are moving. Here again, statistics - to be able to determine if a trend continues in a particular way only a certain number of people dealing with legal matters; how much is that likely to increase? How much space is going to be available for the people who have to work within the system and the cost to the country, therefore the costs to the people?

There are expenses right now that were not there before - rental for accommodation for staff from the Legal Department. It is a large sum of money, approximately \$60,000, and I wonder if Government, when sitting down making policies to do overall examination of its administration, does not take into account matters by Department and make the necessary projections and forecasting to meet them. For, indeed, at a \$60,000 per annum repayment a large loan could be taken. Of course, if we are paying the rental fees for this particular move for this particular Department, we would find it within our means, therefore, if we took a loan to produce accommodation and space which could fall within this same amount of payment. It is very necessary at the growing rate of development in this country (which is placing strain on the Government machinery in just about all of its departments) for Government to be alert, all persons involved to be alert, and as the main thrust or objective is the greatest efficiency and productivity for the greatest amount of savings.

Within the administration of Government falls the area of information. Information is the life blood of any organisation, that is, any organisation performing properly. There are those where information is not readily available. I am talking about information in every single area and facet of Government because I contend there is a lack of information as to what is happening in Government, in departments, Portfolios, from Elected Members - overall, there is a lack. I am not prepared to say that any specific department charged with that is not doing its duty, I would tend to believe that the persons responsible for providing that information might be lax in doing so. The Broadcasting Department is, in my considered opinion, the best means of communication in the Cayman Islands. It is the area where a person driving along has to do no

more than listen. A person in their home can listen, someone out on the sea can listen, and Government, as a policy, should utilise the radio station (Radio Cayman) to the fullest extent.

In making policies for this, I think a sensible and practical policy would be to make Radio Cayman operate as a statutory body where it would get out of the main stream of all of the bureaucracy, or having to refer to this one or the next one, as the case may be. Indeed, if there is any, to get away at arms length from any suggestion where there may be treatment of the news. I am convinced that the radio station can develop and improve in the area of programming. More programmes relevant to the Cayman Islands can be developed in the Broadcasting Department. I am not criticising those who work with it now, I believe that there is a need for persons or a person to assist in this area because it is my understanding that the number who work there now have a full days work, everyday. But this is an area which can be developed. Persons can be informed of their legal rights, they can be informed of the Shipping Registry, they can be informed of what Government is planning to do, or is doing, including the areas as big and significant as debated here in this House this sitting - the Master Ground Transportation Plan.

Dissemination of information and news can be improved in this country. We have the misfortune of having only one newspaper. I suggest that is a very unfortunate situation. For those who read and believe everything they read is the sacred truth, particularly within the ambit of having only one paper, it can be a very serious situation indeed. I sincerely trust that the Government Information will increase its output, not purely to report when some Member is somewhere opening an event or seeing something, but that it gets into the meat and the gist of Government's performance and what Government is intending on doing or not doing. I do trust that somewhere, somehow, there is going to be another newspaper in this country because it is something that is badly needed - rather too much for too many, than too little in this particular field.

In his address, the Financial Secretary gave various statistics on Immigration in this country. It is a growing area of concern, not just my concern but concern from the man on the street, concern from all citizens who wonder about where the Cayman Islands is going in terms of numbers within it, from without. The Government, in my opinion, has clearly left much to be desired in administering its policies in this area. I noted with interest that the present Chairman of the Caymanian Protection Board has, for example, on more than one occasion, in more than one forum, stated that the business of the Caymanian Protection Board is to approve or not to approve applications, and that he is functioning within the policies set by this Government. Those policies need some serious overhauling. One of them that needs overhauling is the policy of this Government which says that persons within the Caribbean region and neighbouring countries are not desirable for our work force because we have too many of them - but they are more desirable if we go to the industrialised, developed, first world countries.

There is the gravest failing in that policy because we, the Cayman Islands, are developing Islands. We are what is called a Third World Country, a developing country. Whether or not there are Members in this Government who believe we have cornered all of the world's money and it will be forever with us, there are those who think otherwise. For persons who come from the developed countries to work here - no restrictions whatsoever on the movements of monies out - someone may think these people do not take Cayman Islands dollars with them. They take out foreign currency, and the big problem of developing countries is to attract that money in, not to make policies which assist that money going out. It was also suggested that within these immigration policies there is a strong element of racism. I think what needs to be done is to look at some of the directives from the Government to the Protection Board to get a very good view of that, taking into account persons who come from the various desirable areas versus those the policies say there are too many of.

I believe we have a social and political obligation - if we have so much work in this country, so much development going on here that we need people to emigrate into this country - that the first call be for the people from this region, our neighbours. We have lived with them all of these years and we are going to continue to live with them unless we sink or this Island floats away and goes elsewhere. So I believe there is some obligation there and the fact that in trading with some of the Islands they actually trade in our currency. So from an economic and financial point of view, it seems like a wise thing to consider and do.

There can be little doubt that the people in the Cayman Islands are concerned about the amount of immigration. There were various alternatives suggested by the Financial Secretary as to the areas that needed to be looked at. I wonder if they are being looked at, or if they are going to be looked at, because there is only one cry I hear coming from the Government and that is "develop". Develop at all costs. If you do not develop all of a sudden everyone is going to become pulverised. That is a false doctrine.

If all of the people in the Cayman Islands who wish to be employed are employed, and one man can only do one job at a time, how are their lives going to be so drastically affected that if we were to stop right now from developing - the hotels and the other areas are all incessantly needing manpower resources - how is that going to lessen the life-style of the Caymanian person who has no fear for his job? who is being paid for that job on a daily basis, and it is ongoing? How is that going to affect his standard of living? The standard of living is being affected in terms of the type of development here now by the fact that effectively (by the rise in prices and the difficulty in getting a loan to build a house) Caymanians are not going to be able to own houses anymore; by the fact that there are policies where 18 year old children can buy two motor cars but they cannot get a loan to buy a parcel of land. These are the things that will affect the lives of the people here. But, certainly, not that we should say at this point in time; "Gentlemen, we are only going to allow the type of development that is going to create shelter for our people, condominiums, apartments and houses. We are not going to allow anymore of the runaway motel accommodation and all the rest of it." The truth of the matter is that if no more hotels were to be built in this country for the next 10 years, there will still be the continual need for having the present foreign work force to fill the jobs that are now being filled because the population statistics show it. The Financial Secretary has shown that in his address. How can the standard of living be lowered for the people who work and toil everyday by saying we have to stop this headlong rush into this world of development?

Bermuda stopped the building of hotels in that country in the 60s. In very recent times I have been told that by two people from that country who have first-hand knowledge. On top of that I am also told that the country has said to the cruise ship people; "Gentlemen, we wish to have 38,000 people less per annum." It is not hurting them, if anything it has helped because they are in a position to enhance the standards in their country and to keep a sensible control on the expansion of population in the country, particularly the expansion of foreign persons coming to live in that country.

There is a Select Committee going on dealing with the Immigration Law, and I trust that when that is completed there will be significant legislation and sections that will address in a practical way the question of immigration. It is one of the main priorities in this country at this time. It affects every single Government Department - Health Services, Social Services, you name it - they are all affected by it. Certainly, someone's Caymanian standard of living can be lowered or affected if there are too many gobbling up what could be theirs, and those are some of the fears that have been expressed to me. Also on the question of Caymanian Status, some firm decision has to be made with respect to that. What I am hearing from the people who speak to me about it is that they wish to only see instances where this may be granted from descendents of Caymanians or where spouses are affected. I tend to subscribe to that position.

In this country there are growing concerns about law enforcement - the Police Department. From various angles I have heard concerns expressed. The policy of Government at this time appears to be to let the police force grow; that there is no need to worry, the ratio of police to citizen is growing smaller, but let the police force grow. I say that is a wrong policy. I say that is a policy where the mere presence of too many police officers can create negative reactions in a peace-loving society.

MR. PRESIDENT: Would you care to take the break there? Does it suit you?

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Yes, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Proceedings are suspended for 15 minutes.

AT 11:25 A.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 11:58 A.M.

MR. PRESIDENT: Proceedings of the House are resumed. The Second Elected Member for the Lesser Islands continuing.

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Thank you, Mr. President.
When we stopped for the break I was commenting on the matter of the Police and an apparent policy with regard to numbers. I was making the point that large numbers of police, even in a society like Cayman, can cause a negative reaction. A policy is needed which is known publicly so that no one is in doubt about what it is - the Government, the man on the street, the police themselves in respect of police numbers, promotions and expansions - the overall picture needs to be known. I contend that at this time it is not known and it is the responsibility of the Government to make absolutely clear what the position is with the arm of law enforcement in the country.

In the meeting before this one there was an indication that there was to be an increase in numbers in the police force. Since that time it is clear that there are to be more added to the number, and included in this are 12 (or 14 as the case may be) from the United Kingdom. I contend that is going to have an unhappy and undesirable effect, and I have heard as much expressed from certain quarters about what is to occur. At the last meeting as well, it was stated in so many words that the Government has gone to the furthest extent, virtually creating a zero requirement of qualifications, to get Caymanians to enter the police force but the numbers are not forth coming. Something is wrong, and that something goes beyond the fact that there is nobody qualified, because I believe there are qualified persons in this country who could enter the police force. I believe it is very necessary to review the whole situation to evolve a policy with regard to the police.

The fears I have heard expressed are that while the police being recruited from the United Kingdom are coming as constables, that they will not remain so. Maybe it is unfounded, but it is a concern. I think people in this country have grown a bit unhappy, and suspicious that what is stated as the official position, in many instances (in veiled terms or in the performance and execution) there are some variances. I believe that at this time the policy is that in the selection of the police force it is left largely to the Commissioner of Police and recommendations are made to personnel and, further on in the process, through the Public Service Commission. I believe the time has come and a policy needs to evolve so that there is a Police Commission and that Commission will look after questions of the selection, recruitment, discipline and all the other areas that come under commissions. I could hardly buy the story that it is too small to be done. There needs to be clear policy about training of the force, although I am aware that any officer coming into the force has some certain in-service training. I believe there needs to be beyond that specialised training and there needs to be a clear policy on it so that the public and people on the force would know about it.

I am all for upholding law and order in its furthest and deepest sense. I am personally concerned about reports I hear which have occurred in fairly recent times in some districts where rebellious citizens, or citizens who take a criminal outlook and attitude to things, have come into serious confrontation with the police. I think that is bad for this society and it bespeaks a certain condition at this time - resentments, for whatever reasons, of criminality, for whatever reasons, of a general lack of discipline. I am not one who subscribes to such a situation. Certainly, I believe there are certain times when the police must take such

action as required to make the point very clearly that while there may be those in the community who may not like a particular individual or individuals in the police force, what they represent and stand for must be upheld in this country or we are in serious trouble.

I would surely recommend some public relations effort through which the public can come into closer contact with the police and understand that, while they are there to protect them, they are also there to enforce the Law and that they will do so whether or not it has to be done at some times forcefully. I believe there is a certain breakdown of respect for the police in this country. I would certainly like to suggest that included in a policy would be where older persons (the impression given nowadays is that the police force is looking for younger men and women that the force does not have anything against older men) would not be made to feel out of place being among younger men as the case may be.

I can think of various persons who are retired police officers. They are in good health and keenly interested in law enforcement as ever they were. They stand more erect I believe than some of the younger men, and Government should take careful consideration of whether it is not a desirable thing that, although they have come up to 55 years of age or whatever the case may be to retire, they be kept on longer than that. That was also looked at by a Private Member's Motion (the Motion was moved and the Government accepted in this Honourable House) where civil servants can go on beyond the retirement age. I think a careful look needs to be taken in the Police Force.

There is another side of it. From the financial point of view, older men tend to be more settled. They have a family, they have a home and have accumulated some savings. The wages, even as they are now, are sufficient for a person to find it attractive enough and able to live with that salary, whereas the younger person is looking for the bigger dollars.

A policy, very clearly needs to be established where the police are concerned. I do realise that this is one of the subjects we have reserved for the Governor and the administration has been assigned to the Third Official Member. I take that into account, but, indeed, I see nothing wrong with some policy along the line as I have suggested.

Employees in the Government service on a whole need to be taken under review in my opinion. Not just the question of how much they are paid, but also aspects of who is taken into the service? What the precise and definite areas that they may be trained in, what facilities there are for training, and what monies have been allocated for it so that it is not just old talk about Caymanianisation, but it is a real situation. There is little doubt that there are, in a very large portion, professional people from overseas in various departments and posts within the civil service. I am not convinced that there is in place a definite policy with regards to the Caymanianisation of those jobs. If it is in the policy, it is surely not presenting itself in the way it is happening in sufficient numbers.

We are made aware that there has been a review of salaries and staff structure in the civil service. It came about shortly after an increase. But I can certainly see the logic of it. We still await to see what that report will say. I have also taken cognisance that there is no amount provided in the Budget which might be representative of any salary increase or increased expenditure in terms of civil servants, and I hope that the Government is in a position to state in due course why that is so because it is bound to entail monies which will have to be dealt with at some point in time within the coming year.

I believe one of the priorities of this country is in creating a proper national pension scheme which will include civil servants. I certainly do support the position taken by the Member responsible for this particular subject to have a study done. As I have said, I believe in working from a position of knowledge and we now have the knowledge with us. So it is now left to us, as Elected Representatives of the people, to sell that idea to our constituents and to sit down and determine where we are going to find the money to deal with this situation. It is money that is a priority in my opinion, and it is something that needs to be addressed in the earliest possible time. No longer can it continue where each year the Government has a system of pay as you earn. It has to be identified and it has to be done in a proper and scientific manner.

I understand that the island of Bermuda is way ahead of us in this respect. Perhaps we can glean things from them, we can certainly chide ourselves that while we feel we have things all in place, there are large and significant areas that have simply just been allowed to happen.

In the civil service I believe it is a sensible policy if Government looked at the number of jobs there with a view to reducing them in the light of being able to study the work that each person is doing, because it is my belief that there is considerable duplication. I know there was when I was there, and I was around altogether for something like 17 and one half years, so I do not believe it has changed too much. In any study and in laying down any policy one has to take into account the efficiency and how the work is distributed. I hope that the present study has taken into account the question of job descriptions for every single soul in the service, an evaluation of every job, and the classification of that job and, certainly, a look at the redistribution of work. I believe there is duplication and that a person could be assigned more duties and could perform them more specifically if they knew that was what they were supposed to do. By a reduction of numbers, the savings from that alone I believe could go a long way to enhance the salaries of civil servants. I am convinced their salaries need enhancement.

I would like to refer to District Administration, that is the administration of Cayman Brac and Little Cayman, and mention a few matters there in detail. I trust the Chair will oblige me. I am not sure what the policy of Government is towards Cayman Brac and Little Cayman. At best I think it amounts to some sort of patch work job - they get as they can. What is the true and overall picture with regards to it? I wonder if it has ever been defined. Personally, I have no knowledge of it. What the Government needs to take into account and be fully cognisant of is that everything that is here in Grand Cayman is in Cayman Brac on a smaller scale with the same attendant problems and needs.

I know that there is the Member responsible on Executive

Council (now the Third Official Member) and I state here that on any occasion I have called him on any matter, he has made himself available, which I appreciate, whether it was to take a call or to have a moment to speak with him. I believe that is good and the way it should be for there are two Elected Members from Cayman Brac and Little Cayman, and we have to look to him for matters which we bring so that they get upwards and to the right authorities in Government and, ultimately, to the chief decision-making body, the Executive Council.

But on the district level there are persons who play significant roles in the administration of Cayman Brac and Little Cayman. I can think of the District Commissioner, his Deputy, the Supervisor of Public Works and the Chief Customs Officer in Cayman Brac and Little Cayman. I am aware that there are certain problems with regards to communications, when something is needed or requested it takes what seems to be an unduly long time. Part of that is because of the separation by some of the deepest sea in the world - two Islands separated by the largest of the three, Grand Cayman. I am convinced that the District Commissioner must be assured that he is not stepping on anyone's corns in Grand Cayman or any Member of any Portfolio when he is to act on something to get the job done; that it would take too long down here to get a yes or no answer and, if he acts in good faith and does something there, he will not be up against any undue reprimands.

I also believe that included in a Policy and in proper administration, there has to be the closest liaison between the Public Works here and the Public Works there. To assist the situation between the two Islands there should be a clear programme in any given year as to what is going to be done in any particular area of Government. Certainly, I would like to see a programme of works drawn up at the beginning of every year for the performance of works so that the public knows that such and such is going to be done on the airport, that such and such is going to be done on the roads, that here is the time frame for it and there is a means by which one can evaluate the progress that is being made. This year, I think it is true to say, there was not as much work completed as it was hoped for.

The policies toward Cayman Brac and Little Cayman have to be such that there is no feeling among the people that they are second best - we are all one people - or there is any situation of handouts or that if an Estimate which may have been made for \$4,000 has been found to cost \$7,000, that there are not people in place in Grand Cayman who are going to say you cannot have the additional \$3,000; that there is clear communication and reassurance from the Government seat here in Grand Cayman.

Earlier this year I asked a question about the policy of air services between Cayman Brac and Little Cayman. I was told it was similar to that in Grand Cayman, to provide the best service and all the rest of it. I am stating that the air service to Cayman Brac and Little Cayman is not what it should be and it can be improved, and it should be improved. I am asking that it be improved. It is, perhaps, the main way the people in these three Islands can be physically together, one with the other in each individual community.

Much needs to be done in a proper policy. If that policy entails dollars to improve that, for that to come the Member responsible must bring that here to the Elected Members of this House, and lay the case out. If it is millions, then it is millions. If it is hundreds of thousands, then so be it. But the overall will towards all of the people can be thrashed out within this Legislative Assembly, that is the way it should be.

In the area of air services mention has been made of keeping and updating. There is a brand new terminal needed, appreciated and everything else. But why let part of it appear primitive by having a confounded roll-up door that you find in industrial works, and not fix it? I think it is a priority...

MR. PRESIDENT:
recently.

I hate to interrupt you but you have covered that subject

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN:

Mr. President, I note it in connection with the cost to Government. Cayman Brac and Little Cayman needs staffing, it needs every opportunity that is provided for in Grand Cayman, including investment policies. I am aware that there is zero duty on people building hotels there. That is good. But I think there is the need for Government in its advertising, tourism and so on, to increase the amount and encourage the investment in those Islands.

Hiring policies also need to be very clear, for there are limited numbers in Cayman Brac and Little Cayman. Certainly that is one area that Government should look at for persons who may wish to (and who are) work past the age of retirement there. I am aware that there are a number of people employed in the Government services there, particularly in Public Works, and I know that goods and services tend to be more expensive there because of its physical location.

I have had some representation made to me where persons are employed at the wage scale and they always seem to be employed at the very beginning of that scale, particularly in the Public Works Department. Nothing is wrong with that, and it is provided for in the Estimates. But I would like to know that wherever it is possible a person can be brought in one single increment above the top, that this be done because that does help a whole lot in those Islands where employment is limited and there is no such thing as having two and three jobs for the majority of people.

We have a matter of tourism here and we like to say we are one of the biggest tourist destinations in the Caribbean - and we are, relative to others. There has been a downturn in tourism. I am not sure that the root of that problem has been identified yet. It certainly needs to be and there needs to be a policy here where, because the Hotel and Condo Association say they do not feel like advertising any particular year because the year before they had it so good, Government must intervene and insist upon policies for advertising for this country. It cannot be left to chance. Solutions are needed, not excuses.

In determining a policy for these Islands one has to sensibly decide how many people we want in any particular year. How many rooms for rent in the hospitality world are we

going to allow? I am not sure that has been done here either. As I pointed out earlier, Bermuda said no more hotels from the 60s and apparently they have not suffered from that. I believe there needs to be a policy that clearly sets standards for properties who offer accommodation which charge top dollar. Are they offering top accommodations? I wonder about it. Inspections once a year? Is that sufficient? Properties should always be expecting someone from a Tourism Inspectorate to turn up to see what they are doing and to be penalised if they are found lacking in any way on standards that should be in place. How can you measure a situation if there are no standards to measure it against?

Going hand-in-hand with tourism is the national airline, Cayman Airways. This year a most radical step has been taken that has brought a liability, in lease payments alone over the next 15 years, of \$112 million. For anyone who wishes to pooh-poo that - that that is not a big deal - they are certainly living in a bigger world than I am, because these Islands are limited - the amount of resources are limited, and the revenue base is limited. It is good to know that for the first time in the history of the airline there has been a moderate profit to June of this year. What leaves me puzzled is if that is the case what was the logic in getting rid of the equipment which helped to make it that way? That is left to be seen. The country stands to see whether the liability that has been imposed upon it is a wise thing to have been done. If it is not we are all certainly going to pay for it. In the Estimates, however, there is still a subsidy for Cayman Airways. Generally speaking, it was stated in so many words at different public meetings that such a thing would fly out the window and would not be necessary again.

One aircraft in the fleet of Cayman Airways that I would hope would be changed is the present one used between these Islands - the Shorts. There is no doubt in my mind, or in the minds of the people in Cayman Brac, that that was the plane to have been changed in recent times.

With all of our development and all of our wealth we continue to hear about complaints in labour. Most of it deals with unfair practices in the work place. The employees complain that employers go to great lengths to beat them out of what is due them, such as gratuities. Until now we have talked about the question of gratuities many times here. Until now there is still no formula so it is still a wide open field and, while it can be administered by Government, it is highly questionable. But most certainly there are continuing complaints about it in the labour market where we have 50 or 60 per cent over and above our own labour force. In this land of plenty we cannot get it together to the extent that labour practices move along smoothly between employer and employee.

On the employer's side, the employers are saying how lazy the Caymanians are - they do not work, they get drunk and they do not come to work. Some of it is true, I do not buy the lazy part of it. If that applies it must apply to a new generation because, generally speaking, Caymanians are anything but lazy. However, I believe it is very necessary to have a minimum wage prescribed, and see that it stands and works, because certain information available to me leads me to believe that some employers do not really want labour as we know it, they are looking for slave labour at the lowest possible amounts of money.

We have passed a Bill that has amended various parts of the Labour Law, and it is good. It could have been more comprehensive, it was not. I hope it is not just to sit there. I hope it is going to be enforced, that the Labour Officers or the enforcers, whoever they are, will act fearlessly because they know there is in place a political will that it be implemented as it is stated in the Law.

Now to the means by which we can progress, by which we can really become a vibrant society which can cause a person to fully appreciate their worth and the best to come out of them - that field of education. We so woefully lack. It is as if it is in reverse because the numbers that are coming out qualified, versus the numbers that could be, I believe there is serious, serious cause for concern. The high schools are not producing sufficient numbers. We hear of high school children who are coming out functionally illiterate, going through a whole course of education - years of it - and at the end of the day they have not acquired enough of the learning skills - reading, writing and arithmetic, and the practical subjects - so that they can meaningfully go into the work place and function. Where does the fault lie? It needs to be found out. Solutions and not excuses - and this country and this Government abounds with them.

There is no doubt that one of the areas where training and education is most needed is in the skilled areas. We have put in place so much physical development and are putting in place so much physical development that we simply must have people to keep maintaining it. The buildings alone - the electrical, air-conditioning, the actual building itself, masonry, as the case may be. How many are we producing? Not enough. Too few. In some instances one wonders if any.

We had some technical schools a few years ago and one thing that the present administration did was to deal that a real bad lick. They took care of that fast. If one thing the Government meant to show was that it was not going to continue onto the present organisational structure and when it went to its present resting place, it has ever since been resting. We need to get the young people trained with skills required in this country. We do not need statements in the papers about what is being planned, or what has been planned, or what is not being planned. We need results. If those results have to be taking it from where it is now and putting it back to the other Portfolio where it was, do it. But we have to get some results. I do not believe we are going to get that when we hear a report from the Public Accounts Committee that the land purchased to build the school on has half of the cliff in George Town. (Members' laughter) We are talking about administration and policies and public management. I am astounded to think that anyone that would purchase or designate an area that had not been examined by the proper people to see if that was suitable or not.

I do not want to believe that the policy of this Government should be that we can not do technical training of any significance until we get a Community College. We need one. But that should not stop the show at this time. I trust it will not be the case that for another year there will be architectural drawings and this consultant and the next consultant, and all the rest of it, when we could take a parcel of land and put down a concrete and steel building or, for that matter, a steel building that would serve us for

the next 10 or 15 years, as the case may be. How dare we stand here and talk about building this beautiful structure with the right outside and facade, in agreement with the town Planning Authority. We want a functional building. So let us get on with job and choose something that is functional. Ask the teachers, they know how much space is needed. Get the equipment and put it in and let us start training our people.

MR. McKEEVA BUSH:

Hear, hear!

MR. PRESIDENT:

Perhaps it might be convenient to break there.

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN:

Yes, Mr. President.

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:

Proceedings of the Assembly are resumed. Continuation of the Second Reading of the Appropriations Bill, the Second Elected Member for the Lesser Islands continuing.

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN:

Mr. President, when we stopped for lunch I was speaking about the need for education, that education is a priority in the Cayman Islands if the Cayman Islands are to succeed. If they are to become successful in any area, education is undoubtedly one of the most important matters to be addressed. In this regard I was commenting on the need for technical training of our young people, and that to train the young people in skills we do not need a fancy building, buildings can be produced of steel. Once they have the amount of space that is necessary, once they have the equipment there and the teachers there we can proceed to educate the young people.

Monies have been provided this year for the building of such a facility - the Community College. I wonder how long such a situation will take and how much longer we can continue with the need to produce people who have the necessary skills in this society. I believe that more utilisation can be made of existing institutions. It has become clear during this sitting of the House that for years no decision by Government has been taken regarding the accreditation of a college that has been serving these Islands for a number of years, that is, the International College of the Cayman Islands (I.C.C.I.). This shows the fact that successive Governments are prepared to let the situation hang rather than deal with it while the people suffer the consequences from that.

Mention was made in the Address by the Financial Secretary that students are attending institutions which do not equip them with the level and quality of education which they need. I should hope that at least if there are instances where Government is offering scholarships to such young people that the Government is ensuring that the institutions which they attend are those which give the quality of education which is desired.

Apparently, there is in place a policy regarding teachers and their recruitment, at least from what regions they are recruited from. Again, this appears to be one against the region in which nature, or the Lord, located the Cayman Islands. We go all the way, thousands of miles away, to the United Kingdom and Canada to recruit teachers. Anyone, including the Government and the Member responsible, should realise that in this region we find people who are familiar with the social values, the way of life, and behaviour patterns, for that matter, that would not be known or accepted or familiar within the United Kingdom. I believe it is necessary for Government to start recruiting teachers from the Caribbean region and not as has been done in the past. It is well known that there are only some schools in the United Kingdom that cater to the large population of West Indian students and, of course, not all teachers there choose to teach in such a setting. From that point of view, therefore, the logic is not evident why from such a cosmopolitan country teachers should be brought here and be expected to perform as well as some teachers from the Caribbean region.

The First Elected Member for Bodden Town spoke about the decade of youth, pointing out the grave need for developing our human resources in our youth. There can be no doubt that is a grave need. Everything must be done, and it is not being done at this stage from the highest political level right down to the schools through a properly administered system that we can educate our people. Motions have been brought here regarding the increased ages to remain in school. That has reached nowhere, except to invite another expert to look at the situation - the old saying: While the grass is growing, the horse is starving.

In the Budget Address it was pointed out that in 15 years, 43 per cent of the population is going to be over 55 years of age. I wonder if that concerns any people in the Government? I wonder if the Government is concerned about that position? They should be, because if one looks at the numbers from 1 to 55 and what is happening in the middle ground and all the rest of it, we should be really concerned. The area of education cannot be emphasised too strongly, for if we are to ever move to a position where we will become self-reliant, where we can run our own affairs and where we can stop at least one area of inflow - that of the professional areas - then we have to educate. Education is the only currency we can spend in this country that can prepare all of our people for future life in the best possible ways.

It all comes down to priorities. I think the Government has successfully gotten their priorities wrong. There are various reports available to Government in the Health and Social Services area. I think having these reports is good because I imagine that the reports factually state the

position where we are at in this point in time. What has to be borne in mind is that those reports cannot truly direct our performance or state what areas, as such, we should treat with a priority.

There is a report regarding the hospital facility. I think it is good to know where we are, what we have, what we do not have, and to provide statistical information based on what has happened in the past and what we are doing for the present. However, I cannot see that we should enter into an area of vast expenditure (as quoted in the papers) of \$20 million worth of health care. Those types of figures are the numbers we hear about in the industrialised countries where there are millions of people living and can be taxed. We are, by rough guesstimates, about 26,000 people. So in any instance where we are going to spend \$20 million in any particular service area, we have to be absolutely sure where the money is coming from and how we can attempt to pay it back. So where the hospital is concerned I believe much can be done to enhance the services now being offered there, both in equipment and in the actual performance of service and also in staffing.

It seems clear that it is necessary to create a system of payment for doctors so that we can attract the type of specialists that we need. I am not sure that simply offering a basic salary is the way to do this. Doctors have come and doctors have left, and I have heard of instances where salary seems to be one of the areas complained about. I am wondering if it is not possible to create a system of fees where some element of those fees can be counted towards the salaries of the medical doctors. It might be easier to meet fully the wages of nurses and other staff on a monthly basis through salaries.

I think it is necessary for a proper health insurance plan to be put into place. Sooner or later the money is going to run out and we are not going to be able to continue to subsidise, as has been happening in the past. I am aware that something is being done in this respect. Again, it is a matter of dollars and cents. The Government Member responsible must sit down with the rest of the Elected Members and together we can determine to what extent, and how we are going to go about it, because we are all answerable - not just one Member charged with the responsibility for health. This is necessary because, again, the statistics tell us that this is an aging population. Birthrates are down. We are not providing a balance in terms of the age in population and the birthrate at this point in time in this country.

The question of Social Services has to be addressed now - not in terms of press releases. There has to be a practical means of achieving the ends which have to be reached in all areas. In drug rehabilitation, our citizens who are now in their twilight years, it all has to be addressed, and speedily. It cannot be done by one individual alone or one Portfolio, as the case may be.

One thing that is particularly bothersome to me is the amount of money being spent in various areas for consultancy fees. There are various large amounts that have been spent this year and, if I remember correctly, under Health and Social Services in this year's Estimates there is something like \$900,000 for consultancy fees. I will have to hear all the details of how that is to be spent before that particular Budget could receive my support. On a whole it seems to be an era where large and ongoing amounts are being spent in consultancy services. As the representatives of the people it is our duty to find out if it is being spent wisely, if less amounts could be spent to achieve the same purpose, because it all amounts to expenses to the country, expenses on the people. If the Government is not prepared in any area whatsoever to increase fees that are charged, be it on stamps or wherever, then the Government ought to be aware that the present revenue basis can only produce so much money. To continually spend and increase the amounts being spent, the money is simply going to run out.

Priorities have really gotten mixed up in this country, at this time. We need no better example than the situation with the Master Ground Transportation Plan. Although that was presented by the Government and by the Member responsible as a priority, most surely from every bit of information that I have had it has not been seen as a priority by the public at large. I cannot see how building super-highways in George Town and spending large sums of money and committing to large sum of money to build roads is going to address the many other areas and priority needs. That bill was not passed, and I think the Government can now look at a situation where pressing areas of needs can be addressed, areas that can help people directly in terms of assisting their needs in health and social services, education and otherwise.

I cannot agree that the Master Ground Transportation Plan was going to be the answer to all of our needs, as it was apparently being suggested it would. It is not going to help us very much to have motor cars to drive when our children are not educated as they should be, or if our people are becoming ill and they do not have the services they need or the wherewithal to pay for it through having health insurance. I think that priorities need to be set. Clear, sensible priorities. At this time they are missing the boat.

Constantly one hears; "Well, what do you want to do? What can we do? We are trying to do various things and you do not seem to be appreciative of that." In the overall picture of the Cayman Islands, lots of things have to be taken into account. This includes managing and taking care of what we now have. For example, something that has been that way for months, if not a year, is when you go to the airport here you are struck when you get to the ticket counter by an overpowering smell and it is not coming from the perfume in the duty free shops. It sits there daily. Hundreds of people pass by every day and they must wonder what is being done about it. If you go by the sense of smell nothing is being done. At the airport terminal building, the various lights and so on missing since the hurricane. What is being done there? They have not been replaced in a lot of instances. The traffic on the road is being blinded on the turn by the airport because of the high bushes that are there. They could be cut back to a level where one could see around the turn. The traffic islands in the centre of George Town with shrubbery so high that one cannot see across it, that causes safety problems. Is nobody seeing these things, or is the only thing in focus the building of speedways around George Town?

Lots of things need to be addressed. Many things in this society are wanting, and living in want. We understand that the amount of traffic at the Airport, the number of people coming in is causing a problem. What is being done to extend the Airport? Is Government going to take some programme to extend it? Are they talking to one of the airlines who have allegedly said they would do so and work

out an arrangement with Government for payments over an extended period of time, as I understand they have done on the Islands of Antigua or Grenada? These are areas that need addressing. We, in this country, cannot very well say we want tourism and when we have the airlines coming here, spending their money and taking their risks in bringing their airlines here to fill the hotel and condominium rooms, and on the other hand to be saying they are providing too much. Too much for whom?

In 12 years of operation Cayman Airways must reach a point of maturity where it is going to have to operate within the competition. Only this year we were told that they made a profit. Whether it will make a profit with the two 737s is another question. But these are the areas that makes one wonder what Government sees as priorities, what is it prepared to do about them; and it is these types of things which some of us as Legislators are concerned about. When there are requests by representatives, why is it that the political directorate simply chooses not to treat that area as a priority? Is it not the case that all of us should largely determine priorities in the country? How can we continue to say develop, develop, develop, which is requiring more and more people to be brought into the country, stressing an already over-stressed infrastructure? Who are we building it for? It is certainly not the Caymanian people at this stage anymore.

I hope we are not suffering from some syndrome as was the case in the United States after the Viet Nam war. It was proven that there was an intense guilt within the American people generally, about that war. I hope we are not getting into a guilt situation where we have so much money that we are duty-bound to let other nationalities come in here and provide employment for them because they may not have it in their own country or, if they do, they do not earn the wages they earn here, to the detriment of the improvement and enhancement of the quality of life for our own people. I wonder about it.

Monies in this year's Estimates continue along the trend of providing monies in areas such as rent and housing for contracted officers. How long are we going to continue to spend millions and millions of dollars paying rent for contracted officers? Are we not going to arrive at some position where we are going to take a million dollars a year and build apartments or houses or whatever the case may be, which, when the contracted officers are gone, can still be rented? There will always be opportunity, all things being equal, to continue to rent them even if it is not to Government officers. Are we not going to take some sensible and wise decision with that type of thing? How many years to come will there be millions in the Budget just to pay housing? Is nothing being done about gratuities that are paid to contracted officers? Is that not a recurrent expenditure? Are we not going to arrive at a situation where those gratuities are going to be insured, or are we going to increase salaries to a point that persons coming here in any particular job, are going to be told; "look, this job pays \$40,000 a year. There are places to be rented in the Cayman Islands, you will take care of your own rent and you will also save out of that money, like everyone else does if you want money to take home with you"? These are real questions. Good Government dictates that these things be addressed, speedily.

Are we going to continue to allow a non-policy decision for musicians to come into the country as they will, to entertain for whatever periods of time, and the papers make a big fuss of the terrible thing that the Protection Board has done to refuse one particular musician who was putting on satanic and demonic types of shows with snakes. How long will departments be blamed for doing what they are suppose to do, while, on the other hand, the same hotel in which the nightclub is located owes Government one and a half million dollars in revenue and nobody is doing anything about collecting it?

We really have our priorities cock-eyed. We are really on the wrong track. How useful is it to talk about agriculture and to try to pacify a situation when a Member may ask for so much for this or for that, but yet, over the years have no realistic policy. Apparently, they are now beginning to have a study done. Other studies have been done in areas of hydroponics that I am aware of, for example. What has really come about to date in the line of agriculture - animal husbandry, plant husbandry? It can be done. It has been proven that it can be done. But how largely it is done will depend on finding people interested and willing to do it and how much the Government makes of it as being a priority. Not least in this process is the provision of monies, of available finances, to do things and, of course, to develop the Agriculture Department and staff it to the extent that it has people available to work with those who will farm or raise cattle, as the case may be.

Mr. President, things just happen here it seems, and it goes on and on unchecked in many instances. Crises arise, then something is done. Someone is seen handing a check to someone or someone appears in the newspapers and that is the extent of it. That is not good Government. Good Government has to be where people sit down and plan, where they derive policies, implement them and follow up until the situation is working to achieve the objectives that have been set. Mr. President, I wonder about a Government that raises much fuss about a cow coming from Swan Island, but major, wilder snakes come in and stay at hotels.

One thing is clear, that is that the Cayman Islands have been blessed in many ways. It has the good fortune of having honest, hard-working, practical-minded people who have lived here and reproduced generation over generation. We have had the good sense to realise that if we are going to get fussy over colour, it should be green in the form of the dollars (we have some variation in ours), that we do not take out on that race being perfect and the next race being bad and that type of thing, we had the good sense to work towards where we are now. While we now have finances and monies - just like it came, it can go. Our position as a sensible Government (and I hope they will share that view) is to encourage it to come for us to wisely spend our monies and for us to do all we can in developing ourselves so as to stem, to some extent, the outflow of that money.

The Government cannot be proceeding in the right way if it is not setting the priorities of the country right, whereby the people - not the ground, not the motorcars, the people - can have their quality of life enhanced through improved education, through improved social services, improved health services, through improvement to where each person is fortunate enough to find that money sufficient unto his needs and that, as near as is possible, we can work and strive towards being an equal people as far as our

means will allow.

Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT:
Member for Health.

Does any other Member wish to speak? The honourable

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER:

Mr. President, I rise to support the Budget Address as delivered by the Honourable Financial Secretary and to compliment him on his able and eloquent presentation and the new format of the Budget Address. He has given us a good history of the global economic position and its relation to the Cayman Islands. He has given us both the positive and the negative effects of the various activities that have happened in that global economy in which we live. There is much information, and to use his own words, much instruction, that Members of this Honourable House and, indeed, the country, could pay heed to in the new decade that is about to dawn, which some people have christened the Decade of the Youth.

The global growth rate of 4.1 per cent in 1988 is a good indication and offers direction. I believe the Government has accepted those directions and those instructions in putting forward the Budget for 1990 that it has. We have been taken around the mulberry bush by certain speakers. One minute we have to control everything, the next minute they have a wish list of 5 million items. We have to make up our minds where we want to go. The Government has been accused of not setting its priorities, not getting its priorities right. The Government's priorities, as laid out in the Budget Address before us, are quite clear. It is rather unfortunate that Members have decided that those priorities are wrong because quite clearly, from the Budget, the Government has allocated \$12 million for the Current Expenditure of Education, \$4.4 million for Capital Expenditure for Education. Roughly \$11 million in Recurrent Health Care, \$1 plus million in Capital Expenditure. Those are the two priorities of the Government. It is quite clear. Government sees education as the number one and health as number two. It is rather unfortunate that those Members who have spoken so far disagree with that posture.

Now, Mr. President, we have heard that the Government is only interested in, I think the word they used to describe it was 'grandiose' and 'pet' projects of the Members. I am quite comfortable and quite happy to hear Members say that priority must be given to youth for the decade of the 90s. What their priority entails, if it does not entail education as number one, followed quite closely by good health, I believe the country has reason for concern. We have heard that we need to educate the youth. The Government is providing for that in the Budget. Education has by far the highest vote of any subhead. They say we need to develop the human resources. Again, the Government's Budget as it was put forward wants to do that. We also recognise that it is fairly difficult to educate a child with a toothache. So we have made provisions for our second priority - health care for the nation. We hear that is a grandiose project that we do not need.

I believe it is going to be fairly difficult, if not impossible, to adequately, properly and effectively educate someone if they are suffering from a toothache, or some of the other diseases from which we provide inoculations for. It appears that some people do not understand what happens in a dental clinic. You do not go to a dental clinic to get your toe nails fixed - but I can understand why some people would feel that way - you go there to get your teeth fixed. They say we have to come up with sensible policies, yet the Government needs instruction on how to do this. But you know in all of their verbose deliberations they have been very critical. That is their right. That is their job. But it would be nice to occasionally offer alternatives because usually when you are pointing your finger across the hall, and you are using your index finger, there are four other fingers on that hand that are pointing back at you and begging for suggestions.

Let us deal a little bit with this decade of youth and that the Government needs to get its priorities in order. I agree with that. I believe the Government is trying to grapple with the problems of the youth. I believe that we have made some mistakes, and might make mistakes in the future. But we are not worried about losing face, like the Japanese. If we make a mistake we simply say that we made a mistake and will try again. On the other hand, while we are trying to put programmes in place, they are simply putting stumbling blocks in the way. My Portfolio and my staff spent nine months developing a drug plan. We believe that is a priority. We believe something needs to be done for the youth about drugs. We sought Members' input. We got none. We are still waiting on that input. When it was tabled, it was reduced to a debate about whose house you were going to buy in a specific constituency. I believe that is concern about the youth.

[The First Elected Member for West Bay rose]

Unless it is a Point of Order I am not giving way.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:
have kept standing.

Well, if he is not going to give way, Mr. President, he should

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER:

We received a lecture a few days ago about how Standing Orders work, when somebody gets up to interrupt you, you are supposed to sit down and let them quote the Point of Order.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Please, let us continue.

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER:
on..

Anyway, Mr. President, the public is quite aware of what went

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:

Mr. President, I rise on Standing Order 34(b).

MR. PRESIDENT:

We had this before, on 34(b) if the Member gives way... He said he was going to give way on a Point of Order, which is not what you are bringing, so we know where we are.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:

Tell the truth, you should tell the truth.

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER:

Mr. President, I believe that is the truth. The public is well aware - they were given two reports, not one. I asked for their input. We got zero. We went ahead, we developed a Plan. I am not telling anyone it is a perfect plan. But what I want to hear is ways we can improve it - not whose house we are going to buy - and what we can do to alleviate the problems that we are not doing. We went along in another constituency, negotiated about a house, could not come to an agreement, decided to acquire it for market value and Finance Committee deferred the funds. But we must make youth a priority. I agree with that. We must make youth a priority.

They say we must have more concern about housing, social services and pensions. I agree with all of those. I believe the Government has spent considerable effort and time concerning itself with what can be done in those areas. But you see, sir, that is our job. It is our job to find the solutions. It is their job to criticise and build walls (so you cannot get it done) for political expediency, then they come back here and tell us we are not doing anything. But I believe the Government has done the best that it could do with the financial resources it had available, the manpower resources it has available. Certainly, in the face of such a great political opposition and troublemaking, instead of working and coming up with some solutions, some suggestions and hope for the people of this country... overthrowing the Government is not a solution to the youth.

They worry about the loss or respect for authority. It seems like some people are quite willing to have the responsibility and the accountability for all these things thrust upon the shoulders of someone else to whom they can point the finger and say; "you are responsible, you are accountable". But, alas, they must retain the authority. If you are going to be responsible and accountable for anything in this life, you should have a certain amount of authority to at least try programmes or solutions that you would like to see put in place. Give them a chance. But, no, they think they must be separate. Somebody else must be held responsible. Somebody else must be held accountable. They, and they alone, must have the authority to say how, when, why and where. They say that Government is not willing to help. But you know, the Government has been trying - is trying. The Budget is quite clear.

The Budget Address by the Honourable Financial Secretary is quite clear as to what Government thinks are the priorities facing this country. What we need to hear from them is which of those scenarios, which of those alternatives, they think we should take. It is quite heartening to hear that the Pension Plan seems to be receiving support. That is good. They will get the opportunity to put that into practice, hopefully in the next sitting of this House in March. They say we need to have sound and sensible policies. I maintain that the Government has presented in the Budget Address, and in the Estimates which accompany it, sound and sensible policies. We have prioritised it - we have made education number one and health care number two.

They say that they were stern school masters and they produced some good students, that is good; and that if we give them a chance they can make a good Government out of us. That is good to hear. They keep getting back to the statement I made about writing off a generation in terms of prevention of drug abuse. You know, that is the generation that we are going to have to write off in terms of educating them and preventing them from getting involved with drugs. I make no apologies for that statement. That is a fact. They might not want to admit it, but it is a fact. Those people are already intertwined and entangled with drugs and have already developed the behavioural patterns which allow them to become so entangled. My concern is the generation that we can still influence from a prevention point of view. Of course, sir, unlike what they would have you believe - that we have forgotten that generation... you see they never continued the argument, they never completed the sentence because we have made great strides in terms of drug rehabilitation over the past year or two. We intend to continue to pick up those of that generation through rehabilitation, that it is possible to do. That is the purpose of that section of the Drug Plan.

I do not even believe they read it, I don not even believe they know it had three areas. They should read it sometime and try and come up with some constructive ideas. Some ideas that might offer up hope.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Would it be convenient to break there?

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER:

Yes, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Proceedings are suspended for 15 minutes, accordingly.

AT 3:30 P.M. THE HOUSE SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 3:50 P.M.

MR. PRESIDENT:
continuing.

Proceedings are resumed. The Honourable Member for Health,

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER:

Mr. President, at the break I was emphasising the point that the

Government has set its priorities in the Budget. They are education, followed by health care. The Education Budget is roughly \$16 million between recurrent and capital, or approximately 14 per cent or 15 per cent of the total Budget. They say we have to get our priorities in order. I believe they are in order. They say we should not be spending on things like the Master Ground Transportation Plan. We should not be spending on the hospital, drugs, pensions and items like that. We need to get our items in order.

I believe it is fair to say that the Master Ground Transportation Plan (MGTP) is exactly that. It is a comprehensive plan to take care of ground transportation in this country for several years into the future. The big question on their part has been cost. The hard cold facts are that the cost for the work to be completed for the MGTP for 1990 is in the Budget, funded from ordinary revenue. I do not think any Member of the Government ever intimated or indicated that the MGTP was going to be done all at one time, or in one financial year. Members have consistently, for the past year, voted funds as needed to implement stages of the MGTP. That is just another example of the Government identifying a problem, getting the resources to properly define the problem, to produce reasonable and long term solutions to the problem after looking at all the possible alternatives. That is what we are doing with health care at the moment. That is what we are doing in education and that is what the Master Ground Transportation Plan is all about.

Of course, for political expediency some people would prefer that we did not plan, that we just build a road here and a road there at the whims and fancies of political desires. We wound up with a maze of roads that led into dead ends and complicated traffic patterns and traffic jams. That is not what this Government is all about. They say the Government is entering into the realm of adversarial politics, that we do not consult them and take their advice. In my opinion, that is not a fair comment. I believe the Government has consulted with them on all the major issues. We have sought input from them. We might not necessarily have made a decision that they wanted us to make, but we made what seemed to be the most reasonable decision, taking into consideration their views and expressed opinions and everybody else's.

But what do they do? We ask for their input, we ask for their consultation, we ask for their ideas. Either we do not get it, or they get up on a political soap-box and call for the overthrowing of the Government because we are making the wrong decisions. That is their way of contributing to good Government - as they like to call it, to whip the Government in line. When you are teaching primary school children, they are not allowed to answer back. When you are teaching middle and high school children, they have to be very careful how and when they answer back. But, when you are dealing with adults and you are giving them a lecture or a lesson, it is expected that they should answer back and defend their positions. That is what tertiary education is all about. They are going to get some answers to their accusations.

They say that we have a responsibility to turn this country over to future generations in as good a financial position as we found it. I believe that is true. I accept that as good advice. That is why we are not proposing deficit spending this year, to take care of all the little, small back roads at the constituency level they want done. This is what seems to have gotten them upset. But that is good fiscal management. The pie is only so big, we can only divide it in so many ways, and we have set the priorities in the Budget. They disagree that those two priorities - education and health - should be number one. Then let us hear what their priorities are. Is it roads and street lights in some constituencies?

MR. McKEEVA BUSH: Consultancies.

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER: Yes, Mr. President, I will explain consultancies. But you know, remarks like that show what people are capable of contributing.

MR. McKEEVA BUSH: You wait until I get up - you are going to find out how much I can contribute!

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER: And the laughter - somewhere in the Bible it tells you something about the laughter of fools is like the crackling under a pot. That is what that is. You notice I am ignoring it. I am more concerned about what is in the pot than the crackling.

They say that all the Government is doing is trying to plug holes in the dyke and we have no real comprehensive policies or anything. They are going to lay down the challenge for us to make 1990 the decade of the youth. I can accept that challenge because I believe that is exactly what is provided for in the Budget. I hope that they are going to help us when we put these plans forward. Particularly at the constituency level, it is not left for the Member who has been charged under the Constitution with responsibility (and, thereby, the accountability) to go out to their constituencies and mobilise the constituents to come and help, to provide us with some voluntary manpower, that they will volunteer to do that as they should have done with the half-way houses under the Drug Plan. We are going to need a lot of help with those. I believe there is a lot of good will out there among citizens that we can tap and use in these programmes, because it is not the buildings that are going to help anyone, it is going to be the programmes. We are going to put the programmes in place and it will be of interest to see how many of them assist us in gathering the necessary voluntary manpower. Government has provided in the Budget certain staffing resources to develop these programmes and we must see how many are going to come forward and help us put the programmes in place. But you see they called that a stop gap policy.

The young people of this country need help. The young people of this country need direction. The young people of this country need leadership. The young people of this country need guidance. The youth of this country need people to lead by example. By example for the respect of authority, to conduct oneself with due decorum and respect, for law and order in any forum within which they operate. That is what they need.

You would think the Members of Government could make

people out of clay and breathe life into them in order to increase resources, because I would not be so bold as to say that every absolute detail, or everything that could possibly be provided by Government through the civil service and other arms to lead the youth, to give the youth opportunity, is being done. But you know, sir, at the tune of \$16 million they are not making such a bad effort. I believe they are trying. I believe they are succeeding to a certain degree. But it is easy to talk about these things, especially when you are not making the suggestions about what should be done but are criticizing what somebody else has done and what they are not doing.

They say that the hospital is a grandiose project which this country does not need. In the same breath they are saying that we should be attracting people to the health care field. I spend a lot of time talking to young people about careers in health care. We cannot do much to attract young people into careers of health care with the present facilities we have and the present levels of remuneration that we offer them. Both those items are under review by the Portfolio at the present time. With their support we are going to upgrade those facilities. I was quite pleased to see that the Public Accounts Committee and at least one Member who has already spoken are clearly recommending and advocating increases in hospital fees and tightening of the system so that those people who presently go up there and claim to have it free and get it free cannot get it. I am glad to see that. We are going to put the management, the systems, the staff and equipment in place to do that.

What we do not want to happen then, is 9:00 on a Sunday morning (as happens now) some political big-wig calls up and says; "You have to treat Joe Blow free." Why? "Because I said so". Because the system is not going to allow that. We intend to make adequate preparation that all those who cannot afford health care will have access to health care, but they will not be able to go up there and claim some politician claims you can have it free and get it free. The system is in place. They will have to work with the system.

While we are talking about that, I noticed that a big deal was being made out of overspending in overseas medical care. I am not prepared to play God. I am not prepared to let anyone in my Portfolio play God, because that would be exactly what we would be doing and what the Government would be trying to do if it limited expenses in overseas medical care to what was in the Budget, because it is impossible to predict how many people are going to get sick and how many people are going to need to go overseas. Presently, there is one criteria and that is a clinical one. Your attending physician makes a recommendation to the Chief Medical Officer that on a clinical basis you need to go overseas for medical care. As long as I am the Member, that is the way it will have to remain because I really could not tell someone who showed up in June that, "I am sorry, we cannot send you overseas, although your need is greater than Joe Blow's who went in February but the funds are finished." They will get the opportunity to put, as the saying goes, their money where their mouth is. They will get the opportunity to vote on improved systems, better facilities in health care for this country. They can place their vote where their conscience dictates. I will act accordingly.

I will deal in greater detail with the use of consultants and what some people claim is a great waste of public funds. But you know, they say the proposed dental clinic is unnecessary - it takes six dentists to work it. When the consultants were retained and when they produced the Plans, I asked the consultants to make a presentation to all Elected Members. They made it quite clear for the reason it was designed in the fashion it was, so that it could be operated by two dentists, not six, because one dentist could work two chairs. To try to say that because the building is designed the way it is, it is going to need six dentists and that what the Portfolio should be doing instead of trying to improve the facilities is to find Caymanians to train as dentists, I wonder if we can really expect Caymanians to want to be dentists and work in the present facilities we have; or want to be dentists to spend five or six years at university and come back and work for \$28,000 per year? I do not think that is reasonable. I believe that anyone can tell you that an accountant who takes three or four years to get his professional membership makes twice that.

What we have to do is to put facilities up that the people will be proud to work in because they can produce quality work. We have to put the managerial systems in place which are going to pay them adequately for their services and, once they are willing to work, they are paid accordingly. That is why we are giving serious consideration to the introduction for a fee for service for the doctors and dentists at the hospital. Because that is the only way we can remunerate them in any proximity to what they should be remunerated at, after spending seven or nine or ten years in school to specialise. Then we have to give them the facilities in which to practice and deliver the kind of quality care that the Government wants, that the people deserve, and that the professionals are capable of giving.

We were told that the Government should project a better image, and were told about an article that appeared some time last week in *The Daily Gleaner* of Jamaica. I do not believe that article originated with Government. I do not believe it is a factual account of what actually took place. The inference drawn from that was that we should work closer with the Chamber of Commerce and be more cooperative with the Chamber of Commerce. No Member in these hallowed and honoured Chambers has tried harder to work with the Chamber of Commerce than this Member. We have been holding discussions since January on the Pension Plan. We have had several discussions on the Drug Plan, in particular the Employee Assistance Programme. Government just sponsored a one day seminar on the Employee Assistance Programme where we invited and paid for over 100 individuals, both from the private sector and from Government. We had over 90 people attend.

The Chamber of Commerce contributed the coffee and juice, and the Chamber of Commerce supported it and the Chamber of Commerce is working with my Portfolio to try and get the Employee Assistance Programme off the ground. I believe we have tried to work with them. But, again, they also seem to believe that irrespective of what other information the Member for Government has, what other concerns, what other limitations and resources the Government might have at the time, the only sensible decision is the one they suggest. If you do not take their suggestions carte blanche and enact them, they say you are not

cooperating. I wonder where they get those ideas from, that that is not cooperating? We have a responsibility as a Government to listen to the lobby of any and all special interest groups in this country. But also to listen to the 'technocrats' in Government, to listen to the peoples' concerns, expectations and needs. Then make a reasonable, informed choice and decision based on all of that information and not just to accept one in deference to all others.

They say that the Government spends too much time on consultancies. I think, in my opinion, that is an erroneous statement. I believe the record of the use of consultants will prove differently and, you know, if Cayman has traditions, one of the traditions has been that when we do things we try to do them expertly. If you are going to do something expertly for the people of this country you should consider an expert's input. But let us look at the great waste in consultancies for the dental clinic. Since I have been in the Portfolio, I have refused to support four plans for a dental clinic drawn by the Public Works Department. That was no fault of the Public Works Department. The Public Works Department produced plans according to the brief and the statistics which the dental and medical staff put forward. They wanted such things as an office for the Senior Dental Officer, which was bigger than the Lab, almost bigger than the waiting area. They wanted a fancy glass enclosure which seated 75 people. They wanted to put the building in the middle of the parking lot, so you had nowhere to park. They wanted to include an O.R. for general anesthetic. I believe all of those things to be undesirable.

In discussions with the consultants on one of their interim reports on the Health Services Plan, both the Management Systems and the Facilities Plan, I asked if they had any experience in dental clinics. They said; "Yes, we have considerable experience in building dental clinics". So I asked for a proposal to look at the problematics, statistics and demographics and come up with something that they felt could meet the needs of this country up to the year 2020 and with certain easy and reasonable expansion capabilities. I took that proposal to Finance Committee and, with some opposition, we got it approved and for C\$48,000, or 10 per cent of the total contract, they produced, what I believe, is a reasonable Plan - a well laid out Plan. They reduced the square footage from roughly 7,000 to approximately 3,000, while increasing the surgical laboratories by two, from four to six. They produced equipment which would allow standardisation and all modern procedures to be done.

Using cost projections given by Public Works as to the square footage of the building, that C\$48,000 or US\$60,000 saved us between one half and three quarters of a million dollars in the building alone. I believe that Government was wise to consult a specialist in that instance, because there is no doubt in my mind that the Plan is a good one. We have had it on display for a week and it will be in the lobby of the Assembly until next Friday for the public, for all the architects and engineers to come by and make their input. We have got some good input from people, some very constructive input and all of it favourable. So I have no fear in the use of consultants, in particular as related to my Portfolio.

I am also being told that we have to do something about social problems. We have to do something about Social Services. I believe it is fair to say that we are trying. Of course, their concern about the Government gets its picture in the paper. Envy is an awful thing. But, I do not believe any Member of Government, any Member of the Executive Council who goes out and solicits the paper to get their pictures put in. I believe that most times when Executive Council Members' pictures appear in the paper it is that they are usually trying to do something constructive for the Government and the people of this country. They are not getting it there from political soapboxes crying wolf and let us overthrow the Government.

[The First Elected Member for Bodden Town rose]

MR. PRESIDENT:

Is this a Point of Order?

POINT OF ORDER

MR. ROY BODDEN:

Yes, Sir. I draw the Chair's attention to Standing Order 35(4). This is three times now I have now heard the Member talk about overthrowing the Government. If he is knows someone who is doing that, Sir, I suggest he should call the name.

MR. PRESIDENT:

The Order reads in the singular; "No Member shall impute improper motives to another Member." I think he is speaking generally. He is not sought to identify a particular Member.

[addressing the First Elected Member for West Bay] I cannot hear you, unless you address me on the microphone. If you wish to, please do. The First Elected Member for West Bay, you said something to me and I could not hear it.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:

I said it is obvious who he is talking to.

MR. PRESIDENT:

I am sorry, I do not see it as obvious. It may be that you have knowledge that I do not.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:

Mr. President, I do not have any knowledge of anybody overthrowing the Government.

MR. PRESIDENT:
continue?

[addressing the Hon. Member for Health] Would you please

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER:

Yes, Sir. I guess overthrow is my word, maybe they prefer 'step down'. I do not have the magazine or the *Caymanian Compass*, but I distinctly... and I will produce it tomorrow, and I will name the names of the people whose pictures are there and who the caption refers to. If that is what the Member wants then I will do when I continue tomorrow. That is what they define as a team effort. That is constructive, you know. When other Members are speaking, I stay in my seat and I keep quiet. I used to have a school teacher who used to ask when you could not keep still if you had worms. Maybe I had better bring some worm medicine here tomorrow.

This country needs teamwork. The Government needs support in the programmes they are putting forward. If they are not the right programmes then let us hear the alternatives. They tell you all the Government is trying to do is get their pictures in the paper and look for accolades and not do anything. They are doing it all quite rapidly.

They say we are wasting time in putting forward plans to improve the health services, putting forward plans for the Community College, putting forward plans to try to do something about drugs. That is a waste of time. The Portfolio of Education, Recreation and Culture and Health and Social Services are doing nothing. I am not ashamed of my stewardship. Whenever there is an election, the people can judge. I hope they can say the same when they rise to debate the Budget, and they can lay down their contributions, the constructive contributions, the constructive ideas, the opportunities they have taken to be cooperative, to produce programmes for the youth, to get involved in a community level to help the youth, to get involved at Government level to help the youth, and not just look for the political benefit involved in championing a few causes. Let us get to the real concerns of this country. Let us get to those things that are prioritised in the Budget.

It was interesting to hear when certain Members had gone to Barbados they asked them; "Where you come from?" They thought we were red, rich and foolish. They said that red referred to the colour of skin... I wonder if it still refers to that or if it refers to political persuasion now. But I went to Barbados to attend a conference, being the Honourable Member for Education, Recreation and Culture. We made our contributions to the debate and they did not ask us where we came from. They asked us if we would not take a contract to manage their countries because we were doing such a good job on our own. I went to Trinidad and argued for the AIDS Plan. I believe it is fair to say that a lot of those countries in attendance expressed the wish that their AIDS Plan had been as comprehensive as ours. In fact, several of them have now adopted various sections of the Cayman Islands AIDS Plan. They did not ask us where we came from, neither did they think we were rich, red and foolish.

They say that it is our responsibility to save the generation that I said would have to be written off. That is going to be impossible to do in terms of regaining the opportunity to educate them and to prevent them from getting on drugs. We are trying to save them, that is why we have the rehabilitation programmes in place. That is why we have more than doubled the staff at the Community Counselling Centre. That is why we have put it out from under the hospital - so people will be more willing and able to utilise it. That is why the Community Counsellors are going around in the districts trying to start A.A. and Narcotics Anonymous. I have not heard any of them say that any of the Backbenchers have volunteered to spearhead A.A., or get it organised in their communities. That is the kind of help we need, sir, not ...

MR. PRESIDENT:

You will wish to continue tomorrow or...?

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER:

Yes, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Right. Before the adjournment is moved I would like to reflect on the Point of Order taken by the First Elected Member for Bodden Town. The reason I gave for not accepting it is one reason, there is, in fact, a more fundamental reason. It seems to me that legitimate attempts to replace a Government are part of normal democratic and political process. I do not see that that would be an improper motive.

[addressing the First Elected Member for West Bay] I repeat, I cannot hear you unless you talk into the microphone. I am a little deaf, please.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:

The Member spoke of overthrowing, sir and that is the part that we took objection to. We know they need to be replaced, we will do that when the time comes, in due Constitutional process.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Fine, I think the Honourable Member who was speaking did say something to the effect that he understood that.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:

It is just that he went on several minutes and several times using the word overthrow.

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER:

I can further explain it tomorrow because I am going to call the names and I am going to bring the newspaper.

MR. PRESIDENT:

We will have the piece from the newspaper tomorrow.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH:

He can bring any newspaper. He will see that I do not want to overthrow the Government.

ADJOURNMENT

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON:
House until 10:00 A.M. tomorrow morning.

Mr. President, I move the adjournment of this Honourable

MR. PRESIDENT:
tomorrow morning. I shall put the question. Those in favour, please say Aye... Those against, No.

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

AYES.

MR. PRESIDENT:
morning at 10:00.

The Ayes have it. The House is adjourned until tomorrow

AT 4:31 P.M. THE HOUSE STOOD ADJOURNED UNTIL 10:00 A.M., TUESDAY, 28TH NOVEMBER, 1989.

**TUESDAY
28TH, NOVEMBER, 1989
10:05 A.M.**

MR. PRESIDENT: Prayers, by the Honourable First Official Member.

PRAYERS

HON. J. LEMUEL HURLSTON: 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.
Papers, the Honourable Member for Communications and Works.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS AND REPORTS

WEST BAY LANDING FEASIBILITY STUDY 1 AND 2

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, in accordance with Standing Order 18, I beg to lay on the Table of this Honourable House the West Bay Landing Feasibility Study, Volumes 1 and 2.

MR. PRESIDENT: So ordered.

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Mr. President, in the September meeting of this Assembly, Private Member's Motion number 23/89 was passed by this Honourable House which basically called on Government to consider the feasibility of a tourist landing jetty in West Bay. Because of the comprehensive nature of this Report, I will take some time in presenting it to this Honourable House. First, I wish to give the background and history of this subject and the events which led to this study being undertaken.

On the background and history. The Government has been reviewing a number of questions concerning cruise ships, their passengers and their effect on the environment since late 1987. Several reports and memoranda have been submitted and various discussions held concerning these subjects. These include the development of better facilities to accommodate both the ships and the their tourists that land on the Islands. Particular issues which have previously been addressed are:

1. The existing anchoring facilities for the ships themselves;
2. The onshore facilities associated with the tenders and their passengers;
3. The possible development of permanent moorings for the ships;
4. The potential for improve reception facilities for the ships by way of sheltered docking sites; and
5. The impact on these ships on the natural environment and on other existing recreation operations, notably the water sports industry.

In recent months these studies have focused on identifying the possibilities for accommodating cruise ships both at George Town and other parts of the Islands. Since then a Private Member's Motion (No. 23/89) has been reviewed in the Legislative Assembly which reads as follows: "BE IT

RESOLVED THAT Government consider urgently the building of the proposed jetty with completion as soon as possible and to report to this Honourable House in November, 1989, and Table regular reports thereafter, until such completion." This Motion refers to the building of a proposed jetty in the Boggy Sands Road area of West Bay.

Based on the above historical background, and in order to facilitate the Private Member's Motion, the Government agreed to set up a working committee to study the feasibility of such a jetty being constructed for the West Bay area to receive cruise ship tenders and their passengers. This working Committee was called the West Bay Landing Committee, and was charged with a number of commitments which I will relate under the terms of reference in a few minutes. The Committee consisted of representation from various Government Departments and was required to invite comments from other relevant bodies and interested parties who might have valuable input to offer. The Committee was given the freedom to seek assistance from any outside agent or agencies which it felt might be of assistance in helping it to achieve the aim set out above and in the terms of reference.

Based on the historical background as just related, and in order to facilitate Private Member's Motion No. 23/89, the Government agreed to set up a working Committee to study the feasibility of such a jetty in the West Bay area. As mentioned, this Committee was named the West Bay Landing Committee and worked under the following terms of reference:

1. To identify the need for such a facility within West Bay, both from the point of view of the residents and of the tourists, cruise ship operators and others;
2. To ascertain the format and structure that such a facility might take;
3. To identify the requirements of such a facility in terms of land and finance. This to include the estimated revenue required for infrastructure and tourist support facilities, as well as the potential necessary development of West Bay to accommodate these tourists;
4. To detail the effects that such a facility would have on the coastal environment, with particular reference to Marine Parks and the important water sports related tourism;
5. The Committee was charged with the responsibility to resolve this problem, if at all possible, and to make every effort to accommodate the needs of the cruise ships and their passengers, the West Bay community and the Cayman Islands as a nation, with due regard to other involved parties and areas; and
6. The study would be called the West Bay Landing Feasibility Study and the Committee would be named the West Bay Landing Committee.

I wish to take this opportunity to thank Mr. David Vousden, the Chairman and Coordinator of the Committee and his hard working Committee for the splendid job which they did in the preparation of this most informative, comprehensive and objective report. I would recommend it to each Member of this Honourable House for their careful reading, as it would be foolhardy to offer any form of criticism without first reading and understanding its contents. As will be seen from the Report, much time and effort was given in obtaining as wide a cross-section of views as possible. The Report includes valuable input from the following bodies, though not limited in scope to those views. Namely, all Government Portfolios and, specifically, the Port Authority; the Watersports Association; cruise ship agents and their representatives; Government Departments; and, of course, the residents of West Bay.

The Members of the Committee were Mr. David Vousden, the Chairman and Coordinator; Mr. Tim Hubbell, the Deputy Director of Tourism; Mr. Errol Bush, Port Director; Miss Sara Webster, Lands and Survey; Mr. Peter Barlas, Coastal Planner; Mr. Parke Patterson, Planning; Miss Gina Ebanks, Natural Resources Lab at the MRCU; Mr. Peter Riley, Architect, Public Works Department; Mr. Donovan Ebanks, Chief Engineer, Public Works Departments; and Mrs. Gwynne Thompson-Ebanks, from the Portfolio of Communications, Works and Natural Resources.

In the preparation of this report the Committee examined in detail the requirements for such a cruise ship landing facility in West Bay. These requirements were based on the following:

REQUIREMENTS FOR A CRUISE-SHIP LANDING FACILITY AT WEST BAY

1. Dependent on its carrying capacity - between 1,200 and 1,800 passengers. Each cruise-ship would need to land an average of 1,500 passengers at a time. This was considered to be a conservative estimate as there are some ships which can carry well over 2,000 passengers.
2. As the average tender carries some 200 passengers any such landing facilities would need to accommodate a minimum of 2-3 tenders. This would require a solid, sturdy jetty construction.

3. The cruise-ships would almost certainly have to anchor off West Bay as the distance between George Town and West Bay would be too great for passenger-carrying tenders to comfortably traverse.
4. With 1,500 passengers being discharged over a period of approximately 1 - 2 hours, certain support facilities would be necessary at, or near, the landing area.
5. At the minimum, the passenger's requirements would be a reception area to consist of cover as a protection against sun and rain, provisions for rest and refreshments, Police, Customs and Immigration representation, on-site medical facilities, tourists information, access to transport (taxis, hire-cars and scooters). In short, the passengers could not be off-loaded at the landing site and simply left to fend for themselves.

Although West Bay as a district has a number of tourist attractions, in central West Bay there is little, at present, to interest or attract the average cruise-ship tourist. In George Town they have immediate and direct access to the Islands's principal centre of amenities.

It should be noted that the above have been identified as the minimum requirements to support such a landing stage, assuming that it is entertaining one medium-sized cruise ship. Even under these circumstances, it is reasonable to expect that the majority of tourist would wish to move immediately out of central West Bay either into George Town, or on sight-seeing tours of the Island, or to more specific attractions, such as Hell, the Turtle Farm or Morgan's Harbour. West Bay would have to undergo considerable- tourist-oriented development in order to entice passengers to remain in the District. The Committee also examined possible land use evaluations in the selection of possible candidate sites. On the question of land use, evaluation and the selection of possible sites, the following tasks were undertaken.

The task presented to the Committee was to identify possible candidate sites in West Bay for the boat/tourist landing and identify the present land uses within each of these candidate sites. With the exception of the existing Government boat-launching site, the area between Northwest Point and the head of Barkers was not considered because of the exposed nature of the coastline and the typical wave climate of the area during Northwester. The southeast area between the head of Barkers and Batabano was also negated because the landing would be located in North Sound and this was undesirable for a host of reasons.

In light of these facts, three candidate sites were identified by the Committee and a possible fourth by the Planning Department. Three of these candidate sites are located on the shoreline of West Bay proper, and the fourth on the public boat launch in Northwest Point. The public boat launch site will be known as 'Candidate Site 1', which is located at block 1E, Parcels 42 and 44. 'Candidate site 2', located at site 5B, parcel 179 is located on the shoreward lands at the junction of Northwest Point Road and Town hall road. 'Candidate Site 3', block 5B, parcels 141 and 166, is located on the shoreward lands behind the church in the southeast direction (the old Willy Farrington store site.) 'Candidate Site 4', Block 5B parcels 163 and 164, is the original Boggy Sands Road site. These four candidate sites were thoroughly evaluated.

Candidate Site 1 - the zoning of this area is Beach Resort Residential. There were certain advantages and disadvantages of this site, and I will give the advantages and disadvantages of each candidates site.

Advantages -

- a) deep water access immediately offshore.
- b) existing public ramp.
- c) close proximity to the Turtle Farm.
- d) some parking already in existence.
- e) Northwest Point Road is relatively wide at this point.
- f) some commercial activity in the area.
- g) low density area which could be easily converted to commercial.
- h) no major dive sites in this area.

Against the background of the various serious disadvantages, which are as follows:

Disadvantages -

- a) site susceptible to Northwester storm energy.
- b) no beach in immediate area.
- c) loss of public usage of area.
- d) proximity to other West Bay amenities was a major consideration.

Candidate Site 2 - Zoned Beach Resort Residential. present land usage is predominantly low density residential.

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 give 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".

In the evaluation of all these candidate sites the following set back requirements need to be considered:

- 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.

I will give a brief synopsis of the Committee review of the various candidate sites.

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