WEDNESDAY
18TH DECEMBER, 1991
10:11 A.M.

MADAM SPEAKER: Payers 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 II, 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 Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, the Members of Executive Council and Members of the Legislative Assembly that we may be enabled faithfully to perform the responsible duties of our high office.

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

Let us say the Lord's prayer together:

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 the light of His countenance upon us and give us peace now and always. Amen.

MADAM SPEAKER: Please be seated. Proceedings in the Legislative Assembly are resumed.

Government Business, Motions. Government Motion No. 11/91, Draft Five Year Education Development Plan 1991-1996. Debate continuing by the First Elected Member for Bodden Town.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

GOVERNMENT MOTION NO. 11/91
DRAFT FIVE YEAR EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT PLAN 1991-1996

(Debate Continuing Thereon)

MR. ROY BODDEN: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Yesterday afternoon prior to the adjournment, I was articulating the background, as I saw it, which led up to this Review. In that articulation when I mentioned the merging of the system of secondary modern and secondary grammar education in the 1960s, I omitted to say that that merger was spearheaded by the now Honourable Member for Education. I apologise for the apparent ungraciousness, and I underscore that point now because its reference will be very important later in my debate. What I would like to do is to continue to outline some important general trends, and then to deal with specific recommendations in the Report and intersperse that with ways and methods which (I think) could significantly improve what has been recommended.

One of the constraints concerning what education can do is the fact that it is sometimes limited by prevailing economic trends, attitudes of political directorates and social order. Education is certainly most effective in situations where there is some consensus as to what it should seek to achieve and also how it should achieve these objectives.

In the absence of politically planned social changes, education is the single most important determinant of socio-economic change in a country or a community. Certainly one could argue successfully that that is the case in the Cayman Islands and since education is becoming more widely accessible and educational opportunities are more widespread there is a marked change in the socio-economic order in the society. What is absent however, and is a corollary of that change for success to be experience is a reduction in the numbers of outside manpower as a result of an increasing number of Caymanians being trained and returning to take up positions with responsibility within the country so that there remains some tokenism. There still remain some reluctance to push Caymanians forward in some of these positions for which they are educated to handle. I might suggest provocatively that that exist in the public sector meaning the Government as it does in the private sector.

If education is to be successful then there are several pervasive elements which education systems must promote. The first, is that the education itself must cover a wide spectrum

of content and form. Certainly it must be of the level that a good general education be a prerequisite for any specialisation, be that in technical or vocational fields or in the field of academia or white-collar occupations.

Secondly, these investments in education and training must be balanced by opportunities for the trainees and the students to apply what they are learning in theory to the real field of work and life so that there is some necessity to marry what happens in the classroom with what exists outside the classroom in the working world and life itself.

Finally, of these pervasive elements, there must be equity so that education and national economic development are mutually supported. If there is one weakness in this Plan it is its failure to articulate and to demonstrate how technical and vocational education should provide this balance and this equity of which I just spoke. Because it is a truism that no society can afford to educate all of its people to the white-collar level particularly in a developing society such as ours.

I have said before from this forum that there is a need for auto mechanics; there is a need for plumbers; there is a need for electricians; there is a need for masons and there is a need for carpenters. I am not convinced that that demonstrated need is sufficiently addressed in this Plan. If it is argued that the Community College will be the source from which skilled trades come, then certainly it needs to be more clearly demonstrated.

Madam Speaker, the Plan, while being a sound document, falls short of showing how we are going to take our learners from the classroom through what I call the socialisation to work and practical job training. This is a conspicuous mode in any complete education plan, provision must be made for that and more so in a plan for our society where we can only absorb a limited number of white-collar workers in both public and private sectors.

I have a preference for the German system of education which they call the "dual track" system. And to certain extent for what is practiced in some of the Scandinavian countries, especially Sweden, where there is a union between the school system and the working world. In the German system there is no differentiating line between the school and the workplace. The system operates in such a way that the Government through the state and through its education system, serves as a kind of employment agency or a canal, in conjunction with the school councillors and the employees to provide a central network which finds apprenticeships for 400 certified fields. So that every German student has the opportunity of not only participating in a sound general education. But if he or she so desire is placed in a state sanctioned apprenticeship system which guarantees employment for him or her upon successful completion of the High School education.

Madam Speaker, it is not uncommon to have a High School graduate in Germany with qualifications in general education subjects which would have allowed him or her to pursue a University course if they so desired. It is not uncommon to find that person working as an auto mechanic. That is the essence of good education; it affords flexibility. What is good about the system in Germany is that for three years from the ages of 16 through 19, these students sign - I guess, a contract could express it appropriately - an agreement where they undertake an apprenticeship, one in which 13 weeks of each year is spent in a formal school setting studying Mathematics, English, a foreign language and a theoretical area of their chosen vocation. The rest of the time is spent on the job.

Now, in our system we have a very rudimentary beginning of that whereby some students are placed in a work experience situation. It may have been in 1989 or 1990, that I suggested how we could improve upon that. I am going to suggest again how we can improve that. Because I note that while the Government is quick to say that the Backbench does not provide any alternatives but is quick to criticise, no note was taken of this. Maybe it was not worthy of being incorporated or it was not worthy of being developed. But it is my contention that we can improve our rudimentary system by extending the work experience programme for more time than just one day per week. And for a closer liaison between school, apprentice and employer or workplace so that first of all the students/apprentices are properly equipped. For I have observed youngsters coming to work in the field of auto mechanics without protective eye wear, without coveralls or a smock, or even without the proper shoes.

Because I do not know what are the lines of responsibility, but presumably if you are studying auto mechanics at some stage you are going to have to go underneath a motor vehicle. And what if while you are underneath that motor vehicle you are looking up and some brake fluid drops in the eye? Somebody's sight is impaired or ruined as a result. Whose responsibility or obligation is it?

The school should begin by ensuring that these youngsters are properly equipped. I have seen these programmes operated in Canada and everyone comes with their goggles, in some cases their gloves, smocks and coveralls. Then there should be a regular liaison between someone from the school who is responsible for coordinating that programme or within that programme visiting the workplace where that student or apprentice is employed. Someone who is going to say, "Well, this is the curriculum, or this is the plan. This student is here for seven weeks and at the end of that seven weeks, he or she must be proficient in dismantling a transmission, assembling a transmission, or being able to repair X or Y." So at the end of that student's tenure in school when he/she goes to someone and asks for a job they can say, "I have had experience in transmission repair, in servicing simple gasoline engine, or I specialise in electrical work on an automobile."

Madam Speaker, believe you me, my curiosity has no limits. I ask a lot of questions and I talk with some of these youngsters. I see them perform and I know that they can do well. It is just that the system lacks coordination. We need to draw the strings together so that we can have a proper show. We need to work on that. That is not expensive and I think we should try and do that.

I am going to take the argument one step further and say, if we were to develop along these lines help is available to us through the International Labour Office, through UNESCO, and through an agency in Japan called the Association of Overseas Technical Scholarships which provides instructors, texts, equipments and tools and which structures courses in various parts of the world including the

Caribbean, where I am sure if we are interested in applying we could get some places.

What I am saying is that these things will not necessarily cost the Cayman Islands a fortune. Help is there if we ask for it. I have said before that for a qualified auto mechanic the wages are not exactly the shabbiest in the world. I would imagine the same thing exist for an electrician, a plumber and a mason in the Caymanian society.

A beginner in auto mechanic can take home anywhere from $400 to $500 per week working from Monday to Friday. Because those whom I know will not work on Saturdays and they work only by appointment. So no one can tell me that there is not some glamour in the work because a take home pay of $400 to $500 per week is by any standard more than attractive. That is when you consider working for someone else from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. If he or she is industrious, that time past 5:00 p.m. until however late they choose to work on private jobs, can earn then as much again or even more. We should seek to develop these things.

I look forward to hearing, from the Member in his reply, how the Plan is going to be geared to cover this ground which is not covered at present. I would have been happy to see details. While most plans do not put all meat off the bone for some people you have to spell and pronounce. I am intelligent but I feel more comfortable when the people pronounce as well as spell because it means in my absence or someone else's absence anyone picking up the document cannot say, "Well, I did not understand that I was supposed to do that," or "I did not know it had to do this." I cannot assume that I will be here all of the time, or someone else will be here all of the time. A good plan should be so well, so clear, so lucid that anyone be it a trained professional or a layman, can pick it up and follow it A B and C.

Compare the German system where two-thirds of the compulsory school graduates pursue apprenticeships, to the system in the United Kingdom where two-thirds of the students leave education entirely when compulsory schooling ends at age 16. Even Britain now see the sense in altering their system and in changing to a more practical system reforming it to down play the direction which leads towards the educational elite to provide more opportunities in practical training and job related experiences.

Madam Speaker, it is safe to say that a revolution in education is taking place not only in the Cayman Islands but throughout the whole world. For indeed, in the United States, first President Reagan and now President Bush has been trying to grapple with what they call the rising tide of mediocrity, trying to make education more closely related to life. Trying to socialise the products so that they can get a better grasp at what the working world is and what life itself is.

To this extent in 1990, the United States Commission on Skills of the American Work Force released a Report which stated that 90 percent of the American employers feels that an High School Diploma signifies only time spent in the seat and bears little or no relation to education and skilled achievement. The then Secretary of Labour, Mr. Ray Marshall, who was the Commission's co-Chair went on to comment that "We have failed to forge a relationship between how well a student does in school and what kind of job he or she can get." He said, "We have turned our High Schools into little more than holding tanks for the non-College bound student."

Even before him, there was a similar concern which led the French critic Mr. Rene Dumas, in a book titled 'False Start in Africa', to caption a chapter, "If Your Sister Goes To School, Your Next Meal Could Be Your Fountain Pen," because he stated:

> "...the overwhelming majority of systems showed a bias towards white collar education with little or no regard for training in the practical subjects and for a technical and vocational education.".

Madam Speaker, with regard to the Education Review Report some of the striking comments had to do with the need to improve the system of record keeping. I agree that there is need for such an improvement. One of the most striking recommendations was for development of more efficient communication of information from the Department, the Portfolio and the classroom. I would extend that to the teacher, the parent and to the students. Because if learning is to be effective it must be a cooperative exercise where all of the elements are interlocked so that each know what the other is doing at all times. I would say that has been a weakness in our system from day one.

One of the things which concerns me about this Plan, for all its well being, is that this Plan is going to be seen again by the teachers as a tablet handed down from the mountain top. This is why I would welcome the Report and the Plan being taken before a Select Committee where all who are interested can come and learn of the proposals, the Plan and have a forum through which they can exercise their options, relate their concerns and tell of their fears and to be encouraged to cooperate and to give it a chance.

I contend that this document in and of itself will not necessarily guarantee success. We have now to rope in the audience, to rope in the people whom this Plan is trying to reach out to, the parents, the students, and the teachers. I would love to see it go before a Select Committee where we could get some feedback, where we could check the temperature, where we could open a dialogue, where we could sell what is positive and where we could improve the shortcomings, because there are several.

The Report calls for an improvement in the pastoral care system. I would say that we could enhance that more if we make provision for one or two specialists, and I have raised this before, who are in a position to deal with some of the behavioural problems which seem now to be endemic in our system at all levels. We must nip these in the bud and the worst ones could be routed into the alternative education system, which has already been started but we have come to the point now where we need some specialists to further develop this.

As regards what has been said about sporting and

extracurricular activities, I would like to see these further developed. Particularly, for the young men if we could have an added option of a Cadet Corps of some sort because there is a marked disintegration in the respect for authority and the respect for one's fellow man among the young people.

Madam Speaker, one only has to take a walk across to the Juveniles' Court Building on any morning that court is in session. I stroll there periodically. I am shocked by the number of our young people who are brought into Juvenile Court for what is regarded as serious offences, burglary, breaking and entering, vandalism, aggressiveness towards one another manifesting itself in wounding and severe beatings.

I remember, Madam Speaker, during my days at the Mico hearing the bugler summoning the Wilmers' Boys School Cadet Corps, watching them drill, march and exhibit themselves was so moving to see those youngsters being ingrained and inculcated not only with the discipline and respect for authority but with respect for themselves. And to watch those boots spit-polished on parade day, those khaki trousers creased so that one could cut one's throat upon them if one was not careful. That is what we lack. That is what we need to counter the more stultifying and deleterious acts seen on American television. The youth, gang-garbed, the flaunting of jewelry, the bop-walk, the rap music and the hanging-out. We can only counter that by offering an attractive and viable alternative. We need something like that.

I believe that we too have a Boy Scout. We should extend it into a Cadet Corp. We investigated that only to be told by the regressionists that we do not need that here. But it is not their children whom I see at Juvenile Court. It is not their children whom I see being held in remand. It is not their children whom I see with the black marks on their records, so they can continue to say we do not need that. It will come. If it does not come now, it will come when those of us on this side of the House form the Government because we are concerned. We are concerned for those parents who claim they have to work two jobs so they cannot supervise their children as much as they should be supervised. We are concerned for the youngsters who do not know better until it is too late and they have a police record as a juvenile and continue and eventually wind up in Northward.

Then too, we should investigate the possibilities of sending away some of our youth on cultural exchanges. I gave an example of one here some time ago and I am going to give it again. It is called "Outward Bound" with its headquarters in Norwalk, Connecticut. These are things that if approached and requests are made, barriers will be broken for one of the greatest tools of education is the ability to travel and to observe, to meet and to understand how other people live. It is one of the greatest tools for the breaking down of barriers and for the removal of prejudice.

In terms of the Plan itself, I would like to draw reference to recommendations numbered trn and 14 concerning the school's Inspectorate. Madam Speaker, the notion of the school's Inspectorate as it was understood is changing, because Britain is moving away from the system of Her Majesty's Inspectorate now to a different system. To my mind a school's Inspectorate conjures up the notion of an audit in a business firm. A school's Inspectorate should be in a position of authority so that it can inform the School Board and the Authority of how well the school is doing not only in terms of academic comparisons. But how well it is doing in preparing the children for life beyond that particular school. It should say something of the teacher's attitude, including their deportment and demeanor. It should say something of their professionalism and it should give some form of prognosis concerning the direction in which that particular school or its programmes are heading.

While the Report and the Plan calls for an inspection every three years, I say that an inspection is of such a significance in education that it should be done ideally, annually, or at its maximum once every two years. My logic is simple. In the case of a school not doing well; an inspection every three years. What can that do? If staff needs retraining, if attitudes need changing, if the curriculum needs improvement, three years does not allow sufficient follow up for significant improvements to be effected or remedied in time to save that school from decline. An inspection annually (as it was done in these Islands during the time of the late Mr. Clifton A. Hunter) or an once every two years would afford better opportunity for follow up and for improvement.

The Inspectorate must not be punitive. Its sole basis and purpose must not be to sanction the weak or even to elevate the mighty. It must have its foundation in the overall improvement of the system by affording some standard or standards to which all schools must subscribe and try to achieve. While at the same time giving credit to those who are doing well and encouraging them to continue. It must afford opportunities such as refresher courses, professional training, etcetera, for the weak. It must not degenerate into a body which sanctions, cuts off, or ostracises the weak. So I would say that we should strive to have a school's Inspectorate set up preferably by a body outside of the Education Department but with an affiliation to the Portfolio, a corpus of professionals who ideally, should have come from among the pool of teachers who were so experienced in classroom management and so respected that their words would be taken. If it necessitates secondment for some people to get the necessary expertise and experience, then we should do so. But I would not want to see an army brought in from overseas to do this job.

Madam Speaker, recommendation number 12 concerning School Boards as proposed here, I would like to go on record as saying this is unworkable, unsound, and in a small system such as ours should be discouraged. Because I cannot be sure as outlined in the Plan that there is not going to be some conflict, some misinterpretation of the role of the School Board vis a vis the Parent Teachers Association and the Department itself.

I am for maintaining a centralised system in our small school system. I like the fact that the Portfolio and the Department keeps the necessary tabs on things. I think if we go the School Board route we are going to be farming out the authority and somewhere along the line it is either going to get contaminated or the lines are going to be blurred and there are going to be too many gray areas.

If the School Board is not going to be responsible for individual school budgets, for hiring of the teachers, what are they going to be doing? If they are not going to be responsible for drawing up the rules of conduct, etcetera, what are they going to be doing? In the Canadian school system with which I am familiar, in the provinces which have the Roman Catholic Separate School Board as against the State School Board, there are certain differences because in the Roman Catholic Separate School Board system preference is given to teachers who subscribe to the Catholic dogma not to mention some other things. These School Boards are responsible for hiring, school budgets, etcetera. That cannot work in our system because we are too small. The numbers are not there and all of the funding comes from central Government. So we must remain a centralised bureaucracy. To do otherwise and to go the School Board route is going to put too much pressure on the teachers and the system is going to break down. Because on one hand you are going to have demands on the Department and on the other hand you are going to have demands from the School Board. The teachers are going to suffer. We must maintain a central bureaucracy. That was the beauty and strength of our system. Let us try to improve upon that rather than getting sophisticated and diverging. We have to remember not everything that is workable overseas is suitable to our situation here.

Recommendation 42. I still contend that the school leaving age should be 18 years. That is a universal phenomenon as far as High School leaving age is concerned. While I would accept the compromise of the addition of one year now, and one a year later, 18 is the optimum. Because if we have people coming out of school the age of 18 and they decide, for whatever reason, that their formal education is be terminated at that point then they can do one of a number of things. That is the age of majority so they can get married, they can accept a job with legal responsibilities, they will have qualified for the age to drive a motor car, they will have qualified, because of age to negotiate bank loans, mortgages, etcetera, for themselves. So for all intents and purposes their period of socialisation is over and they can launch themselves as adult units in society, as and of themselves.

If we keep them in High School to that point and they desire to go further either into Community College or into University, they could go. But that is the age, I contend, at which they should come from High School. If they say they are tired of formal schooling and want to take a break or they are so romantic that they want to get married, then, that is all well and good too. But to keep them in the system and when they reach the age of 16 years, nine months, say they have to then go to the Community College for another two or three years, I do not think that that is going to work very well because at some point there should be a break where the individual can exercise his or her option.

In terms of recommendation 43, I think that it is commendable to develop a National Curriculum. I have been an advocate of this from day one and I commend and encourage the people in charge of Education for going this route. My only caveat is that the National Curriculum Chairman should be someone with a degree in curriculum development or curriculum studies either at the graduate or post-graduate level but that they should have in addition to this about five years teaching experiencing. The position should not necessarily be held by the Chief Education Officer. But ideally by someone other than that because I see the Chief Education Officer's role as being responsible for the overall administration of the Education Department and for liaising and communicating with the Portfolio and the Member. If he or she has the added responsibility of being Chairman of the National Curriculum Commission or whatever it is, I think that will be putting too great a responsibility on one person, especially if that person is ultimately responsible for the administration.

I am led to wonder how the National Curriculum would work in a system where we have private schools which subscribe to the American standard of education. If we could effect this liaison, if we could effect this change comfortably without bringing any stress or resentment upon these people. Or if we could work a situation where they would have to teach a core of subjects from the National Curriculum but would then be allowed, if they so desired, to teach other subjects not offered in the National Curriculum.

Recommendation 44. I made a note that this should be expanded to offer however limited, some scope for training and exposure in agriculture, animal husbandry and related activities. The rationale being that we have just recently had unveiled here a $5 million Agricultural Development Plan. And if there is to be some continuity and if that Plan is to reach the maturation point then, I think we need to have a corpus of these subjects introduced at some stage in our education system.

I say this full well realising that the Cayman Islands will probably never become an agricultural country in the sense that some of the other countries in the Caribbean. But certainly if we think seriously about diversification of the economy, we must create some scope for imparting of the knowledge in agriculture or agriculturally related matters.

In terms of recommendation 45, I have made a note. I would like to preface my note by saying that I give credit for the foresight of the Government in the development of the formal Summer Internship Programme and for the Labour Market Information System. I believe that the time has come now when we should try to incorporate and structure, so that we can begin to merge some of the theory gained by some of the students sent abroad with meaningful and relevant opportunities in the real world.

In my note I have suggested that there is no need to further enlargen the Government bureaucracy by turning this into a separate department. The Labour Market Information System should ideally be an extension of the Labour Office with two officers; one with a background in development studies and economics and another with a strong interest in labour statistics and that we should approach the United Nations Development Programme and the International Labour Office for help in developing our labour market information system.

Recommendation 47, I think is incomplete in that it should take into account private sector representation.

Now, Madam Speaker, recommendation 46 dealing with the International College of the Cayman Islands is a simmering cauldron. I would shy away from a state monopoly on

education and I believe that to go the route where the state has the sole monopoly on education at the college level is courting disaster. Certainly, it is courting disfavour in our situation. The time has come for us definitively to address this institution known as the International College of the Cayman Islands. Are we going to allow it to exist? Can it exist in our society? Is there a role for it to play? We have to stop the buck-passing.

I believe, as I have said here before, there is a role for it. It can coexist. It can develop into a mutually supportive organisation and entity complementing the Community College and the Government system of education. I believe there is scope for it. I believe that would be a good yardstick by which to measure the growth and development of the Community College. I believe the Government would be well advised to take some interest in its development and certainly, to try to develop a system whereby it, "the Government" could have some say in its regulation. Because Madam Speaker, it has been in existence for some 20 years now. So how can we logically go and tell it that it cannot exist anymore, after having allowed it to exist for that length of time? If it were to be aborted we should have aborted it in its infancy.

The responsibility ultimately lies with the Member. Certainly anyone reading recommendation 46, is left with the impression that the consultants are suggesting its demise. It is not for me to answer what its fate should be. But I would encourage the Member and his technical support team to come to a definitive position with regards to this institution. Bearing in mind that a Motion was introduced, passed, and accepted in this House about the International College of the Cayman Islands. I think that we might need to sit down and dialogue. Elements of the Community College administration and elements of the International College of the Cayman Islands administration need to sit at a table and thrash out the directions in which they see their respective institutions going. And to ensure that they are developed into mutually, complementing institutions rather than rival institutions wasting their resources and manpower on out-gunning and out-doing one another.

Madam Speaker, recommendation 50 dealing with the Cayman Islands Achievement Tests. It was unclear to me exactly what these tests would determine, namely if the objective was to determine the level of literacy, mastery of a particular skill or skills, and there is certainly a lack of follow up at the end of the final test. I wonder what provisions would be made for remedial care if that is needed at any stage.

But, I am not objecting to the tests, I am only saying that there are gray areas which we need to improve to remove any doubt, or uncertainty, or any lack of direction. I would only suggest to the Honourable Member and to his team that these tests should take the form of what is now becoming popular in education circles. That is, that they are based on what is called "performance assessment", so that the pupils taking these tests are allowed the opportunity to show that they can think for themselves.

Madam Speaker, with your permission I would like to give an example of what I mean. A performance assessment question would have two parts; it would have directions which would go something like this:

> PART I
>
> "You have 90 minutes to work on a paper that tells about an experience you have had in the past. Read the passage given and think about the subject. You may use a dictionary or a thesaurus as you revise and edit your rough draft.".
>
> That is a direction. The task:
>
> PART II
>
> "Think about a time when you felt happy, scared, surprised or proud. Write it so that the reader will understand what happened, who was involved, how the experience made you feel and why the experience was important to you.".

So what we should seek to elicit at these stages is the ability of our students to think critically. We should shy away from multiple choice items because educational researchers have discovered that while those were widely used and advocated some years ago and are still used they are not the optimum measure of a person's ability to think critically.

Then, as any educator would know, these tests would have to be standardised and to be reliable, valid and structured in some way as to make them fair to all of the students sitting the test whether they are in East End, Cayman Brac, Bodden Town, West Bay, North Side or George Town. And also, they must be fair in respect that children in the Government school system have a chance of doing just as well as those in the private school system. I know that this was not the case and certainly, I believe in terms of the National Achievement Test, might not be.

These Achievement Tests should be structured in such a way that the students are not only tutored in the subjects of the test to the exclusion of all other subjects as is often done now. So that we have students who do exceptionally well on the test. But when they go to the next level of schooling their performance at that level is not indicative of how well they did on the test to take them to that level.

Madam Speaker, with regards to recommendations 51 and 62, I have made a bold suggestion. I would like to say that the time has now come where our system should develop a school leaving exam which is geared specifically to the needs of the Caymanian society. I have suggested, for argument sake, that we could call this the National Certificate of Education or the Cayman Islands School Certificate. Its curriculum and subject areas would be arrived at by consultation and input from organisations like

the Chamber of Commerce, the Society of Professional Accounts, the Law Society, the Bar Association and from other interested parties and organisations in the private sector. It should be so structured that it is the first formal exam to which our students at the High School level is introduced.

I further stated that, ideally, a student should take this exam at the age of 14 years and nine months. In my plan a student would have two chances to sit this exam, the first at the age of 14 years and nine months, and for those that did not do well at this first trial there should be another one a year from then at the age of 15 years and nine months. If one does well on the first try then one is routed on a track that would take them into academia and one could then concentrate on the CXC, the International Baccalaureate, or what other external exam there are which would allow the student to gain university matriculation.

Assuming that the student was not successful during the first test and had to resit the test at the age of 15 years and nine months, that does not mean that the student who had to do it would be excluded from going the university matriculation route. But it would still allow that student to do it while affording him or her an opportunity to go the route and get into some technical or vocational field which might culminate with him/her pursuing professional certification in this field through the Community College.

So under my plan, Madam Speaker, every child graduating from our High School would be equipped to meaningfully fill some place in the society. He would be socialised to work and would have some experience in a profession or trade. So that the National Certificate of Education or the Cayman Islands School Certificate, while not getting the student into the University of the West Indies, or the University of Miami, would get them into Canadian Imperial Bank Ccommerce or Barclay's Bank, or into Maples and Calder, or into Government at some level.

Similarly, instead of turning out a corpus of students as we do now with no meaningful qualification, who are for intents and purposes unemployable, we would have the vast majority of our students so qualified that they could occupy posts at the beginning position in any organisation in the Cayman Islands.

The Plan, while not specifically articulating that, could be adjusted to do so. I would hope that the people who have to interpret this Plan would be so flexible as to take into consideration these kinds of adjustments. Because if the Plan is seen as dogmatic, if the Plan is seen as complete then, there is little use of engaging in any further dialogue or debate.

One other significant change which the Plan calls for and which I welcome is altering the bureaucratic structure so that the Education Council is no longer chaired by the Member, or the Minister when that comes. I believe that the Member or Minister should be the ultimate source of appeal and that he or she should be free of the obligations and responsibilities of chairing the Education Council.

As a matter of fact, I would tamper a little, for use of a better word, with the structure and the role of the Education Council and to avoid misinterpretation, I would change its name. I would dare to call it the National Advisory Council on Education. I would stipulate that its members be made up of representatives from the various districts as it is probably now. But it is not stipulated in the Regulations which governs it, and choose from among the rank and file membership as its Chairman so that the Member would be in a position if need be to make a decision or decisions on matters taken by the Council so that the Member, if it became absolutely necessary could overturn and override decisions made by this National Advisory Council.

The reason I would specifically put in the word "advisory" is because the Council should be just that. It should advise the Chief Education Officer and the Member on routes to take. I would not even have the Member attending those meetings. He could read the minutes or be briefed. I would have him completely removed from that situation. His representative at that point could be his Principal Secretary or the Chief Education Officer. I think it is imperative that we do that for the efficient running of our organisation and for improvement in the bureaucratic structure.

Madam Speaker, to the Plan itself on page 8 the section which says, 'Pupil Enrolment: Past Trends', I would like, with your indulgence, to read two short paragraphs to preface some comments I will be making on this. I read:

> "Over the past two years (88/89 - 90/91) enrolments in primary schools (reception, infant and junior) have increased by 3.6% with government schools taking a larger share of the total enrolments. The number of non-Caymanian children grew by 9.4%, as against 2.1% for Cayman Children, the share of the former in total enrolments reaching 21.4% in September 1990 (Appendices III to V).
>
> Private, Middle and Secondary schools increased their share in total enrolments at this level and; again, the number of non-Caymanian children grew by 17.4%, as against a decrease of 2.8% for Caymanian children.".

I read that, Madam Speaker, to underscore this important point. The number of non-Caymanian children in our school system is increasing by, one could almost say, geometric proportions in comparison to the number of Caymanian children. The Report itself stated that this trend is likely to continue for some time because of the socialisation and economic patterns in our country namely, more women are educated and are taking their positions in the working world. And it is a sociological fact that it is the case where women are educated and employed in the work force, the rate of child bearing decreases proportionately. We have to be careful that we are not designing and creating an expensive education system to educate non-Caymanian children.

Madam Speaker, I am not going to rehash every item of this, rather I will draw your attention to page 12, Table I, Projected Expenditure for the Department of Education, 1991

and 1996 with the Low Immigration Variant and the High Immigration Variant. We are going from 1991, $13 million to $15.3 million in 1996, and in the High Immigration Variant again in 1996, to $16.9 million. The Table gives the percentage increase.

I would like to draw your reference, Madam Speaker, to the note which says:

> "Under the high variant, the average growth rate of the budget in constant prices will be 4.75% as against 2.85% for the low variant. These growth rates do not take into account provision for pre school centres nor additional expenditure for "A" level students at the Community College.".

I want to underscore again, the point that we need to be careful that we are not developing an education system which will benefit largely non-Caymanian children.

Now, the proposal to restructure the system so that we have Government subsidised pre school education is in my contention, unwise and unsound and the Government should not encourage the development of pre school education to the point where it is monopolised by private individuals because it is going to make it exclusive, expensive and out of the reach of the rank and file Caymanians.

Government should encourage companion development of its own pre school system and some in the private sector so that those who so desire can exercise their option. While the Government reserves the right to regulate these systems and to inspect them, it should not to lose track that pre school education comes entirely into the hands of the private sector.

If that is allowed and we have a system, as is proposed with the phasing out of the Middle School and the building of four new High Schools. What is going to happen is that it will result in educational chaos, social ostracism of certain elements and resentment. And, I would remind the Honourable Member that it was exactly this kind of social resentment, social ostracism and two tiered system that he eliminated when he merged the secondary modern with the secondary grammar system. Is he now telling me that he is going to undo that good act by diverging and splitting? I say, "No, no, one million times, no."

Madam Speaker, I do not want to get into any political argument about who built what and who did what. But I say that the Middle School has its place in the education system of our country. As a professional without a shabby record of classroom teaching, and as one with qualifications and experience in educational administration, I would say that the only thing that is wrong with the Middle School, in my assessment, is that it has been allowed to degenerate into an entity unto itself rather than remaining a feeder in to the High School.

If we put it back on track where it assumes its original role as a feeder in to the High School, we will see that the Middle School most definitely does have a role to play in our educational system. I cannot advocate its demise at this point in time. You know what I like about it, Madam Speaker? Is that it contributes to the mix of all our students who go into the High School. They meet at the Middle School and they move rich and poor, white, yellow, brown and black Caymanians and foreign national. That is good. That is positive. We should strive to maintain it. Then too, we must keep that one High School because that is the final mix prior to us letting them go as adults into our society. That is what is strong about this system and I have to remark that on a recent visit to the two Primary Schools in our constituency, the Second Elected Member for Bodden Town and I had to marvel at what is called in Canadian society, "the mosaic," that we saw in those classrooms. We saw the dark with the fair, with the yellow living amicably. That is what make the Caymanian society strong. That is what we have to maintain and it begins in the school.

SOME MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROY BODDEN: If we break that up we are going to lose. We are going to turn to where South Africa is trying to depart from now. Not intentionally, because these things very seldom happen intentionally but because of some deknighted expert from yonder who believes he has the key or the answers. We have to sit and take the best and what is practical and applicable in this document and put those into practice so that, let me repeat it again, I am not advocating any phasing out of the Middle School. What I am advocating is that it be brought back on track and fill the role for which I believe it was designed to serve, as a feeder into the High School and to serve as the first formal socialisation point for the children of the various districts and the various socioeconomic strata, etcetera, into the High School system.

Madam Speaker, as for expanding the system from the current High School to four, the first thing we will be doing if we do that is duplicating our resources. We have to have four physics labs, four chemistry labs, four libraries, four home economic centres, four physical education complexes, begin four set of staff, begin to calculate the cost in dollars and the recurrent expenditure.

Madam Speaker, any school system where we have less than 3,000 students at the High School level there is no need to do that. Plus the fact that we are going to be denying our students the priceless experience of social interaction from the children of West Bay with those of Bodden Town, with those of East End, with those of North Side, with those of George Town, and the non-Caymanian with the Caymanian. This interaction is the key to a safe country because when they grow up cooperating and respecting one another, intermarrying and interrelating there are no differences between them and us, we are all one. But if you bottle up East End, North Side and Bodden Town, you are building rivalries. That is a powder keg just waiting to be ignited. That was so in the days when education in the Cayman Islands did not rise any higher than the primary level. But that is not good enough in this day and age.

I would like to see this broad association continue because I will tell you one thing, we have a lot of things in this country but we do not have any overt racism or any overt class

distinctions. If you go up there all of them have uniforms so you cannot differentiate or distinguish the rich from the poor. The classes are so structured that they all cling together.

Madam Speaker, this must continue. It has its foundations in the Primary School. I saw it at Savannah Primary and it is striking. It is the one place in the Caribbean were you can see that. I pride my country on that because I have travelled to quite a few and you do not see that mix at all. I do not need to go any further than our next door neighbour to hear this racial argument about who is white and who is black, and who is rich and who is poor, and this thing and that thing and the next. We do not want that here at all but if we have this four High School system and this phasing out of the Middle School system, we are laying the foundations for social disaster.

I say that from the point of view as a professional, fully knowing what is in the annals of the profession. I say that from the point of view of a school teacher and from 14 years of classroom experience and I say it from the point of view of a legislator and a leader in the community, it must not happen.

Madam Speaker, not only that, it is going to cost us in the millions of dollars. Our education budget is going to increase by exponential notation if we go this route. It is impractical to build a High School to accommodate only 500 students.

Madam Speaker, I would hope that the Member takes cognisance of this and that the Member seeks further input into this radical and drastic plan because this, along with these particular recommendations is not going to be the panacea that it is made out to be.

MADAM SPEAKER: Honourable Member have you reached a point where we might break off?

MR. ROY BODDEN: Yes, Madam Speaker.

ADJOURNMENT

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Madam Speaker, as many of us wish to attend the Civil Service Christmas Party, which I think begins just about now, I move the adjournment of this Honourable House until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

MADAM SPEAKER: The question is that this Honourable House do now adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. I shall put the question. I shall put the question. Those in favour please say Aye...Those against No.

AYES.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Ayes have it.

AT 11:59 P.M. THE HOUSE STOOD ADJOURNED UNTIL 10:00 A.M., THURSDAY, 19TH DECEMBER, 1991.

THURSDAY
19TH DECEMBER, 1991
10:32 A.M.

MADAM SPEAKER: Prayers by the Honourable Third 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 II, 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 Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, the Members of Executive Council and Members of the Legislative Assembly that we may be enabled faithfully to perform the responsible duties of our high office.

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

Let us say the Lord's prayer together:

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 the light of His countenance upon us and give us peace now and always. Amen.

MADAM SPEAKER: Please be seated. Proceedings in the Legislative Assembly are resumed. Presentation of Papers and Reports, Report of the Standing Finance Committee. The Honourable the First Official Member.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS AND REPORTS

REPORT OF THE STANDING FINANCE COMMITTEE
(Meeting held on Monday, 4th November, 1991)

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Madam Speaker, I beg to lay on the Table of this Honourable House the Report of the Standing Finance Committee held on Monday, 4th November, 1991.

MADAM SPEAKER: So Ordered.

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Madam Speaker, the meeting of the 4th November dealt with a number of supplementary requests from mainly four Heads of Departments and it totalled $2,256,466. Details are as follows.

Head 21 - District Administration, Construction of Roads, sub-Head 41-006, $250,000 to meet the cost of upgrading two miles of the South Coast Road; Head 29 - Medical Health Services, sub-Head 41-014, Medical Facilities, $161,577 to meet the cost of required equipment to carry out improvements to the secondary clinical services at the George Town Hospital and to maximise the productivity of the then, newly appointed pathologist; Head 31 - Communications, Works and Agriculture a sum of $132,000 for sub-Head 01-005 Wages, to meet a shortfall in wages for 22 group employees at the Central Funding Scheme for the remainder of this year.

Under sub-Head 41-020, Purchase of Lands, $1,076,458 provided for the acquisition of Block 44B Parcel 25 for the Bodden Town Bast Ramp - $134,375; secondly for the purchase of Pedro Castle Block 32E Parcel 50 - $852,500; thirdly, for the purchase of Block 98D Parcel 50, Cayman Brac to allow for expansion of the Faith Hospital - $75,250; and lastly as a detail to the $1,076,458 a sum to acquire a portion of Block 98D Parcel 4 for the extension of the cemetery - $14,333.

For Head 37 - Public Works an allocation of $21,311 to provide additional funds under Fuel and Oil Supplies. Under Maintenance of Buildings a sum of $109,660 and for Maintenance of School Buildings, $26,315 and for the Maintenance of Staff Houses $10,807.

To provide additional funds for Vehicle Maintenance & Hire, again under Public Works, $11,738 and Construction of Roads a sum of $456,600 for the purchase of OPY Parcel 84 which belonged Mr. and Mrs. Chollette, $450,000; and secondly, to meet the cost of double chipseal of the Church of God Parking Lot, Harbour Drive, which has been offered to Government for the parking of buses and taxis on the proviso that Government was prepared to meet the cost of paving the area, $6,600.

There were a number of other virements which totalled $114,000. Some virements dealt with the Land Acquisition of the George Town Primary School and also funds used from the present allocation of the 1991 Budget to deal with other roads not specifically named during the time of the approval of the Budget, and $12,000 for a carpark behind the Public Library to provide proper parking facilities.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before we proceed to the next item it will be necessary for the suspension of Standing Order 14(3).

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER 14(3)

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Madam Speaker, in accordance with Standing Order 83, I move the suspension of Standing Order 14(3) to allow Government Business to be taken.

MADAM SPEAKER: The question before the Honourable House is that Standing Order 14(3) be suspended in order that Government Business may be completed before Private Members' Business. The motion is open for debate.

The Third Elected Member for George Town.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Last week when this same motion came up, I agreed at that time for Government Business to take precedence, however, what has happened during that period is - and since I was kind enough to consent to that, the Private Motion which I had in relating specifically to putting the Education Plan and Report in Select Committee - I was informed by the Member that he was going to attempt to move on with his and then make some technical move I assume, to either say mine was superfluous or not to have it debated. I know we are part way through a debate but what worries me at this stage, Madam Speaker, with that approach to it, I am bound to vote against this and ask that our Private Motions come on.

In any event it does not appear that we are going to finish everything with Finance Committee intervening tomorrow, at least not before the weekend. Unless the Member or Government could somehow allow some sort of concession rather than their attempt to not have my motion debated then I must at this stage say that I would have to vote against it.

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Second Elected Member for Bodden Town.

MR. G. HAIG BODDEN: Madam Speaker, I have to oppose the motion for the suspension of the Standing Orders which would prevent the dealing with Private Members' Business today. When this Meeting of the House started, the Backbenchers all agreed with Government that we would give up Thursdays so that Government could proceed with its Business and this was done primarily because the Financial Secretary wanted to get through with his Budget before the end of the year.

The result has been that the Meeting is coming to an end and no Private Members' Business, other than Questions, have been on the Agenda. So we have, I believe, three Private Members' Motion down to be debated and I think it is only fair that the minority in the House should be allowed the privilege which is guaranteed then by the Standing Orders that private Members, despite the reduced numbers in the House, will be allowed ample time to get some Business on the Floor of the House. I would suggest to Members of the Government that in the name of fair play they allow the Private Members' Motions to go on today by not supporting the motion for the suspension of the Standing Order.

There is another reason for this, Madam Speaker, the reason mentioned by the Third Elected Member for George Town which I will not go into in any great detail, only to assure the House that I too, have heard the Member for Education indicating that if his motion passes, that is a Government Motion, he will do everything he can to keep the Private Member's Motion off of the Floor. This would be totally wrong. It would be an injustice. It would be a denial of the freedom of speech simply by using the force of might, taking away from us the right which we have under the Standing Orders, a right we had given up, we could have debated our motion a couple of weeks ago but only trying to help the Business of the House flow in a sensible and normal manner.

Madam Speaker, I suggest to all Members that they do not agree to this suspension and so allow the private Members to go on, particularly that our motion with regard to the education matter may be concluded before the Member is able to railroad it.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Elected Member for Education, Environment, Recreation and Culture.

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, the Second Elected Member for Bodden Town has just demonstrated most admirably why we are still in here. He gets up and talks rubbish. But for the repetition which has gone on in this House, we would have been finished with this Meeting long ago.

Madam Speaker, the position is simple. As I understand it the Business Committee took the decision early that Government Business would take precedence over Private Members' Motions as the Business proceeded. Members will note and you will note, Madam Speaker, that

Government Motions that were in fact placed on the Order Paper subsequent to this one, or put on the Agenda subsequent to this one, were taken first. That was with the specific understanding that Government Business would continue to flow.

Now, Madam Speaker, the Third Elected Member for George Town and the Second Elected Member for Bodden Town are not being truthful. What I pointed out to the Member was that he should use his time in debate on my motion to say what he hoped to say on his motion in that if the Government Motion succeeded a natural consequence would be that his would fall away. That is in accordance with Standing Orders. That is no trick or technicality. That is a natural consequence and if after eight or twelve years in here they do not understand that, that is their problem.

As I understand it the Business Committee recommended that Government Business continue and at least one of them, as I understand it, is a Member of that Committee. If not, it is certainly made up by most of the Backbenchers so it must have had their tacit agreement. And, just to say that Government will vote for the Suspension Order.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before another Member speaks I would like to draw attention to the Day-to-Day Minutes of 12th December, last Thursday. The question that was put to the House was:

> "In accordance with the will of the Honourable House, the Honourable First Official Member, Leader of Government Business, moved the suspension of Standing Order 14(3) to enable Government Business to take precedence over Private Business during this Meeting of the House.".

That is what is recorded. Now if Members want to change that they are at liberty to do so. The First Elected Member for West Bay.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Madam Speaker, as a Member of the Business Committee, the decision of the Business Committee to carry on with Government Business, as I took it, was to facilitate the Budget and its procedure, Budget Debate, Finance Committee and then the Report.

It is true what Members have said that if we carried on with the Government Motion which is being debated now it would mean that the Private Member's Motion related to it would fall away. We on this side know that. As was said we are part of the Business Committee and for certain I do know my Standing Orders and I knew that was going to happen but we carried on giving the Government the benefit of the doubt.

It is obvious that they do not intend to facilitate this side of the House therefore, we would like to take, as the Standing Orders say, today as Private Member's Motion day. My motion is the first Private Member's Motion and I am ready to proceed with that item. I therefore, cannot support the suspension.

MADAM SPEAKER: If no other Member wishes to debate... The First Elected Member for Cayman Brac & Little Cayman.

CAPT. MABRY S. KIRKCONNELL: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I too, am a Member of the Business Committee of this House and in deliberations we agreed that we would allow on Thursdays the Business of the Government to take precedence over Private Members' Motions and I still stand by that.

We also discussed during that time that it was unfair to the listening audience to get the disjointed broadcast. If the debate which has been put forth here the last day and better over the Education Report is suspended today and we go into other Private Members' Motions and come back after that day is over it will be confusing to the listening public. Therefore, I think the decision which we took in the Business Committee, the motion that we passed here, was for the duration of this Meeting and I am prepared to stand by the vote that I took at that time.

I have also stood here in this House and supported the suspension of Standing Orders to allow Private Members' Motions to continue beyond Thursdays in order that the continuity of the debate could be carried out and I see no reason why we should not give Government that same courtesy today. So I would not agree that we should go to the Private Members' Motions today, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: I shall now have to put the question that Standing Order 14(3) be suspended in order that Government Business may take precedence over Private Members' Motions.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Madam Speaker, I know you are on your feet....

MADAM SPEAKER: Well, if you know that I am on my feet would you sit down for one minute, please....?

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Well, it is a matter of procedure...

MADAM SPEAKER: Just sit down a minute please, Sir, would you?

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: All right.

MADAM SPEAKER: Would you? All right.
Do you wish to say something further before I put the question?

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: I said it was a matter of procedure, Madam Speaker, if we passed a motion last week why are we proceeding with this now then?

MADAM SPEAKER: That probably could be a procedural question but I will still put the question in order that there can be no confusion. The question is that Standing Order 14(3) be suspended in order that Government Business take precedence over Private Members' Business. I shall put the question. Those in favour please say Aye...Those against No.

AYES & NOES

MR. JOHN D. JEFFERSON, JR.: Can we have a Division, Madam Speaker?

DIVISION NO. 38/91

AYES: 8	NOES: 7
Hon. Thomas C. Jefferson	Mr. W. McKeeva Bush
Hon. Richard W. Ground	Mr. John D. Jefferson, Jr
Hon. J. Lemuel Hurlston	Mr. Truman M. Bodden
Hon. Norman Bodden	Mr. Gilbert A. McLean
Hon. Benson O. Ebanks	Mr. Roy Bodden
Hon. D. Ezzard Miller	Mr. G. Haig Bodden
Hon. Linford Pierson	Mr. John B. McLean
Capt. Mabry S. Kirkconnell	

AGREED BY MAJORITY: **STANDING ORDER 14(3) SUSPENDED TO ENABLE GOVERNMENT BUSINESS TO BE COMPLETED BEFORE PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS.**

MADAM SPEAKER: Debate continues on Government Motion No.11/91, Draft Five Year Education Development Plan 1991 - 1996. The First Elected Member for Bodden Town continuing.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

MOTIONS

GOVERNMENT MOTION NO. 11/91
DRAFT FIVE YEAR EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT PLAN 1991 - 1996

MR. ROY BODDEN: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

At the adjournment yesterday I was commenting upon some of the negative aspects of the proposed development of four High Schools in the system and I was suggesting that the social implications, the financial strain, and the duplication of resources would far outweigh any positive effects.

It could be argued that this proposed segregation could be eased somewhat by the opportunities for exchanges, interschool debates, sports activities, etcetera, but one would have to weigh this in light of the overall effects on the development of these young people. It can be quite successfully argued that the negative aspects of this proposal would far outweigh the positive aspects.

In this regard too, one would have to consider that such a proposal would already add to the burden of an obvious segregation of youth from the wider society by the limited experiences which they have at school. Largely because of an extended schooling period particularly at the High School level these students will be increasingly segregated from the adult world with the exception of course of those with whom they come in contact in the day to day experiences of school life. Also they will become increasingly segregated by inference from the world of work unless of course we go on to develop meaningful apprenticeship and work experience programmes. This separation with less contact among children belonging to different age groups even within the same family will cause social strain and adjustment problems.

I am reminded of some of the behavioural problems already experienced in the school system which if can be asserted, have their basis in social maladjustment among youngsters. I am stating categorically that if this proposal is implemented then these behavioural problems which have been experienced in the past and which the system continues to experience will only have greater manifestations because such a segregation, I contend, will only serve to exaggerate socioeconomic and social class lines which in the system as it stands with one High School, is not an obvious demarcation.

I would further suggest that young people will grow up in a society where they meet adults in specialised roles and in segmented contexts for example at the preschool age, in nursery schools and in day care centres and at the other ages at the class teacher and specialist teacher level. Instead of as at present in continuous contact with one adult or a specific group of adults where there is

opportunity for continuous interaction.

Such experiences will become further reinforced as they progress through this proposed school system where they will be taught various subjects by specialised teachers and not to mention where they will be treated by specialists in medical care and social work so that what this proposal will do is to cut off from our High School students opportunities which they have to mix and merge and become acculturated into the adult world as those situation exist. If we go to the four High School system these opportunities will be significantly decreased.

For young people segregated in their particular geographic environs this pattern of fragmented contact will be bound to be detrimental to the development of their social behaviour and social adjustment. We have to remember that young people are already in a squeeze. It is a fact that biologically speaking the teenagers of today mature at least two years earlier than did their counterparts some 50 years ago. Yet today, young people remain in school longer and assume important adult responsibilities much later so that I would like to re-emphasise any denial of the opportunity to mix and merge with the wide cross-section of adults will only be detrimental to the social development of these young people.

We also must bear in mind that under this proposed system if there is no developed apprenticeship programme, is there is no scope to marry what is theoretical with what is practical and everyday then I am going to argue that those children who come from less education conscious environments are going to suffer from the lack of exposure and exchange of ideas and ideals from the wider section of their companions.

Madam Speaker, I believe that before we embark on this move we should seek to canvass the wider cross-section of this society. We should seek to get input from the parents, from the teachers and it is not far-fetched to suggest from the children themselves because they will be the users of this service that we are proposing to develop.

We must remember that while schools in the Cayman Islands have in most instances become larger, the learner is still processed in a school plant and this Plan does not articulate any strategy to change this significantly at the High School level.

One of the striking things which remains to be clarified and to be explicitly stated is that the Plan, it seems, is predicated upon the same mode of what is called in the profession, "classical, frontal instruction." That is, the same method of a teacher in a classroom of 20 or 30 students forming a learning laboratory where it is expected most of the interaction will go on, for the Plan does not specify in any significant detail any change in teaching methodologies which would involve the students in any greater detail than they are being involved now.

This must be an important shortcoming because professional educators realise that the most effective learning goes on in a setting where there is an exchange. Learning is supposed to be based on activities. I contend that one of the weaknesses in our system, as in many systems, is the fact that the learners, the students, even when they are 17 and 18 years old are expected to be for the most part passive.

I would like to suggest that one of the reasons why many teachers experience behavioural problems is exactly this. They expect the child to sit passively for five hours of the day and not have the opportunity to exercise himself or herself so that for the most part what happens is an exercise which is little more than a monologue with the teacher spewing out the information and the children being expected to absorb it with no opportunity to participate.

I would have been happy to see developed in this Plan some notion that could lead me to believe that we would be moving away from the classical, frontal instruction to involve the students at a more active level either, as I have said, through a more developed work experience or through classrooms which will be equipped for the students to take part in the learning activities.

Madam Speaker, it was little more than a year ago that I called for a national dialogue and a national debate on education and the *Caymanian Compass* of 25th November, 1990 picked up on that call. In an editorial for that date for which I crave your indulgence to read two brief sections stated:

> "The education of the country's youth is a matter that requires expert knowledge but it is also a matter where members of the public should have extensive input.
>
> The call for a national debate on education which emanated from Legislative Assembly last week ought to be heeded."
>
> "No educational system will be successful if it ignores the views, opinions and aspirations of the community in which it operates. Public input is essential for success.
>
> For a national debate to be useful, however, it will be necessary for the public also to hear from those most intimately involved in the system - teachers, principals, administrators, counsellors.".

If this Plan is to succeed then we should embark on this course. The argument will be made that this Plan and these proposals were taken to the public. I can vouch for that fact because when they came to the constituency for which I am the representative, I availed myself of the opportunity to go on two occasions, one with the full panel of consultants, the other when the Member and the local consultants and some of his technical team came. Unfortunately, I have to remark that the attendance could have been better, however, that does not exonerate the Government from seeking yet a wider audience.

I believe the success of any Plan must, to a large extent, depend upon its salesmanship because one could have the best product in the world far surpassing that of the competition, but if that product is not marketed and if that product is not represented by its salesmen excellently then it will not be taken. So because one might have gone to a particular jurisdiction, although the meeting was announced in advance, it is not good enough to say that because one received only 12 or 14 people in the audience that one has exercised one's obligations and responsibilities to those people and considers that it is good enough not to return.

What I have difficulty with as a manager and as an administrator is that too often we on the top hand down the proposals and the recommendations and expect them to be carried out without being questioned, without the people involved in them having any say.

Madam Speaker, one of the successes of the Japanese management system is that system involves everyone in decision making, from the lowliest worker on the shop floor to the managing director. Each participant is allowed to feel that it is his organisation, it is his decision. When the consensus has been arrived at everyone has an obligation for the successful implementation of the plan and the proposals. I believe if we were to take these plans to a wider audience of specialists, of interested people, of employers, we would get an excellent working document. If we did not, no one could say we did not try.

As it stands now we have a good starting point, a good general background, a comprehensive beginning. It now needs to be honed into a tool which can carve out an education system comprehensive and widely accepted enough that it can serve as the basis for development of education in this country for perhaps the next decade, with few modifications.

There should be no need to run this like a relay through this Parliament because there are many things in this Plan which need expanding, which need to be explained and which even need to be understood by those who will be teaching in the system, by those who will be learning in the system and by those who will be participants in this learning exercise. If we do not have such an involvement then the success of this Plan and all the work which has been put into this will be questionable, will be of marginal significance. I am a firm believer that we must have functional participation at all levels if we are to experience success even in the most humble undertaking, let alone in one as bold and as revolutionary as this one.

It is patently fallacious to expect parents, teachers, counsellors and the learners to swallow this system hook, line and sinker when time has not been taken for them to have their input into how the system should develop. While I commend the Member and his team for the work gone into the undertaking, I am saying here and now this is just but the beginning.

Let us now embark on the dialogue stage. Let us take some time to solicit the opinion of parents, of the wider public, of interested people in the community, be they local or foreign national, be they employers or employees, so that when we come to the final phase no one can justifiably come forward and say, "Well, we did not have a chance to discuss the Plan, now you are asking us to be a part of it."

Madam Speaker, educational policy in the Cayman Islands is faced with the fundamental problems of an evolving Cayman Islands. Educational policy is faced with the fundamental problems of a growing Cayman Islands, problems of identity and alienation among young people, accelerated social and economic change, the demands of modern technology, the pressures of living in a consumer society, the continuous evolution of the Caymanian family, even to the extent where the single parent family is becoming a common phenomenon, including the increasing number of families where one or both parents have to work two jobs in order to make ends meet.

Educational policy in the Cayman Islands is also faced with the effects of mass media, especially television which is changing the behaviour patterns and the mores of the young and malleable in our society. It is faced with a challenge to authority by the students.

The obvious panacea is not necessarily a plan, rather it is a workable plan. It is incumbent upon each of us, certainly it is incumbent upon each Member of this august Assembly to sincerely offer his or her opinions on how best we can proceed from this Plan.

The *Caymanian Compass* of today's date sums it up succinctly in its editorial and I quote:

> "It is imperative that Members of Assembly on both sides of the House now put politics aside for a few days while this crucial subject is under discussion."
>
> "Rather, each member should do his utmost to assist the House towards reaching a stage where the Education Plan can be tailored so that it will yield the utmost benefit.
>
> It is incumbent upon the backbenchers to come up with feasible, well researched, and sensible suggestions and criticisms, as well as endorsements when those are due. It is up to the members on the government bench to listen and consider seriously all comments made in good faith.".

Madam Speaker, let me try to conclude by saying I have made my comments in good faith. I chose some of the recommendations which I thought my elaboration and my ideas could enhance. Those chosen were not intended to indicate that they were exhausted rather, they should be interpreted as being exemplary. I could have chosen more. Suffice it to say, however, that for the most part those not discussed by me meant generally, that there was merit and soundness in the recommendation.

I have outlined as best I could the areas that I see could being potentially trouble causing areas. I will respectfully offer my support, moral and otherwise, and would say to the Member if there is anything within the ambit of my experience or expertise which can help him further develop his

Plan then he need only make his request known. I will consider it an honour and a privilege.

I have suggested that the time has come for us to review and perhaps accept the existence of the International College of the Cayman Islands and try to merge it into our system so that it develops as a complementary institution to the Government's Community College. I have suggested that it is high time we think of developing a meaningful Schools Inspectorate. While I did not mention it earlier in my debate, I would like to say I welcome that part in the Plan which calls for the development of two Teachers' Centres. I believe that this is definitely a positive step and I give it my wholehearted support.

I would also like to say at this point in conjunction with encouraging the development of these Teachers' Centres that it would be good if the teachers could form themselves into an association, an association from which could emanate a code of conduct and a standard of behaviour as well as opportunities for social exchanges. I believe this effort should come from and among the teachers themselves and when they have done so, I would encourage the Government to accept this association and to respect the teachers' wishes in as much as they lead to an amicable relationship between the administration and those who carry out the wishes of the administration.

Madam Speaker, there is nothing so hard as effecting a revolution. This Plan is a revolution. The Member needs the help of a lot of people. The Member also will have to, unfortunately, listen to a lot of people some of them, like myself, who will attempt to talk down to him on occasion. He has been around for a long time, much longer probably than I will ever be around so I need not tell him that patience is a virtue.

Madam Speaker, politics being of the nature that it is, is sometimes ungrateful and unfair. Many politicians, as a matter of fact most of them who effect the greatest changes sometimes have to leave their vocation unheralded, unthanked and unappreciated. I do not know what will be the fate of the Member introducing this Plan but I dare say that if the Plan is aired, if he allows opportunity for input, then he will have done his job and it will not matter who thanks him, who appreciates him or who was gracious to him. He will have been able to say at the end of the day that he did his best under the circumstances.

I would only conclude by saying again, that I have tried my endeavoured best to be as frank, as forthright and as positive and encouraging as I could be. I have spoken from the position of a professional, from the position of a legislator and from the position of a Caymanian wishing to see only the best for his fellow Caymanians.

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The House will be suspended for 15 minutes.

AT 11:35 A.M. THE HOUSE WAS SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 12:22 P.M.

MADAM SPEAKER: Please be seated. Proceedings are resumed. Debate continues on Government Motion No.11/91. The Third Elected Member for George Town.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: The Government Motion which is before this Honourable House is one which is asking the Legislative Assembly to accept the Draft Education Development Plan 1991-1996 for implementation. I want to deal with some matters separately and then to go through the Plan itself which has to be read along with the Education Review that it is based upon.

The striking thing about this, Madam Speaker, is that this motion is asking this Honourable House to approve a Plan, and to approve it without the benefit of detailed study in a committee, which is going to commit this country, in principle, to $34.25 million of capital over the next five years, and I believe it will be more as time goes on, and a recurrent expenditure of $77,360,000 million.

The motion has been very shrewdly worded because to look at it, it seems that we are basically dealing with what is set out in the Review. The Review does not get into a lot of detail in this area but the Plan itself does set out what is Government's course over the next five years. Significantly, there are areas of the Plan that I can support. There are areas that I cannot support and what I do not think is a responsible decision on my part, would be to vote "in blank" so to speak, for what is not only going to be a blank cheque for the Member for Education but also a blank cheque to adopt in total the Draft Five Year Education Plan.

Let me say this, I do not believe that education should not be reviewed from time to time. I commend the Member for that Review. I have nothing against that nor the people who have toiled on that committee to deal with it. They have produced a document which is reasonably comprehensive. I believe that financing for education is a top priority for this Government and all previous Governments and I have no problem, as we have just seen, we have appropriated a considerable sum of money, $3.5 million or thereabouts to deal with the Primary School which is being built. On the other hand, I believe that things have to be done right.

The area that worries me with this is that I believe that the rush to get this through is wrapped up in the Member for Education's coined phrase that the Opposition, and presumably in this instance the public, can have their say but Executive Council must have its way. We know he coined it and we know that he lives by that and I find it strange to believe and hard to believe that a document with 63 recommendations, many of them major and radical recommendations, could go out to the public and be listened to by the Member and come back here in the same form.

Now he is not perfect and we know that. Therefore, I do not believe that there has been the necessary input. We have seen no written evidence of what submissions were

made by the different authorities, teachers of private and public schools, PTAs, and we are really left, at least I believe, since nothing has been changed from the 63 recommendations, this document has to be put out to the public for further exposure. Secondly, I do not think a document with 63 recommendations should come to this Honourable House to be voted upon in one vote for all or for none. I think it is very unfair and what it does is basically give the Member for Education, what he keeps telling us, that Executive Council must have its way.

This document is, in my opinion, as important as, or more important than, the Constitution of the Cayman Islands because it is the generations of tomorrow that are going to have to run this country. If the people are not up to the standard that they should be, then regardless of what constitution or anything else, laws that are passed, the country is going to suffer and it is not going to work.

The procedure taken before and accepted by this Honourable House in relation to that other important document, the Constitution, was to let it go out to the public but to come back into this House to a Select Committee where evidence could be taken from the different parties and it could be written down and laid on the Table of this House so that we know decisions were based upon facts and upon representations.

Those are my broad outlines other than going into specific areas of the Education Plan. It seems to me, and I do not intend to try to go through every recommendation in here but to deal with some of the major ones, that the main area of concern, the main problem, lies within the area of management and administration of the schools. This is clearly borne out at page 32 of the Education Review Report where it says:

> "3.1.4 Within the area of management and administration of schools, Education Department staff, Principals, teachers and parents are all concerned about the lack of linkage between the main stages of education. The role of the administration to advise, assist, guide and improve communication amongst teachers and schools is not being fully achieved. The result is a high level of anxiety among teachers, particularly in the primary schools, with an emphasis upon competition rather than upon co-operation. A number of features in the current system encourage such an outcome. Schools at different levels are administered in very different ways. There is an urgent need to provide greater clarity and understanding regarding the relationship between managers (Principals and teachers) and administrators (the Education Department).".

Further on this, we find at page 34 of the Report which is dealing with the system of record keeping, compilation, interpretation of data. It says this:

> "3.2.1 The Office of the Portfolio and the Education Department have found the present system of record keeping to be both ineffective and unproductive.
>
> "The major recommendation has been that, as the demand for information retrieval increases, that immediate steps are taken towards automating a school administrative system throughout all schools and the Department.".

Another area I would like to base what I am going say comes on page 51 and this is what it says:

> "The team's discussions with Principals, teachers, advisers and administrators consistently returned to the problem of lack of communication between the different levels of education and between the schools and headquarters. It is in the nature of all educational systems that the physical separation of schools from each other, and of the administrators from the field, causes problems of communication which can seriously reduce efficiency and co-operation. However, the problem does appear to be particularly severe in the Cayman Islands.".

Madam Speaker, the basic problem with the education system (when I say that I include the total system beginning from the Portfolio down) is a lack of communication, a lack of guidance by those who are at the top and there is nothing which can be done, there is no radical change within the system that can work until you correct that problem. It must be corrected first.

It is known that the Member for Education unfortunately, does not get around to the schools or have meetings with staff as often as he should. It is crucial that he, as the leader of the education system in this country, is fully aware and fully supportive of his department, the teachers and the Heads. What is not addressed in the Education Plan is how this major, and it is a major problem, going to be corrected.

We find that practically nothing is said about this, one short paragraph in it which sets this out as one of the objectives. Beyond that, other than saying that it is going to be addressed, there is nothing in this that shows specifically how we are going to meet this problem. I would have thought that the Plan itself would have come out with detailed solutions to major problems. It does deal with some, do not get me wrong, but this specific one, as far as I can remember, had only one short paragraph dealing with the objectives over the five year period.

Madam Speaker, if we do not solve this problem then to radically change areas of the system is going to create more chaos in the education system of this country than we have ever seen because no matter whether you put the best schools or the best teachers in the world out there, if there is a lack of communication, guidance, or interest in many instances by the Portfolio, then the system will fail.

There has to be team work between the Portfolio, the Department and the staff in the schools.

Until that is achieved I would strongly recommend that any major change to the system not be touched because even if they reach a stage of abolishing the Middle School and setting up the other two schools, setting up the preschool, if there is no communication they are back to square one. This is why, at the root of the problem, is what actually befalls most Members in Executive Council. We know that this lack of communication, lack of guidance with the Member for Health of Social Services has been raised before. So it is not unusual and I do think that it is something that they do not know about but I just see it as being swept under the table and hopefully when the chaos comes through the changes that are coming in they will blame it on the changes on they will blame it on someone else. What we know for sure is that Executive Council never blames anything on themselves.

Now we have seen the schools in this country deteriorate over the last few years and I believe that the problem for that deterioration in quality, the reason why as is alleged in here, looks to me like the Middle School, the Primary Schools and the High School are nearly functioning as totally independent institutions. This was never meant to be and if there is a lack of a system and cohesion in education then it cannot be advanced, it must deteriorate. The correction has to come from the Member for Education.

At page 68 of the Review it states:

> "3.14.3 Parents as well as teachers were concerned about the lack of linkage between the three stages of education, and there was widespread concern about evaluation and assessment, particularly at the end of both the primary and the secondary stages.".

Throughout this Review we keep coming back to the reason for the problem within the system. I am going to submit, anyhow, that to remove the Middle School is not the answer because you are still left with four phases of schools. You have the Preschool, Primary, High School and now "A" levels at the Community College. So cutting out one school does not, in my view, solve this problem. It is another radical change which will not only cost a lot of money but will cause a lot of mental agony to children within the system.

The Member for Health used a well known phrase that if education is expensive, try ignorance. Madam Speaker, when we are looking at $34.3 million in capital expenditure and $77 million in recurrent expenditure then in my view, it is ignorant for this House to try to accept this Education Review en block without taking its time to go through it recommendation by recommendation to see what is good - it has a lot of good in it - and trying to begin to solve what must be the first solutions. If there is not a solving of the basic problem, I believe that the other things which are being done are going to lose their impact and their effect because they are overshadowed by this problem. So I would submit that until the Education Plan comes to grips with this problem of lack of communication, lack of linkage, the other steps should not be taken.

I would now like to go down through what I would call the other major, and some minor, recommendations which have been made, commenting only on some of them to show that throughout this Plan there has to be a stage by stage implementation and that I believe the Plan has to set out what it regards as the most difficult problems but problems that are preconditions to implementing other areas of the recommendation.

They have set out in the Plan how they intend to deal with different stages of this but once again there is nothing specifically that I can see that is going to deal with the problem of communication. Do not get me wrong, maybe the Review Board would have had difficulty in doing that because it is something that is probably peculiar to the Member for Education but it is still there. It states at page 9, in paragraph 1.17 of the Review: "Liaison between the two stages of school would be of vital importance.".

The people who did this Review, and I said earlier I commend them for their dealing with it and producing a detailed document, have stated throughout from the beginning to the end that what is of vital importance is correcting the problem of liaising and standardisation between the schools.

MADAM SPEAKER: Honourable Member, would you take the luncheon break now?

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Yes, Madam.

MADAM SPEAKER: The House will be suspended until 2:15 p.m.

AT 12:48 P.M. THE HOUSE WAS SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 2:23 P.M.

MADAM SPEAKER: Please be seated. Proceedings are resumed. The Third Elected Member for George Town continuing the debate.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would now continuing looking at the Education Review and under Term of Reference III it states: "There is a pronounced increase in behaviour problems and an apparent lowering of motivation, particularly of older children in the system.". Further down it mentions: "The most effective from of pastoral care is through the overall quality of the school community.".

There are two recommendations, Recommendations 5 and 6 which I think are good. It says:

Recommendation 5

"It is recommended that teachers should be given greater guidance with regard to the exercise of their pastoral duties. Specific time needs to be allocated to enable teachers to meet students individually as well as in small groups.".

Recommendation 6 says that sporting activities and clubs should be encouraged. Where it gets to be somewhat worrying and we come back to this problem of communication and linkage again but in a different way, is found at page 38 which deals with an examination of the school support systems such as psychologists, educational advisers, teachers centres, etcetera, and it says:

"However, the requirement for a group os educational advisers, psychologists, therapists, peripatetic teachers and a centre for advisers and teachers to meet are all necessary parts of the education service. A number of the support systems link directly with Social Services, but there is a lack of clarity regarding the relative roles and functions of specialists working in the two departments.".

So we find in the support system, and this is extremely important to a school system, that the proper pastoral care and other areas of support are placed in it and that there is a unified approach by Social Services and by the Education Department to deal with this.

Recommendation 8 is for the establishment of an Education Centre and this I think is something which is good. I think to have the staff develop and to have the interaction which is needed then a good Education Centre becomes important. Not as important as some other areas of the system but I think it is very important because the Centre itself will provide a means of communication between the staff. It recommended that an Education Social Worker to be attached to each school. I support that. I do not have a problem in that area.

Where we begin to see some effort made is with the area dealing with a review of the structure of the Education Department. This sets out several objectives but they come back mainly to developing, co-ordinating, and supervising in an increased manner.

Let me give a word of warning. If there is a governing body set up for each school and if there is a lack of communication between the Department and this body, the schools will become even more isolated and independent. So it is important that the Boards, whatever power they may have, are in some form of reasonable communication with the Department.

In relation to the Recommendation where the Department should carry out regular evaluations, possibly on a three-year cycle, I think is good and is something which is positive. The References which deal with the conditions of service are set out here and they deal with some of the inequities which exist in the present skills and how they are to be corrected.

Then we go on to looking once again, at page 51, at the problem as is mentioned here of the return of the lack of communication between the different levels of education and between the schools and Headquarters. In this case they must mean the Department and the Portfolio. In this several things have been set out and a lot of the focussing is around an Education Centre and having it sited in a central place.

Recommendation 24 proposes that the Chief Education Officer should pay particular attention to communication with the media, with the business community, with governing bodies and with parents. Once again we are back to having the communication process set up. I was happy to see that they recommended also with the business community. In effect, children will go from school, some will go on to college, but many of them will go to work in the private sector and I believe that knowing and communicating with the private sector can be important to finally placing them in the best position in the work force as is possible.

I believe, as has been mentioned in this, there has to be an increased in-service and external programme for an overall scheme of teacher and school development and that this I know is continuing in some way now but should be intensified.

We come to page 60 and on this I would like to spend a bit of time because it deals with the abolition of the Middle School. If I may I would like to read a bit of this. It begins by saying: "3.11.1 The consideration of the issues raised by Term of Reference XI and the major education questions raised in the curriculum section have led to the proposal for the a major change in the schools system.". So they admit there that it is a major change in the system.

"The details of this systematic approach is referred to in the recommendations following Term of Reference XIV. In consideration of the relevance of the middle school, the consultants have agreed that in the radically changed circumstances, and in the light of eleven years' experience, the qualities expressed by the excellent work of the Middle School can be effectively incorporated into a system which focuses on two main stages of universal education; primary and secondary. The rich experience of the Principal and staff of the middle school in curriculum development, pastoral care and educational innovation, will provide an excellent resource for the new system of primary schools and high schools.".

Madam Speaker, if the team is being honest in their opinion about the Middle School, on the basis of what I have read, I do not understand why they are abolishing it. There is a very clear admission here and further down I will refer to that that there has been excellent quality in the Middle School. It has obviously served a very good purpose and while things have changed, I do not believe that the

circumstances have radically changed.

What it seems to me as and this is where I would very dearly love to hear the views of teachers and other people both from the Government and the private sector involved with middle school concept, where is the radical change. What it seems to me has happened is through a lack of communication and a lack of interest by the Member for Education we have had the Middle School stay out, become isolated and become nearly an independent body. This could only have happened, as I see it, over the past five or six years because there was not this lack of liaison between the systems in the beginning and they admit here that it worked well.

Now, I would like to know what the real reason for making this, as they put it, a major change in the system. When we have the problem which relates to isolation of a school, the fact that we abolish one school and we get down to what the team refers to as two schools, the primary and the high school, they are going to drift in the same direction as they have drifted in the past six or seven years unless something is done to stop the drifting which causes the linkage to be shattered and the isolation of the schools.

While I can support this recommendation limiting schools to reasonable numbers, at this stage to take what has been accepted nationally and I believe has been accepted within the teaching profession and wipe it out which I will show later on, I believe there was some politics in this, I can not support this and I am certain that the majority of people in these Islands do not support it either.

The Middle School and especially at a time when drugs are prevalent and increasingly prevalent in society is going to take that banned group in their most difficult years of changing from minor children to adulthood and is going to place them with children up to 16 and 17 years of age. We are going to get now what the First Elected Member for Bodden Town has referred to as the beginning of the isolation of children from different areas of the Island and we must have as a result of that a deterring effect on the overall rounding of the child's education and his future.

The whole idea of the Middle School was one in which, as the consultants have mentioned in this, at least what they referred to as "the rich experience of the Principal and staff of the middle school in curriculum development, pastoral care and educational innovation, will provide an excellent resource for the new system." So they are really taking obviously what is a very good underlying aspect of the Middle School and they are going to transpose it partly between the Primary School and the High School and then they are going to launch on one of the most expensive building projects that this country will ever see.

I want to give a bit of history of the Middle School because I believe that there is a lot of politics around this despite what the Member for Education said earlier. At a meeting that was held in 1978 the Member for Education who was a Member of the House then, I was at that stage the Member for Education, on a committee with Mrs. Daphne Orrett and Mrs. Mary Lawrence and some others, stated in their Recommendation 6:

> "In view of the lack of statistical evidence that the High School will be too large and unwieldy in the foreseeable future the implementation of the Middle School should be postponed. Funds which might be used to establish such an institution be used to upgrade the Primary Schools by the provision of very necessary additional classroom space, staff and proper supervision for these schools.".

We know that the Member for Education bitterly opposed the Middle School. I have never understood why except that it was not his idea. When we went from place to place in the districts dealing with the Education Law and policies at that time we consistently came up against the supporters of the Member for Education, Mrs. Lawrence and the other ones who were always trying to stop the Middle School from going into effect.

I must say this, I very much appreciated Mrs. Islay Conolly who then as Chief Education Officer stood by the recommendations of which she was an integral part and very courageously, I would say for a civil servant in those days, resisted this in public meetings. I will specifically appreciate her for that. What I am saying, I guess, is that let us not believe that the Middle School has been totally free from politics because this is the first time that the Member for Education has been able to take a devastating swipe at crushing the Middle School. I do not believe that the people of this country are going to sit back and take it like that. I think he needs to remember that if these policies come into effect and the teachers of these schools and the parents are not behind this, it is not going to work. That is why I believe that this mad rush to force this through the House on a general debate is not the right way to go.

I do not understand because there is not a lot more in this recommendation other than to really say that we are removing it because there were three different isolated divisions of schools, the Primary, Middle and High Schools. But when we get back to it what we have now is going to be four divisions. We are going to have the Preschool, the Primary School, the High School and we are going to have "A" Level children in the Community College and believe me if lack of communication was a problem with those three, with two of them situated within the vicinity of each other, there is going to be a lot bigger problem at this stage.

So I do not think that the system is simplified by breaking it into the segments that the education consultants have recommended. I would strongly suggest that this specific area which is to me, and is stated in this, the major and perhaps the most radical change in the system be looked at very carefully but that the Portfolio and the Education Department get their house in order first and ensure that the continuity and the communication between the different schools, the Department and the Portfolio are worked out.

On top of that, Madam Speaker, it has to be very traumatic to a child and also to teachers and the Education Department to take on these major and radical changes over a very

short period of time. I think if they have a good thing here, improve on it. If there is isolation between the three schools now, work it out. What I do not follow is that when I was the Member for Education back in, mainly, the late 1970s and early 1980s, I requested that all teachers in schools meet at least one a month, that Heads meet one a month, that the Department and the Heads meet and that we meet from the Portfolio.

In the beginning there was a lot of resistance. I was told, true or not, that in one of the Primary Schools two teachers had not spoken to each other in something like two years. I sat down with them and said, "You are professionals and whether you like each other or not, one has to get along for the benefit of the children."

And there was resistance when I asked to see minutes of these meetings. They thought all sorts of things but after they saw that when I got the minutes of meetings that I did not attend, I was able to look at them and begin to see where the problems were. As a result of that we built up a considerable amount of very good faith between the Portfolio, the teachers and the Department. At times I would actually go to the schools with my Principal Secretary and with the Chief Education Officer and sit down and say to the staff, "What are your problems?" I would say to them, "I cannot assist you on matters which relate to your conditions of service but there are people here who can deal with them so let us look at the overall problems and try to solve them."

This is what I think we have to try to get back to, producing an atmosphere for team work because if we do not get that the changes which are recommended are going to be difficult and some of them are going to be impossible to implement. The Reference which refers to the curriculum states in a paragraph on page 67: "It is the view of the consultants that the present system, which responded well to the problems identified in the late 1970s, is no longer appropriate to the very changed economic, demographic, social and educational situation of the early '90s.".

My question to this is simple. Why has the education system not progressed and dealt with the changes that have come to us? Even if we create a system now which is perfect, if it does not keep up with the times then we are going to have to repeat this exercise on a massive basis every few years. Here, I think it is a lack of foresight when we have the education specialists admitting that the school system has fallen behind the times. Once again, I think I mentioned this earlier, it states on page 68:

> "3.14.3 Parents as well as teachers were concerned about the lack of linkage between the three stages of education, and there was widespread concern about evaluation and assessment, particularly at the end of both the primary and the secondary stages.".

This is not just going to go away. It is a problem which has to be dealt with and I do not see linkage improving by merely changing the school system. There has to be radical changes by the Member for Education, his Portfolio and radical changes if necessary in the Department because they must sort out the linkage before we end up now with four different sectors within the school system, otherwise we are back to square one.

The recommendation in relation to pre-schools is one that I think is commendable. I believe that the earliest starting is something that will help the younger children and I believe, as this states in here, that there has to be proper regulation of the pre-schools. That I think is a commendable recommendation. However, if Government makes this mandatory, Government must be prepared in the event that private pre-schools do not deal with the demand that they are prepared to take up the slack and that they are ready for it because it is just not good enough to drop this down and suddenly we have a situation as we had in West Bay with children in the Town Hall with half walls between them. This is not good enough.

I think whenever anything is going to be brought in we must be prepared to have it fully brought in. Whatever amount of this that can go out to private pre-schools or kindergartens, whatever, this is good. I think the more the private sector can do, the more Government should let them do it. Not only does it ease Government of an economic burden but it provides a competitive edge even in that area to see that standards are kept high. This is now coming to an area under Term of Reference XV which goes on to talk about the different schools and the College and they state: "A fourth new high school will need to be built at a distance from George Town, but such a school was already envisaged in the Education Plan.".

Madam Speaker, whether the lack of linkage and lack of communication in the system is because of a physical separation of schools or whether it is the people within the Department and the Portfolio not giving the guidance that is necessary, I do not see where taking the approach of ending up with four High Schools is the overall answer to this. Extending the period of compulsory time in school is good. As I said, I think if Government is prepared to take on the responsibility fully, that is commendable. At page 74 it states:

> "3.15.5 The changes described above are likely to have a major impact on the social, educational and economical needs of the country.
>
> "It is considered that core skills, in "reading, writing and counting", to be mastered by pupils in primary schools, should be co-operatively defined and understood by teachers.".

A lot of this had to be in the schools before. What I do not understand, our stress, when I was in there, was to try to raise the standards of the primary schools, to try to get the core subjects brought in to see that children could read, write and do arithmetic and it seems to me that a lot of the basics seemed to have slipped out of the system without anybody knowing anything about it.

I think we are more to a stage where there has to be some

patching of areas of the system that already exist rather than having radical changes which the team admits is going to have a major impact on the social, educational and economical needs of the country. They are right. It is going to have a major and a traumatic impact.

The National Curriculum Council, I think establishing that should provide a good means of review and of simplifying and perhaps even assist with communication. It refers to Subject Committees and I guess there will be other committees under that. However, I would say that it is important that people on that are able to effectively deal with the National Curriculum and that they are not overshadowed by any lack of interest by the Member or the Department.

At page 81 we find a reference to the International College of the Cayman Islands (ICCI). I have always believed that the private education institutions, including ICCI have a place in our society. The same as I believe that a medical system dominated by Government is bad, I also believe that an over-dominated Government education system is bad.

I have always been in support of having private schools in the Cayman Islands. They have contributed a lot. They save Government a lot of money and they assist students with education which otherwise they may not have gotten, or gotten fully because normally, the Government's physical building programme is some distance behind what the current needs of the country are.

I am not just saying that in relation to this Government. There have been problems in the past. I know the difficulty of keeping up with it but I think we have to remember that even more importantly than that where you have independent institutions in education, there has to be pressure to keep standards up between the schools which, I guess competing is not the best word, but which have to relate to each other and have to live side by side within the community.

While I think that the Community College is very good, I will deal with that a bit later, I do support it, I also support the private schools including the International College of the Cayman Islands. I believe that the swipes taken at it by the education team were, in my opinion, unwarranted. It had, in the early days, as any other institutions, its problems but it has now been within the Caymanian society for some 20 years, I believe and having survived that long and having contributed, I believe that a more positive approach has to be taken to finding solutions to whatever problems may be in its way to it being clothed with the necessary authority that it needs.

I know the Member for Education will probably raise the fact that it was in there during my eight years. That is so and we looked at it carefully. We had communication with the principal people in it and we differed in some areas but I believe many of the teething problems which existed in the early days have now been overcome. I guess what I am saying here is that I believe that it is in Government's interest to look positively at how ICCI can be fitted within the overall education system to continue to contribute. No matter how good the Community College is if there is no other institution that is out there to measure its standards by, I know it can be measured internationally, but it is good to have within the community an alternative as well to the Government-run institution.

I am happy to see that the Community College is progressing. I am happy to see that it is developing well. It has some new buildings that we voted the money for and I believe that it can be developed and it can continue to play a very important part in the Caymanian community. I have nothing against doing the "A" Levels in it but I used it to point out that the system is not going to have two sectors of schools but that an integral part, the "A" level which prepares many of the children for university and college is going to be another part where there has to be proper liaison between the High School and the Community College to make sure that they do not fall into the same problems that are now alleged throughout the system, the lack of communication.

It was very interesting to see the analysis on the National Achievement Tests and to see the findings that were set out in the Report. The criticisms that have been leveled at things like the GCSE and other external examinations once again I think need to be looked at very carefully because maybe the problems or some of the problems which have arisen in relation to areas of this could have been once again back to the basic problem of a lack of linkage, a lack of proper guidance and development of the curriculum.

What I find difficult to understand is how so many things went wrong so rapidly. I believe that the correction of these should be done in a proper way after proper consultation. I would like to hear what the Education Panel that did this Review had to say on many of these subjects. I would also like to hear their views of teachers who have been in our system for a while and worked with it, because it seems to me that what Recommendation 52 has done is to throw out three external examinations, the International General Certificate of Secondary Education - University of Cambridge (IGCSE), the Caribbean Examinations Council (CXC) and the International Baccalaureate (IB) offered by the Community College and they have recommended that they do not propose a continuation of the present IGCSE arrangement.

I have read what is here but what I am saying is that I do not know that this is sufficiently detailed to fully grasp what the education specialists are getting at. They surely must have spent very long periods of time going through this and evaluating it. It is unfortunate that we do have the benefit of the details of this before the House. In fact, we have nothing before the House except the Member coming here and saying, "This is what has been recommended and I went out there and the public agrees with all 63 recommendations and we are going to implement them." The change here and I am not saying that they are not right, maybe they are right, but this change is once again a radical change. It is a major change in the system and if we miss on it then there will be several years' worth of children who may not be getting as good an education as they should get.

I know there is a difference in the way of life between here and the United Kingdom but there is also quite a difference between us and other Caribbean Islands and the North

American continent so most external examinations, many of them are going to be fraught with having areas which are irrelevant to children within the Caymanian community. This is perhaps where, as has been recommended in here, there has to be developed the local subjects, local curriculum which can fill these gaps. The choice then spread in taking if we can, what is best from each of the external exams or taking what is regarded as the best external exam.

One of the things that we have to make sure of in all of this is that whatever is chosen is going to be something which is internationally recognised and sufficient for students to gain entry into technical colleges, universities or whatever. If we fail in that then I think we have a generation which is going to miss some of the higher skills in higher education that they could have had otherwise.

I know that this is going to be done, I think I saw in the Report that it was to have been done by June, or it is going to be done by June of next year, but I would at this stage urge the Member for Education to be really cautious on how he moves in this area. If we do have a problem which we may have with IGCSE let us look carefully at it because you have to remember that it has not been very many years that was introduced here. What we do not want to happen is in a few years' time have to reverse the system again.

At the time, I do not know whether it was the right choice or not, it obviously has been recommended now as not being suitable. I think the basis for that was largely that a lot of the subject material was unsuitable. It says here:

> "The unsuitability has to do with the cultural biases, economic differences and emphasis and the fact that examinations incapable of responding to needs of Caymanian pupils of the country has a number of positive features.".

When did the Portfolio for Education and the Department for Education realise this was a problem? Presumably it must have been known to the Education Department and I think it is worrying if we are going to move on the basis that every few years we have to take and reassess the external exams. I know they change but I guess what I am saying here is that I hope the choice in this area is right.

In relation to special education, after the team deals with the confusion in the definition of "special education", which I think they are correct on, they propose a Care and Assessment Centre.

> "It would deal with problems presented by children who do not necessarily come within the definition of "special education " indicated in para. 3.17.1, but who need additional support beyond that which can be provided in the normal school. The impetus for such a Centre appears to arise mainly from the demonstration of severe behavioural problems, and it would appear sound practice to provide a temporary secure and supportive alternative to school for a limited period of time.".

This will be good when developed. I was very surprised to find at page 91 that it was alleged, as mentioned in here, and I read from it: "In one school the number was held to be as much as 70%.". I think that definitely could never be right because there is no way that the majority of children in a school and I hope I am not talking out of school, so to speak, could be in need of special education. There are children within our society who do need this extra help and I think we have to provide it to them. I agree fully with what the education specialists have said. Somewhere in this if not in these paragraphs here, they have said that they do not want to paint a wide band of children as in need of special education the aim being to keep the children within the mainstream or return them to it as soon as possible.

There were different discussions in relation to timetabling and a lot of this I am not going to attempt to go through but what it seems has arisen is that the division between the core subjects seems to have been out or proportion. And that many of the other subjects, too little time was given. I think that was basically what was dealt with. However, I think coming through this is that it is important for students to have good English, good math, and to have a sound basis in perhaps some of the other core subjects, sciences, whatever, so that they are in a position to develop in relation to the other subjects that depend very much on reading or whatever as a system for learning.

I noticed that in relation to staff deployment they seem to be recommending that wherever possible teachers move from class to class rather than the children, which I think is logical. On the size of schools, obviously the smaller the school, normally the better chance there is of enhanced learning. Now I do not know where the role of the Education Council is at present, it was re-established under the Law which we brought in 1983 but I do believe that the Education Council has focused more and more as time has gone on towards seeing that it gives scholarships and to placing more and more people within the needs of the society and within their capabilities. Whether the criticism here is correct or not I do not know. It says: "Excessive emphasis is placed on an academic orientation and the production of a narrow academic elite.".

I would think that that is perhaps, hopefully, somewhat harsh because I really believe that as the Education Council has tried to draw up its priorities for where scholarships would go, as far I know, it has given a fair number of scholarships out on the technical side, but hopefully this gap would have been filled.

At page 106 which is dealing with recommendations of any necessary reforms to the curriculum of the education system says:

> "3.19.6 Also, the reforms require a major shift in the role of the Department in giving leadership to curriculum development at the primary, middle and high school levels. The shift enables a response to be made to the criticisms about the curriculum as perceived by teachers, parents and pupils. It

places an emphasis upon accountability (conscious selection and clarification of norms and goals and the use of training and development of teachers, principals, specialist officers and administrators, and use of internal assessment).".

We come back once again to the problem of leadership and I guess what just about all of the Elected Members of Executive Council seem to have a problem with has been this question of communication, a lack of getting team work and a lack of leadership. As I have mentioned before, correcting this problem has to be the first priority before we move on to dealing with the other major changes. I think once that is corrected, some of these major changes will not be necessary.

It goes on to deal with the time spent on the different areas of the curriculum. The area that I found interesting was at page 113 where it deals with advising on measures to determine national literacy and numeracy levels. This is what it says:

"The tests would be described as the Cayman Islands Achievement Tests (CIAT) and would be administered to 8 year, 11 year and 14 year olds (or pupils in Grade 3, Grade 6, and Grade 9). For clarity, the tests may be described as CIAT-3, CIAT-6, and CIAT-9.".

Those ages, substantially, give or take a year or two, are where we have the division now with the Middle School. So they must realise that these are critical years when testing becomes important.

I know the Member for Education said that one problem was only having three months after a child now goes into the High School to decide on his options. Well, if that is a problem then correct it by working in more time on which to make the decision. But I do not see, if it is accepted that these critical areas remain, how it is going to help the system by cutting out one specialised area of three years of schooling when a child is at his most critical stage of going from childhood to adulthood and the many problems which arise during those years.

I would now like to look at some of the responses that the Chamber of Commerce received to its questionnaire and to show that even if this is only partly right, the feedback that the Member for Education has gotten that the public accepts all 63 recommendations hook, line and sinker, cannot be logical. He cannot really honestly believe that he has exposed it right and given people the proper opportunity to go in depth into it because what teachers - from the private side, so that I do not get any problems from the Member worrying about it - have told me is that they went to meetings and they spoke but it appeared to go in one ear and out the other. Nobody can tell me that you can go out with recommendations this radical and this expensive and everybody will accept every one. In fact, I was amazed to find that the Portfolio accepted all of the recommendations in principle as well.

I would just like to touch on a few of these. For example, one question held that 79 per cent felt that under normal circumstances students should be required to pass each class before proceeding to the next, that was a high percentage there; 84 per cent felt that there is a need for more numeracy and literacy testing at all levels of the school system and the Report bears that out; 32 per cent rated the education system as good and 34 per cent as fair.

What I found interesting and perhaps this does not relate to a specific area in the Report but 69 per cent of the parents are involved with the child's homework and 41 per cent say that they help nightly with the child's homework; 33 per cent, which was the majority, felt that there is enough local and regional content taught in the schools and only 42 per cent agreed that sporting activities are emphasised enough in schools.

The detailed area of the Chamber of Commerce's Report has gone into somewhat more detail and it appears to me from this that the view, in relation to the Middle School in the meetings I understand that people have had, was that this had done good and that they felt that while it could be improved by better counselling and communication of expectations, that by and large, parents have been happy with it.

The awareness of people locally who responded to this, and it would have been a fair amount, at least shows that there is a lot of interest out there and there has to be in education because it deals with peoples' children. Some 93 per cent say they were aware of the facilities locally for further education such as ICCI, the Community College, the Law School and the Chamber's courses. I want to come back to deal with a specific area on this in some detail at a later stage.

MADAM SPEAKER: Would it be convenient for you to take a suspension?

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Yes, Madam.

MADAM SPEAKER: The House will be suspended for 15 minutes.

AT 3:35 P.M. THE HOUSE WAS SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 4:05 P.M.

MADAM SPEAKER: Please be seated. Proceedings are resumed. The Third Elected Member for George Town continuing the debate.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would now like to go on to deal with what I regard the proper way of dealing with these documents that are before us, one of these is some 186 pages and the other with the Addenda to it probably covers about 25 pages.

When there is a document that has a lot of detail in it the best way this can be dealt with is to look at it in detail because each recommendation has to be gone through in detail, which cannot be done on the Floor of this House. We know the debate here is more of a general debate whereas perhaps five or 10 days could be spent looking at the individual recommendations, at least the major ones and having access to the people who made these recommendations, having access to people who have worked the system. Unless this is done I believe we are doing an injustice to this Education Review and the Five Year Education Plan.

This is why the process that was used for the Constitution, where after the document had been exposed a Select Committee looked at it, listened to people, recorded the views of people and finally, presented it on this Table so that supporting the document and the recommendations will be the necessary evidence and reasons behind why the Committee either accepted or rejected specific areas.

I really believe that if we do not take enough time to look at this carefully we are going to be doing an injustice to the future generations of this country. I cannot understand how the Members of Government can sit here, vote for a Select Committee for the Constitution, a Select Committee for Immigration, a Select Committee for Ethics, a Select Committee for nearly everything in the world, we must have 10 Select Committees but when it comes to what is important we find that they do not support that approach. I do not know why. It is beyond me because they have to believe in that system of looking at things in depth and rationalising things because they have moved in the past to have Select Committees on far less important matters than this.

I do not know whether the Member for Education feels that there may be some of these recommendations which may not be justified when the hearing comes out or whether it is just simply that he feels, as he keeps saying, that Executive Council must have its way but there is a right way and a wrong way and I really believe that the right way has to be to take this into Committee. We can sit fairly often, as we saw in the Constitution, that was done in a very short period of time. It was probably one of the shortest Select Committees we had because the Chairman had it sitting day after day. I think that we can give this the same sort of priority. So I would be asking the Members to consider this carefully. At a later stage it will arise and I do not want to go any further into that. I feel that rushing this is not the answer and I do not understand and the Member has not been able to satisfy me as to a good reason for having to rush this at this stage.

Now I turn to the last of the document, the Draft Five Year Education Development Plan. That begins under the heading Appreciation by saying that all of the recommendations made were accepted in principle. It goes on to deal, and this is what I could not find earlier to read, with the main problem and this is the way the general statement on it reads: "Strengthen the administrative and management capacity of the Department of Education and the school system.".

How? That statement is a general statement. What has to be in this Plan is how this is going to be effectively achieved. I do not think that it can be swept under the carpet. What I find somewhat conflicting is that, at page 4 paragraph 2.2 Programme Components, we have a statement saying that the restructuring of the school system will consist of four levels which I mentioned earlier, Pre-school, Primary, Secondary (High), Post Secondary/Tertiary/Further Education. Then at page 60 of the Review where it is dealing with the Middle School it says the problem of spilt sites does not occur within the new system.

Madam Speaker, I cannot see how four High Schools on different sites is any different from two Middle Schools and two High Schools on different sites. In fact, the Middle School and the High School are on adjoining sites so communication should be a lot better. It should be possible for staff to walk from one to the other and sit down in the conference room and meet. So if we are going to accept that we have gone from three levels to four levels and this is why I would like to be able to ask the consultants some of these questions and they may have a logical answer but I do not think that the Development Plan can get away with just saying that they are going make changes or they are going to alter things without having the depth and the reasoning behind it.

We come to paragraph 3.0 Management for Efficiency & Effectiveness. The Plan says:

> "Any significant improvement in the performance of the education system can only be established and sustained if the machinery and operations at the Department level are efficient and smooth running, if there is a comprehensive evaluation system in place to monitor the implementation and progress of programmes, and an interactive data base developed to serve as a decision support structure for the education system.
>
> To ensure the success of the Education Reforms, it is important that the necessary steps be taken to improve efficiency and effectiveness both at the Department and school levels, and that there is stricter accountability.".

What is lacking throughout all of these statements is that they leave out the Portfolio. If there is a lack of guidance at the top then you are going to find it trickling down through the whole system. There, in my view, is where the problem with education lies. For seven years it has deteriorated because of a lack of performance, efficiency and effectiveness from the Portfolio level. There is an acknowledgment in this that this has to be done. How is it going to be done? You cannot teach an old dog new tricks.

I would have like to have seen in this dealing with management specifically what is going to be done because from what I can read in this while I agree that some things will assist in that, I do not believe that it attacks the main problem in the system. At page 10:

> "It has been assumed that private schools would keep the same share of enrolments in each level. If, for any reason, they should develop more slowly, government schools would have to build additional classrooms and recruit additional teachers.".

Madam Speaker, for the Budget this coming year we found grants to private schools decreased. I had better check that, my facts may not be correct. If it was not decreased, it was not increased by very much.

What is important is that Government gives the support, not just in money but that Government involves the private schools in areas where there can once again be a linkage and team work within them and also that there is some support financially to a much larger extent than exists. When the Backbenchers had the Budget, we doubled the grants to schools, grants such as sports because we felt the importance of this.

I think that more stress, more co-operation and more help has to be given by the Member for Education to the private schools. I did an exercise about a year ago and it was amazing to see the cost of recurrent and capital expenditure on education per student by Government. The savings were considerable when a student went to the private school. It must be looked at as good economics, if nothing else, that they are encouraged. For example, if one of those schools with maybe, roughly, 300 or 350 students, is relieving Government of $500,000 recurrent expenditure and probably millions of dollars of capital expenditure it has to be in Government's interest to pay a small percentage of that to keep it going.

So it is one area in which I feel there needs to be more support. In fact, at page 12 of the Plan it says:

> "Based on a per pupil cost of 15,000 CI$ in primary and 18,000 CI$ in secondary schools, the total expenditure is estimated at 21.75 million CI$ (Low Immigration variant) and 34.25 million CI$ (High Immigration variant).".

So those figures alone would be dealing with capital cost and are tremendous. So I am saying support the private schools more, encourage them, assist them, try to get them to work more closely and Government to work more closely with each other. It has to be in the interest of education in the Islands.

The last main area I want to deal with is the cost. I preface this by saying that I think money can be spent on nothing better than education and solving the social problems of a community. But we have to bear in mind that what we are looking at here is a tremendous amount of money. Some of it has to be spent in any event and the Member knows, I do not think there has ever been a Government, or I hope there has not been, which has brought a request for reasonable expenditure for schools which has not been supported. The Backbench has always supported expenditure on schools.

We are now looking, because of the changes in the system, at a possibility of $34 million over the next five years in capital expenditure and $77 million in recurrent expenditure. So it is a large amount of money. What I would like to be satisfied on and this is where a Select Committee would come in is exactly where and details of the cost which makes up this huge sum. If it can be justified, I do not have a problem in approving a large sum for education provided it is not going to bankrupt Government any further. I believe that it would be negligent of myself and negligence of my duty to see that the public gets full value for its dollar, to sit here, and on the basis of two pages in this programme and a bit in the Review, to make an in principle decision on what is, in total over the next five years, some $110 million.

I know that some of this, as I said, has to be spent. A substantial amount of recurrent expenditure has to be spent but it is just not good enough to present something like this to the Legislature without details and then expect us blindly to add another $34 million onto an already over-stretched budget. Presumably it would have to be in loans and this would then put the loan Portfolio, in fact, up by about 30-odd per cent, close to $80 million.

With the increase in the recurrent expenditure and Government's incapability of producing sufficient local revenue to cover a reasonable amount of its capital, and all of its recurrent and statutory expenditure, I think we deserve details of this and we need to look at alternatives to see whether they could not be more cost efficient without reducing the standard that is necessary for the school and the high standard it should be at.

I realise that it is our children in these schools but I believe that if a dollar cn be saved it is equivalent to a dollar being made and the Government at this stage needs to save and it needs to make dollars. So they should be anxious to assist in this area. I believe it is somewhat presumptive and perhaps overambitious, the programme set out in Appendix II to the Plan. At the pace that the Member for Education has moved in the past he does not have a high hope of achieving this at that speed. If it is not implemented part by part then we are going to have a system which is lagging and things are going to get out of hand again.

As I said earlier, there is nothing in this that seems to me to be dealing with the problem of management even though there is a column called Management for Efficiency and Effectiveness which gives details of how we are going to deal with the major problem. In fact, the management here looks like it really just relates to management of these parts of the system which are brought in year by year.

So I cannot, in all good conscience at this stage, accede to a blanket acceptance of the Development Plan and of the Education Review, which are both integrally linked.

In summary I accept and have mentioned in there several of the major recommendations. I believe these documents have some very good parts in them, however, there are parts which I would like to look at closer and there are parts which I do not agree with and I would need to be convinced that the decision is right. Because of that I believe that if the Member tries to railroad this through the House, either through extremely long sittings, or sitting during holidays, or periods, or whatever, rather than putting it for a reasonable time to a Select Committee to study it, he is going to lose a lot of the support which he could have gotten and he is going to find that the task of implementing it is going to be a lot harder.

MOMENT OF INTERRUPTION - 4:30 P.M.
STANDING ORDER 10(2)

MADAM SPEAKER: Honourable Member it is now 4:30 p.m. Are you going to be...

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Sure.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER 10(2)

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Madam Speaker, in accordance with Standing Order 83, I move the suspension of Standing Order 10(2) to allow the debate to continue until 5:30 p.m.

MADAM SPEAKER: The question before the Honourable House is that Standing Order 10(2) do be suspended in order that the House may continue until 5:30 p.m. If there is no debate...The Second Elected Member for Bodden Town.

MR. G. HAIG BODDEN: Madam Speaker, I have to oppose the suspension of Standing Orders in this instance because it is impossible to finish the Business of the House simply by extending for one hour this evening and maybe one hour tomorrow evening. Several Members still have to debate this important motion and there are also three Private Members' Motions to come, and the Financial Secretary has his Finance Committee meeting which could well be tomorrow. We cannot possibly finish.

Another reason for opposing this is I can understand the reason for the Finance Committee meeting tomorrow so that the Financial Secretary will get his votes for this year concluded before 31st December and I agree with that. But in the case of the motion which we are dealing with now, the Member for Education has refused to let the Members know, even in a secret meeting which we held, his reason for wanting this done other than his policy that Executive Council must have its way.

Furthermore, we have come to the end of the year and we have to consider the staff of the Legislative Assembly, the Speaker, the Members, the staff, they are all civil servants and they should not be taken advantage of. It is true all of their money has been taken away by the Government this year but still they should be allowed some festive time with their families and we have just found ourselves with this motion in a bad position.

If the Government failed to plan or planned badly and did not get this important motion dealt with during the time which they had, it is their fault. We must remember that this year has had 365 days just the same as all of the other years and we cannot allow this Member who wants to have his way, have his way all of time, especially when we are dealing with something as important as the education of our children.

You know, Madam Speaker, that there is an amendment to this motion, which if carried, will put this motion to a Select Committee which will take many weeks and will call witnesses who may not be able to come over the holiday season. My suggestion to the First Official Member is that when we finish tomorrow at our regular time, that the House be adjourned either until 6th or 7th January....

MADAM SPEAKER: Honourable Member, we are now discussing the suspension of Standing Order 10(2) to go on until 5:30 p.m. so I do not think it is relevant what you intend to do tomorrow, please.

MR. G. HAIG BODDEN: All right. Thank you, Madam Speaker, for bringing me back on track but I must vehemently oppose this motion since nothing can be achieved. We will only get a little bit further into this debate and there is no conclusion in sight. And as nothing can be achieved by the suspension of this Standing Order, I will have to vote that the House adjourn now.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Second Elected Member for Cayman Brac & Little Cayman.

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I rise to, in effect, agree with what the Member for Bodden Town has said in terms of an objection to the suspension of Standing Orders to go on until 5:30 p.m. That has been done in many instances almost throughout the past two weeks. I think it is not helpful in terms of communicating what happens in the Legislature to the public because when debate goes on until 5:30 p.m. in the evening it brings it on radio way into 2:00 a.m. and past that in the mornings, so therefore it is not serving a purpose there.

I believe that the major part of our deliberations have been dealt with, mainly the Budget. This is a very, very significant Bill that is before the House and I think that the pressure

which is being created by extending the hours of the House here to debate this is bringing us nearer into Christmas Day when tempers and feelings about continuing will change and in that process this Bill will not get the attention, the depth and the detail that it deserves.

Madam Speaker, whether or not this Bill is passed, and I hope it is not passed outright as it is, this Bill needs full opportunity of debate by all Members and not under a situation of pressure that is being deliberately created here on the instigation of the Member for Education in requesting the extension to have this Bill debated further. Come Friday, if it suspended again, then come Monday we are into Christmas. It is not right for that to be done. I object to the suspension for the extension this afternoon.

MADAM SPEAKER: The First Elected Member for Bodden Town.

MR. ROY BODDEN: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I rise to add my vehement objection to the continuation of this debate. There was first a discussion as to the merits of continuing and when the Honourable Member piloting this motion through the House was asked by myself to give his reason of urgency so that we could consider it and try to comply and be co-operative, he gave a most contemptuous and disrespectful answer.

Madam Speaker, it makes little sense for us to continue as we are doing. The debate at this hour takes listeners takes listeners well into the early hours of the morning. No attention....

MADAM SPEAKER: Honourable Member, that point has already been made. Please do not have any repetition of what another Member has said.

MR. ROY BODDEN: Madam Speaker, thank you for your alertness. I contend that this is far too important an issue for us to run the 100-metre dash over. The Member knows the seriousness and the implications of this debate and it seems he is just trying to pull rank on the Backbenchers.

As a conscientious representative, I cannot support any hasty decision to push this important matter, this matter which is going to affect young Caymanians possibly for the next 30 to 40 years. I cannot be a part or party to any decision that is going to push this speedily, as that Member wishes, through this Parliament.

Madam Speaker, it would be an abnegation of my responsibility and posterity would not look kindly on anyone who is a party to that. If that Member has an overriding reason he should have told us, otherwise, I say we should adjourn...

MADAM SPEAKER: Honourable Member, the matter is the suspension of Standing Orders. Please confine your debate to that, if you would.

MR. ROY BODDEN: Madam Speaker, I have said my piece. Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: Thank you. Honourable Elected Member for Education, Environment, Recreation and Culture.

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Madam Speaker, I hope that I would be given two seconds to reply to some of the garbage that has been put forward on this motion.

MADAM SPEAKER: Excuse me, Honourable Member, I am going to have to disallow the word "garbage". It is occurring too frequently in this Parliament.

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Could I use "rubbish", Madam?

MADAM SPEAKER: No, I do think not that is proper either.

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Well, irrelevance...

MADAM SPEAKER: If you are referring what Members have said...

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Irrelevancies, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: That sounds better.

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: The point that I am making is the Member did ask in the Committee what was the urgency. I told him I would tell him on the Floor of this House because....

MR. ROY BODDEN: What?!!

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: ...and that I would have done so....

(Interjections)

MADAM SPEAKER: Order! Order!

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Madam Speaker, these were the words I used, "I will tell you in the House, I would do so here if you were responsible."

(Interjections)

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Madam Speaker, the Member has just proven more loudly and eloquently than I could ever do, how irresponsible he is. Government has acted responsibly during this meeting. Each time an item came up one Member spoke and each Member from the other side has deliberately, in my opinion, repeated himself.

Madam Speaker, I am prepared to vote on the motion.

MADAM SPEAKER: The First Elected Member for West Bay. Please speak to the motion for the suspension of Standing Order 10(2), Sir.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Sorry?

MADAM SPEAKER: Please speak to the motion for the suspension of Standing Order 10(2).

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Well, what is before the House, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: I am just asking you to keep it relevant.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Madam Speaker, I had no intention of speaking because I, too, need to get out of here. But, because of what has gone on, I do not think that I should just sit here and let it go by. The Member for Education, as usual, did not tell the whole story. He said he was not going to allow it for some reason or another, the same reason that we had. I do not know what that meant. That is what he said.

But the truth is that all of us have been discussing all day long the merits and demerits of closing at 4:30 p.m. today. All of Government accepted that we could close off at 4:30 p.m. and come back at another time convenient to Government and Madam Speaker. They wanted to sit.... Well, there are a lot of things which I do not think I should even mention.

All that I am saying is that they have not been honest in this whole thing with us for whatever reason. I believe there is a sinister reason behind it. If you remember, Madam Speaker, I kept my debate short on it.

MADAM SPEAKER: If no other Member wishes to debate, I shall put the question. The question before the Honourable House is that Standing Order 10(2) should be suspended to continue the Business of the House until 5:30 p.m.

QUESTION PUT: AYES & NOES

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: May we have a Division, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: Certainly.

DIVISION NO. 39/91

AYES: 7	NOES: 7
Hon. Thomas C. Jefferson	Mr. W. McKeeva Bush
Hon. Richard Ground	Mr. John D. Jefferson, Jr
Hon. J. Lemuel Hurlston	Mr. Truman M. Bodden
Hon. Norman Bodden	Mr. Gilbert A. McLean
Hon. Benson O. Ebanks	Mr. Roy Bodden
Hon. Ezzard Miller	Mr. G. Haig Bodden
Capt. Mabry S. Kirkconnell	Mr. John B. McLean

ABSENT
Hon. Linford A. Pierson

CASTING VOTE
Speaker cast her vote with the Noes to retain the status quo.

MADAM SPEAKER: The result of the Division is seven Ayes, seven Noes and in accordance with procedure to maintain the status quo, the Chair votes with the Noes which means that the House will take the adjournment motion.

NEGATIVED BY MAJORITY: **SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER 10(2) TO ENABLE THE HOUSE TO CONTINUE UNTIL 5:30 P.M. NEGATIVED BY MAJORITY.**

ADJOURNMENT

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Madam Speaker, we went round and round on this one as to what to do with tomorrow morning. I believe that the consensus on the Government side is that we not convene Finance Committee tomorrow morning but to continue this debate tomorrow. So I move the suspension until 10:00 o'clock tomorrow morning.

MADAM SPEAKER: The question before the House is that the House should now be adjourned until 10:00 o'clock tomorrow morning. I shall put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AYES & NOES

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Can I have a Division, please?

MADAM SPEAKER: You certainly may.

DIVISION NO. 40/91

AYES: 7	NOES: 7
Hon. Thomas C. Jefferson	Mr. W. McKeeva Bush *
Hon. Richard Ground	Mr. John D. Jefferson, Jr
Hon. J. Lemuel Hurlston	Mr. Truman M. Bodden
Hon. Norman Bodden	Mr. Gilbert A. McLean
Hon. Benson O. Ebanks	Mr. Roy Bodden
Hon. Ezzard Miller	Mr. G. Haig Bodden
Capt. Mabry S. Kirkconnell	Mr. John B. McLean

ABSENT
Hon. Linford A. Pierson

CASTING VOTE
Speaker cast her vote with the Noes to retain the status quo.

**Madam Speaker, my no goes to not meeting tomorrow morning for the House in Session but rather to meet as Finance Committee as we had agreed. Thank you.*

MADAM SPEAKER: In accordance with procedure we had agreed that Finance Committee would be held at 9:30 a.m. and the Chair votes for the Noes.

NEGATIVED BY MAJORITY: **THAT THE HOUSE DO STAND ADJOURNED UNTIL 10:00 A.M., FRIDAY, 20TH DECEMBER, 1991.**

MADAM SPEAKER: In effect, that means that Finance Committee will be meeting at 9:30 a.m. and I would hope that all Members would be prepared after the meeting if there is time, to continue the Sitting of the House.

The House will be adjourned and Finance Committee will meet at 9:30 a.m. tomorrow morning.

AT 4:48 P.M. THE HOUSE ACCORDINGLY STOOD ADJOURNED UNTIL THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE STANDING FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING, COMMENCING AT 9:30 A.M., FRIDAY, 20TH DECEMBER, 1991.

FRIDAY
20TH DECEMBER, 1991
4:05 P.M.

MADAM SPEAKER: Prayers by the First Elected Member for Cayman Brac and Little Cayman.

PRAYERS

CAPT. MABRY S. KIRKCONNELL: 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 II, 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 Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, the Members of Executive Council and Members of the Legislative Assembly that we may be enabled faithfully to perform the responsible duties of our high office.

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

Let us say the Lord's prayer together:

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 the light of His countenance upon us and give us peace now and always. Amen.

MADAM SPEAKER: Please be seated. Proceedings are resumed in the Legislative Assembly. We will continue with Government Business, Motions. Government Motion No. 11/91, Draft Five Year Education Development Plan 1991-1996. The Third Elected Member for George Town continuing the debate.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

GOVERNMENT MOTION NO. 11/91
DRAFT FIVE YEAR EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT PLAN 1991 - 1996

(Continuation of debate thereon)

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Thank you, Madam Speaker. There are a few other areas which I would like to mention before winding up my debate. In the Education Review at page 107 it states:

> "3.19.8 Major reform requires that the curriculum in all grades (or classes) at all levels be conceived in terms of broad areas. One approach is to identify five areas as follows:
>
> (i) Basic skills (Language, arts, mathematics)
> (ii) Caymanian Studies (Art, music, games, drama, community activities)
> (iii) Life skills (Family-life education, social studies, health education)
> (iv) Work Oriented Studies (Agriculture, Art and Craft, Housecraft)
> (v) Science-Technology (Integrated science, computer awareness and second language).".

They go on to show the structure and shape of the curriculum, setting out the hours that will be spent on those specific areas. This is once again a very broad and sweeping, but as it says here, major reform. It is one that I think has to be looked at carefully because it is inconceivable that the education system could have reached such a stage where just about everything in it has to be subject to major reform. It has obviously been left to degenerate to a state where even the curriculum at this stage seems to be out of touch and something that is not promoting good education.

In this specific area I would have liked to have had proper input from people who have worked the old curriculum and really find out why because throughout all of this nothing in many of these instances, has been said as to why there should be this major reform. After looking at areas of it, I am coming to believe that there are sections in this Report that are being changed for the sake of change. Someone is trying to put their stamp on education forgetting that this is dealing with the lives of our children. Children, emotionally, at all ages through the young up should never be subjected to a lot of radical changes at one time. This specific area is one that worries me. I do not know and I have not been satisfied as to why there is this feeling that there has to be major reform here.

A lot has been set out. For example, it says:

> "Thus the curriculum should feature much more practical encounter with the wider community in order to:
>
> (i) eliminate irrelevant materials that clutter up syllabuses of the schools; [What irrelevant materials?]
> (ii) Link school curriculum very strongly to how the community works, plays, feeds, clothes and shelters itself;".

This is a continuing process that should have been done over the seven years that the Member for Education lay sleeping in the Portfolio. Now at the eighth hour in the eighth year we are finding this major reform in all areas, literally, of the schools coming there.

One important aspect that it has mentioned is that the curriculum should "reduce problems of discipline among pupils for whom school has little meaning." How many pupils in school fall into that bracket? These are serious and deep founded problems that this is seeking to correct. In some instances perhaps it is correct what they are doing but without the detail and really without a plan because the Five Year Education Development Plan is really one of the smallest documents that I have even seen which deals with such wide-sweeping, expensive changes. This is where the problem of trying to come to grips with a document like this comes from.

There are two areas in this, the Plan itself, that have been touched on, by the way. At page 11 it states: "Finally, it has to be kept in mind that the global subsidy to private schools should increase proportionately to their enrolments, which would raise it to 330,000 and 385,000 CI$ respectively, depending upon the variant.". Madam Speaker, it would have been good to have seen how the reasoning for those figures, that small amount, has come about. As I see it, Government is hoping to unload a substantial part of compulsory education onto the private sector and I believe that they are trying to do it without paying for it.

Another area that I was able to look at during the break clearly brings another area forward where there has been concern expressed. While the experts have said that many of the physical facilities and buildings in the schools are good, if we look at page 16, Appendix I which is the Budget Allocation to Education, we find that in 1983 and 1984, 15 per cent of the budget was for education. But this has dwindled over the years to a low of 12.61 per cent in 1989, 13.2 per cent in 1990 and 1991. So what seems to be happening is that less emphasis is placed on expenditure in education. This has probably been the result, where we have had instances that schools do not have the necessary supplies and equipment and as we know the Member for Education, in his own district, had children in the Town Hall in a holding situation for several terms, all through, I think, a lack of planning and also a serious reduction in the percentage of revenue which is going to education.

The money is going to other pet projects be they the Jennett "L" or the Hospital on two sites, or whereever. I think the Government has to get back its sense of direction and along with talking about supporting education, it must put its money where its mouth is. I can find nothing in Appendix II to the Plan, which sets out the Recommended Schedule of Main Programme Components, that shows anything there which is going to be either urgent or important to be fulfilled within a critical time in the first year of this programme.

In fact, other than having to make a decision on External Examination Boards who are invited to "sell their service", which I thought was a very unusual way of putting it. There seems to be none of the urgency which the Member seems to have dreamed up in relation to this motion. If this is not properly studied in the few areas which I have touched on, some are good, some are very worrying and I think some are just simply bad, then the country is going to be the worse off for it.

I would like to quote from today's *Caymanian Compass* newspaper at page four, I would just like to read a few short paragraphs of the Editorial. It has in it a considerable amount of wisdom and hope, hope which unfortunately when it comes to the Member for Education is a pious hope because I do not think that anything seems to change his mind once it is in a situation where he feels Executive Council must have his way. This article is headed "Flexibility in Planning." It says:

> "During the current Assembly debate on the future of education in these Islands, at least one member has suggested that the proposed five year plan should be flexible enough to incorporate suggestions made in the House.
>
> It does indeed make sense that the plan be flexible, both to incorporate comments and suggestions made now, but also to allow for adjustments during the five years of its proposed implementation.
>
> The plan as it stands incorporates some new concepts and substantial departures from present practices in a number of areas.
>
> In that context, it will have to be possible to make adjustments in accordance with experiences made in the introduction of these new concepts in the system.".

It goes on to talk about referring to a Select Committee which I will not read now. I will hold off on that until a later stage when that arises. It is around the aspect of flexibility that I believe the key to having a plan that is workable and acceptable, not only to the professionals in teaching but to the

Cayman Islands, is important.

What we are seeing here today and I will bet what will be the final results of this is that what was drawn up by the team of four or five people - because part of the time one was off the Island - many months ago, the 63 recommendations, has gone out to the public, apparently. I do not believe that the public has accepted all 63 recommendations. It is going to come to this House, as it now is and we know that the Executive Council Members must vote for this motion and it is going to pass, or probably pass through this House without any amendments. That is nearly as absurd as realising that this Honourable House at times is run and controlled by one vote. It finally reaches a stage where if there can be no flexibility in the plan itself then I believe that the rigidity that is built into the approach to it is going to be in the plan. It is then going to be carried out to the letter regardless of whether it is good or bad mainly because it may be a political embarrassment to the Member for Education to humble himself enough to change the recommendations that may not be right.

Everyone else seems to see the reasoning. Everyone else seems to see areas where there is some give and take but when it comes to the Member for Health and the Member for Education they must have their way, as they are doing in this instance. That is the reason why they have had so much difficulty, I should say the Member for Health in that instance, in trying to implement what the people do not want. If there is one thing that a politician should learn at an early age it is that you represent the people and you must give the people what they want. When they do not want it, you may get away with it some of the time but you will not get away with it all of the time. Sometimes one may have to wait until the four year election period is up but it all comes back home in due course.

I do not think that attempting to go any further into the specific areas, which I have carefully indexed and annotated throughout, is really going to constructively take me or this House any further at this stage. I would like now to turn to summing up and finalising the position as I see it. What we have here is firstly an extremely heavy expenditure of money. I want to follow that by saying that I believe that money cannot be spent in a better area than educating our children but I think there has to be some reason to this and when we are asked to approve, in principle, amounts which, with recurrent and capital expenditure, total approximately $110 million, there should be the same in-depth look at it as we do on the smaller expenditures which come up and as we dealt with today.

While there was $7.5 million in Finance Committee a lot of them were very small amounts, some of them only hundreds of dollars, but there has to be some accountability. It is not good enough to approve the Plan in principle, move on with it and then come back to this Honourable House and say, "I have started building schools, I have started employing people, I have started doing all of these things because you have approved it in principle and now we have to look at it." I am also wondering what has happened to this Public Sector Investment Committee? Have they looked at these large sums of money? As I see it the Honourable Financial Secretary is providing good machinery in Government, be it the Central Tenders Committee, or this Committee which looks at investment, but nobody seems to want to use it because they are afraid that the results of what is in the interest of the public to get value for money, is not going to be in the interest of the Members.

So we have here an approval in principle for implementation and I think this is where the crucial part of this comes in. This is now being approved for implementation and it must be accepted that we are now approving in principle a commitment over the next five years of $110 million on the High Immigrant variant. Even on the Low Immigrant variant we are looking at $92 million for a country which at present has been having a deteriorating financial position. I believe that a large amount of this expenditure is arising because of radical changes which could either wait, or which should only come at a later stage.

I am not prepared to vote in favour of this even through I want to make it abundantly clear that there are areas in this Plan and in the Review that I do accept. But because of the railroading which is being done on it, it is forcing Members to either accept all or reject all. I think that it is sad when the Member reaches that low an ebb in his approach to such an important matter. I dealt also with what is the most worrying thing in this and quite frankly, I could have stated that unless this problem of a lack of communication and a lack of understanding and continuity between the schools, the Department of Education and the Member for Education is solved, then most of the other recommendations would be impossible to fulfill.

One of the many things of the present system which have been criticised in a critical way has been the fact that the new system is going to simplify education because we will have a Primary School and a High School. Yet set out, both in the Five Year Development Plan and in the Review, are very clearly four stages. Both of those documents set that out. There is the Pre-School, the Primary School, the High School and the "A" levels are done at the Community College.

However, throughout it is clearly stated that there has to be continuity and linkage between all of them. It is just not good enough for the Member for Education to continue to shut his eyes to this problem, a problem which exists not only in the Education Portfolio but also with the Member for Health, who we know obviously does not get on with most staff, or accept the advice of many staff....

MADAM SPEAKER: Honourable Member, would you please keep your debate relevant? I have been observing Members with a tendency of "summing up". Now summing up, in the opinion of the Chair, should be confined to lecturers who are lecturing on a particular subject and they want to impress on their students point A, B, and C. But in a debate you should make your point. Please do not repeat it because we have dealt with communication, we have dealt with continuity and linkage and in your previous debate you read a couple sections of the Report on that. Please do not repeat yourself and be relevant. The reference to the Honourable Member for Health has no relevance at all with the Education Plan. Thank you.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Thank you, very much.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Second Elected Member for Bodden Town.

MOMENT OF INTERRUPTION - 4:33 P.M.
STANDING ORDER 10(2)

MR. G. HAIG BODDEN: Madam Speaker, I notice that 4:30 p.m. has passed. I do not know if we are going to have the usual suspension, or what before I begin?

MADAM SPEAKER: Perhaps in the interest of everything being correct, let us ask for the suspension of Standing Orders, if you would First Official Member.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER 10(2)

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Madam Speaker, in accordance with Standing Order 83, I move the suspension of Standing Order 10(2) to allow the debate to continue until 6:00 p.m. this afternoon.

MADAM SPEAKER: The question before the Honourable House is that Standing Order 10(2) be suspended in order that the House should continue its Business until 6:00 p.m. The Second Elected Member for Bodden Town.

MR. G. HAIG BODDEN: Madam Speaker, I have to oppose the suspension of this Standing Order on the grounds that the entire Government Bench seems to have become obsessed with their own deficiencies in managing the affairs of this country and in getting the important Business of Government before the House in sufficient time to finish before the Christmas recess, which is upon us.

As there are several Members left to debate this subject and as there are many other items of Business, Private Members' Motions and other Reports to be laid on the Table, it seems physically impossible to finish the work of the House before the holiday season. I strenuously oppose this motion for suspension and although I sympathise with the Member for Education, I cannot stand by idly and let him have his way as he always like to do.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Third Elected Member for West Bay.

MR. JOHN D. JEFFERSON, JR.: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I rise to oppose the suspension in order for the House to go on. I feel in the interest of all Members here that some amount of reasonableness has to be exercised. When I say that I am referring to the Member for Education. It is Christmas and regardless of whether or not we stay here until 6:00 p.m. this afternoon or 7:00 p.m. tomorrow afternoon, this issue is not going to be dealt with and completed before Christmas. So I see no reason why we cannot suspend or adjourn the House and set a later date which is more practical and acceptable to all Members. So I oppose the suspension.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Third Elected Member for George Town.

MR. TRUMAN M. BODDEN: Thank you. It seems to me that what is happening with these continuous extensions and waiving of Standing Orders is that the House and the people in here, who, all of us are only human, are really degenerating mentally and physically. We sit here for long hours and quite frankly, without any insult to anyone, Members in this House are really sitting there, when we get to these late hours, basically half asleep. I mean all of us. What I am saying is that common sense has to prevail at some time because we have a major debate going on and while the Member for Education feels he must have his way, he should have his way another day because time is running on and Christmas is coming upon us. We all have families that we need to get to and to sit here again this evening until 6:00 p.m. seems to me more like torture than really trying to be constructive and productive.

I would hope that this would not continue because I do not think that it is in the interest of good debate, or good temper, or anything else in this House. I am sorry but I am not going to support it.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Elected Member for Education.

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Madam Speaker, I suggest you put the vote. We agreed earlier to go on. The only difference is that the motion is from 5:30 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. Similarly, I think we delayed coming back. I think the Third Elected Member for West Bay has a lot of gall coming into the Chamber for the first time today and then objecting to sitting for one hour.

MADAM SPEAKER: The First Elected Member for West Bay.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, just let me say if this House wants to sit tomorrow, Sunday, Monday and Tuesday, I will be here but that does not say anything for the other people. Sitting here until 5:30 p.m. is one thing but sitting here until 6:00 p.m. is another matter on a Friday evening and we must take into consideration that the House does not function just within this Chamber.

The House functions by other factors and we have to take into

consideration those members of the staff, the clerks who have young children and that sort of thing, who need to get home. It is, as I said, one thing to talk about 5:30 p.m. as we have agreed and another to come back now and suggest 6:00 p.m. I would like to say that the Third Elected Member for West Bay had a matter that he had to take care of, constituents and otherwise, which took all day. The House did not start until this afternoon. The Members were in Finance Committee all day.

Madam Speaker, I cannot support this.

MADAM SPEAKER: Honourable First Official Member when we discussed this, this afternoon, we did say we would go on until 5:30 p.m. I would ask that you amend your motion to 5:30 p.m. We want to keep everybody's tempers and everything else under control, please.

AMENDMENT MOTION TO SUSPEND STANDING ORDER 10(2)

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Madam Speaker, it is not my temper that I am worried about. I will move anything the Members wish. If we want to stay here until midnight, I will stay with you. If you want to leave at 5:30 p.m. or 4:30 p.m., I will go too. I have no objection to moving the amended motion to 5:30 p.m.

MADAM SPEAKER: Well, since this is what we agreed upon originally, I will put the question: Those in favour of the suspension of Standing Order 10(2) to allow the House to continue until 5:30 p.m.

AGREED. STANDING ORDER 10(2) SUSPENDED TO ENABLE THE HOUSE TO CONTINUE UNTIL 5:30 P.M.

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON GOVERNMENT MOTION NO. 11/91:

MADAM SPEAKER: The debate will continue. The Second Elected Member for Bodden Town.

MR. G. HAIG BODDEN: Madam Speaker, the events surrounding the presentation of this motion leaves great doubts in my mind not only about the motion but whether the Member should continue as our Member for Education. His actions in the presentation of this motion clearly seek to deny the people of this country the ample opportunity they need to hear this debate and to digest the 63 recommendations in it. He seems in a hurry to get through this, a hurry which was absent over the last seven years. He has swallowed the entire Report and has again become a victim of the creeping commercialisation of consultants, those consultants which have led to a sonic boom in the advice industry in this country.

It is my opinion that if this advice explosion continues, Cayman will become a country of sheep-like "advisees" hooked on direction by consultants, traumatised by the admonitions of moralisers, cowed by the expertise of specialists and bulldozed by the authority of pundits. We should not let advice on any subject particularly one as important as education, obliterate the good advice that is already available in these Islands. What the Members of Government are afraid of is to spread all of the advice that they have on the Table of a Select Committee and see what is best for the country. What is important is that the Government should pick out the advice that best helps the educational problems of this country. It is very unlikely, seeing the attitude of the Member and his supporters, that the Government will take this extraordinary and sensible approach.

Look before you leap is advice they could well take. It is a pity they did not follow that advice with the other major projects which they tackled. Now, as they did with the airline and the Hospital, they are about to leap into the dark of this unknown and unfathomed area, and to make the same blunders and mistakes that are carrying this country downwards. Dennis Healy said that the first law of holes is that when you are in a hole you should stop digging but the Member for Education does not seem to be able to stop digging and he gets deeper and deeper as the hours grow later and later. If he believes that he can wear out the Backbench, he has a real shock coming because thank goodness from the oldest right down to the youngest we are all in top physical condition.

On page 164 of this Report the consultants tried to warn the Member against the mistake that he is now making. The very action which he is now committing had been pointed out by the consultants and he had been warned in no uncertain terms not to do what he is doing.

> "This review clearly recognises that:
>
> 1. pervasive changes in the school system of the Cayman Islands would be attempted and are expected to be set in motion in a relatively short time of 3 or 4 years.
>
> 2. the infrastructure to manage and control the changes is presently insufficient....".

The consultants tried to warn the Member against hasty action, against his pre-election syndrome which is just as dangerous as the premenstrual blues. The consultants told him not to act hastily because the country, in the different areas to cope with this change, is insufficient. They outlined them under number 2, "availability of number of administrative staff."

We heard the Member say that he needs to get this done because there is one person he has to hire and because that man might not be available by 1st January. He had better not get that man if he is that important. What is going to happen if that man should die tonight, or had he

died last night? No man is indispensable. He may be a good man but I will bet you there are 100 other ones out there just as good, perhaps even better. But we do not know why he has to hire this particular man out of the millions of professionals, we do not know.

The consultants say "trained personnel within the department to give leadership in curriculum development, pupil assessment, and materials production" are insufficient. Yet, the Member ties to make the world believe that this debate must finish by Christmas Eve or the heavens will fall. The consultants go on in their attempt to warn him but as the Third Elected Member for George Town said that is a pious hope, he will not be warned. They warn him that there is an insufficiency of "decision-making rules that should be established between the Portfolio, the Department and the Schools." I think the consultants were being very, very kind to him by saying there is an insufficiency.

I believe there is a total lack. We heard the Third Elected Member for George Town outline how over the last seven years the Member has slept like Rip van Winkle. He has been asleep. The consultants go on to say: "In particular, the reorganisation of the school system into primary and secondary, the introduction of a curriculum development unit, the use of flexible and relevant assessment techniques, and a redefinition of classroom teaching will result, in what educational planners call, a major disequilibrium.". Total chaos! The consultants predict there will be total chaos if the Member takes hasty action but he is hell-bent on galloping and he does not care whether he destroys the system. He knows he is finished as a politician. His days of being the Member for Education are finished but if he can take his one vote and change the system and create havoc, he will do it. For seven years he showed no interest at all.

The consultants go on in their noble attempt on page 164 this warn this stubborn Member: "A principal task of the Education Review is to enable the education system to accommodate and assimilate the changes...." [Notice those words, the choice of those words, not something that is done hastily.] "...accommodate and assimilate the changes within a structure that would enable the education system to continue growing and evolving.". This is what the consultants want. You heard my learned friend from Bodden Town explain it in his erudite fashion about the flexibility that is needed in this Plan. The same thing the consultants say, the same words repeated by the Third Elected Member for George Town. I do not know if either one of them paid much attention to this page but certainly they are on the right track because this is what the consultants say. They did not say destroy the system. They said let the system continue to grow and evolve. This Member is out to destroy the system and he is destroying it by his hasty action. I call upon him to stop his madness and to send this Report to a Select Committee in January, February or March of next year when people can be called in.

The consultants tell him that he must take advantage of the situation which he has to do what needs to be done. As I lack the words to express what they have said, I will read their exact words. "In other words, to use the disequilibrium as the motive power for achieving harmony, balance and consistency at a higher level of productivity.". God bless the consultants. I am sure the Member did not read this page of the Report. I must tell you that when I read this Report the first time I did not take much note of this page but I marked one word on it at that time and on a second reading of the page, I looked at the word "constraints" which had arrested my attention and I made a careful study.

The consultants say: " - becoming aware of what factors may be considered as constraints and of how the constraints operate.". This is what alarmed me. The consultants know that to do what they are doing there will be areas in which we will have to tread softly. There will be areas in which there will be financial constraints, professional constraints, there may even be policy constraints but these have to be studied. I am not attempting to read the entire page but I will deal with one more line on this page: " - monitoring all processes that compel changes to be socially valued, culturally controlled and economically driven.".

If the Financial Secretary's Budget Debate had not been presented last month, I would have said the consultants had stolen a line from that Report because they speak about the processes that compel changes which are controlled and economically driven. Yet we hear the Member get up and tell us about building four High Schools and that they are going to have 500 or less children in them. I assume this to mean that when they reach a capacity of 500 he will build a few more High Schools. This is because he only had a superficial look at a table in this Report and did not study the impact of changes that are economically driven. I will be dealing with this area later on after I have concluded my opening remarks.

The First Elected Member for Bodden Town spoke in eloquent terms about the social and cultural effects these changes would have. He spoke about the segregation and the isolation. Although he probably knew all about this from having a Masters in Education, it is printed right here in this Report that these are some of the most important factors in this Report. It is not that the Member can get his Report passed by 31st December, not that he can get his pet project, like the other three Members have gotten their pet projects.

The Report speaks of fundamental changes that have to be made. On the next page, page 165, it is said: "the Chief Education Officer would need to find increasing ways to enlarge the involvement and activity of colleagues across the educational spectrum. In periods of change, people act purposefully when there is free and easy flow of information.". How are we going to have free and easy flow of information with that Member? We had to drag it out of him. We had to almost beat it out of him to find out why he wants to go on, on Old Year's Eve with this important meeting which should be held in the calm and the quiet of the New Year.

We believe on the Backbench that is, the Members who have spoken, that there are many good recommendations in this Report. We also believe strongly that there are some recommendations which should be discarded, there are some recommendations that should be modified. I do not believe my short four hours will allow me to deal individually with the 63 recommendations but I will attempt that on Monday, if I can.

Many parents have spoken to me about this Report. These are parents that either read the Report or attended some of the meetings, or read some of the little information that was in the newspaper. But these are parents who are concerned about their children and they raised concerns about some of the changes which are being made. For example, after a number of years the "A" Level students will be doing their "A" Levels at the Community College rather than at the High School. Many people feel this is wrong. What is going to happen is that a lot of children and this has been the history of education over the years, many children do not realise why they are going to school until they are almost ready to leave. Some of the most intense studies take place in those final years.

If we follow this Report in its entirety we will be taking these children of 16+ out of the High School and sending them to the Community College where they will have a cultural shock, an adjustment to a more adult environment. We know that children of that age usually have strong attachments to their teachers and at the time when they are beginning to get along well and beginning to enjoy their studies we are going to uproot them and send them out into the fourth section of this system.

If one looks at page 70 at Recommendation 41, one will see: "At the completion of formal schooling it is proposed that there should be the opportunity for all students in the age range 16-19 years to attend full time or part time courses of further education, organised by the Community College, to replace courses currently offered by the sixth form of the Cayman Islands High School, as well as a wide range of courses of a personal and vocational nature.". So what is going to happening is that when the changes are complete the sixth form as we know it will be transferred to the Community College.

The main thrust of this Report is to do away with the Middle School. The Third Elected Member for George Town dealt at length with the political history and there is no need for repetition of that but the whole Island knows that the present Member for Education has been against the Middle School from its inception and as a result he did with the Middle School, over the last seven years, what the Member for Health did with the Hospital and the Member for Communications and Works did with the roads.

They did not spend the money for the renovation of the Hospital, they did not fix the pot holes in George Town, in their hopes that they could justify the brand new systems. Maybe later I will read the exact section of the Report which shows that the Middle School, while it had done very good work at its inception, had been allowed under the membership of the now Member, to grow into a separate entity disjointed from the system not molding the children to flow into the High School.

I also feel that it is wrong to do away the reception classes. This is where I think we need to talk to parents who have these small children. This is where we need to talk to the Primary School teachers and perhaps the Pre-school teachers. This is where putting this motion into a Select Committee would allow the Members to hear firsthand the reaction of the people directly involved. My feeling on the reception classes is that we are dealing with very young children. If they are sent to a reception class in the Primary School of which they will later be a pupil, by the time they enter the School itself they will be familiar with the older children, with the teachers, with the system and they will be at home.

If you send them to an outside pre-school, they have one cultural shock leaving the comfort of their home and going to pre-school, then after a couple years these young children, three years of age or whatever, are uprooted again and jolted along into what may be a hostile environment for these very young children. These are things that we as Legislators need to discuss with people who know because the Member has no knowledge and it is apparent that he has not read the Report or he would not be acting in this hasty fashion.

Now we are told that we have to get rid of the Middle School because the Middle School does not let the children flow into the High School. In fact, if what the paper reported that the Member said was true, he is supposed to have said in his debate that the Middle School has no place in this system. Yet, they are going to take a child from the Primary School, this was a point made by the First Elected Member for West Bay, a child of 10 years and send him into the High School without the benefit of passing through the Middle School where he will mix with children much more developed and more adult. We know that the years 10, 11 and 12, the pre-teen years, are the years when these young children's minds are formed for good or evil, the time when they are most impressed by the behaviour of other people.

We are talking about these children who this Member is now going to take and hurl from the Primary School into the High School because someone who read some book told him it was a good thing to do, without any attempt to discuss this in a Select Committee with the parents, teachers, or social workers. He is doing an injustice to the youth of this country. I should say he is continuing to perpetuate what he has carried on for seven years. I believe that these pre-teen age years are the most important in the formative years of a child's life.

The First Elected Member for Bodden Town spoke about the four High Schools which the Member is going to create. We know they like construction and we know they like to give out contracts to their friends. If I listen correctly I think I heard five High Schools because he said at one time there might even be one in West Bay and we know there are going to be two in George Town and one in Cayman Brac and he has promised one for Bodden Town and I will deal with that later.

But the cost.... It does not matter if you have four, if you have three or if you have five, the cost is multiplied that many times. Let us say he would only have four, the one in West Bay will just be a promise for now, let us say he will have four, it is just like his two site Hospital because I do not believe that is one man's idea. Four schools will mean four Headmasters, equipment for four schools, transportation to four different areas of the Island and I could go on and on.

To quiet the fears of the public the only opening statement which I recall from the disjointed presentation that he made was that the cost should not frighten anyone. Imagine that! Seventy-four million dollars for recurrent expenditure. This is what this Report asks us to approve. Thirty-odd

million dollars for capital works. Over $100 million and the Member for Education makes a statement that the expenditure should not frighten anyone because he has been taking 14 per cent of the revenue anyhow. It will frighten the public if the Government's policies do not change.

MADAM SPEAKER: It is now 5:30 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Madam Speaker, I hope I get it right this time. I move the adjournment of this Honourable House until 9:00 o'clock, Monday morning.

MADAM SPEAKER: The question is that this Honourable House do now adjourn until 9:00 o'clock, Monday morning. The First Elected Member for West Bay.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Madam Speaker, I am rising to enquire about what is the way forward as far as the Business of the House is concerned, as far as the Order Paper is concerned?

MADAM SPEAKER: I should hope it is the intention that the Business on the Order Paper be completed as quickly as possible.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Bearing in mind that we have the Public Accounts Committee Report to lay Monday morning, that would be added then.

MADAM SPEAKER: What does the First Official Member have to say on that?

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Madam Speaker, I think the Order Paper for Monday morning should include the presentation of the Public Accounts Committee Report as well as the Report from Finance Committee and the Report of the Standing Business Committee.

MADAM SPEAKER: Fine, if that is agreeable to Members. I shall put the question that the House do now adjourn until 9:00 o'clock on Monday morning. I shall put the question. Those in favour please say Aye...Those against No.

AYES.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Ayes have it. The House is accordingly adjourned until Monday morning at 10 o'clock.

AT 5:30 P.M. THE HOUSE STOOD ADJOURNED UNTIL 9:00 A.M., MONDAY, 23RD DECEMBER, 1991.

MONDAY
23RD DECEMBER, 1991
9:28 A.M.

MADAM SPEAKER: Prayers by the Honourable Member for Communication, Works and Agriculture.

PRAYERS

HON. LINFORD A. PIERSON: Let us Pray.

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

Bless our Sovereign Lady Queen Elizabeth II, 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 Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, the Members of Executive Council and Members of the Legislative Assembly that we may be enabled faithfully to perform the responsible duties of our high office.

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

Let us say the Lord's prayer together:

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 the light of His countenance upon us and give us peace now and always. Amen.

MADAM SPEAKER: Please be seated. Proceedings are resumed in the Legislative Assembly.

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, 1990. The Honourable First Official Member.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS AND REPORTS

REPORT OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL ON THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS OF THE CAYMAN ISLANDS GOVERNMENT FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31ST DECEMBER, 1990

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Madam Speaker, I beg to lay on the Table of this Honourable House the Report of the Auditor General on the Financial Statement of the Government of the Cayman Islands for the year ended 31st December, 1990.

MADAM SPEAKER: So ordered.

REPORT OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE ON THE REPORT OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL ON THE AUDITED ACCOUNTS OF THE CAYMAN ISLANDS GOVERNMENT FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31ST DECEMBER, 1990

MADAM SPEAKER: Report of the Public Accounts Committee on the Report of the Auditor General on the Audited Accounts of the Cayman Islands Government for the year ended 31st December, 1990. The First Elected Member for Bodden Town, Chairman of the Committee.

MR. ROY BODDEN: Madam Speaker, I beg to lay on the Table of this Honourable House the Report of the Standing Public Accounts Committee on the Report of the Auditor General on the Financial Statements of the Government of the Cayman Islands for the year ended 31st December, 1990.

MADAM SPEAKER: So ordered.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER 72(5)

MADAM SPEAKER: Suspension of Standing Order 72(5) by the Leader of Government Business.

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Madam Speaker, in accordance with Standing Order 83, and on behalf of the Finance Committee I move the suspension of Standing Order 72(5) to allow the Report of Finance Committee to be laid on the Table without the Minutes.

MADAM SPEAKER: May I ask the House to revert to the Report of the Public Accounts Committee. I was waiting for the Honourable Member to speak on the Report, which he may do so now.

MR. ROY BODDEN: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am suffering from a spate of temporary absentmindedness. In the interest of brevity may I seek your permission to begin with section 6, of the Report, which deals with the Programme of Hearings, omitting the proceeding five sections which deal with the reference etcetera, the formalities and the laying out of the Committee which we have read numerous times before?

MADAM SPEAKER: Yes, you may, please proceed.

MR. ROY BODDEN: Thank you, Ma'am.

PROGRAMME OF HEARINGS:-- In exercise of our duties, we, your Committee, in our preparatory work, duly considered the following documents before reaching a constructive programme of hearings:

- The 1990 Public Accounts Committee Report on the 1989 accounts;

- The 1990 Government Minutes on the Public Accounts Committee;

- The Auditor General's Report on the 1990 Accounts; and

- The Report and Accounts of Government for the year ended 1990.

Your Committee subsequently arrived at the following programme and plan for its meetings:--

1. That the Committee would hold its meetings in a public forum;

2. That the proceedings would be recorded and the Minutes would be produced verbatim;

3. That the Committee will meet to consider the various aspects of the Auditor General's Report and in so doing, would call certain Controlling Officers as Witnesses at the meetings. The Controlling Officers called are as listed in Item 10 below.

MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

Your Committee held two meetings, namely the first on Wednesday, 30th of October, 1991; and the second on Thursday, the 31st of October, 1991.

STANDING ORDER 74(8)

In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 74(8) the following Civil Servants attended all Hearings with witnesses:

Mr Nicholas Treen - Auditor General
Mr Woodward Terry - Deputy Financial Secretary (Administration)
Mr Roger Bicknell - Accountant General

In attendance with the Auditor General were:

Mr Paul Hurlston - Audit Manager
Mrs Debbie Welcome - Audit Manager
Miss Gwendolyn McDermott - Senior Auditor

In attendance with the Accountant General was:

Mrs Sonia McLaughlin - Chief Accountant of the Treasury Department

WITNESS HEARINGS

Your Committee heard witnesses on the 30th and 31st of October, 1991. Notice in writing to all

persons called was initially sent from the Clerk's Office on the 18th October, and on the 21st October, 1991, because it was necessary to reschedule our meetings.

LIST OF WITNESSES IN ATTENDANCE

The following persons appeared before your Committee:

Mr Kearney Gomez - Principle Secretary for Communications, Works & Agriculture
Miss Corrine Glasgow - Secretary of the Public Service Commission
Mr Peter Gough - Director of Management Services
Mr Donovon Ebanks - Chief Engineer of Public Works Department
Mrs Joy Basdeo - Principle Secretary for Health & Social Services
Dr Bernard Martin-Smith - Chief Medical Officer
Mr Mervyn Connolly - Hospital Administrator
Mr Allan McNaughton - Chief Marine Surveyor
Mr Delano Solomon - Registrar of Companies
Mr Dennis Marsden - Director of Prison
Mr Walling Whittaker - Chief Environmental Health Officer
Mr Harding Watler - Principal Secretary for Tourism, Aviation & Trade
Mr Carson Ebanks - Director of Planning
Mr Woodward Terry - Deputy Financial Secretary
Mr Roger Bicknell - Accountant General

EVIDENCE IN WRITING

Because of the limited time available to the Committee, questions prepared by Members of the Committee were forwarded to:--

Hon J Lemuel Hurlston - Administrative Secretary;
Mr Roger Bicknell- Accountant General;
Mr Woodward Terry - Deputy Financial Secretary (Administration);
Mr Richard Beswick - Director of the Water Authority;
Mr Sheldon Hislop - Director of the Civil Aviation Authority;
Dr John Davies - Director, Mosquito Research Control Unit; and
Mr Sam Basdeo - Principal of the Community College of the Cayman Islands

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

General Reserve Fund

i) The Government has told the Committee that the General Reserve is established under Section 29(1) of the Public Finance and Audit Law, 1985. However, the Committee is not aware that the Legislative Assembly has passed such a Resolution under the Public Finance and Audit Law. It was told that the Finance Committee, acting on behalf of the Legislative Assembly, has authorised the Funds's existence. In fact the Committee understands that the General Reserve Fund was in fact established before the Public Finance and Audit Law came into force and that specific rules and procedures for the fund were debated and decided by the Legislative Assembly.

As the Committee is not completely confident of the provenance and legal propriety of the General Reserve Fund perhaps the best way forward now would be to apply section 29(1) of the Public Finance and Audit Law and pass a new Resolution for the Fund

ii) The Public Finance and Audit Law require that properly established funds have to be subject to such conditions, exceptions and limitations as may be specified by the Legislative Assembly's Resolution. The Committee hopes that they are clearly set out for the General Reserve Funds, and that included in these procedures are rules governing transfers into and out of the Fund. It is suggested that these procedures will be briefly encapsulated into the Financial and Stores Regulations.

iii) The Committee notes that whilst the transfer of $7.8 million in 1990, was clearly proposed to the Legislative Assembly in the 1990 Budget, documentation and speech of the Financial Secretary which were both considered in some detail by the Finance Committee, no specifically recorded decision was made to approve this particular transfer. For the avoidance of any doubt or uncertainty in future years we would suggest that these transfers be subject to specific decision by the Legislature after consideration by the Finance Committee.

iv) The management of the public's funds and revenues is much simpler and less restricted by convention than that in the United Kingdom. The Committee therefore see no need for the country to have an independent "Comptroller" function which our Auditor General so kindly offered to perform if so required for our General Reserve Fund.

v) The Committee was surprised to be told that the Government has no detailed policy on the size of the General Reserve Fund. It is hoped that the Government will consider carefully what size of General Reserve Fund would be most appropriate and then devise a plan to reach that level within a sensible time period. The General Reserve Fund is enormously important for the Committee in helping to protect and buffer public financing from the volatility of our relatively small economy. The Committee tentatively suggests that an adequate General Reserve Fund would contain no less than about 100 to 150 days worth of gross Government spending.

Excess Expenditures

i) The Committee took evidence from five Controlling Officers regarding the reasons for overspending and was sufficiently 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. Unauthorized 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, the Committee wishes to reiterate that Controlling Officers are directly accountable for excess expenditure. The Committee requests the cooperation of the Financial Secretary and the Accountant General in its quest for absolute fiscal responsibility. The Committee views control and direction of all matters relating to the financial affairs of Government with utmost seriousness and suggests that procedures for monitoring departmental spending be reviewed and improved.

ii) The Committee is however concerned that all the Controlling Officers examined this year are "repeat offenders". The resources of the Government are not unlimited, far from it, and whilst the Committee has again been sympathetic to these officers it would be prudent for them to understand that it is their statutory obligation to plan, control and monitor their spending in such a way as to not exceed the sums actually appropriated to them by the Legislative Assembly.

Arrears of Revenues

i) The Committee note with some satisfaction that the information in the schedule of Arrears of Revenue at Appendix I to the Government Accounts is now more complete than ever before. It is hoped that next year **all** Controlling Officers will provide the necessary information and that the Committee will at least have some estimate of the arrears arising under Motor Vehicle Tax.

ii) The proper control and prompt collection of taxes, fees, charges etcetera is very important for the cash flow of the Government and the Committee hope that the Government will continue with their productive efforts in this area. It is very pleasing to see that the introduction of a debt collector's post has been so successful and it is the wish of the Committee that if it can be shown to be clearly cost effective further resources should be put into this area.

Accounting Control

i) The Committee note with some optimism the positive comments in the Auditor General's Report regarding Payment - Vote Control. The Committee hopes that the Treasury and Departments will continue to improve standards in this area so that next year no Departments will be delinquent in their accounting responsibilities and further that the Treasury Department will continue to ensure that the very highest of accounting and control standards are maintained.

ii) The position regarding the Vote Control of receipts, deposits and advances described by the Auditor General is rather disappointing given the progress made in recent years with the payments vote control. The Committee hopes that the Treasury will not be lenient with Controlling Officers who do not fully comply with best practices in these areas.

Supplementaries

The Committee hopes that the Government's new budget setting and budget control procedures will help prevent the need for such large amounts of supplementaries ($17.7 million in 1990) in future years. It notes that estimates of the cost of prospective pay awards are now included in the Annual Budget and this will help lessen the demand for supplementaries.

The Committee fully appreciate the difficulties in controlling requests for supplementary expenditures by spending Departments and also note that the Financial Secretary appears to have already greatly limited them in 1991. However, the Committee would urge him to consider whether an adaptation of the British "cash limit" System would improve central control over our Governments spending. The "cash limits" approach appears to be a simple device which has had remarkable effect in the United Kingdom. Appended to this Report is an extract from "Public Sector Accounting and Financial Control" by Henley et al, which describes the purpose and operation of this control system in the United Kingdom.

Waivers

i) The Committee welcomes the more complete disclosure in the Government's accounts of the large amounts of various waivers made during the year. Waivers are unusual and are special financial transactions which require proper and full accounting disclosure. Therefore, the Committee very much welcomes the Government's promise to keep tighter control and better statistics in this area.

ii) The Committee would urge the Government to continue with their new policy of wherever possible providing the persons or entities benefiting from waivers of import duty with grant aids. This, then, makes the giver and receiver of these public resources more accountable and provides the government with better control.

Maintenance of Government Buildings

i) The Committee is concerned to see that budget provision for the maintenance of Government buildings and roads have not been normally adequate. In particular the injection of funds for roads maintenance is not consistent with the rapidly increasing road mileage for which the Public Works Department is becoming responsible. The Committee was pleased to have been told that the Public Works Department is now developing a plan for the adequate and regular maintenance of Government buildings and roads. The Committee hopes this will be completed as a matter of urgency and it suggests that the plan be fully funded to enable proper maintenance to best professional standards to be carried out. The Committee believes that urgent priority spending now in this area will avoid very much larger costs in the future. The lack of maintenance now is a false saving and is not conducive to value for money.

ii) The Committee notes that Government is now considering selling property which it has not been maintaining properly in the past. This is not a prudent measure at this time and the Committee is alarmed at the neglect to public property that this indicates and the loss in value it implies. The Committee also recommended that the revenues from the sales of public assets are clearly detailed in the Estimates and Accounts so that the amounts from various sales of property may be clearly seen.

Management Services

i) The Committee is very pleased to see that the Management Services Unit has been busy and look forward to seeing in future years a great improvement in the efficiency, economy and effectiveness with which the public sector operates. The Committee's attention has been focused on the need for the Government to have satisfactory procedures to ensure that staffing levels are adequate but not excessive to achieve approved objectives. The cost of the Government's human resources are by far the most significant element in Government Expenses. The [effectiveness, efficiency and economy with which the Government uses and] control of these important resources is critical to the Government's general ability to provide good value for scarce public money. The Committee hopes that the Management Services Unit will continue to put significant effort into this area and to continue to improve its ability to carry out effective staffing inspections and work measurement studies.

ii) The Committee is pleased to see that the Management Service Unit is to prepare an annual report. We hope this will be laid before the Legislative Assembly and that it provide details and statistics on the progress of implementing the Unit's suggestions and recommendations.

Public Service Commission

i) The Committee has observed that staff were being recruited and paid under capital heads (e.g. for the Agriculture Plan) without the involvement of the Public Service Commission. Whilst the Committee commends the Government for not hiring expensive consultants for this, from the evidence it took it was not clear to the Committee that this was proper and right; and would recommend that the Public Service Commission reviews this and any other similar practices in order to establish guidelines for the Commission's involvement with such special recruitments. As a general guide this Committee would wish to see all recruitment, other than short-term specialised consultancies, go through the Public Service Commission. Funding for these types of staff should also not be subject to any creative budgeting or accounting treatments so as to avoid proper scrutiny, control and accountability.

ii) The Principal Secretary (Communication, Works and Agriculture) had promised to provide this Committee with certain information regarding "consultant" posts for the Agriculture Plan. At the time of writing this Report no information had been provided.

Overseas Medical

i) It is clear to us that the practice of accounting for overseas medical expenses through advance accounts may not be quite proper and does not afford the accountability that these large expenses require. Very large amounts of theses expenses have been written-off without good cause over the years and control in this area has been severely criticised by previous Committees. It appears that further large write-offs are now likely and that improved systems of review promised by the Government have not worked with complete effectiveness. The Committee would prefer the Government to consider whether such expenditures should be brought to account directly - at present these expenses seem not to be brought to account at all, unless they are written off or converted as loans. Recovery, where this is appropriate, should be through control accounts and these revenues brought also to account expeditiously.

ii) The Committee would also suggest that unpaid overseas medical expenses be written off more timely and consideration given to devising a policy to assist those who genuinely are unable to pay these sometimes catastrophic expenses.

Localisation of the Civil Service

i) The Secretary of the Public Service Commission told us that it is a stated objective of the Commission to localise the Civil Service as far as possible without sacrificing efficiency. In this the Commission has the Committee's fullest support. If this has not been done already then the Committee wish to strongly recommend that the Commission prepares a detailed plan of action to achieve this localisation objective, with a timetable attached for the specific accomplishment of set goals and targets.

Design Fees for Capital Works

i) The Committee was very alarmed and concerned that the Chief Engineer was not informed and obviously not greatly involved in the appointment of Works Consultants for the design of the new George Town Hospital. We would expect to see the Chief Engineer fully consulted on the appointment of any work professionals and he be aware of and agree to the terms and conditions, including the fees for their employment.

Fees charged by IHC for the Dental Clinic

i) The Committee has further examined the Chief Engineer on evidence he provided the Committee, concerning the unreasonableness of fees charged by the consultants (International Healthcare Corporation) who were employed by the Member for Health and Social Services for various design and other services for the George Town Hospital Dental Clinic. We are now happy that the evidence and opinion of the Chief Engineer and his professional departmental officers was reasonable and well based. The Committee takes note that the information provided by the Chief Engineer suggests that the Government may have been less frank in their response regarding these Fees. If this act was committed deliberately then the PAC must view this as an attempt to mislead the Committee. It is hoped that this has not been the case and the Committee expects the Government in its Minute to provide an accurate representation.

Contract for Overseas Medical Treatments

i) The Committee observed that the Government have an agreement with the Cleveland Clinic to provide medical treatment for certain medical cases which for various reasons may not be treated locally. This arrangement appears to have improved arrangements for acquiring overseas treatment considerably and the Committee commends the Government for improving arrangements for overseas treatments. However, large amounts of money are spent on these overseas medical treatments at the Cleveland Clinic, and the Committee was concerned to note that the agreement with the Cleveland Clinic had not gone to the Central Tenders Committee nor had the agreement been subject to any review or cost comparison since it began in 1989. The Committee derived some comfort from assurances that the price to the Government by the Clinic, for their work are similar to those charged by them to the American Government. However, the Committee is surprised and concerned that the Government has not been reviewing these costs and the contract arrangements annually. After careful consideration of the evidence provided to us by the Principal Secretary for Health and Social Services and the Chief Medical Officer, which contained much prevarication and obfuscation, we see no good reason why the services provided by the Cleveland Clinic could not be subject to competition on price and quality; and that there is probably some merit in considering whether advantage could be had by having contracts for the supply of overseas medical treatments with more than one supplier.

ii) The Committee noted the involvement of International Healthcare Corporation in introducing the Government to the Cleveland Clinic. We would ask the Government to assure us that IHC, its agents or Associates, received no fee or any type of remuneration from them or the Cleveland Clinic for this or any other related activity.

Level of Hospital Fees

It was not clear from the evidence the Chief Medical Officer gave the Committee whether hospital fees need to rise to make the hospital financially self-sufficient. He seemed to disagree with the conclusion of the Auditor General (Para 79 of his Report which noted that current fees recover about 60% of the true costs of a particular service) although the Auditor General has confirmed to the Committee that he had taken every care to establish with the Chief Medical Officer that the relevant facts in the Auditor General's Report were fair and accurate. Despite this the Committee may be assured with the Chief Medical Officer's estimate that current hospital fee levels are about right for the Hospital system to be financially self-sufficient and no new rises in health fees are therefore necessary or imminent. As is his wish, the Committee will also look forward to the expected significant reduction in the $11 million the Government currently contributes to the Health Services when the Health Services Authority commences operations.

Hospital Accountant

The Committee is pleased to see that the Hospital has retained the expertise of a fully qualified professional accountant, Mrs. Brenda Whitewell, following the previous Hospital Accountant's resignation in December 1990. The Committee places great emphasis in the new Health Services Authority having sound, stable and strong financial and accounting functions and following the Financial and Stores Regulations.

Central Funding Scheme

The Committee was very pleased to hear that substantial steps have been taken to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Central Funding Scheme (now the Department of Vehicle and Equipment Services). The Government is to be commended for the very positive and meaningful way they have responded to this and previous Committee's concerns in this area.

Prison Population Costs

i) The cost, both financial and social, of an ever increasing prison population have become considerable. The Committee again appreciates the excellent and informative evidence from the Director of Prisons and fully appreciates his efforts in keeping his very demand led expenditures within reasonable distance of his budget. The Committee hopes that next year it will not have to have the pleasure of his company again. The Committee shares his concern that more should be done to reduce our proportionately very large prison population and thus reduce the need for further increases in public funds in this area. Where it is cost effective and appropriate from a social and practical perspective it is recommended that the Government consider:

(i) making more use of proper parole procedures;

(ii) reviewing sentencing procedures to include more "community work" and other alternative type sentencing;

(iii) where this is economical make extra effort to transfer foreign offenders to their own countries even if this means making a financial contribution towards their custody abroad; and

(iv) generally invest more in crime prevention.

Payments to the Member (H&SS) for certain entertainment expenses:

The Committee noted with some satisfaction that following our enquires into this matter last year, and on the request of the Accountant General, the Member for Health and Social Services has now repaid certain entertainment expenses that he incorrectly claimed and for which he was wrongly paid. The Committee suggests that the Financial Secretary may care to issue a note to all Officials reminding them of the rules and basis upon which entertainment expenses may be made. This may help avoid such embarrassing situations arising in the future.

Losses:

The Committee views the fraud of customs duty by a Senior Government Officer with some displeasure and is disappointed that no disciplinary action was taken on this officer before he resigned for medical reasons. Despite Government's opposition to our suggestion the Committee feels that if Government were to start to pay customs duty on its own imports then this would help prevent this type of abuse and provide our increasingly effective Customs Department with a much better control environment within which to operate. The Committee hopes that Government will reconsider its position on this.

Computer Services:

i) The Committee was pleased to see that the recommendations arising from the Anderson Computer Services Review which a previous Committee instigated some years ago are being instituted in a well thought out and methodical manner. This type of approach to the introduction of consultants' recommendation appears to the Committee to be instructive for the many other departments labouring to introduce the very many and varied consultants' reports provided to Government in recent years. Progress with the Comprehensive Information Plan and the Disaster Recovery Plan has been somewhat slow, but the Committee understands that next year we will see good and better progress in these two most vital areas.

ii) The Committee has had a special interest in the introduction of the use of micro-computing. It is very pleased to see that this is progressing well as it see the distinct possibility of efficiency and effectiveness gains from their proper use and perhaps a lessening of the need for costly manpower resources.

The Government/UNDP Performance Improvement Programme:

i) The Committee found the evidence supplied to it by the Administrative Secretary very impressive and it greatly value the effort that he has made to properly brief the Committee in this area. The Committee will continue to watch the progress of the Performance Improvement Project with great interest and wish for it continued success. It is hoped that Departmental Managers will give their utmost support to achieving the Performance Improvement Projects' aims and objectives and thus help the Government to obtain better value for money from its scarce resources.

ii) The Committee supports the Auditor General's comments concerning the need for better and improved management information, particularly at the Senior Manager level. The Committee hopes that this will be given very serious and careful consideration by the Government.

Government Stores:

i) The Committee recorded its view that the proper control and stewardship of Government Stores is very important. Controlling Officers must comply fully with the Financial and Stores Regulations (FSR) governing this area. It hopes the Government will do more to insist that those Controlling Officers not following FSRs will quickly do so, or face appropriate disciplinary

action. The Committee is particularly concerned to note that only a few Departments were satisfactorily performing in this area and that in particular, weaknesses existed in stores inspections, stocktaking and reporting.

ii) The Committee commends the Public Works Department in its prompt response in addressing the problems identified with their stores and hopes that these problems will be resolved by the time this Committee next meet.

Pensions Fund:

i) The Committee was pleased with the excellent and full disclosure provided by the Note on Pensions in the Government Accounts (Note 2). The Pensions liability is very large, actuarially estimated to have been some $32.4 million at the start of 1989. Whilst the Committee is content with the Government's plan to build up the Pensions Fund fairly gradually until it is large enough to be self-supporting, we think that it would be wise to now develop a detailed plan for this with the aim of making the Pensions Fund fully self-sufficient, in say, a few years time. However, to do this the Committee is of the view that this may require an earlier revision of the actuarial assessment of Pensions Liability than is apparently currently envisioned by the Government.

Internal Audit:

i) The Committee is pleased to see that some progress have been made in instituting and effecting Government Internal Audit Unit. It is hoped that the Internal Audit will contribute greatly to the further implementation of the rules and procedures detailed in the Financial and Stores Regulations and generally help maintain an environment of good internal control and management within the Government.

ii) The Committee would like to see Internal Audit expanded to the Statutory Bodies. The need for an effective internal audit in these various independent entities is important to provide sound systems of control. The Committee suggests that perhaps this may be done either separately from the Government Internal Audit or, if more convenient, through the Government Internal Audit Unit with repayment for the services actually rendered.

Immigration Department:

The Committee noted that plans have now been made for the reorganisation of the Immigration Department's financial systems and awaits the appointment of a suitable financial officer before they are fully implemented. The need for good, sound financial control at the Immigration Department is great, and the Committee welcomes the progress made.

Investment Procedures:

The Committee noted with great satisfaction that detailed rules have now been prepared and approved for the Government's Investment Procedures. This is a very sensible move and is highly commendable.

Tendering and Contracting:

i) The Committee is pleased to be assured that the Central Tenders Committee (CTC) is reviewing all the contracts that are required by the Financial and Stores Regulations to be brought before it. The Committee would suggest that the CTC and other appropriate authorities remain vigilant in monitoring Government contracts to ensure that all appropriate contracts, including those only required to be vetted at the departmental level, are dealt with properly. The Committee places great stress and importance that Government procurement polices and practices are open and competitive, they will provide good value for money and may be seen by the public to be fair and equitable.

ii) The Committee is pleased to note that a careful watch is made for the possible collusion of contractors. It suggests that the Government is vigilant in ensuring that collusions do not exist by carefully monitoring, signs of price fixing and market sharing so as to discourage this very unacceptable practice.

iii) The Committee is confused over the current practice concerning "Approved Register of

Contractors". If such Registers are not to be used then perhaps the Financial and Stores Regulations (FSR) should be amended accordingly. The Committee recommends a thorough review of our practices in this area so that the best and most efficient and effective control procedures and systems are adopted and that these procedures and systems are properly and correctly reflected in the FSR. Changes in procurement practices, however sound and economic, should not proceed any charges to the Financial and Stores Regulations.

iv) The Committee also feels that the fair, open and competitive contracting procedures that produce good value from public procurement should also apply to the Statutory Bodies. We would encourage the Government to issue guidance to the Statutory Bodies on this to ensure, with out a doubt, that good systems of public procurement are in operation in this part of the public sector.

The Accounts of the Statutory Bodies:

A key element in the accountability of the Statutory Bodies is their prompt tabling in the Legislative Assembly of their audited Financial Statements and Annual Reports. During the past four years the Committee has seen a distinct improvement in this and derives a good deal of comfort that those Bodies who are able to promptly lay their Financial Statements are exercising a reasonable amount of financial control and stewardship. The Committee hopes that this satisfactory situation will continue to exist and urges the newly created Statutory Bodies to make this a concern priority. The importance of good, strong and sound systems of financial accounting control cannot be underestimated.

Public Sector Investment Committee (PSIC):

i) The Committee is pleased to see that this most important control is progressing well. It is surprised that the Government is not able to confirm that all projects in the Budget will have gone through the appropriate PSIC procedures. The Committee hopes that for the 1993 Budget this will be a standard requirement for all projects requiring funding.

ii) The Committee records its complete dissatisfaction that the Government have not submitted its Health Plan, or the Plans for the new George Town Hospital to the Public Sector Investment Committee. The explanation for this, from the Principal Secretary of Health and Social Services is completely unsatisfactory. It would be foolish in the extreme for Government to provide any form of assistance or guarantees to the soon to be formed Health Services Authority without a thorough Public Sector Investment Committee's Review which inter alia would determine what the expected running costs of the two site hospital will be; where and how will we be obtaining the extra staff to run these facilities; and whether the building costs for the new hospital which the Committee calculated it at $178,000 per bed, is reasonable.

Control and Accountability of Public Sector Bodies:

Introduction

i) There is a wide variety of Statutory and other Public Sector Bodies which now form a large and growing part of Cayman's public sector. In particular, the importance of the services provided by such Statutory Bodies as the Water Authority, Civil Aviation Authority and the Port Authority are very obvious. Whilst this has not always been so, and this Committee and previous Committees have taken evidence on this in the past, these Statutory Bodies are by-and-large now well run and are operating reasonably. It is very important for our country that the Statutory Bodies and Authorities continue to perform well; provide good stewardship on the public assets under their control; are reasonably solvent and do not become an undue drain on the very limited public purse; and are properly accountable to the public and the Legislative Assembly. Other types of public sector related bodies such as grant aided bodies, publicly owned private companies, and private utilities monopolies licensed by the Government to operate in the Cayman Islands have similar high requirements for good performance, control, services and accountability.

Statutory Bodies

i) The Committee recommends that all the Statutory Bodies should prepare annual business plans to go together with their annual budgets. The full development of long-term strategic and development plans is also essential and these should be linked with the Government's own medium and long-term planning systems. All these plans require to be fully considered and

authorised by the Boards of the Statutory Bodies.

ii) The Committee recommends that Government should provide the Statutory Bodies with some general policy guidelines and direction. Also, Government Board members should be given more specific instructions on Government's aims and objectives for the Body concerned.

iii) Whilst noting the good work that is being done by the Chairman of the relevant Statutory Bodies the Committee feels that the Executive Council Members should not be Chairman of Statutory Bodies. The only exception the Committee sees is the Currency Board. This will strengthen and reinforce the operational and political independence of the Statutory Bodies. The Committee commends the Member for Communications, Works and Agriculture (CW&A) for his practical approach in divorcing himself from the Water Authority Board and eventually the Port Authority Board.

iv) The Committee feels strongly that the Statutory Bodies must establish operational and financial performance measures and targets, which should also cover quality of services.

v) The Committee considers that financial contributions to the Government from Statutory Bodies should be by negotiated agreement and not through unworkable provisions in relevant laws. It hopes that Government will consider whether the relevant parts of the Law on this aspect need to be revised.

Publicly owned Commercial Companies

i) The Turtle Farm and Cayman Airways (CAL) are both very important companies which are wholly owned by the Government. Cayman Airways is of particular strategic importance to our country. Both companies are clearly public assets and their stewardship and control must be subject to normal accountability procedures. The public and the Legislative Assembly have every right to see that these public assets are operating well and providing good value for money. The larger and more important of these two enterprises - Cayman Airways - has been in financial difficulties for some time. Previous Committees have attempted to analyse CAL's problems in order to evaluate whether the company is economic and efficient and have suggested timely remedial action. This has proved to be difficult and recommendations that the Committee have made on this subject have largely been ignored by the Government. The exception to this was a suggestion some four years ago to have an independent and expert review of the performance and operation of Cayman Airways Limited. The Government reluctantly agreed to this, followed by further deterioration in CAL's financial position, and has only just received the results of the Review. The Committee hopes the Review's recommendations are introduced speedily and are closely monitored and managed by the Portfolio, independent of CAL's Management.

ii) Whilst the Committee has certainly no reservations about the quality of work done by the current external auditors of the Turtle Farm and Cayman Airways, the Committee would prefer that the proper cycle of public and parliamentary accountability be complete for these public assets and have our Auditor General perform this function. This will enable us to ascertain more easily that these companies are well run and give good value for money.

iii) The Committee would like to have enquired further into the formation of a Government owned company called "Cayman Air" but has so far not been provided with the information it has requested. But we will return to this subject at a later time.

Public Utilities Monopolies

i) Without a doubt, the commercial public utilities monopolies operating in the Cayman Islands, example, Cable and Wireless, Caribbean Utilities Company, Cayman Water Company, have contributed greatly and beneficially to the development our country. Nevertheless, it is the considered opinion of the Committee that in certain ways the control and operation of these bodies, which play such an important and strategic part in the operation of the country may be improved upon.

ii) The Committee's recommendations concerning the Public Utilities Monopolies are:-

a) That the accounts and annual reports of these companies should be laid on the Table of the Legislative Assembly.

b) Subsidies through waivers of customs duty should be through grant aid properly authorised by the Legislative Assembly. (The Committee was very

surprised to see that some of those subsidies were very large in 1990 - $1 million each to Cable and Wireless and Caribbean Utilities Companies).

c) Licences for the operation in the Cayman Islands should be for shorter periods than 25 years.

d) Government appointees to the Boards of these companies should be given direct briefings and instructions from the Government on the policy which Government wish these businesses to follow. Such Board members should be clearly seen to be representing the Government and should not be appointed if conflict of interest problems arise.

Grant Aided Bodies

i) The provision of grants to non-governmental bodies is a cost effective and flexible way for Government to achieve some of its policy aim. The Committee feels that specific terms and conditions must be set for such grants and the achievement of these terms and conditions monitored and evaluated carefully. The Committee is most pleased to see that the Financial Secretary has already taken some positive actions in this direction.

ii) Many of the organisations in receipt of grant aid were set up under specific legislation. These organisations should have extended to them full public accountability and in future the Committee will be examining those financial statements of the organisations required to lay their accounts before the Legislature. Those without this requirement currently in their Law should also be required to do this.

iii) The Committee would also prefer the Auditor General to be statutorily appointed the external auditor of organisations established under Law and which will be receiving substantial annual grants from Government. The Committee understands that the Farmer's Market and Cayman National Cultural Foundation are requesting that the Auditor General become their external auditor and commend their sensible actions in this respect.

Regulatory Authority

i) The Committee very strongly supports the formation of a small independent regulatory authority for the Statutory Bodies, the Government's Commercial Companies and the Private Utilities Monopolies. The Committee sees this regulatory authority modelled on those now fairly successfully operating in the United Kingdom in similar circumstances. There is a definite requirement to provide the customers and consumers of these organisations with an avenue to achieve good standards of service, good performance and make complaints. Because of the lack of competition in the provision of these services an independent regulatory authority would also assist in maintaining the costs of the services provided by these organisations at reasonable levels. Funding the regulatory authorities should come from the organisations.

Fees and Charges for Government Services

The Committee took evidence from four distinct areas of Government which provides direct services to the public for which fees are charged so that it could examine more in-depth the issues involved. These Departments were, the Registrar of Shipping and Marine Survey Department, the Planning Department, the Environmental Health Department and the Hospital. The four services examined did not recover all their costs, and in the case of the Hospital, and the Shipping Register and Marine Survey Department they were significantly in deficit.

The Registrar of Shipping and Marine Survey Department

i) The Committee notes Government's commitment to continue to develop and maintain a first class Shipping Register. The Public Accounts Committee is pleased to see the high calibre of staff that has been retained by the Government to operate the Shipping Register and particularly, the Marine Survey Department. The Committee appreciates the amount of hard work that has gone on locally and on the international arena to bring the Cayman Ship Register up to first class operational standards.

ii) The Committee appreciates the specialized nature of the shipping industry and the relative difficulty of attracting new business to Cayman. The Public Accounts Committee believes that attainable targets must be set for the increase in size of the Shipping Register.

iii) The Committee was surprised to find that the majority of the fees charged by the Register of Shipping and the Marine Survey Department are well below industry standards, even though the level of fees does not appears to be a decisive factor when registering a ship. The Committee was pleased to be told that Government has, recently embarked on a marketing strategy to promote and attract business to the Register.

Planning Department

i) The Committee was pleased to see that Government has now instituted a Fee Register and as a part of that exercise individual Departments were asked to submit a proposal to have their fee structures reviewed. The Government must also ensure that it does not impose such measures that would cause undue pressures on the Government's overall development policy for the Cayman Islands.

Environmental Health

i) The Public Accounts Committee is pleased to see that the efforts of the Chief Environmental Health Officer and his staff has had a significant impact on the improving rate of collection of annual garbage fees paid by all sectors of the public.

ii) The PAC is also of the opinion that until all of the technical difficulties in the collection process are rectified, it would appear counter-productive for Government to increase Garbage Fees. With this in mind, it is therefore most important that the Chief Environmental Officer continues to seek ways in the short term of containing his costs without compromising the level of service. The Committee also encourages the Government to give some priority to the implementation of a proper Solid Waste Management Plan in a suitable area which will help to serve as an organisational framework and whereby the revenues from garbage disposal could be maximized without increasing costs.

Health Service Fees

The Committee observed that hospital costs continue to rise and are likely to rise further following the completion of the new George Town Hospital and the two-site health facility arrangement which is Government's current policy for the Health Services Authority. The Committee is skeptical that the Health Services Authority will be able to be financially self-sufficient as alleged by Government without further increases in fees, and urge that every effort to be made to reduce costs and keep fees to a minimum.

Fees and Charges

i) It is financially wise for the Government to strive to recover reasonable costs, where possible, for the services it provides. From the evidence this Committee has gathered it appears that in many instances this is not the situation, yet the Government continues to lay blame on the PAC.

ii) The PAC believes that in order for cost recovery to be effective it is of paramount importance that the Government ensure that the costs of services are controlled and kept at reasonable minimum levels so that the fees charged to the public will not be considered excessive.

Witnesses

i) Many witnesses promised to provide this Committee with written information but failed to do so. The Committee will be considering what action to take on this issue at a later Public Accounts Committee meeting. Other witnesses, in the view of all our Committee Members, were deliberately obstructive and uninformative when providing answers to the Committee's questions. This is definitely unsatisfactory and the Committed will not be so tolerant at future meetings if this reoccurs. For the first time the Minutes of evidence taken by the Committee are verbatim. This will enable all interested persons to see exactly how and what information was obtained, and will silence the completely unjustified criticism of bias levelled by the Government last year at the Clerk to this Committee.

ii) The Committee would request witnesses to familiarise themselves more generally and properly with, in particular, sections of the Auditor General's Report relevant to them, last year's Public Accounts Committee Report, Government Minute and the Government Accounts prior to attending meetings of the PAC. Most Controlling Officers were very well prepared, however,

some appeared not to even know that matters under their control were contained in those documents referred to above. This reflects badly on them and waste valuable Committee time.

Written Questions

For the first time, in order to speed up the Committee's process and Controlling Officer's valuable time, the Committee requested information by way of written questions to Controlling Officers. This approach had the support of the Government. This was somewhat of a qualified success and the Committee will be reviewing whether to continue with this next year. If it is decided to follow this procedure, written questions will be sent out well in advance of PAC's meetings, so that follow-up questions may be contemplated where required.

The Committee would also hope to have generally more informative replies from Controlling Officers. Nevertheless, the Committee much appreciates the time and effort put into most replies and we are very thankful to the Deputy Financial Secretary, Mr. Woodward Terry, for coordinating things for the Committee.

Role and Function of the PAC

The Committee records its concern and resentment with the Government comments in last year's Government Minute which we interpret as an attempt to restrict the role and remit on this Committee. Any attempts to undermine and undervalue the work of this Committee by the Government is cause for grave concern and trepidation. The role and function of the PAC has been fairly and properly established by parliamentary practice [see *Erskine May*], precedent, tradition and our Standing Orders. The PAC has no executive powers other than those to summon witnesses and gather evidence, only the right to state its findings candidly, forcefully and openly. Our aim is to be vigilant and effective as part of the vital public accountability process and thus serve and protect the public's interest. Every effort is made to be unbiased and non-political and to deal only in the facts provided to the Committee. The Committee is formed from the Backbench Members of the Legislative Assembly and covers the full spectrum of available political views and loyalties. The Committee does not dispute the right of the Government to reply to our Report in similar candid and forceful terms if it is considered necessary. In fact, the most treasured part of our public accountability system is the Government Minute which is Executive Council's formal reply to the recommendations and comments made in the PAC's Report. The Committee therefore greatly thank the Auditor General for enclosing at Appendix G of his Report a full description of the PAC's role and function which we hope will be carefully considered and understood.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Your Committee offers its sincere gratitude and appreciation of the cooperative spirit exhibited by most officers appearing before it. As usual, the Committee is especially appreciative of the support, assistance and constructive advice given throughout by the Administrative Officers, the support advice and information provided by the Deputy Financial Secretary and the Accountant General during deliberations.

The Committee wishes to record its gratitude for the assistance provided by the Auditor General and his devoted staff. The Committee regards this assistance as invaluable to the effective working of the Committee and look forward to a continued productive relationship.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO THE HOUSE

Your Committee agrees that this Report be the Report of the Standing Public Accounts Committee on the Report of the Auditor General on the Financial Statements of the Government of the Cayman Islands for the year ended 31st December, 1990, to the Legislative Assembly.

MADAM SPEAKER: Thank you. This would be a convenient time for the House to be suspended for 15 minutes.

AT 10:46 A.M. THE HOUSE WAS SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 11:08 A.M.

MADAM SPEAKER: Please be seated.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER 72(5)

MADAM SPEAKER: Proceedings are resumed, Suspension of Standing Orders 72(5).

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Madam Speaker, in accordance with Standing Order 83, I move the suspension of Standing Order 72(5) to allow the Report of Finance Committee to be laid on the Table of this Honourable House without the Minutes.

MADAM SPEAKER: The question before the House is that Standing Order 72(5) be suspended in order that the Report of the Standing Finance Committee be tabled without the Minutes of the proceedings of the Meeting held on Friday, 20th December, 1991.

I shall put the question, those in favour please say Aye, those against, No. The Ayes have it.

AYES.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Ayes have it.

AGREED. STANDING ORDER 72(5) SUSPENDED TO ENABLE THE REPORT OF THE STANDING FINANCE COMMITTEE TO BE TABLED WITHOUT THE MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE MEETING HELD FRIDAY, 20TH DECEMBER, 1991.

MADAM SPEAKER: Report of the Standing Finance Committee.

REPORT OF THE STANDING FINANCE COMMITTEE

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Madam Speaker, the Report of the Standing Finance Committee meeting held on Friday, 20th of December, approved a total supplementary sum of $7,415,014. In that meeting also was approved virements and transfer of loans and clearing of Advance Accounts as well as agreeing to amendments to the Report of the Appropriation (1992) Bill, 1991.

Madam Speaker, on Friday last, which is so recent, I do not propose to go through in detail the Supplementary Expenditure approved as the proceedings of Finance Committee were aired on Radio Cayman. So I see no benefit to the public by repeating all this again, and I submit this as the Report.

MADAM SPEAKER: So ordered.

Report of the Standing Business Committee.

REPORT OF THE STANDING BUSINESS COMMITTEE

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Madam Speaker, I beg to lay on the Table of this Honourable House the Report of the Standing Business Committee.

MADAM SPEAKER: So ordered.

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Madam Speaker, the Committee met on one occasion, that being Thursday, 14th November, and thereafter, dealt with Papers and other matters by giving the Chairman and the Clerk the approval to set them down and where in doubt consult the Members of the Committee.

There were a total of 11 Business Papers for this meeting and I would submit that this is the Report as agreed by the Committee to be laid on the Table of the House.

MADAM SPEAKER: Government Business, Motions. We will continue with the debate on Government Motion No. 11/91 - Draft Five Year Education Development Plan, 1991-1996. The Second Elected Member for Bodden Town, continuing.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS
MOTIONS

GOVERNMENT MOTION NO. 11/91
DRAFT FIVE YEAR EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT PLAN 1991-1996

(Continuation of debate thereon)

MR. G. HAIG BODDEN: Madam Speaker, this Christmas will be remembered by the people of these Islands as "Black Christmas" for many reasons; one being that the Government has become so disorganised it could not complete its business for the year. But I think the saddest day will be the day when the vote is taken on this important Motion which is before the House. The Member has decided to railroad the Motion and put it through without giving the many people out there who would like to discuss the important points in it, the

opportunity to so do. We know from experience that Reports, such as this one, never really fair well if the system of participatory democracy is used. But the Member should never fear this - although some sections of it may be changed he may find that the Report, to be adopted, could be improved.

One aim of a former Member of Education, Mr. Truman Bodden, had been to strengthen the Primary Schools and I believe the present Member is losing a golden opportunity when he seeks to exclude (by hastily dealing with this) many of the people in these Island who are ex-teachers, ex-employees of the Education Department. Because if a child does not get a good start in any Primary School there is not much hope that his development will flow smoothly. The Member will not be getting any input from people with experience in this field and this is because he seeks to finish this business so rapidly.

The consultants in the Report recommended that we have full and ample discussion and to quote one section using their exact words they say, and I quote: "Education becomes what it ought to be in proportion as it becomes an activity of the whole community and school programmes acquire meaning only in terms of this wide context of human development.". All who have spoken on this side of the House have been endeavouring to do is to help the consultants fulfill their visions of establishing a better educational system. Yet, the Member continues to frustrate the consultants.

The Report is an indictment against the present Member for Education. He is severally criticised for not training Caymanians in the teaching profession according to the Report done between 1985 and 1990; only 14 Caymanians entered the teaching profession. This has to be a reflection on the Member's attitude. Again, on this yuletide we see a further display of his attitude which despite the resources of this country, which have doubled in the last six or seven years, the Member just sit there plodding along in his weary way exhausted, but stumbling along in the dark. The Report clearly shows that the problems of Education are not with the Middle School, or any specific school, or any specific area. The Report is with the Member and his Portfolio, his lack of oversight, his benign neglect of his duties and perhaps this is why he cannot afford the deep scrutiny which this Plan warrants.

The *Caymanian Compass* editorial, on the 18th of December, suggests that Government should listen to the Backbenchers. Perhaps they draw this conclusion because every time the Government has failed to take the suggestions of the Backbench they have made a mess of things. Cayman Airways as an example and I could cite another half dozen programmes. The following day, the editorial on the 19th of December, says "it is up to the Members on the Government Bench to listen [meaning to listen to the Backbench] and consider seriously all comments made in good faith. But the Member is not about to listen to the Backbench, not about to listen to anybody. He is putting through this Report just as he received it.

The editorial for the third consecutive day, on the 20th of December, had this to say and I quote the exact words: "If a Select Committee were to re-examine the Plan in detail several benefits could be derived.". Nobody is saying that this is not a good Report. Nobody is saying that there are no good features in it. What every Member who have spoken from this side of the House have said is summed up in this one sentence. "If a Select Committee were to re-examine the Plan in detail several benefits could be derived...." But we have a stubborn and hard-headed Member who refuses to listen because he believes, as he has said in the past, Executive Council must have its way.

In his opening statement the Member admitted that there were a couple of areas of concern and one of them was the phasing out of the reception classes. Yet, he has not discussed this with the Members of the Backbench. He will not discuss it with the parents, he will not discuss it with teachers.

The Report which is before the House is a very lengthy report and it contains recommendations to make fundamental changes within the school system as we know it. I certainly wish that time allowed me to discuss all of these recommendations but that is not possible. Members who have spoken have referred to some of these recommendations, and have dealt at great length with a few of them. But the Plan which the Member has brought and which is the subject of this Motion, more or less seeks the adoption in full of the entire Report.

If we say yes to this Plan without a Select Committee examination that would go into individual recommendations, we will be giving the Member a free hand to do as he like with every one of these recommendations. This is my great concern because the Member's actions in the past particularly, in dealing with the youths of this country have been very biased indeed, and has shown him to do only what he wants to do regardless of what is right for the country as a whole.

The first recommendation in the Plan sets out, what I call the structure for it, dealing with the accountability, the capacity, building, partnership and participation. I have no fault with that and would like to comment only on part three of it because I believe this is the key issue here and this is the song of the Backbench. On page 33, the consultants speak of bringing the community into the schools and taking the schools out into the community. How can this be achieved when the Member will not even allow the Report, as he has told us, to go to a Select Committee where the community could help and where there could be a mixture? My understanding of education has always been that if education is to be worthwhile it must fit the student for life, for his work in the future, for his interaction in the community.

The Report recommended the continued use of computers and put special emphasis on a proper retrieval system where it would be easier to get information. And we have to agree that this would be ideal. The third recommendation suggested that one officer should be given the responsibility for the management of the data system. This is very important because so many times, within Government we have found that nobody is responsible for anything. If we call the Member, depending on the mood he is in; he will send you to the Principle Secretary or the Head of Department or somebody else down the line.

In dealing with the Report system the consultants recommended that the Annual Report on Education should contain not only the statistics but should contain

comments on the progress and development of educational institutions and services. In other words, the Report must not only carry the bare figures, but also must show what the result is, what these figures mean and what can be done to improve a bad ratio or whatever there may be.

The Report was highly critical of the Government's attitude towards the work of the Social Clubs in the school. They mentioned the Key Club amongst other bodies, but said that support is lacking and there is too little time. And, of course after the Member got this Report he cut-out the services of late school buses, then told the House that the children who were affected by the service of late school bus were not children the ones taking classes after school but were involved in these extra curricular activities. This is why I am concerned with his handling of the Report. Because he will not address any subject that he has not first thought out or one that did not spring from him. Page 37, and I quote:

> "The involvement of children in student councils and in clubs can provide an extremely useful way of identifying students opinion and enabling students to influence the life of the school. The Key Club at the Cayman Islands High School, which is supported by the Kiwanis Club carries out activities improving both the school and the wider community. Support, however, is lacking, and there appears to be too little time within the school week to carry out constructive activity.".

He had this Report in his hand when he cut out the late school buses. I understood that was because they could not afford to pay for them - I heard it on the street - that this was because of financial constraints. Yet, they are building a $16 million hospital which we do not need.

Recommendation 5 requests that specific times be set aside to enable teachers to meet students individually as well as in small groups. This will probably come about with the reorganisation of the time tables and reorganisation of the curriculum. Recommendation 6 of the Report says, and I quote: "Sporting activities and clubs should be encouraged further, but specific time needs to be allocated for club activities. The lunch hour is not adequate for such purposes,".

We were told at the time when we questioned the cutting out of the school buses that the children would not suffer because they could use their lunch time for some of these activities. The Member had this Report in his hand, and this is why we need a discussion with the people in the Portfolio, with the people in the Department, with the parents, the teachers and so on. It is my contention that an injustice is being done to the school system of this country today by the railroading of this Plan by brute force and just because they have collective responsibility and an extra vote guaranteed on this side.

The seventh recommendation for the implementation of a national curriculum and we can support that without any question. Recommendation 8 encourages the continued use of the Teacher's Centre. But recommendation 9 in my opinion is on of the most important recommendations in the Report. Because it recommends that an Education Social Worker be attached to each school. This would give an opportunity to have some kind of Social Worker in each district. This is something that the present Member for Education has resisted continuously. Now he has passed that legacy on to his protege and still we do not see a Social Worker in each district. While I do not intend to try to read this Report this paragraph and the comments of the consultants are so important that I think it should be read. It is a very short paragraph and it reads:

> "Recommendation 9
>
> In view of the variety and number of the different persons involved with pastoral and support work in schools, it is recommended that consideration be given to the appointment of an Education Social Worker to be attached to each school. The post could be established at a part-time level within a small school. The main purpose of the ESW would be to improve liaison between the schools and the community, particularly with parents and families, and also with regard to special educational, health and social services provision. Visits to individual homes could take place prior to the children's entry to school and particular support could be given for children experiencing social and emotional difficulties. The ESW would be regarded as a member of staff of the school, but not engaged in direct instructional activity, except possibly in the area of family life education.".

And I know the present Member is not going to carry out this recommendation.

As far back as 1986, the First Member Elected for West Bay and I have had a Motion passed in Finance Committee to have a Social Worker living in the districts, in Bodden Town and in West Bay. We continually talk about it, other Members talk about it, and neither the Member for Education nor the Member for Health think it is important, so it is not done. They are doing an injustice to the youths of this country because social problems usually start at an early age.

We hear about children before the Juvenile Courts, they have made children criminally responsible now at the age of eight. We hear about these children six and eight years old that cannot be controlled by their parents. But the good side of it is that a child who has reached his teen-years with a good social foundation, having had a good home environment is not so easily shaken. This is why we think it is necessary that a recommendation like this should have priority above building new High Schools or anything else, and this is a recommendation that need not cost a lot of money.

The consultants say that in a small school the Social Worker could be engaged on a part-time basis. I would add that for the rest of the time that Social Worker could be allowed to spend it time in the district doing other social work, but the first priority would be the attachment to the school.

I know the Member for Education will have difficulty with a notion like this. This is too simple for him to understand, this is too cheap for him to carry out, to implement. But

this is practical and in a district where there is a small school the Social Worker would be attached to the school, and would do all the work that he is called upon to do by the teachers; to visit the parents but if there was time left, other cases outside of the school could be referred to him.

Here we are not talking about mundane things like whether the Member get home for Christmas or not. We are talking about the lives of young children because whatever this country become in the years that are ahead, whatever leaders we have they are going to come out of the school system. And if they do not get off on the right foot from the Primary School right up through the system it is not easy to correct them.

The Member for Education does not even want to tell us he is not going to do it. He just ignore the pleas of Elected Members for Social Workers in the district. And I believe this is a good recommendation. But I think it needs to be discussed with the people from the Social Services Department, it needs to be discussed with the teachers, it needs to be discussed with the parents, the people that the Member for Education does not want to come before that Select Committee.

Recommendations 10 and 11 just deal with the structure of the Education Department and set out a graph as to how the ideal system should be. Page 43, of the Report carries a staving criticism of the Member, a staving criticism of coordinated community involvement with schools and I think we should look at that a little. It reads and I quote: "The general impression gained by the consultants is that there is little coordinated community involvement with schools.". Only yesterday, I was talking to a lady who is now herself a grandmother,. but is interested in her grandchildren going to school. She is a lady from the district I represent and she cannot understand why people who have spent a lifetime in the school room, why they are not going to be called as witnesses before this important Committee to discuss from their experiences matters on this most important matter ever to come before this Legislative Assembly in the last three years. And she named people from our district who have been involved in education, like Mrs Theoline McCoy, Miss Orma Bodden, Mrs. Hildred Ebanks. She cannot understand it!

I wish we had the time, and I would tell the House what I told her, but it is not suitable for this forum because I know the reason why. But the consultants criticised correctly, the Member, because he is the one with responsibility and he says, I quote:

> "The general impression gained by the consultants is that there is little coordinated community involvement with schools. A good deal of voluntary effort encourages relationships between schools and certain service clubs, volunteers and particularly parent/teacher associations. In addition there is a strong interest in sport, particularly at the primary school stage.".

But what they are saying is that because of this Honourable Member, he does not think he is the one responsible. But he is the one in charge and I have nobody else to blame. There is little coordinated community involvement, and I would like to pay tribute to the Parent/Teachers Associations throughout the Island because I think they have functioned well.

In my constituency we get calls from them all the time, but most of the time when we pass the problems on to the Member or to the Education Department, that is the end. Because the Government, under the leadership of the Member is doing what it sets out to do. And because he can only marched up the hill or down the hill he cannot look at anything in between.

Recommendation 12 suggests that there be a School Board. I personally think that is a good idea. They suggest a body of 8 responsible people who would serve as a body to look at the schools. They recommend that it would contain parents, leading members of the community, a teacher representative and the Principal ex-officio. The work of this Board would be to show interest in the operation of the school and its resources, and receive a regular report from the Principal; receive and discuss the Annual Education Report and the Education Review Report on the school.

The recommendation does not go on to say what Authority this Board would have, whether it would simply be an Advisory Board which would just pass on its findings to the Member or whether it would have some authority to enforce some of the ideas which they would come up with.

These are things that need to be discussed in great detail. These are not things that can be answered by the Honourable Member when he get all worked up by the proddings he has had from this side. He will be in no state of mind to objectively answer these questions and in fact, he does not know the answer. He is not an expert in education. He will have to consult with his technicians, with his people in the Department and this is why, if I am not repeating myself, that we need more study because this Report is far reaching and we notice even the technicians did not have the answers, even they had to refer back to the files for the answer. So it needs to be done in an atmosphere where we have the time where we can call witnesses and so on.

No. 13 recommendation is to appoint a District Recreations Officer. Now this shows how little the consultants were told about what the Honourable Member for Education had been doing in the last seven years. While I agree, a District Recreation Officer would be a fine thing, I believe the facilities should be put into place first. Because we know that the schools, particularly in my district, has the only play field. And when the bigger children uses it we get complaints from the school teachers about the facilities being destroyed, about interferences that the smaller children get from the bigger children when they go to use these facilities. I am going to deal with that in greater detail when I come to the recommendation further on in the Report. But as time is running out I have to have a word on it now.

In the Budget for 1992, on page 43, make a statement that there are no recreational facilities in Breakers or Bodden Town. Yet, we see the Member for Education has not included

any funds, but he has put $200,000 in the Estimates for 1993 and by then everybody knows he will be history as far as managing the Government is concerned.

So, although he knows there is a need and admits there is a need, he does not have the will-power to do what is right. This is why I am not impressed when he said in his opening remarks that he was going to pay attention in providing sporting and recreational facilities. I dare say, the only mention we will see is the mention where the *Caymanian Compass* repeated that part of his speech on the day they reported on his speech. Because for seven years we have asked him to fill the play field in Bodden Town at the Civic Centre and he has told us he is going to have $200,000 in 199,3 and he is going to do it then. But I hope that this country will have better luck.

Recommendation 14 of this Report suggests that there should be a regular evaluation carried out in each school by the Education Department every three years. This is just a recommendation of a consultant who came here probably for the first time in his life and may not every come back again. We do not know if that recommendation for a three year review is the proper thing for the Cayman Islands. The Member believes he has the answer, but so far most of his answers have been wrong, in fact 90 per cent of them over the last seven years have been wrong.

It would have been good if the matter of the three year review could have been discussed with individuals who have some knowledge of these reviews. We have on this side of the House the Second Elected Member for Cayman Brac and the First Elected Member for Bodden Town that are trained school teachers, trained at one of the best training college in the Caribbean, MICO Training College. And my learned colleague went on to get his Masters Degree in Education. These men know this subject. What is more, most of their teaching experience has been in this country. All the input they have had and all the suggestions they would make to improve this Report are lost to generations of Caymanians because of the stubbornness of the Honourable Member for Education. He should hang his head in shame.

Recommendation 15, suggests that a committee of teachers be set up to analyse the Annual Performance Evaluation Report in order to exploit its good features and to eliminate its major flaws. I find no fault with that only to say that it seems to me that this Report has gone overboard on the subject of testing and evaluating, and this is something that we need to discuss. Because, as I mentioned in my opening, that they have put Caymanians into a situation where they are just advisees taking the advice of advisors who know nothing about this country. We are now putting the school system into where it will become the most computerised plastic testing organisation in the world. I do not know if this is right and the Member does not know, but it is his business to find out and there is a golden opportunity if he will use it, if he has the courage to get up and say I made a mistake. But as big as he is, I do not think he is tall enough to say, I was wrong and I am going to amend this Motion and put it into a Select Committee for January 15th of next year.

Recommendation 16 recommends that there should be a manual and that follows naturally out of the former one.

Recommendation 17: "The final instrument should have a strong cooperative orientation. Teachers should be aware of their strengths and limitations.". This is one of the problems with this present Government. They have run it in such a fashion that there are good people there, good technical people in Education, in the Medical field, in other areas but these poor people do not know whether they are going or coming because they dare not open their mouth for the fear of being victimised or kicked out of the Service.

Recommendation 18 says: "The Portfolio and the Department need information about all teachers in order to make administrative decisions - about placement of teachers within the system,..." There is no area that we get more criticism from than in the placement of teachers. It is a common thing to get a call to say that there was a teacher at this school and the teacher is doing an excellent job, the children love this teacher, they are getting along well, they are getting good grades, but somebody, probably on the instruction of the Honourable Member -I do not know how it is done - decides to move her out then the school suffers. We have heard these complaints, we have seen letters in the paper about it.

These are areas of concern that parents would like to talk about because many of them have first hand cases that they could bring before the Select Committee. But this will be denied. This will not be allowed because Executive Council must have its way.

MADAM SPEAKER: I think perhaps Honourable Member it is now time for you to desist from using that remark.

MR. G. HAIG BODDEN: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I trust that the Member has gotten the message.

In recommendation 19, is that there be a salary review for teachers. It is a pity that the Government has allowed teacher salaries to fall to such an extent that it became necessary for the consultants to plod them into reviewing the salaries. I believe we would be better off paying money out to train Caymanian teachers and to hire teachers rather than talking about building four or five high schools. The same thing is happening with the Hospital.

Recommendation 20 is that there should be an orientation period, that is a period where teachers being hired from abroad would find out about the Caymanian way of life, the Caymanian culture and would find out whether they believe they can fit in to our society and whether they can follow our traditions and help to pass this on to future generations.

The same thing is recommended for new Caymanian teachers, that when a new teacher comes in to the system, that that new teacher be given support from the older teachers in the system, with, as the consultants says, the emphasis upon supporting the teacher rather than scrutinising the teacher so that his adjustment to the school system is easy for the benefit of the children. It is recommended that

incentives be given to Cayman Brac so that teachers may want to stay there. They have a problem in Cayman Brac with a high turn-over amongst the teachers and I wonder how the Member expects to get input into this? Is it going to come from the First Elected Member for Cayman Brac? Is it going to come from the Second Elected Member or is he going to allow teachers that have worked in Cayman Brac and know the disadvantages? Is he going to allow them to come before a Select Committee? Is he going to allow the parents in Cayman Brac or is the First Elected Member from Cayman Brac going to deny even that for the Cayman Brac people?

Recommendation 22 says: "Improved opportunities for in-service training and for professional updating will be essential if the education reforms are to be successfully carried forward.". What this recommendation says is that not only must you train new people but you must constantly upgrade the skills of the existing teachers. You may have a teacher who has come out of University ten years ago and that teacher might need a refresher course. This is money well spent because this person has shown an interest in education and would like to continue, and is in a position to benefit from this course. But how are we going to discuss this with teachers already in the service?

Recommendation 23 says: "In order to advance professional development and enhance social welfare, it is recommended that the Education Department facilitate the setting up of a Teachers' Association.". I recommend this strongly. I remember in the early 1950s when I was an assistant teacher in the schools here we had a very strong Teacher's Association. In fact, it was one of the few organisations in the Cayman Islands at the time and it served a useful purpose. I am a little surprised that the teachers here have not already banded themselves into an Association.

I believe one of the draw backs is that we hire so many teachers from abroad, and some of them come on very short contracts, that they really do not become involved in this type of organisation. But the consultants suggest that the professional staff of the Education Department would benefit from a Teacher's Association because I believe a Teacher's Association properly organised and properly run would benefit not only the teachers and Education Department, but the children of the Cayman Islands would be the greatest beneficiaries.

There is a recommendation number 24 that the Chief Education Officer should pay particular attention in communication with the media, with the business community, with governing bodies and with parents. This is useful because so many times we hear objections from parents about major changes and these objections come about sometimes because the parents do not know what is going on. I am glad the suggestion has been made that the Education Officer will be the one to talk to the media because the Elected Members of Executive Council does not do a very good job with this area once they can get their Colgate grin in the newspaper, that is about all. We have to beg and beg to get the tiniest information, as we have had in this instance from the Member for Education. Some open communication with the media will help the Department, in that, they may not be criticised for some of the things that happened. If the parents knew that they were going to cut out the late school buses or whatever it is, if this is explained before hand rather than finding it out when their child could not get home from George Town late one evening.

The same thing happens with a move to take out the teacher's aides from the school. We learned this was done only after people started questioning. Why was this not made known to the schools where these teacher's aides worked that they would be cut for whatever reason? There is some very serious implications in this Report and they are areas that need to be discussed over and over and over again because this is a Report that when some of the things in it are implemented are going to be with us for a long time to come.

Recommendation 25 is a useful one. It calls for an exchange of views between the Member for Education and the Chief Administrative Officer with principals and representatives of Teachers, Education Advisers, Education Officers and other groups of people. It is even suggested that when these meetings are held there should be representatives from Cayman Brac so that everybody in the system knows what is going on, everybody in the system knows what is happening.

Recommendation 26 is something that the Member needs. I quote: "It is recommended that a coherent in-service programme be initiated as part of an overall scheme of teacher and school development, and coordinated to ensure the maximum benefit for the increased resources that will be required.". So often, the Member just tells us he is going to do this or that, he does not know why, only he has decided. If we question it, we get no answers, he says he is doing it for the same reason we would not do it. It just does not make sense.

Recommendation 27 is that there should be emphasis on the in-service education to support the changes proposed by the Review. Throughout this Report we find that what the consultant is saying, it that you make use of the resources which you have. You have a lot of teachers, they are well qualified, you should listen to them. You should not be the one to make all the decisions without prior consultation and ample discussion. Again, in recommendation 28 the Member is told that the Education Department should pay particular attention to the significance of the community as a resource and to programmes which support the curriculum and the activities in each school.

Throughout the Report the Member was asked to involve the community, not to shut out the community. But to use the community to make the school a part of the community. The Member look upon this Motion as his motion, look upon this Report as his report, detached from the people of the Cayman Islands and forced through here without any input from the community. A terrible mistake is being made today and the people to suffer are the children in our school system.

Recommendation 29 says: "The Portfolio should establish a five year capital development programme for education, to include the provision of new schools,..." And the final statement, these Plans should be "...linked to the wider development plans of the Cayman Islands Government." I wonder if the Honourable Member know what he is being told? Any capital expenditure for education must be

considered side by side with the money that the Honourable Member for Health is going to spend on the new Hospital. Must be considered side by side with the money that the Honourable Member for Tourism owes for Cayman Airways and must be considered side by side with the money which the Member wants for the Jennette T Development.

The Capital Development Plan for the Education system cannot be done in isolation it has to be considered as the consultants said, linked to the wider development of the Cayman Islands Government. These are serious words for thought. How then can the Honourable Member operate on his little Island all by himself, in his little cocoon?

Recommendation 30 needs to be read in its entirety, it is very short and I quote:

> "In view of the need to make sensitive and effective adaptations to the existing Middle School and High School on Grand Cayman, to provide an additional High School, and in the medium term, two additional primary schools, the Public Works Department should assign appropriate staff to work closely with the Portfolio, the Education Department and education personnel in designing school buildings that respond to the changes recommended by the Review.".

Now the consultants foresee that the Honourable Member would make the mistake that he made, which I outlined on Friday, that he would rush headlong into this programme without any consideration other than getting it done by Christmas Eve.

The consultants know that the recommendations that they have made are going to be very costly money wise, and the consultants probably heard although, I do not think they were told by Government, that there were three other spurs in the Government seeking to go in three other directions for capital funds and there would be a big demand on the resources of these little Islands.

What I think concerned the consultants most was, be that if the Member went out today, and I think he is going out after the 1st of January, to build four High Schools, we might have un-equipped, underfed, undernourished, underdeveloped high schools. The consultants have asked them to examine any capital development which they embark upon, together with the other developments that are taking place and this is good common sense.

Recommendation 31: "Discussions should be held with Principals of schools to determine the measures need to ensure security of buildings, particularly outside school hours.". I think this is one area where Members of the House would have liked to sit down with a Select Committee and talk with people involved in security; private firms in this country, police, the managers of the school, Public Works Department because this is an area that has been the root of a lot of trouble in the past.

There is a recommendation for improving the security of the buildings but like all the other recommendations in this Report there will not be an opportunity for the people with experience to advise the Legislators who will have to provide the cash and we will only know what the Honourable Member choose to tell us. If we were only going to be told all that he is to tell, we could feel safe but what he is going to tell us depends on the mood he is in. Recently he has been in a bad mood.

Recommendation 32 is for a part time or full time member of staff in order to maintain the high standards in the school grounds. This is something we need to study carefully, and it is something that could be discussed with the Agricultural Department, perhaps with some of the horticultural societies; the landscaping and the keeping of the grounds. Because an attractive school building with well kept grounds must certainly enhance not only the appearance of the schools but the ability of the schools to function and children would be more apt to learn and learn the lesson of neatness in a school that is well kept, rather than one that is dilapidated.

MADAM SPEAKER: Would this be a time where we could take the luncheon break?

MR. G. HAIG BODDEN: Yes, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The House will be suspended until 2:15 p.m.

AT 12:40 P.M. THE PROCEEDINGS WAS SUSPENDED

PROCEEDINGS RESUMED AT 2:26 P.M.

MADAM SPEAKER: Please be seated. Proceedings are resumed. Debate continues on the Draft Five Year Education Development Plan. The Second Elected Member for Bodden Town.

MR. G. HAIG BODDEN: Madam Speaker, the Draft Plan and the Report being considered by the House have been put forward by the Honourable Member for Education. But it is good that the public to realise that him alone is not responsible for the mischief which he is carrying out. Because of collective responsibilities the other three Elected Members of Council has an equal burden to bear in forwarding this Report.

It is unfortunate that none of the other Honourable Members of Council have yet spoken on this important subject and we look forward in hearing their views on the reasons why they are helping to push this Report through in such an unorthodox fashion. If they are accepting no responsibility for this Report then, they should tell the public why they are acting like clones in allowing the main root to go ahead

with the Report. Because, as has been shown by other speakers and by certain recommendations, which I have mentioned, there are many new areas covered by this Report and recommendations 33 and 34, which I will deal with now, are two such new areas. These two recommendations cover ground that has hitherto been uncharted waters in our development.

Recommendation 33 recommends the establishment of a programme leading to a graduate qualification for teaching arising from cooperation between the Community College and a University Education Department. Recommendation 34 goes on to a consideration of a sustained in-service course at the Community College, which would offer opportunities for teachers to work along side administrators and other government and non-governmental managers and professionals. While there may be merit in both of these recommendations, the recommendations are so novel to our system and to what had obtain heretofore, there is certainly a glaring need for full discussions before the recommendations can be accepted.

This is where I rely on the other three Honourable Elected Members of Council to guide me as to the reasons why they have accepted the actions of that Honourable Member, and to tell us of the reasons why they can accept this Report without any attempt to explore these new avenues. While an individual Member of Council may have responsibility for a particular subject, it is the collective will of Council that puts the policy of that individual Member into force. And, while a Member may hide behind collective responsibility, we have to remember that in the instance of this Educational Report, as in all matters of policy, collective responsibility does not come into play until after a majority of the Members have accepted the Report or the proposal or whatever it is.

Recommendation 35 is that the Chief Education Officer, the Deputy Chief Education Officer and those officers concerned with finance, personnel, monitoring, maintenance and supplies, should be in the Government Headquarters building in close association with the Portfolio for Education, Environment, Recreation and Culture, and the other main Portfolios and Departments. I believe that it is only since the Member received this Report which recommended that the Department be housed in the same building with the Portfolio that the Member has turned his department out of the Glass House and rented a shiny new build down at the Harbour Centre for the administration of the rest of the Education Department.

Perhaps the Member for Communications and Works can tell us why these changes in offices were made at a crucial time when the Report recommended that they all be housed in close proximity to each other. It seems to me that the same system of implementation has been used with this Report as had been used with the Cayman Airways Report. Because we saw major and far-reaching changes being made in the airline at the time when the result of the Report should have been known or was very close at hand and the Government went ahead and allowed these major changes, as they are doing now with this Education Report.

Recommendation 36 seems to be a good one in which one person would be designated as a manager of the Education Centre and responsible for facilitating liaison between the various users of the Centre. Recommendation 37 seems to have anticipated the moves that would have been made to implement parts of the Report before full approval had been given for all of it, because Recommendation 37 reads: "In view of the likely effect of the recommendations of the Review, it is recommended that the proposed Care and Assessment Centre be reconsidered in consultation with the Social Services Department.".

In other words, what the consultants were saying throughout, and this has been brought out time and again in the Report, is that this Report must not be taken in isolation. But must be considered with everything else in the Government; Social Services, Public Works Department, Finances, everything else. The consultants spent a lot of time in dealing with the curriculum and with the terms of reference they were given and as the First Member for Bodden Town went into great length in dealing with that, I will not spend too much time on the area.

The years when children are compelled to attend school came in for very firm recommendations, and as the school age (which is the compulsory age) is set out in the Education Law, I think it is only fitting that we should examine these ages. One criticism, by I believe two speakers so far, has been that while the school age has been extended they were not happy with where the extension of that period came about and they were hoping that it would have been a firm extension at the end of what had been the normal compulsory school age.

I think the way the existing law is that a child is compelled by Law to remain in the education system until the age of 16 or thereabouts, and while the child may be allowed to continue in school beyond that age it is not compulsory that a child attend.

What the proposals are in the Plan which is before us and the recommendations here, is that at the pre-school level children attend from three years of age to four years nine months, and they do not enter Primary School until they are four years and nine months old. I have already dealt on Friday with the cutting out of the reception classes and we heard about the getting rid of the teacher's aides and the complaints from parents where some of the teacher's aides will not be available in some schools to help with the reception classes next year. This has been brought in the instance of the Savannah School by a letter which was written by the First Elected Member for Bodden Town and myself as a result of a complaint which came up to us through the Parent/Teachers Association.

Here again showing the crying need for all the people involved to meet and discuss this most important matter. Not being a trained educationalist myself, I am not here to say whether pre school or reception class is better. But there are so many people out there with the academic knowledge, so many people with the teaching experience, and above all, so many parents and guardians with the day-to-day knowledge to discuss this matter and reach a very good conclusion. It amazes me how a person can claim to be the Honourable Member for Education, claim to have an interest in the school system yet deny all these people access and ignore their knowledge, experience and know-how. How can he receive the blessing of the three Elected Members charged with responsibility for making policy in this country?

It recommends that the Primary School age would be from four years and nine months to ten years and nine months which is a higher age than formerly existed in the system. This is because there is a recommendation to do away with the Middle School which was a thorn in the flesh to the Member from its inception. From the way the recommendations were written I have come to the conclusion and it would be very hard to convince me otherwise that the consultants were asked to find a way of closing the Middle School.

Whether that act is right or wrong is something that I feel should be discussed at great lengths if the recommendation before the House is the correct one for us today. Why is the Honourable Member afraid to discuss it? Because he said in putting forward this Motion there were really only two points that had come under fire and they were; the change from the reception classes and the obliteration of the Middle School.

The third recommendation is that the secondary school years should be from ten years nine months to 16 years and nine months. I believe the 16 years is now the compulsory age, as I mentioned earlier to which children attended. So that without any change in the Education Law, at this level the compulsory age would remain more or less the same.

One of the reasons for the changes that were made further down the line was the disparity between the ages of the schools and the separate entities of the school that they were trying to melt in to the system. Yet the consultants over-looked the age differences when they put the ten years and nine months old children into the High School with the 16 years and nine months old. What is even worse is that later on when we send these 16 years and nine month old children into the Community College to do their A' Levels they might be rubbing shoulder with 35 year old who can be admitted at the Community College. They do not see anything wrong with an age differences at this level.

While they may be right in recommending the demise of the Middle School, they are totally wrong with the reasons they gave for it. I believe these reasons were only put into the heads of the consultants because he could not think of any just reason why it should not continue to exist. Apparently, this has been swallowed by the other Honourable Elected Members who believe that their only purpose is to say Amen when the Member for Education announces his policy. They are not to question anything regardless of how out of fashion it may be. Regardless of how ridiculous it may be. But let me tell them that when he falls because he has erred in this matter they too shall fall. It is not enough just to keep quiet and believe people will not notice because there is an articulate Backbench that will make it known that they did not speak when the role was called for dues.

Recommendation 39 says that it is recommended that there be an opportunity for children over the age of three to attend day care or nursery facilities established in centres within local communities. We do not know if that is good or bad but there are people out there who could tell us. Years ago children did not go to school until they were seven. Now this Honourable Member is putting them in an institution at the age of three, that is, in a different institution from the Primary School.

I believe one of the problems with young children today is that they are being pushed, being tired-out and burnt-out. These are things that ought to be discussed with these Members that are bold enough to accept these controversial assumptions. The Honourable Member will not give the opportunity to people who have had experience.

We hear about young children being tired, exhausted and we heard the Honourable Member talking about having them in an institution for a full day. No longer will they go to class for a half day. These are three year old children and I wonder if he is going to have beds for them to take their afternoon nap or is he going let them sleep on the floor? Or has he not yet discussed this with the Member for Education and the Member for Tourism?

These are serious problems which need to be discussed fully. I see the Member making maneuvers with his mouth, no sound is coming from it but the mouth is in motion and I think it is just as well that no sound comes - but these are serious considerations that need to be examined. Examined in the closest detail because we are talking about fundamental changes which will affect this country for good or evil this day onward. It is not like if you make a mistake in renting a plane that is too expensive, all you have to pay is dollars. We are going to pay with lives because the Member like the Napa car advertisement will not listen.

Recommendation 40: "The Review envisages that there should be a formal educational school system considered as a coordinated whole, starting at four years, nine months and completed at 16 years and nine months.".

MADAM SPEAKER: I hope, Honourable Member, you are not going to repeat that again. You have already given us those statistics.

MR. G. HAIG BODDEN: No, Madam Speaker, I have no intention of repeating it. I was dealing with recommendation 40 which we had not gone into. The issue I want to raise on this recommendation is that this Review seems to have been brought about because there was a Motion from Elected Members of the Backbench to increase the school years from the top end. And I remembered the debate on that, especially for the Elected Member for Bodden Town, when he said that these children at that age of 16 were really not suitable to go out into the work force and to compete with adults. I believe it was his hope, I do not remember whether he was the mover of the Motion - as a mover of the Motion it was his hope that these children would be given more time at this level to allow themselves to better adjust and cope with the harsh realities of holding a job as a school leaver in an adult world. By the way things are going, I do not believe this hope will be realised.

Recommendation 41, which I will not go into in any great detail since that simply deals with the upper end of the school age. Other than to say that I, personally, believe many

parents - and I mentioned this last week - and I are really disturbed by the fact that in a few years time children will not be able to attend Sixth Form in the high school but will have to do it in the Community College.

Recommendation 42. I already dealt with a part of it, the other part is that High School should be limited to a roll of 500. I think that is a foolish recommendation taking into account the situation in the Cayman Islands. I think it is impractical, it is expensive and I do not see how we can maintain it. This is where consultants are useful but where common sense is better because all consultants come and give you what they recommend to be considered the ideal situation. They come and tell you that no high school in Grand Cayman or Cayman Brac should have more than 500 children. But as the First Member for Bodden Town said, do they know the costs if you have 2,000 children and you have four schools? You have four separate costs and this has been well articulated by the Honourable Member so I need not go into that.

Let us be reasonable people. Do we have to accept this recommendation and go out and build a new high school every time the enrollment reaches 500? When the Member started introducing this Motion I had to look at the First Elected Member for Bodden Town and smile, when the Member for Education said we will have a high School in Cayman Brac. We will have one in George Town, we are going to turn the Middle School into a High School and, we are going to build one in Bodden Town.

I do not think that you, nor I, will ever live to see the day when that Honourable Member will build a High School in Bodden Town. Because if he takes as long to build a High School as he has taken to do all the tiny little projects he has put off for seven years until 1993, even Methuselah would have completed his life-span by the time he get around to a school. I think he was just talking and I do not expect that to ever happen. If he is removing the teacher's aides from the Savannah School because he cannot pay them, do you think he is going to build a High School there?

MADAM SPEAKER: Would you please stop referring to the Teacher's Aides, that is being repetitious, Honourable Member.

MR. G. HAIG BODDEN: I will, Madam Speaker, but I feel so strongly about it. I think it would be good if the Honourable Member for Communications and Works would tell us if he is going to provide in his construction programme a school and when it will come? This is why I believe we need to examine them in great detail and to question them. I know we will hear some excuses when the Member get up to speak why this was not done. And we will hear some ancient history. We will hear all this, but we need some straight talk. And I trust if it does not come from him it will come from one of the other three Elected Members.

Recommendation 43, recommends that a National Curriculum Council be formed with the task of establishing a national curriculum. As I touched on this in my opening and perhaps referred to it, at least one other time,...

MADAM SPEAKER: You need not refer to it again.
Thank you.

MR. G. HAIG BODDEN: I will not spend a lot of time on it.

MADAM SPEAKER: Or any time on it, Honourable Member, please.

MR. G. HAIG BODDEN: I had hoped, when I saw this Motion on the Agenda that the Member in putting it forward would have dealt with these recommendations. After all it is his Motion and it is his business to tell the House what is going to happen. But he skirted the issue on most of them and this is the reason why I felt it is my duty to try to draw him out if that is possible. Recommendation 44, also deal with the curriculum and I will not go into that as I too, am concerned about how near we are drawing to the holiday season.

Recommendation 45, suggested the establishment of a Labour Market Information System in conjunction with the Government and economic institutions. I believe this would be a good thing because children at schools need direction. They need to know which jobs will be available, they need help in qualifying themselves for jobs that they will like and Cayman is a small community. There is not much use in becoming qualified if the job is not available and if jobs are available for which you are not qualified, you will either have to take the job at the very lowest level or move into some other area. This is important and this is one area where the Committee could have heard from businesses all over the land - the construction industry, the engineers, the banks on what they expect from school leavers. What their needs are and I believe that a golden opportunity has been missed by not inviting them to become witnesses.

There is in the Report a very serious recommendation and I hope that the Member will put aside all his politics and answer straightforwardly what he intends to do with the International College of the Cayman Islands? I have seen some correspondence from them which indicates that they are fighting for survival. On page 81, of the Report speaking about the College, it is said: "Consideration should therefore be given to the question of its continuing registration and use of the title "International College of the Cayman Islands'." It does not bother me if they want to change the name,...

MADAM SPEAKER: Second Elected Member for Bodden Town, the matter of ICCI was very fully dealt with by the First Member for Bodden Town.

MR. G. HAIG BODDEN: I realise that, Madam Speaker. I just call on the Member to tell us, yes or no. Will this college be allowed to continue as a college? I have one point I would like to make that was not mentioned by the Member, and it is my understanding that the college has a pretty well equipped kitchen which

could be developed and used as part of the hotel school. I heard some rumours that the Government would like to buy the Transnational House - the Grand Pavilion Hotel and develop it as a hotel school. We would like to hear if there is any truth in this and if there is any plans afoot for this?

Moving on to recommendation 47. This recommendation is for a scholarship and student support Board. The Board should have an independent Chairman and the best possible advice and guidance. Recommendations are made as to the membership, but I would like to add to those recommendations that private sectors be included on the Board as well. The recommendation is for representatives of other Portfolios and the Community College Board.

Recommendation 48, has been dealt with by me and I think another Member touched on it. Recommendation 49 is a very short one and suggested that the Portfolio establish a board for further education policy. It should incorporate other post-school institutions, distance learning facilities and individualised learning through informal and formal education channels. A recommendation such as this certainly cannot be digested by the public with so little information on it. As the Member is not giving out any information I can only say this is another example of where we are expected to approve a Report without all the full facts.

The First Member for Bodden Town dealt at great length with the examination systems, the assessment of pupils and the external examinations which are covered in recommendation 50, 51, 52 and 53. So I would only be repeating some of what he said although I feel I could add a little to it. I will not try the patience of the Chair with those sections.

There is in number 54 a recommendation to change the name "special education," probably to remove any stigma which may attach to that term and I would have no argument against that. The other two sections 55 and 56 also deal with that and were pretty well covered by other Members. The curriculum seems to have come up in other recommendations but I think it is just the way the Report is written. I would not want to go back into that as I do not want to be guilty of repeating myself when there is so much more to say on this very important subject.

MADAM SPEAKER: Honourable Member is there any reason why you are delaying your speech because it does not seem as if you are very well prepared?

MR. G. HAIG BODDEN: No, Madam Speaker, I want to deal next with the section on the serious money problems we are asked to agree to with this Report. It is my belief that never before in the history of these Islands has this country been so short of cash. When is it going to end? Will the Member tell us where he is going to find the money when he changes the system to have one high school for every 500 students?

He is seeking by the approval of this Motion before the House, a very large capital expenditure and as large as the figure is we know that what has been put in here is simply a ball park figure for the sake of the Report and has not been actually costed. Also, a part from the high capital expenditure which will run us into many millions, there is going to be the recurrent expenditure to go with it. What I would like to say on it is that if this House adopts this Report, on top of the news we have just received about the new Hospital and, on top of the bad news we received from the Member for Tourism about the debts of Cayman Airways when he answered the Parliamentary question a few days ago; we will have committed this country to debts which we cannot pay. If we look around we will see many examples of countries where greedy politicians did the same thing but in the end found themselves in financial ruin having to go out and beg mercy from their creditors.

I believe and have always supported funds for education, but it is time that common sense should come to the Government and they should sit down and decide which one of the massive programmes they want to do most of all. Instead of trying to do them all when they know they cannot and the revenue will not support it. So whether the Report which we have before us is good or bad, the country still has to decide whether they can embark upon a programme of spending more money. In closing, I would like to suggest to the Member that now that his eyes have been opened, he reconsider his stance on this Motion and will amend the it before the House, so that we may get some help with it from the vast number of people out there who would be willing to come in January or February to a Select Committee and arrive at a solution to some of the problems which have been pin-pointed by this Report.

If I am not able to persuade him, I trust that when the other Honourable Elected Members of Council meet with him, they will try to show him the way.

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The House will be suspended for 15 minutes.

AT 3:35 P.M. THE HOUSE WAS SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 3:56 P.M.

MADAM SPEAKER: Please be seated. Proceedings are resumed, debate continues on Government Motion No. 11/91. The Second Elected Member for Cayman Brac and Little Cayman.

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to speak on Government Motion No. 11/91 which deals with the Draft Five Year Educational Development Plan 1991 to 1996. Before I get into the arguments which I wish to present, I must say that I think being here in this Legislative Assembly today the 23rd of December, is really a bit much. And I think that it does not speak well for the Member for Education

insistence why we are here. It is too serious a matter for him to take it lightly, which I think his insistence has done and certainly it is too much an important matter for me not to say something on it.

We deal with various Motions here from time to time and certainly in my opinion this is one of the most important. I would like to refer to the recitals in the Motion which the Member has moved before the House. It says:

> "WHEREAS on 27th June, 1991 the Honourable Legislative Assembly passed the following Motion:
>
> THAT THE EDUCATION REVIEW 1990, AND THE DRAFT FIVE YEAR EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT PLAN 1991 - 1996, BE ACCEPTED AS THE BASIS FOR NATIONAL DIALOGUE AND FINAL PREPARATION OF A FIVE YEAR EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT PLAN WHICH ITSELF WILL BE BROUGHT BACK TO THIS HONOURABLE HOUSE FOR DISCUSSION, DEBATE AND FINAL ACCEPTANCE.".

Because of that, this motion is before the House. I think that the attention of the House should be drawn to the fact that the Draft Five Year Plan not only supposedly was a basis for National Dialogue. But it is this very same and identical Plan without any change of one jot or tittle that is back before the House to be passed here today or tomorrow or whenever.

This motion further argues that:

> "AND WHEREAS there has been subsequent meetings held with teachers in the Government schools as well as private schools and public meetings have been held in ALL districts in the Islands, including Cayman Brac;
>
> AND WHEREAS as a result of the consultation which has taken place Government has accepted that the Plan as drafted should become the FIVE YEAR EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT PLAN 1991-1996.".

The meetings that have been referred to and the various debate, I believe, is highly insufficient for this Bill to be before the House asking for an outright acceptance of the House at this time.

There is an amendment to this Motion which asks for a Select Committee and I believe if ever there is a Motion or a matter before the Legislative Assembly that deserves to go to a Select Committee it is this one. So when it comes to the final vote I will not vote for the acceptance of this Motion now before the House. The Resolve is that the House accepts this Plan, which was supposed to be only a basis for discussion as the final and all encompassing Plan for the Cayman Islands. As I mentioned from the very beginning (I think) this matter is being treated very lightly. As I try to develop an argument I will certainly try to show why I said this is one of the most important Motions to ever come before this Legislative Assembly.

I would first like to review just what our system of Education is now. For, if one should just take the presentation of the Member for Education, one would believe that we do not have one a Education System, nor have we ever had one, nor did that system ever produce anyone who learned their ABCs or could add two and two to get four. The Member, and all of us, except for a few have all been part of the system in this country that have produced some educated people.

The statistics at this time, according to this Report show that there are nine Primary Schools in the Cayman Islands - nine; six in Grand Cayman and three in Cayman Brac. These schools are divided into two. You have the infants, the juniors - four years and nine months to nine years and nine months in the Primary Schools. As it presently exists we have a Middle School which have an intake of children from the Primary Schools from nine years and nine months up to 14 years. From the Middle School the children of the Cayman Islands go into Secondary Schools; namely the Cayman Islands High School, which caters to them from about 13 years to 15 years when they compulsorily must attend school. They can go beyond that but it is in special circumstances that this is allowed.

Strange as it might seem, we also have Private Schools - six of them all in Grand Cayman. The total population of the Private Schools is 1,036, again according to the findings of this Report. Our system, as it exists, also provides for 25 privately owned schools which cater to children under four years and nine months. A note is made that only four are really providing genuine pre-school education the others are day-care and child minding centres. So far I think it goes to show that over the years we have developed in a manner that has met our educational need all being not perfect. But has met those needs and indeed, so well that I cannot believe that the only way to fix this system, which is presently in place, is to totally undo it. Destroy it and radically and revolutionarily change the whole system into something that is suggested in this Report.

The need for pre-schools is evident to anyone who would even try to think a little bit because of our rapid development in this country and because of the fact that the cost of living has risen so very high it is necessary for, in most instances both parents nowadays to work. So there has to be a place to care for children who are not of Primary School age. That is one reason. The other reason is that it has been founded by educationalists that it is good to introduce children into a play form of learning from about age three. Some say it can and should be done even earlier. We start normally about three years of age. We have been able to cater for ourselves in that manner and indeed the response from the private sector has been good, in that there are 25 privately owned schools serving that particular cause.

In this country there are also some special schools; we have the Lighthouse School, which again, according to the Report caters to the severe learning disabled and there are now

50 students in that school. There is even a home-based programme where children are identified that they might have a need for special help towards their education there is in place some means for assisting. Specialists, I understand, go to these schools. It is also called an early intervention programme which caters according to the Report to children three to five years; and then there is the Sunrise Adult Training Centre which is a facility with mental retardation, that is able to train them with the use of specialists to be worthwhile citizens in terms of being able to do if it is even that one task, well enough so they can earn a living and take their rightful place in a society.

Although, if I remember, I think it was this year the Member for Education has certain problems with agreeing to such persons being employed in one of the hotels here which is far sighted enough, and realises the good that can be done in terms of catering to those types of persons in their employment. Our Education System goes even beyond that, for we do have a Law School which is producing so many lawyers now that I understand the entrenched lawyers are saying there is too much and it should be stopped, and we should just not produce anymore attorneys now. We should just provide degrees for 'In Law'. I have nothing against that part of it, but I do know from the information I have, that that is a serious argument going down in some quarters of the legal fraternity in this country that is getting a bad name, as apparently the specialists here in this Report are giving some aspects of our present system because it is doing so well. The Law School supposedly does not reach the same standards as if you were to attend Greys Inn, or one of the Inns in England. But yet, the students here are not buying their degrees and they are passing with Honours the degree courses from a British University.

One of the most recent schools in this country, or shall I call it a college, the Cayman Islands Community College recently came on stream. That is the particular pet project of the present Member for Education and I certainly commend him in his effort to get a Community College. My only criticism of that is, there is more walkways and courtyards than it is classroom space and it is delivering skilled training which we so badly need in this country.

From the Report I see that the Education Specialists, or experts here were recommending in effect that this become an extension of the Cayman Islands High School. I think that is ridiculous. A college is supposed to be just that, a college. If it is not a college, call it a High School extension but do not attempt to call it a college and let it be the sixth form extension of the High School all in one. In the same breath claiming that it is going to go into two year programmes to take people up to certificate/diploma levels in various skills. Then there is the International College of the Cayman Islands which has been around for over 20 years. And which I firmly believe had a death blow delivered to it by these experts who wrote this Report on the behest of the Member for Education. I think he fed the thought to them and then mention was made by these experts in the fashion that they regarding this particular school, - I will deal with it in a little more detail as I speak.

The consultants go on to point out that we have other education provision. They show that Government businesses and commercial concerns offer a wide ranging in-service training programmes in their various businesses. Therefore, the first point that I wish to make is that we do have an education system in the Cayman Islands; a very wide education system. I am the first to admit, and indeed I have been critical of it, that the system needs certain corrections, certain streamlining, certain people need to be fired, and certain people need to be hired, the Member for Education should give up his particular subject and let someone else deal with it and all of the other things. But, we have a system. As I look at this Report, and many persons have spoken on its virtue, I found certain inadequacies. I note that there are 20 Terms of Reference. I do not know who developed the terms of references, but certainly those terms of reference invoked, I believe, some of the answers that the Member for Education has been looking for some time.

One of the things I find in this Report is the fact that the consultants in the Report, accurately came up with a number of findings - a number of problems in the system. It is not as if it is so earth shattering because I do know that the First Elected Member for Bodden Town, for example, other Backbench Members and myself of this House have criticised these very areas and pointed out these very areas which need to be corrected. However, as we know, the only way it is of any good is if someone outside comes in and listen, then turn around and tell you the very same thing you already know. They have done it. I see many findings as such in this Report. What it is lacking, and I will show this in some instances, that while it has identified the problem it has not set down the details as to how to correct it. And, they have made certain recommendations that they give no basis for, It is something like the Report for International Health Care (IHC) in making certain recommendations in numbers. But yet it was not supported by the data that they used to arrive at that hypothesis.

I am not going to sing as many praises about this Report as has been done. I have stated where I think it has indeed done what it was expected to do, and I have stated where I feel it has fallen short. If it is one thing that this Report should have done or brought to the attention of all the people who read it and read it, reading not to confute, but to weigh and consider is the fact that we have an immigration problem. By that I mean, that all of the millions of dollars that are recommended in this Report to be spent in this country, it is largely and almost catering to teaching the children of non-Caymanians in the Cayman Islands.

That was the most outstanding part of this Report. The first part that really grabbed me and I must say again, in this particular respect the consultants are very forthright. They choose a particular part they called the setting, that is the Cayman setting and I would like to read a few lines from it. "All education systems must relate closely to the nature and distribution of the population. Thus in 1979, it was estimated that there were 16,700 in the Cayman Islands, of whom 81 per cent were Caymanians.".

The figure for the end of 1989 had risen to 26,500 and the percentage of Caymanians had been reduced to 63 per cent. On a high projection of population growth the number of Caymanians would fall below 50 per cent by 1995. On a low projection the number would remain marginally above 50 per cent.

When the Honourable Member for Education presented this

Motion, I sat hoping that he would bring to the House some position of his Government on the question of the induced population growth. What he has done is brought the Report here and said, look, I endorse this rapid rate of population it is going to continue and let us have your approval to go and spend $34 million in capital, and incur by 1995, $78 million for recurrent expenditure thereafter. That is what had been done. He never mentioned the question of the fact that, the elected representatives in here for the people of the Cayman Islands, are being asked to accept a population growth by non-indigenous people that is going to place us Caymanians in 1995, less than 50 per cent of the population.

He should really tell the country what else he has in store because the consultants did not put this down here just to have there. They are showing that educations systems should relate to the population. If he is not going to agree that the population should continue at a runaway pace, then, all of the things that are in this Report would not be relevant. There would be no need for building four high schools, simply to say, we will have 500 in it and when it becomes 501 we will build another high-school. That is another finding, and another recommendation here that I highly question. I think it is absurd.

These consultants noted, and I quote another sentence here: "However, it is clear that the main source of population growth is provided by people whose origins lie outside the Cayman Islands. This provides a particular and special problem of economic, social, cultural development and must therefore, inform many of the recommendations in this Review." These were the points of the Report before the Member came to ask for its acceptance. He and his fellow colleagues in Executive Council should have sat down and considered and used this as a basis for discussion. But should have brought parts of these recommendations to ask for acceptance, not the Report in its totality.

In this particular section the consultants also note that the growth expansion itself requires continued dependance on a significant supply of expatriate manpower. Many of our economic, social, political problems relate to our population growth and the question of immigration in this country. I cannot forget that in the latter part of last year we had a visit from a Minister of State from the United Kingdom. He asked very few questions and he did not have very much time to spare - or so he said - one thing he enquired about was the views of Elected Members on the question of immigration? I wonder why? He was concerned about it, for whatever his reason was. I am certainly concerned about it and I know my reasons here, are many.

MADAM SPEAKER: Honourable Member, it is now 4:30.

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

ADJOURNMENT

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Madam Speaker, I believe it is agreed that we adjourn this Honourable House until 10 o'clock, Friday morning.

MADAM SPEAKER: The question before the Honourable House is that the House should now adjourn until 10:00 a.m., Friday, 27th December, 1991. If there is no debate, I shall put the question. Those in favour please say Aye...Those against No.

HON. W. NORMAN BODDEN: Madam Speaker, I was just rising, and maybe it is at the wrong time, but anyway if it is, I hope that you will allow me to take this opportunity as is customary on behalf of my colleagues the Elected Members of Council, of course, this does not prevent either of them from saying their bit if they so choose. But having risen I would like to extend to you, your family and the rest of the staff and, also to my colleagues in the House my very best wishes for a happy holiday season.

I am very much aware that this has been a difficult meeting for you, Madam Speaker, and undoubtedly on many occasions your patience has been tried almost beyond limit. But if it is any comfort to you, I can assure you that your performance during this meeting has certainly given me personally a much deeper appreciation of your performance in this House as a Speaker of our Legislative Assembly. I think that this country is well served and proud to have a lady of your caliber filling this responsible position in the Cayman Islands.

So with those few words I once again, extend our very best and warm wishes to you and your family and trust that you will have a very nice Christmas Day and Boxing Day and we look forward to the House reconvening on Friday.

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: Thank you, very much.
Mr. Bush.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Madam Speaker, I would like to associate with the kind words offered by the First Member for George Town and the Member for Tourism. This has been a tiring year and it is most unfortunate that we have not yet finished our line of business, nevertheless Madam Speaker, I trust nobody's Christmas has been messed up.

Over the Christmas season, we hear many beautiful carols and the one that I like best is that one which sing about a 'thrill of hope, for yonder breaks anew and glorious morn.' We look forward to that thrill of hope in the new year. I believe I have already sent greetings to you and I would just like to wish everyone a very Merry Christmas and a prosperous and happy New Year.

MADAM SPEAKER: Thank you, the First Elected Member for Cayman Brac and Little Cayman.

CAPT. MABRY S. KIRKCONNELL: I thank you, Madam Speaker.

In order to save time I too, would like to associate myself with the remarks by the Honourable Member responsible for Tourism, Aviation and Trade and to extend that little further, Madam Speaker, to all the people of the Cayman Islands. I would like to wish a very Merry Christmas and all the best for the season and in particular to the members of my constituency.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Official Member.

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Madam Speaker, the Official Members on this occasion do not want to be left out of the scheme and this appreciation, for I believe that in the last - I do not know how many days it is now, - it must be close to 20 days - all of our patience has been tried as the Member for Tourism put it "beyond the limit on occasions." But we are very happy to get this opportunity of saying to yourself, Madam Speaker, and the staff of this Honourable House warmest wishes for a joyous Christmas Season, and hopefully to spend the New Year with a different kind of tempo. Rather than working this close to Christmas. To the Honourable Members of the Legislature, we wish for you and your family all that is good for the Christmas Season and for the New Year. For the people of the Cayman Islands we also wish them the very best for a joyous Christmas Season.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Second Elected Member for Cayman Brac and Little Cayman.

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I too, would like to take this opportunity to wish for all Members of this Legislature and their families a very happy Christmas and a very prosperous New Year. I think we as Legislators have certainly done a perfect job of adversarial politics and indeed the good Lord has brought us to this point in time, healthy and well, as far as I am aware.

You too, Madam Speaker, I would like to say special wishes to you and your family. I associate myself with the remarks of the Member for Tourism. I think you have done a splendid job and I know your patience has been tried many times. But I think the way you have conducted the business of this House is certainly exemplary.

I would like to thank all the members of staff who have been so kind and considerate to me in many instances here. I would like to thank them and to wish for them too, a very Merry Christmas and to all the people of the Cayman Islands, a particular reference to my constituents, my friends and family.

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The First Elected Member for Bodden Town.

MR. ROY BODDEN: Thank you. I wish to be associated with all the other comments and accolades which have preceded what I am going to say in your regard, Madam Speaker. I would also, at this time like to wish for my colleagues in this House a very prosperous Christmas and New Year when it comes, especially to all the peoples of the Cayman Islands but dearest to my heart those of Bodden Town who have so graciously entrusted me to be their representative.

For you, Madam Speaker, I would like to say that one of these days when you so choose you can tell people that you were a lion tamer because I have been impressed with your dignity in the Chair in handling the tempers and the tantrums, the idiosyncracies of 15 stalwart; hard-backed men who sometimes each insisting that his point of view is the most important and should be heard.

Madam Speaker, may God richly bless you and may you continue for a long time to preside over this august body.

MADAM SPEAKER: Thank you, Honourable Members. I really had forgotten that Christmas was so close when I was putting the question on the adjournment. I want to thank you all, most sincerely for your kind words of expressions and best wishes for Christmas.

I too, want to wish every one of you, your family and your friends a most joyous, peaceful and happy Christmas. And I hope that we will all remember the song of the angels, 'Peace and Goodwill to all men.' Not only for the remainder of this year but also for the coming year. I too, want to pay a special tribute to the Clerk, the Deputy Clerk, the Clerk's Assistants, the Hansard Reporters, and the other staff. On your behalf too, we must not forget the ladies who have been feeding us so well. I think perhaps some of us may have been gaining a couple of ounces but they have worked very hard.

Of course, Mr. Cline, the Serjeant-at-Arms (and there is no wonder at all why he is so slim) has been running up and down the whole time with messages, hither and yon. We want to thank them all, including the nice-looking police constable outside. We want to thank them too for the security which they have given us. They are very conscientious and they, too, are to be wished by us all a very Merry Christmas and a prosperous New Year.

We look forward to seeing you again on Friday morning. Thank you all very much and I have put the question that the House do now adjourn until Friday morning at 10 o'clock and the ayes had it. The House is now adjourned.

AT 4:40 P.M. THE HOUSE STOOD ADJOURNED UNTIL 10:00 A.M., FRIDAY, 27TH DECEMBER, 1991.

FRIDAY, 27TH DECEMBER, 1991 10:09 A.M.

MADAM SPEAKER: Prayers by the Honourable Member for Health and Social Services.

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 II, 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 Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, the Members of Executive Council and Members of the Legislative Assembly that we may be enabled faithfully to perform the responsible duties of our high office.

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

Let us say the Lord's prayer together:

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 the light of His countenance upon us and give us peace now and always. Amen.

MADAM SPEAKER: Please be seated. Proceedings are resumed in the Legislative Assembly.

Presentation of Papers and Reports Report of the Accountant General and Accounts of the Cayman Islands Government for the year ended 31st December, 1990. The Honourable the First Official Member.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS AND OF REPORTS

REPORT OF THE ACCOUNTANT GENERAL AND ACCOUNTS OF THE CAYMAN ISLANDS GOVERNMENT FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31ST DECEMBER, 1990

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Madam Speaker, I beg to lay on the table of this Honourable House the Report of the Accountant General and the Accounts of the Government, 1990.

MADAM SPEAKER: So ordered.

Government Business Government Motion No. 11/91 Draft Five Year Education Development Plan 1991 - 1996 the Second Elected Member for Cayman Brac and Little Cayman continuing the debate.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS MOTIONS

GOVERNMENT MOTION NO. 11/91 DRAFT FIVE YEAR EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT PLAN 1991 - 1996

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, it was Monday when I rose to speak on Government Motion No. 11/91 and it is Friday today, and I am again in the Legislative Assembly continuing my debate on this topic. It is still not clear why the mover of this motion should find it necessary that this all be dealt with in these days of the Yuletide, however, that might become clear after awhile.

Madam Speaker, on Monday I pointed out how this motion is asking for a complete acceptance of the Report from the Education Consultants without any changes whatsoever or any input which supposedly was to have come from the Education Department and the Portfolio. I also made the point that the Cayman Islands presently has an education system, one that is quite comprehensive in fact, and I argued that this country needs that system streamlined and fixed in certain areas but that radical change such as is

recommended in this Report is unnecessary and, in fact, undesirable.

When we adjourned on Monday, I was looking at the section of the Report which dealt with the Cayman Islands setting in which this Report was done and the factors involved in the particular Report. At this time, Madam Speaker, I would like to look at the section which deals with the main development issue for it is within this area that one can get the true picture of what is happening in the Cayman Islands and to which this Report should relate. The consultants note and I quote; "Within no more than two decades, the Islands have been transformed from an undeveloped economy in to one of the world's prosperous small island economies. The rapid pace of economic growth was accompanied by an equally rapid growth in the demand for trained manpower which could not be met on Islands with such a very small indigenous population.". Undoubtedly one of the problems which is before us is to find those trained persons in our small indigenous population. Overall, I believe for the amount of money which is spent, we are not really doing a good job. The consultants note that because of the situation and I quote again: "This has led in turn to substantial inflows of expatriate professionals and other types of skilled labour, leading to the significant shift in the balance in the population towards non-Caymanians.".

On Monday, I pointed out that the Member should, in his presentation, have said whether his Government favours, accelerated increase in the population in this country or whether his Government favoured the low variant situation.

MADAM SPEAKER: Honourable Member may I remind you not to repeat anything that you have said before, please?

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Yes, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: The question still is, that a decision has to be made and one can only assume it is made by the fact that this Report is recommended by Government to be accepted in its totality. What is very significant is for the Member and for the Government to take note of what these consultants have pointed out in this particular respect. When it says: "The change has, however, created concerns about the perceived social and cultural consequences of a continuing rapid pace of growth in the economy.. Therefore, for the Cayman Islands, the main development issue is the pace of economic growth.". This becomes a bit more alarming when we look at the figures which were given by the consultants and it says:

> "If the number of work permit holders and their dependents continued to increase at the average rate for the period 1979-1989 (less than the rate in the last three years) then the population would reach 53,300 by the year 2000, of whom only 39 per cent (20,700) would be Caymanian. If growth were gradually controlled from 1991, so that the rate of increase of work permit holders were held to that of the Caymanian population by the year 2000; then the population would reach 39,500 of whom 52 per cent would be Caymanians.".

Those are the facts that are before us. Those are the facts that need to be dealt with and addressed and they have not been addressed by what the Member has said so far. Are we prepared to see the Caymanian population continue to fall while we spend millions of dollars to educate non-Caymanian children? This Report touches most profoundly on the social, political, economic well being of this country. It is inescapable particularly what has been recommended in this Report in some areas will seriously reverse where we have arrived at to-date.

We are aware that this country has spent in the past three years, and again it is out to spend for next year, large sums of money - $130 million next year. While education, in my opinion, has to be one of the most important matters to be dealt with by any country, can we consider entering into costs such as are set down to be spent in this particular Report? The Report points out that the projected expenditure for the Department of Education Recurrent in 1996 if the high variant it taken and I must take the high variant because that is the way it is, that is the way the population has increased here in the last few months it is going to be $16,903,600 in 1996.

Madam Speaker, the Plan also goes on to inform the Government that if they take their recommendations the Recurrent Expenditure up to 1976 if the various buildings and so on go on there will have been spent $77,360,000 million. These are, indeed, staggering figures. They are recurrent, it means each year that the Government must find these sums of money to maintain the education system which the consultants have recommended to the put in place. How can we afford this? How can we possibly afford this money when we are in such a tight financial situation at this time?

This is why I say that a plan should have come to this House asking the House to approve certain specific positions, certain specific expenditures, to do certain specific things. It should not be left wide open to the wide acceptance of this Report. The Report makes 63 recommendations altogether and I do not propose to deal with all of them but to choose some which I would like to deal with in some detail to make the point that I believe needs to be made in regards to where we are going in the next five years in Education. First I would like to refer to Terms of Reference I. A note there on page 32 that:

> "Within the area of management and administration of schools, Education Department staff, Principals, teachers and parents are all concerned about the lack of linkage between the main

stages of education. The role of the administration to advise, assist, guide and improve communication amongst teachers and schools is not being fully achieved. The result is a high level of anxiety among teachers, particularly in the primary schools, with an emphasis upon competition rather than upon cooperation. Schools at different levels are administered in very different ways...".

Much can be understood from those particular comments. It did not speak there about any school buildings. It spoke about a very basic need that is lacking. A lack of linkage between the main stages of education and a lack of communication in the school system and the fact that schools are administered in different ways at different levels.

I would ask the member for Education, since he has had this Report from last year, has he or his staff of the Education Department done anything to correct this situation and if he has, how has it been done? These are the problems of education. These are the true problems. We have a system, these problems have been identified, what has he done about them? The Report notes: "There is an urgent need to provide greater clarity and understanding regarding the relationship between managers (Principals and teachers) and administrators (the Education Department).". Unless the Member for Education, and unless those in management authority in Education are prepared to make unpopular decisions to remove some people who may not be performing, or to boldly go out and promote some who are showing by their performance that they should be in a particular job, it is not going to be any better. Certainly if the Portfolio of Education is not able to handle this situation centrally, when it is centrally administered, it is quite impossible to decentralise and hope that it is going to fix itself.

In the particular recommendation, in Terms of Reference I the consultants suggest that:

"The review of the management and administration of all Government schools should be governed by three main guidelines:

(i) Accountability -
(ii) Capacity building -
(iii) Partnership and participation -".

How good it would have been if the Member had come to this House and said what had been done in this particular area. This does not require any money. This simply requires reshuffling and rethinking and reorganising within the present system. If accountability is to be taken into account, then the Member ought to be accountable for his attitude of simply coming here and saying approve this Plan and let me do all that it says in five years.

The Member and the Education Department and the Portfolio must correct the problems as they are known. The problems are not within, the number of schools and classrooms and all the rest of it. I will speak on that particular area shortly. Terms of Reference II in recommendation 2 says: "Action should be taken to establish a fully automated administrative information and retrieval system.". My question is, was there one in place? If it was in place, what was it doing? What function was it performing and if a fully automated system should be established what should it contain? What data should it contain? There is no information here in this particular recommendation as to what it should contain.

Recommendation 3: "An officer should be given overall responsibility for the management of the data system.". Are we to understand from that that the data system of the Education System in the Cayman Islands was handled by three, four, five or six different people? Or was it not handled by anyone at all? I wonder if since this recommendation, anything has been done to appoint a person to deal with the situation? I wonder if this administrative information and retrieval system includes making sure that students overseas get their scholarship money on time and that they are communicating with the various institutions on time and in a proper manner? It does not say. But I wonder if such a person has yet even been thought of to say nothing of being appointed?

Recommendation 4, says: "Through the Office of the Portfolio the Education Department should issue an annual report on education, which utilises statistical data and comments upon the progress and development of educational institutions and services.". All of these things need to be done long before we get into a situation of creating more schools. The actual way that the schools are run is where the problem, as I understand it to be, and the complaints that I hear from parents, it is not the buildings they are complaining about, it is the way the schools are run. The way the teachers handle the teaching situation, handle the children, what the children are required to do or not required to do. That brings me to Terms of Reference III: "To examine the present system of pastoral care,".

One thing I have observed over the years since the time I used to teach is that education has reverted to some heavy sounding names. The fact that I have been out of it for some time, I tried to enquire exactly what was meant by pastoral care and as I see this Terms of Reference referred to the School Council Key Club and the fact that I went to the dictionary and saw that pastoral refers to the shepherding the guiding of people offering leadership I imagine that this refers largely to the extra curricular activities within the schools where the teacher is to be the good shepherd and take his flock into the pasture. I wonder why the Report did not say here or make recommendations exactly how this could be achieved and exactly what should be included in this? I would imagine that there are examples in other schools systems that they could have recommended. What did strike me was that in Recommendation 6, is that it says: "Sporting activities and clubs should be encouraged further, but specific time needs to be allocated for club activities. The lunch hour is not adequate for such purposes and it is suggested that a more substantial period should be made available, e.g. a

substantial part of an afternoon.".

The question I pose is, has the Portfolio instructed the High School or the Middle School or any other school to take steps to correct his particular deficiency? If so, what has been done? What has been done, Madam Speaker, is the question. It says also in Recommendation 5: "It is recommended that teachers should be given greater guidance with regard to the exercise of their pastoral duties.". Who is going to give this greater guidance? Is it the same Education Department or the same Portfolio, the same Member who apparently has not given it prior to this recommendation? Lets say that is the case. Has it now been given? I trust so. I do trust that it has.

In Terms of Reference 4 I note that the consultants say: "The variable size of schools, the distance between schools, particularly on Grand Cayman and Cayman Brac, and the overall small size of the school population (and I wish to underscore that small size of the school population because further on I will show how this contradicts other recommendations made) limits the degree of professional specialisation available within the school support systems. However, the requirement for a group of educational advisers, psychologists, therapists, peripatetic teachers and a centre for advisers and teachers to meet are all necessary parts of the education serve.".

I agree. I agree, I definitely agree. I have said this, other Members have said this but it seems it was necessary for the consultants to say the same thing we have been saying. Now the questions still must be asked, what has been done about it? Naturally, the education system and the welfare of children should link with Social Services. Particularly where children might be from a less favourable economic financial background, there would be a need for some linkage there but I note what is said. "A number of the support systems link directly with Social Services, but there is a lack of clarity regarding the relative roles and functions of specialists working in the two departments.".

I think that is saying that this Government is managing real badly and that the Education Portfolio and the Portfolio of Health and Social Services are not coordinating effectively enough or there is no one with enough courage there to instruct these people that they have a similarity of services to approve or to give and that they should get on with the job. Has the Member done that or anything about that to-date? Or, is it the case, as we hear so often, if not on the floor of this House in the Common Room, that a Head of Department does not want to do so and so, or you do not understand how hard it is to deal with such and such a head of Department. Everyone in the world has a boss. If it is no more than the good Lord, so there are certain responsibilities and duties that must be performed by a Head of Department, by the Principal Secretary, by the Member or the Minister, as the case may be. One cannot shrug that off on the other.

The Report says: "Although not currently in post, the position of educational psychologist was clearly recognised as being useful by all schools.". I did not know that there was not one, but one would have thought that at least there would have been one educational psychologist because children from various backgrounds, various environments have need at least for a psychologist whom they can take with or whom can make recommendations to them as to how they can meet certain problems of life and indeed make recommendations to the Heads of any particular school where there may be children who have need of certain emotional care.

Other speakers before me have referred to the Education Social Worker to be attached to each school and I will not repeat what they have said about it but the point I will make and I do not recall any of those making it, is that it says In each school, which would mean in each location, in each district, in each section of this country. That is necessary, undoubtedly it is necessary and the consultants have said that it could be part time initially but it is something which should be developed. It all ties back into the need for coordination between Education and Social Services but not one centrally in George Town in this case, because in this particular instance, you need that person right where the children are gathered together in a school population.

The consultants have said that the structure of the Education Department should be reviewed in order to facilitate the recommendation of the Review. I agree with this, I think that the organisational structure of Education in this country has long needed review and certain changes. As I look at the structure which has been put out in a chart, I see that three Education Officers have been recommended with specific duties and responsibilities and that the input would come from pupils, teachers, school plant facilities resources; finance would be inputted and the output would be the children that the system would turn out at the end of their period of education. Has anything been done with this? Or is the Member waiting for the person to come here with a magic wand to put this in place?

Has the Portfolio looked around at the people who are presently in the Education Department and decided, initially, who might be suitable for these particular positions? Have they looked out in the field to see who might be there that could be brought in, irrespective of whether they have not been there for 30 years or not, but if those persons show initiative and merit that they should be considered to be brought in? Has this been done? If it has not been done, then what is the Member waiting for?

Madam Speaker, I think that in this country it is so small that the only type of proper management for the school system is centralised management and so the recommendation that the Portfolio should establish a governing body for each school, I have a certain problem with that. If we only have nine schools and it is not possible to set up the structure in the Education Department good enough to centrally manage and set down rules and guidelines for the schools that all of the schools can follow, how can it improve this system by decentralising and making each school have its own governing body?

It has recommended at least eight person for this Board and the Report has said: "The Board would take a close interest in the operation of the school and in its resources, and receive a regular report from the Principal. They would also receive and discuss the Annual Education Report made by the Education Department, and The Education Review Report on the school.". What I understand from this

is that the people who sit in the Glass House and the people who sit in the Tower and the people who sit in the Education Centre and so on are not sufficiently in touch with the schools that they are supposed to be in charge of. That is what I think this is saying as well.

Certainly to go to find eight people in each district of this Island to bring about this great change in this coordination and so on, I do not see it. You could find these School Boards suddenly wanting to run the show or become Education Departments in themselves. What instructions will the Portfolio or the Education Department give them? That is not very clear at all. I do not believe that this is a good recommendation and I certainly believe that it is easier because of the size if a proper system is put in place, if the proper people are in office, there is not the need for each school in this Island having a School Board that is going to be attempting to run the school.

There is the PTA which gives the linkage and the coordination between teacher and parents and I believe that if that is functioning in the proper manner the Education Department and the Portfolio should have all of the information that it needs. I believe that the recommendations made by the consultants that their should be careful appraisal of teachers performance on an individual basis is very necessary. I do not know what particular forms are used when doing the annual appraisal on teachers but I suppose it would be similar to those used by the Civil Service generally, however, I did note that the consultants have made recommendations to improve certain areas of this. This again does not have to come here to the House to have approval. I am wondering if since this Report anything has been done to that annual appraisal report for teachers?

I truly wonder if inspections and the review of performance of each school is not done in this country anymore? Or, if it is, to what extent is it done? I well remember, as a student, that there was an annual inspection and I well remember a gentlemen called Mr. Clifton Hunter, who teachers and students and everyone in that school looked with some fear and trembling on the day of annual inspections. Now it was not that he was necessarily coming to look at the performance of a teacher on the day he came, he was looking at the school generally - the number of people in the classes, the classes, the dusters, were the children well dressed, what were the discipline and behavior conditions. Does that not happen anymore? Now that there is more staff, has the system fallen down on that too? I really wonder about it, Madam Speaker.

Can the Member tell this House something about that? What has he done? Every three years, inspections are an on-going process of management and those inspections should not wait for three years in a school, they should be done at least annually and in fact, every three months would be good. Which means, an inspector would drop in unannounced to a school to see what is going on there and that way you would have on-going evaluation, therefore able to correct a situation which may not be going properly.

So a three year cycle is a long time to wait to do an evaluation in what the school is doing. Perhaps that is what is wrong now that evaluations have not been frequent enough and thus the school system is suffering. Again, I do not see how this inspection can be a cooperative exercise between the inspector or someone so designated, the staff and governing Board of the school. I could see them consulting with them, but the School Board, the staff and so on doing this evaluation inspection, I really do not see that at all.

I do not believe inspections should be something where one looks to bring punitive action against a teacher but it is one that would identify areas of weakness and recommendations would be made to correct it. We have too few Caymanian teachers to attempt to get rid of any of them simply because they may have a slight lisp.

I note that the consultants recommend a manual which would contain certain clear definitions of all the terms used and it should attach clear meaning to the points on the measurement continuum in this House that the only way we could quickly and effectively bring about improved situations in the work place is through work manuals that clearly set down what has to be done, how it should be done and to whom you report and all the rest of it with clear guidelines. I totally support that particular recommendation.

I would like to now turn to Terms of Reference X, and look at the physical plant and equipment. The consultants have looked at the question of funding, as was requested in this particular Terms of Reference and I would like to read what it says: "With regard to external funding, the present position as it effects to development loans from the Caribbean Development Bank and the European Development Fund, is that these are applied to airport development, water and sewerage development, fire service buildings and the Post Office building. The resourcing of capital expenditure is clearly a matter for the Executive Council and the Portfolio of Finance and Development.". Has the Member really discussed this matter with Executive Council and the with the Portfolio of Finance and Development? He should because the figures that we are talking about here will exceedingly add to the amount spent in this country and on education.

It recommends for example: "That the Portfolio should establish a five year capital development programme for education, to include the provision of new schools, the adaptation of existing buildings and the establishment of an Education Centre.". I can believe that an Education Centre is something that is necessary because if one can bring together the administration of all the various parts under one roof, it is good and I take note of the fact that while it is talking bout centralising the Education Centre to have everything in place and easier coordination, it is talking about decentralising the way the management of the Education system is held in other areas. There seems to be inconsistency in that, to me.

Recommendation 30 speaks of new schools. It recommends doing away with the Middle School and I imagine the adaptations they are talking about is making it another High School and two primary schools and what the Member has said here is that Cayman needs is a High School in West Bay, one in Bodden Town and two in George Town. I have serious concerns about this situation. I am not too young to remember or too old to forget that this country of ours, 20 odd years ago, 30 years at the most, we were

so insulated in this country that we spoke with distinct accents. If a person from Bodden Town came to a dance in George Town there was sure to be a fight before it was over because Bodden Towners were not supposed to come to George Town. It was the same way in any of these Islands.

In the two smaller Islands, Cayman Brac and Little Cayman which I represent, there were clearly division among those, the people in Spott Bay stayed where they were, those in the Creek, those at West End stayed where they were. We had insulated ourselves so much that we even spoke differently. West Bayers, George Towners, Bodden Towners, could we possibly imagine other parts of the world? Could we, for example, think of a Jamaican talking about a Spanish Towner or a Clarendoner and so on? They are Jamaicans, we are supposed to be Caymanians. There are Americans, New York is as proud of their particular state but they are Americans. We had insulated ourselves because of our physical reasons before there were roads.

Another serious problem had set into this country because of this closed society, there was inbreeding within the districts. It is an indisputable fact, why now do we have what is called the Cayman disease? A genetic problem. Because of that particular insularity and now when we have gotten over that, when there is not such a distinction in accents and so on in the various districts, when it is not unthinkable that a young man in East End will marry a young woman in West Bay or that a young man in the West End of Cayman Brac will marry a young women in Spott Bay, why do we want to reverse that by creating another situation whereby we are going once again to confine children in certain districts to that particular area?

If there is a High School in West Bay, and there is one in George Town and there is one in Bodden Town, we are again taking the children of these Islands and confining them and they will not have the opportunity of socialisation as has come about from the time we had the Comprehensive System. Now, the Member for Education is the man who likes to say he was the one that brought the Comprehensive System. I well remember it. The last place I taught was the Secondary Modern and there was then the Grammar School and there was a clear division between the pupils that went there. The Secondary Modern School supposedly was for those who were not as bright as those in the other school or who had different backgrounds, socially and financially.

Do we want that again? I do not think we should have it, I do not believe this country should have it. When the change came to Comprehensive Education hundreds of students were turned out of the Secondary Modern because they were not accepted over in the Grammar School. Not that they were not bright children, not that they were not bright children. Are we going to put that again in place? Why did the Education Department not look at the consultants and say look that particular recommendation of yours, take it and be gone with it. We will not have that, we will not allow again in this country what happened to us years ago, that has been reversed through the process of education.

This is the most awful part of this whole situation. How can we in good conscience and good sense approve such a thing? The recommendation is to do away with the Middle School. The Middle School has approximately over all 800 children. The High School has about 1,090 children. Everyone of us know that Cayman is quite unique on this earth, every other High School in the world, their graduating class is at least about 1,000. We are so ridiculous and we have so much money that we are going to build High Schools and there shall not be more than 500 students in them. What a contemptible, foolish idea.

The Middle School in the Cayman Islands should not be tampered with. The children of the Cayman Islands should have the right when they are 11+ to come from every nook and granny of this country and socialise and mix with each other and understand that on a human basis, they are equal, even though many go back to poor backgrounds and some go to the very affluent. But they meet together as people. The High School - a 1,000 students. We have 1,000 students and we are talking nonsense about building four so that there can be 500 in each school. Somebody was using something heavy when they came up with this idea. I totally disagree with that recommendation. Absolutely. It is a retrograde step and it should not be done unless it is in someone's vision that they want to create that insularity in the districts again, that they want to bring about some sort of discriminatory situation in this country. I absolutely, totally reject that situation and the recommendation.

Who will it profit? What will the students gain from it? The students will gain nothing from it. We will need more teachers, we will need more buildings, we will need more equipment, the young people who grow into 17 or 18 years of age will not have had the opportunity of mingling on a daily basis with the children from West Bay and George Town. No, Madam Speaker, definitely not. I know who will profit from this. It is clear and I can see construction profiting from this large capital undertaking of $34 million and I would wonder whether any arrangements have been made for this construction to be carried out by that construction company? Because there is lots of pretty pennies to be made in this. Someone has long vision that this is going to be a profitable thing in the construction, is that the case? These are the things which this country needs to ask and to become aware of what is being proposed to be done to this country. It should be rejected. We have come this far through our present Education System where we are able to get away from the West Bayer, the Bodden Towner, the East Ender, the Cayman Bracker and all of those terms and realise we are one people. It should never be reversed.

It says in the area of Primary Education the review proposes a ceiling of 300 children in the Primary School and 500 in the High School. This would require urgent attention to be paid to the provision of a further primary school in George Town and one in West Bay. On these recommendations hinges a lot of what this is all about. On this hinges what it is all about. Another thing there is no basis on which one can come up with saying there should be 500 student in the school or that there should be 300 in the primary school. If you have classes which are the right size and the pupil/teacher ratio is correct, what are we trying to prove? I think what is being proved is that the mismanagement in Education continues and they are trying to camouflage that by building more schools.

I would like to refer to the changes in the terms of the age groups that is now also recommended for the schools. As it presently exists there are four levels in the schools. We have a pre-school situation in the Cayman Islands where Government primary schools are taking in children at 3 years 9 months up to 4 years 9 months. This allows working parents to have the opportunity of having their children at school while they are working and that those children at least are taken care of for part of the day. It is not costing them an arm and a leg.

This Report is recommending that this be cut out in the primary schools. Although, as I noted earlier in the very words of the consultants, the school populations are very small so what is the great urgency in this, I do not know? I do not know but certainly it is being recommended that these be cut out and that pre-schools be built either by Government, now this is the kicker, Government must build other schools as pre-schools or to get the private sector involved, but they must not have them inside the schools that exist anymore.

For people with money, I can certainly see a very good lucrative business in building a pre-school and for parents who want to have their children from three years to 4 years 9 months go to pre-school, they will now have to pay $50, $60 $75 or $100 a week in these schools, whereas, before they did not have that cost. So it is bringing a hardship on parents, at least some. Some prefer to have children into the private pre-schools, and so be it. There is a place for them but now it is going to be a field day for those who have money to build them and will get approvals to operate them. They say they are going to cut those out.

On the Backbench, most Backbenchers have advocating increasing the school year or adding on to the compulsory time students must go to school to bring them to about 18 years of age when they will reach the age of responsibility under law. Not only are we personally concerned, there has been scores of representation by teachers in this particular respect. The Member has to know this, the Portfolio has to know this that parents are objecting to their 15 and half year old children being put on the street. They are children, they are adolescents, they are not adults. If one would take the time to observe those 15+ children, once they come out, few of them get employment. They knock around for about two years and it is around about 17 or so that they become mature or more stabilized, then you will find them in jobs. So that was the reason for the recommendation by this House and if I remember correctly, it was led or brought by the First Elected Member for Bodden Town, to increase it so that we could get the school leaving age to be 18 years.

But no, the Member for Education, and this has been his baby, he wanted, and I have heard him state it, an add on year in the primary school. That is exactly what the consultants have come up. They have recommended to 16 years 9 months in the High School. I think that the Member for Education has had a major problem with the Middle School from day one. How he can find anything wrong with that when he did not find anything wrong with his Comprehensive School that brought all the children together, why would he find something wrong with that particular period of the child's life in going to the Middle School. I charge it is for political reasons.

I would like to read what it says here under Terms of Reference XV, page 71:

> "In recommending that students remain at school for one further year, to the age of 16 years 9 months, it is also recommended that there be an additional year in the primary stage. Whereas currently pupils are required to spend five years in the primary schools, three years in the middle school and three years in the High Schools, they will, under the new system spend six years in the primary school and six years in the secondary (high) school. After high school, advanced and other post school courses will be provided by the Community College.".

There is absolutely no need to cut out the Reception classes in the primary school that is serving well. There is obviously place and room for them. If there is not, it can be provided, teachers can be provided and that is meeting a very serious social need at this time. There is no need to cut out the Middle School by adding one more year in primary school. Give the children an early aspect of socializing from all of the various districts and while it is good that there is an add on year in the High School, I would not quarrel with that, but certainly the Community College should not become an extension of the High School.

It should not become the sixth form of the High School. If the Community College is to be an extension of the High School, then it should be renamed to be the Extension of the Cayman Islands High School. If it is a College, which I understand it is supposed to be, where it will teach much needed skills, skill training, particularly technical and vocational, mechanics, electricity, air-conditioning, all the rest of it, then let it be that.

But how is that supposed to cater to a general teaching situation as it is in the High School and also be perfectly working towards teaching the vocational and the technical parts of education in this country? Again, I think that that is the Member's wish and if was politically desirable to have this because of the $5 million outlay on the present Community College and I think it is the way of getting students for the Community College. It will also give the impetus to go into another phase of that which will be another $5 million, no doubt will be awarded to that construction company.

MADAM SPEAKER: Have you reached a point where we might take the adjournment?

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Yes, Madam Speaker.

OBITUARY
Mr. Melville Goring

MADAM SPEAKER: Before we adjourn I wish to say that Members are aware of the passing Mr. Melville Goring. Mr. Goring was a nominated Member in this Legislature from the year 1969 to 1972. He also served in the British Marines in World War II. Mr. Goring, as many of you are aware, was one of the most active and ardent Members of the Cayman Islands Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. I know that many of you will miss seeing him at our CPA functions. I know that the Legislature will also wish to extend deep condolences to his widow and relatives and as usual we would ask Madam Clerk to write to Mrs. Goring to this affect. As a mark of respect, may we stand for one minute's silence.

The House will be suspended for 15 minutes.

AT 11:30 A.M. THE HOUSE WAS SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 11: 51 A.M.

MADAM SPEAKER: Please be seated. Proceedings are resumed, debate continues, the Second Elected Member for Cayman Brac and Little Cayman.

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

When we took the adjournment I was commenting on the fact that while the age increase had been recommended at the high end of the school age to 16 years 9 months, it fell short of the 18 years which was recommended by so often here in this House. If I remember correctly, by a motion asking that Government look at doing this particular extension to the school age and noting that the Community College is to become an extension, as such, as far as I am concerned, of the Cayman Islands High School.

I do not disagree with the National Curriculum Council as has been recommended by the consultants for I believe it is there a national curriculum can be developed which can reflect the subject areas as we have immense need of in this country, in terms of our development and it is out of this National Curriculum that we can produce such a curriculum that can take our children over and beyond thee age of 16 years and 9 months. As if to make way for this extension of the High School into the Community College, the consultants have also made certain observations where the International College of the Cayman Islands (ICCI) is concerned. Again here, I accuse the Member of Education for having a hand in this particular recommendation.

One of the things that it says, the last sentence of that recommendation is that: "Consideration should therefore be given to the question of its continuing registration and use of the title 'International College of the Cayman Islands'.". There is certainly no argument in this Report whatsoever to support the consultants making such a statement. If I understand what the present state of affairs with the ICCI, it is not registered. It has not been registered during the Government prior to this one and it has not been registered during the term of this particular Government. I could have seen or understood the consultants saying in their Report that it is high time for the Government to decide what will be the criteria for allowing this College to continue its operation and the consultants could well have said to the Government it is unfair that you should keep this institution hanging the way that you are.

I believe that the Government past and present has failed to specifically say to this institution we wish you to function within this level, we wish to know that you have this level or qualification of staff and we wish you teach particular subjects. They have not done that and still they have not done that. Its name - I do not see where its name has any blight on the Cayman Islands. So this particular recommendation, I think is largely in an assistance to justify the Community College. If a private institution of higher education, it goes without saying that the students who are now attending there would have to go elsewhere and if the elsewhere is the alternative of the Government Community College, then the situation becomes very clear indeed.

I know as a fact that there are many educated persons in this country that have come as a result of doing some of their education at this particular College. It has shown what it can do, the Community College has yet to really do that. It would be wrong in itself for Government to make any attempt to do away with the ICCI, because then there is no competition one way or the other, and it is a very good environment in which standards could fall or if one institution creates a standard, there is no challenge to it one way or the other by another.

What I believe that the Member for Education should do is to ensure that he sets down, for that institution, the level of instructions it is supposed to produce in collaboration or cooperation with universities over-seas, and if he thinks the physical plant needs improvement, then he must tell them so.

The hee-hawing with this particular institution over the past 20 years is absolutely unfair and unjust to that institution. The big problem with it is not its name, not at all. The problem lies with the Government that has at no time taken time to instruct that institution in what it must do. If they set down certain guidelines or requirements, let the world know it. Publish it and it at the end of the day, they do not meet those requirements, which are reasonable, then you have an excuse. But as it is now, this is simply a recommendation which I believe is politically flavoured and against ICCI which has done much to produce educated people in these Islands. In this respect as well, I see nothing wrong whatsoever with ICCI giving A Level instruction if they have the capacity to do it, so I can see no reason why the Community College must be the only institution to teach A Level subjects in this country.

Again, the onus is on the Education Department and the

Member and the Portfolio and all persons involved to do something about this. To fix it, not to build more buildings as is being talked about in this Education Report.

I think that the recommendations to look at other external examinations is a valid one and I support it. I support too, the recommendations to look at the Caribbean Examination Council, the CXC exams, for I have never taken the idiotic position that some of the subjects taught under this, history for example, which taught about the various forms of Government namely, the Socialism and days of slavery and all the rest of it, was bad for our children to know. If they were never taught and it was never explained, they would never know how to avoid it, so I have never been one to go along with some idiotic arguments I have heard in this particular respect. Certainly the GCSE does not seem to be fitting the bill in a lot of respects and I think it is time to look at other examinations.

There is one Term of Reference No. XIX on page 103, that has elicited certain findings of these consultants. I think this really sums up what and where the education system in these Islands really finds itself. This Term of Reference was: "To examine throughout the education system the entire curriculum, with particular emphasis on the areas of language development, mathematics (basic literacy and numeracy), science, social studies and family life education;".

I think it is very important that I should read some of these findings here because I think in a nutshell the consultants have put it all down under this particular Term of Reference. For one thing it refers to the Education Council and notes that it is Chaired by the Member responsible and it is so set down in the law as a general rule I believe that Boards should not be headed by the Member or the Minister, as the case may be. It is better for those persons to maintain an appeal position and there is no way that they can be Chairman and also hear appeals from themselves.

Hear it notes that:

> "In particular, it would probably be more appropriate for the Education Council to focus on its advisory rather than its executive role.
>
> The curriculum of primary, middle and high schools in the Cayman Islands may be considered in terms of three principle vectors:
>
> Accountability for management and supervision
>
> Capacitiy-building for human resources development
>
> Partnership and Participation for creating cultural synthesis
>
> These analyses show certain tensions existing within schools and among schools. Some of these tensions are:
>
> i) Much curriculum and pedagogy remains unimplemented.".

According to this, there is some curriculum now in the schools that is not implemented. There is some teaching that is not done. It also says:

> "ii) Neither teachers nor students spend enough time on teaching and on learning, and teachers are not completely aware of how time in a schools day is used.".

I wonder if the Member for Education and his Education Management team in the Portfolio and in the Department took a note of that. This has to be a serious indictment of what is presently happening. This is what needs attention and it does not say a thing about the additional schools that are needed here to achieve this. This is pure management. This is what is not being done or being done partially or part way or half heartedly.

> "iii) Assumptions by the Portfolio and the Department of what takes place in classrooms do not always relate to actual practice, and knowledge about classroom interactions is not shared in useful ways.".

What a situation.

> "iv) Excessive emphasis is placed on an academic orientation and the production of a narrow academic elite.".

I interpret that to mean that you narrow it down, you take your best students in a particular class and you teach them because you want them to pass those particular academic subjects but the thing of woodwork, mechanics and so on, it is treated very lightly, indeed. You want to create a small and narrow academic elite. It also says:

> "v) Teaching-learning puts heavy emphasis on rote memorization.".

Not meaningful understanding. I wonder if in the schools they use charts and audio-visual and actually put the children to work with practical things that they can do or if it is like it says here, by rote memorization.

> "vi) Course content is defined by agents outside the school and some of what is taught is irrelevant to life in the Cayman Islands.".

Does the Member need to know what he needs to deal with first and foremost? Do the people in the Portfolio, in the Department in the Teacher's Centre or wherever have any doubt as to what they need to deal with?

> "vii) Curriculum is conceived and is taught as a set of discrete subjects.".

Limited, Madam Speaker, limited to discreet subjects. Although we need persons who can lay blocks, certain skills in that area, automotive mechanics, air-conditioning, electricity, all the rest of it. No, no, emphasis is not put there. Set of discreet subjects is where it lies.

Another indictment:

> "viii) School and its curriculum and its examinations are being consciously used to induce conformity among pupils, and hence to grade some and 'degrade' many boys and girls. Thus, the curriculum tends to generate a major wastage of young talent".

Is that not true? Look at the amount of money this country spends and the results which it gets. Lastly in this particular finding they say:

> "ix) The differences between theory and practice create tensions in curriculum development and the instructional practices that emerge.".

Those are the things that I believe every parent in these Islands would want to know was being addressed by the managers of education in this country. Those are the problems that exist day to day and need to be fixed. Those are the problems that are stopping our children from learning. Not the fact that they assemble in one location, like the Middle School or presently the High School. They are not the problems.

In this particular Term of Reference, out of them all, I think the Member should pay very serious attention to, because unlike their recommendations and findings in other areas of this Report, this particular Term of Reference is rather specific. If this, for example, was brought here to this House and the Member wanted this passed, I believe in matters like that he would have had unanimous acceptance and unanimous passage of this particular Report.

As it stands, I can see where it is clear there is a recommendation to provide a job for someone to implement this Report. A recommendation is in the Report to that effect. I understand that the Member is looking at appointing such a person and that might be necessary but there are many, many in-house problems that we do not need three more schools to fix. They can be fixed now and they have been wanting to be fixed for years. The fact they have not been fixed is a sad reflection on those persons who are responsible for seeing that they are fixed.

Lastly, I believe that to attempt to implement all of the recommendations contained in this Report are unnecessary and too costly. To implement all of them will harm our education system and while there are some recommendations here, and specific recommendations as to how to implement them, other areas leave much to be desired.

If the Education authorities in this Island is to call upon their own resources as is presently in post to advise and to guide teachers and all the rest of it, as has been stated in this Report, then they had better shape up because obviously, so far, it is not being done. For those who cannot shape up, they should ship out and I think that is where the problem lies.

Most political managers want to be the nice guy to everybody and try to please everybody. One does not please anybody and where something needs to be done, it has to be done and there needs to be the courage and the accountability to do that. I do not think that that has been done, so far, in this case.

I cannot support the passage of this Report in its entirety as it has been brought to this House.

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Third Elected Member for West Bay.

MR. JOHN D. JEFFERSON, JR.: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to offer my contribution on the proposed Five Year Educational Plan for the Cayman Islands. This Plan is very comprehensive and if all the recommendations are accepted and implemented, there will be far reaching and drastic changes in public education in the Cayman Islands as we know it. The Plan also calls for some very unpopular decisions to be made and in my opinion, also some decisions to be made which are neither practical or affordable. This Plan calls for the expenditure of a great deal of money.

The Plan has some good features, some good

recommendations as well as some very controversial recommendations and what I would like to do in my debate is to address some of the positive recommendations and also deal with some of the controversial areas which have been high-lighted in this Plan. One of the first issues that is dealt with in this Plan is the need to develop a National Curriculum for the public schools in these Islands. The emphasis was that particular attention should be paid to the importance of vocational education at both the primary and secondary levels.

On page 12 of the Plan recommends the establishment of a local teachers training facility in this country which can be used to train people locally for careers in education. On page 12 it says: "The recommendations concerning a teacher training facility will also need to be planned and financed in the medium term, and would need to meet the training costs for at least ten students each year.". It is my belief that if we had such a facility established locally, that we would be in a position to attract more Caymanians in this profession because Caymanians would be in a position where they can continue to hold on to their jobs, earn a living while at the same time taking advantages of the courses being offered by this facility.

I recall some years ago that we had quite a programme and I am not sure if it still exists, Madam Speaker, where we had some agreement with the University in Miami and teachers employed locally were able to attend classes outside of their working hours and work towards a degree or a qualification in teaching. As I recall there was probably 25 or 30 teachers who took advantage of this programme and were able to complete the course of study and was awarded a degree from the University of Miami. I feel that the local training college could be established along the lines as was used for the local Law School, where there is an affiliation with a recognised university or universities overseas. And that the final degree, which is received by the student, is from one of these recognised institutions.

I recall this being one of the first motions moved by the Backbench, after the 1988 Elections, calling for the establishment of a local teachers training facility. I am pleased to see that such a facility is recommended in this Report.

I am also pleased to see that the Report embraces and accepts the issue of raising the school leaving age because the present system where a young man or woman leaves the Cayman Islands High School at age 15 is unfair and is totally unacceptable. The only point that I would like to add with respect of this issue and I guess it basically amounts to the same thing, but I would have liked for the extra year to have been added on to the end of the students career, rather than spending an extra year at the primary level.

The Report also deals with recommendations on the Education Council and I support these recommendations and also in particular the recommendation that the membership of this Council shall consist of not more than 12 members of whom not less than two shall be representatives of private schools and two shall be resident in the Islands of Cayman Brac or Little Cayman.

I believe with this type of membership that it gives a better chance of both private schools and schools in the other Island of Cayman Brac to be better represented.

The Plan also calls for the issuance of an annual report on education by the Chief Education Officer and I think this is good in that we will be in a position to evaluate and to determine what is being done in our schools, what progress is being made on an annual bases. It also, I feel, will improve and emphasise greater accountability in the system. That is from the class room to the administration.

On page 37, dealing with Recommendation 5: "It is recommended that teachers should be given greater guidance with regard to the exercise of their pastoral duties. Specific time needs to be allocated to enable teachers to meet students individually as well as in small groups.". I am glad to see this emphasis because I feel, and it has been proven, that it is important individualised attention and instruction is very important in the lives of our children. Each student has their own specific needs and problems and the system should be geared that our students can move along at their pace and also encourage the communication and the relationship between a student and his teacher.

MADAM SPEAKER: Honourable Member, may I remind you not to repeat what another Member has said. That has already been dealt with on pastoral care - teachers, please, in future.

MR. JOHN D. JEFFERSON, JR.: But, Madam Speaker, I must add I think that anything that I say would have been dealt with before by other Members but I will do my best to use my own wording as far as these recommendations are concerned. Recommendation 6 deals with encouragement of sporting activities and the activities of clubs in the schools and it also highlights the need for greater time being made available for such activities.

One of the elements I see being absent or very lacking in the system today is the activity of inter-school competition to a certain extent and also activities within the school on an organised basis. I feel that it is very important for the physical side to also be emphasised in our educational programme because in addition to a healthy mind, our students need to be involved in wholesome physical activities.

Moving on to Recommendation 9, it deals with the appointment of an Education Social Worker for each school and the main purpose of this Social Worker would be to improve the relationship between the school and the community. I think this is very healthy, it encourages parental involvement and it creates an interest by the parents, more interest by the parents in what is going on in the schools. I feel today when it appears that that involvement in on the wane, that this is a good proposal.

Recommendation 12, proposes some creative suggestions, in that, even though the primary schools and the Middle School is all part of the Public Educational System, they feel that it would be healthy for each school to have a governing body in their respective districts. I believe this is good in that it is a way of, once again, encouraging community involvement and it also encourages greater

accountability, as far as the school is concerned because there is somebody that has the personal interest and is involved basically on a daily basis in the operation of the school and is a watchdog for the school. That is very healthy, Madam Speaker. I feel that if this is accepted and implemented it could be a good thing.

Recommendation 13, deals with the appointing of a District Recreational Officer in order to coordinate and encourage, better coordination of recreational and sporting activities, particularly within the districts. I feel in order for these programmes to be affective, we not only need a National body, but we need a body that operates within the districts. Each district has its own peculiarities and I feel it is important that people be employed in those areas and in particular, someone from within the district, to see to it that the recreational and sporting activities in the districts are properly organised because we all recognise the importance of recreation and sports in a healthy community.

The Plan also calls for the regular evaluation of the schools and they suggest on a three year cycle. I think this is good but I remember when I was a student in the public education system in this country and in particular when I was a student at the West Bay Town Hall, that there was a system of inspection or evaluation. It was not an in-depth situation, but the Chief Education Officer on a routine basis visited each school, met with the teachers and students and also attended some of the classes for 10 or 15 minutes to see what was going on and it was amazing the effect and the influence this had, not only on the teacher but the students in that system.

I wonder if such a system still exists? That is the system of visitation or inspectorate and I also wonder who is now responsible for conducting such visits? I believe it is important for there to be established proper goals for the educational system and there must be some evaluation with regard to the progress in achieving such goals.

I support the regular evaluation of the schools. I feel it probably should be a little more frequent than three years but, suffice it to say, that the visits or inspections should be done on a routine and frequent basis. As a result of these evaluations, Reports go to the Portfolio and also the governing bodies of the respective schools outlining the findings.

Recommendation 19 and 20 on page 49 and 50, deal with teachers in particular. It deals with the creation of specific salary scales for the teachers and also ensures that the present situation of someone who joins the teaching profession, as opposed to some of the other areas in Government and where there is such a disparity in starting salaries, is eliminated. I think this is good and it also deals with emphasising the need for attracting young Caymanians to the teaching profession. It also suggests ways of retaining those young Caymanians, as well as other teachers who are employed in the teaching profession, by seeing to it that there is a proper orientation period of at least the initial year for new Caymanian teachers with the emphasis on support, rather than scrutiny.

I think for a young Caymanian finishing school and coming back all excited about making a contribution, it is important first of all for that young Caymanian teacher to feel important and worthwhile. It is also important for them to have a proper orientation to the system and to the classroom and I feel that this can be done maybe by the Principal or senior teachers in the school, as well as by the Education Department.

I heard of one incident recently where a young Caymanian was in the system for over a year before the Member for Education knew he was a part of the system. I do not think this is acceptable. As a routine they should start at that level and work their way down to the classroom..

MADAM SPEAKER: If you have reached a point where we might take the luncheon break Honourable Member? The House will be suspended until 2:15.

AT 12:47 P.M. THE HOUSE WAS SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 2:17 P.M.

MADAM SPEAKER: Please be seated. Proceedings are resumed, debate continues on the Government Motion No. 11/91 the Third Elected Member for West Bay.

MR. JOHN D. JEFFERSON, JR.: Thank you, Madam Speaker. When we adjourned for lunch I was dealing with Recommendation No. 19 and 20 which called for the establishment of special provisions in dealing with teachers, that is the salary scales, proper orientation, the classroom and support for those teachers once they are employed. My contention is that with respect to whatever else might be done, I think this is a key to putting some degree of responsibility back into the system. The key is training our people to fill the positions in the classroom.

The next recommendation I would like to deal with is Recommendation 46 dealing with the ICCI. I do support the position of previous speakers on this issue. I feel that Government should establish the requirements, the College should strive to arrive at these requirements, they should be licenced and should be allowed to compete and survive with Government's support.

Recommendation 47 deals with the establishment of a newly constituted scholarship and student support Board with the Chairman, being an independent person. I think this is good and I support any move that would further enhance the chances of Caymanians who have an interest, to go off for higher education and being in a position to get financing for their education. I agree that the Member for Education should be the appeal of last resort. In other words, should be the person if there is a question or a problem, that an appeal is made to.

Recommendation 51, deals with the different types of

examinations that are being considered. The argument behind these recommendations I support, and I feel that it is important for our educational system and what is being taught is practical and relevant to the environment in which we live.

I also agree with the recommendation put forward on page 90, of the Report, which basically recommends that the discontinuing of the "special education" label that is presently found in our Middle School and the High School. What was amazing was that the consultants mentioned that in one school students labelled in "special education" consisted of something like 70 per cent of the school enrollment. I think this is one reason why some of our students probably do not do as well as they would otherwise do because they are constantly reminded that they are slow and they need special assistance but I think that it is important for all students to be assessed properly and be allowed to operate or exist at the pace and the level that they are capable of operating at.

The solution that they recommend is that it is essential to respond to such problems, however, it is to identify them as be firmly within the framework of normal educational activities and to shape the curriculum to deal with these problems. I think this is the best route or approach to these students who have special needs rather than trying to isolate them and label them which only brings an inferiority complex and self doubt about their ability.

I feel as a whole, the Plan is a good one and I mentioned this to the Member himself. I said, the only real area of contention is the Middle School - the role of the Middle School as far as the future plans of public education in this country. It is still my contention and I support what the other Members have said on this issue and I do not agree that they should be done over night or even done. I think much thought and evaluation must go in to the process before a final decision is made with respect to the role of the Middle School.

It is my contention that the problem does not exist with the Middle School, I think the problem exists with the curriculum. I feel that the recommendation of a new National Curriculum would eliminate many of these problems and the special needs that we have right now. Where you have a curriculum for the Middle School and then you run into a total different situation at the High School level, if the curriculum could be so designed that it flows smoothly from primary through to the Middle School and through to the High School I think many of the problems that presently exist in that area could be eliminated.

I do not regard lightly the dismantling of the Middle School system. I think also that the consultants recommendations, with regard to the size of the schools in the Cayman Islands, where you have no more than 300 in primary school and no more than 500 in a High School is an ideal situation. It is an ideal situation but I am not sure that it is either practical or affordable because right now we were told by a previous speaker that we have only something like 1090 presently enrolled in the High School and even though that is a big High School, it does not seem to create any unusual amount of problems. Not the sheer size.

I think if it is determined that we need another High School, then I feel it is important for Government to locate property and have another High School built. I would say a central location would be ideal because the proposal of building another High School in the Eastern districts specifically for those students, I do not think is a good thing because I support the position of previous Members that the aspect of socialising is very important and has done much to create the present environment that we enjoy in this country of racial harmony.

I feel that if this situation is reversed, it will have negative effects, maybe not in two or three years down the road but over a period of time people from the different districts will resort back to the old ways of life that existed before a central High School and Middle School system was introduced in this country.

I do not agree that we can afford to build three or four high schools. I do not think it is necessary and I do not believe with all of the other demands that we have right now on this country for funds that we can afford to take another $35 million and invest in capital works in the area of education. I am not sure that the architects were aware of it when they designed the system but I feel that the establishment of a central school system, as far as the high school level is concerned was one of the best things that ever happened in education in this country.

I feel also that the establishment of these different high schools will only add additional cost. For every high school, middle school or primary school that you build, every additional one as has been mentioned, only adds cost because you are not in a position where you can maximise the use of your resources, that is the teachers, materials, transportation etcetera. All these additional costs will be duplicated with each school. We have to be practical. At the end of the day we must be in a position where we have a system that works but also a system that this country can afford to support.

I also support the idea of this Plan going to a Select Committee, as has been mentioned before. I do not believe it is an issue that should be rushed, and I think every effort should be made to allow as much input as possible so that when a decision is made, and the plan is implemented, we can be confident that we have done the right thing and it is a system that the people support and want.

I feel that, as the Member mentioned in his initial remarks, this Plan has to be implemented over a period of time, that is those provisions which are least costly and practical can be implemented immediately and those issues that are much more expensive, phased in over a period of time. Regardless of how much we say in this House, the Member knows he has the support of the eight vote and the Plan will pass, but I would just like to urge the Member that with regard to the recommendation of the Middle School, the time be spent before a final decision is made with regard to that very controversial recommendation.

In closing, I would like to say that I feel that despite all these different recommendations that are being made, I feel much can be accomplished if greater emphasis is placed on encouraging Caymanians to choose the teaching profession as a career. Special emphasis should be placed on

seeing to it that they are properly compensated and supported and also I am interested to hear what the Member has in store or planned in the area of discipline. Re-introducing discipline in the school because I feel that is probably one of the key issues and one of the main reasons we have the problems that we have at present in our schools.

I am not sure of the percentage, but a high percentage of our students are being taught by ex-patriot teachers, and not only ex-patriot teachers because many of my teachers when I was in the system were ex-patriots but a great number of them were West Indians. Now we have more of the British in the system and I feel what has happened to a lot of those teachers, they have been intimidated. They are being intimidated, they have arrived at a position where they say well, I am not prepared to discipline a child because I am afraid that his father or mother or guardian is going to come and attack my physically. I feel until we can recruit and train sufficient Caymanians and re-introduce special discipline in the system regardless of all of the other recommendations and provisions which are made to the system we will not see the results that we are looking for.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: If no other Member wishes to continue the debate, is the Honourable Member prepared to reply thereto?

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Madam Speaker, I just need a moment to get my notes in order because I have been taken rather by surprise at the rapidity at which the debate has concluded. When I introduced this motion I did so strictly on the merits of the Five Year Education Development Plan 1991-1996, without introducing any politics, as I very well could have, and perhaps as events have developed would have been well justified in doing. I chose to take the route that I did because it is my view that the education of the youth of this country is far too important a matter to play politics with.

I did so too in what has been now shown to be a false hope that particularly the Third Elected Member for George Town and his colleagues would have accepted an opportunity to improve the education system in this country. Something that I will show as I proceed in this, he did blessed little to improve during his tenure as the Member responsible for Education.

So, I trust that I will be given some latitude in my response to respond to the political rhetoric presented by the Third Elected Member for George Town and his cohorts. I never anticipated in my wildest dreams that Member would have taken this opportunity to waste the time of this Honourable House, public funds by tying up Radio Cayman to broadcast what I will prove was nothing short of a vain attempt to tarnish my political image.

The Third Elected Member for George Town and the Second Elected Member for Bodden Town very often accuse me of living in the past because I like to go back in history when dealing with many matters in this country. The truth is, they have never learned and it appears they will never learn the adage that those who do not remember history are doomed to repeat it. In this instance, it would have been well for those two Members in particular, to have remembered the Review of the Education System of the Cayman Islands that was done by the British Council in October/November 1981 when those two Members were in Executive Council and the Third Elected Member for George Town had responsibility for Education.

Those two Members in particular would have us believe that the problems in the Education sector have developed only in the last seven years but I intend to use the Report that I have just referred to, the Report known as the Brookbanks and Isles Report that was done on the Education system in 1981, to prove that the education system, if it could be called a system in 1981, was a mess and that the recommendations that were made to put it right were never carried out. If those recommendations had been put into effect, much of what is being proposed in the present Plan would not have had to be done at this time. It would have been done before.

I want to get a few untruths out of the way before I really get into the meat of my reply. The Third Elected Member for George Town, and just about every other Member who spoke, said that it was well known that I have always been vehemently opposed to the Middle School concept and the Third Elected Member for George Town quoted from the Minutes of a meeting which I attended some time in 1978. He said that I was a Member of the House and that I gave the introduction of the Middle School system serious political Opposition. He has to be the only person in the Cayman Islands that does not know that I was not a Member of this House from 1976 to 1980.

In 1978, I attended a Parent/Teachers Association meeting at the High School where I had two children attending and as I had a right to do. At that time, the then Member for Education, the Third Elected Member for George Town came to that meeting, pushing the Middle School concept on the basis of numbers. It is true, as he read out in the Resolution, the statistics, the projected enrollment for the school, did not bear out his claim. He was accompanied on that occasion by a well known lawyer in town, who, I understand, did not want to send his children away before they were 12 or 13 and he helped him push the idea. I, at that meeting, along with others, said that we thought that the efforts and money, the resources would be better spent if it was spent in the primary sector.

The Second Elected Member for Bodden Town said that it was well known that that is where the Third Elected Member devoted his energies, that is, to improving the primary system. But that is not so! As I will prove! The Member went on to say that everywhere he went to have public meetings, he encountered opposition to his plan. If the Member encountered opposition, he should have listened to it because four years later in 1981, Mr. Brookbanks and Isles said that the primary system was in a shambles.

This is the Report, it is called the Review of the Education System in the Cayman Islands, October/November 1981. I want to start with this Report by highlighting some of

the main recommendations contained in the summary of their recommendations.

Recommendation No 5 said: "There should be a coherent system of education.". Later, as I will read, they at one time said if it could be called a system, what we had then. They said: "There should be a central statistical system for prediction and updating the size of the school population in districts and that it should be instituted as a matter of urgency.". The Member did nothing about it and comes here and tries to criticise me because there is not statistics other than the Central Statistics Office to base planning on. It said: "Every primary school should as soon as possible be given a large flexible space or hall.".

As I go on, I will show that the halls for the schools were not built until after I took back the Portfolio in 1984. He said that he tried to do and had done everything for the improvement of working conditions of teachers. Recommendation No. 11 in this Report says: "There should be an improvement in the scale of payment for trained teachers so that the gap between the graduate and trained teacher scales at the corresponding points is of the order of $2,000.". That came about after I took back the Portfolio.

Recommendation No. 12: "The Government should be asked to give special consideration to the needs of primary school and non-graduate teachers when their new housing measures become operative.". It goes on and on and recommendation No. 20 said: "A nursery school for not less than 60 children aged three and above should be provided for the George Town area.". That was in 1981. Did the Member do anything about it? Nothing.

Recommendation No. 36: "Instead of having a series of separate units operating under different Portfolios one College of further education should be created in George Town where the majority of these needs could be satisfied. No other institution need then be recognised or licensed including the International College of the Cayman Islands.". That is Recommendation No. 36. The Member did nothing about establishing this college of further education which is now the Community College. I did that, and he tells me that I did nothing. He should go hide his head in shame and why did he not deal with the problem of ICCI on the basis of these recommendations? This was given in 1981, so the recommendation contained in the 1990 Review is no startling revelation. It should certainly not be to that Member.

The title of his address seemed to have been, 'lack of communication' between the Portfolio the Department and the schools but this is the final closing paragraph to the introductory chapter of this Report, that is the 1981 Report:

> "In addition to these main recommendations we have made a number of suggestions which we hope will be followed up. Example, that there should be improved communication throughout the system and that a teacher's centre should be incorporated in the college of further education, that higher education courses should be developed as necessary in the college of further education in association with U.S. universities and an experienced Principal of a college of further education be recruited from overseas for a period of three years.
>
> It is important that the whole of our Report should be carefully considered and the guidance offered evaluated if the quality of education throughout the system is to be improved.".

I want to repeat that again, Madam Speaker: "...there should be improved communication throughout the system.". That Member came here trying to make us believe that he had all of the communication in the world going, there was no problem with the communication when he had the system because he went to the schools once a year and sat down and talked to his teachers.

On page 17 of this Report, paragraph 5(2), that is the 1981 Brooksbank and Isles Report, which is an indictment on the system says: "The time has come when in the present state of Caymanian society education must be systematised. It is no longer satisfactory to proceed by what might be called benevolent inactivity.". That is what they felt of the system in 1981. Then the next sentence says;

> "An EDUCATION SYSTEM is needed. The division of the service into three discreet sectors each regarding the other with detachment, if not with jealousy, should be ended. It should be recognised that what happens to a child at five, influences directly what a child does at 16 or 18. A big effort needs to be made by the Education Department in public relations to spread recognition of the fact that the academic successes of the high school are also the successes of the infant teacher. Or to put the matter another way, that remedial problems of secondary children are best dealt with by improving the childs education in the primary school.
>
> We have made suggestions regarding the sectors of education elsewhere but here they may be summarised by saying that the system will only begin to be efficient when each and every primary school and the Middle School enjoys and deserves the same prestige as the High School. Policy planning and resources should be directed to that end.".

The consultants came here in 1981, told him the same thing I told him in a public meeting I told him in 1978, for which I get criticised. But, the Member, although he went around looking for input, did not expect to get input. He only wanted an endorsement of his policies.

It is well known what he did to the primary school specialist that was in his Department at that time who gave him the same argument. Mrs. Williams, because she told him he did not have any statistics to base his decision on, he made her position redundant in the Service. That little man.

I want to read a little bit more from this.

"The essence of any system is that it should be clearly understood by all involved, that is Members, parents, staff in the Education Department, the schools, the institutions and Government Departments. In particular, it means there must be cooperation and agreement between Members and officials on policy and its implementation and on the roles of Members and officials. Much confusion is at present caused by lack of definition of roles and by overlap of functions in the that he public and teachers are in great uncertainty.".

The Third Elected Member for George Town has the gall to come and stand up in this House and say that the education system deteriorated after 1984.

What the present consultants have said is that the system is good, but it needs to be made better. These consultants said the system was a shambles so any goodness in the system now can only have come about since I took over in 1984. "A fundamental of a system is that it should be planned as a whole and in its parts. Here the Education Service has a serious weakness. The Service needs a statistical base for planning its operations.". Throughout that is the song that has been sung in this Report and I might as well say now, that this Report never saw the light of day. I never saw it until six months ago. There is a big letter on file where they criticised this because the people went in to areas they were not asked to look at. That is how much input that Member wanted.

I am not going to use all of the places that I had marked in this Report in the interest of time. But I want to make my point. Dealing with the primary schools again: "There is no doubt that moral in primary schools is at a very low ebb. The causes of this depression are many.". And this Member and the Second Member for Bodden Town come here and tell us that that is the system that he paid most attention to. By God! what must have been the condition in the secondary, if this was the one he concentrated on, that gets such a indictment?

I refered to the hall awhile ago and in the meat of this Report, the 1981 Brooksbank and Isles Report, the one that was given to the Third Elected Member for George Town. They even gave him an example to go by, they said: "Each primary school should have a hall. The building which is being provided at Our Lady of Perpetual Help is the type of building which we have in mind.". And he did nothing! The only hall he built was at the High School which already had a hall. He had to build that hall to prove that it could be hotter than the one that I had put there between 1972 and 1976 and that the roof could blow off in Hurricane Gilbert. He did nothing for the primary schools.

I want to read the whole chapter on the George Town Primary situation because each time I try to do something for this district, that Member tries to put me down. He had the recommendations what to do and did nothing about it. The reason for that is because you cannot turn on care for people like a spigot. If you do not have it, you do not have it and that is that Member's problem. They said:

"We regard George Town as being in special need. In addition to the hall, we hope that in due course the primary school will enjoy the use of the room provided for the Deaf Unit and of the present Teacher's Centre when these are moved to new premises as we recommend.".

The Teacher's Centre was converted after I took over in 1984.

"George Town remains a large school, over 300 pupils and may well grow larger. We have, therefore, considered whether a new school should be built to serve the area to relieve the pressure on the existing school. We rejected this because the numbers of pupils are marginal to justify the second school, but much more importantly, we believe that the existence of a new school would lead to a recurrence of the social problems which George Town has now largely overcome.".

They were right. If that Member had to do it, he would have created social problems with it. And the 1981 Report goes on to say, the one that is an indictment on the Third Member for George Town:

"We consider that the needs of the area would be better served by providing a nursery school for not less than 60 children on a good site, close to, but not necessarily on the George Town site. To be successful, the nursery would require careful administration with particular attention to the following points. A good nursery teacher must be appointed to be in charge, admission should be for children of the age of three.".

Had that Member heeded that advice, I am sure the other districts would have had their infant school too. I now have to grapple with that in 1991 because the Third Member for George Town failed to do it when it was recommended in 1981 - the nursery schools.

You heard him say he was not sure about the tests because they had one now. The National Achievement Test that he thought was doing a great job. You know what the consultants told him in 1981? The National Achievement Test should be scrapped. It is not understood in the schools, its purpose is obscure. Its intent, whatever it may be, is thoroughly mistrusted by teachers and it is by no means a well devised, well checked, or well marked test. And, he has allowed that test to carry on with this recommendation for 10 years.

I saw this Report for the first time about six months ago when the consultants dug it out.

(Interjections)

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, please, order.

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: The Third Elected Member for George Town and his cohorts would have the country believe that the Middle School was a model of organisation and results and that the only children there were the 10 11 and 12 year olds that should have been there. I want to couple with this, the fact that the Third Elected Member sought to give the impression that there was never any problem with over-crowding at schools in his day, that he always had accommodation and that he did not have to put them in Town Halls, as in the case when there was the over-run on the contracted time in West Bay.

In September, 1981, the student population of the Middle School was comprised like this; nine to 10 year olds - 29 boys, 34 girls for a total of 63; 10 to 11 year olds 75 boys, 79 girls total 154; 11 to 12 year olds - 82 each total 164; 12 to 13 year olds total 173 boys and 176 girls total of 349. Now that is 12 to 13, already of the age group. 13 to 14 had 35 boys and 23 girls total of 58; 14 to 15 you had two of each and there was no mixing according to him.

On the basis of space this is what they say because of pressure on space at the Middle School, the final phase of building is not yet complete. The Chief Education Officer issued an instruction in September 1981, that for the academic year 1981/1982, another term for the academic year. There could be no further admissions of non-Caymanians to the Cayman Islands Middle School. And that is the man with the plan that had all things that were needed.

They go on to say and again, I am talking about the Education System in 1981. "We are concerned that the educational consequences for parents and children in the lack of clarity of policies in this area and even more, at the absence of a clear educational planning policy.". That is the man that said that he had the Plan and the policies, he always liked to brag about he had policies in place. Policies for what? To destroy the system?

I only want to read one section on the Secondary System in 1981. It is not proposed to attempt to set out in detail the organisation of the school. (that is the high school) In the first year in school, pupils are observed and assessed and during the latter part of the year children choose options under guidance. The guidance is largely teacher assessment of children in four categories, one of which is unlikely to gain even a CSE, grade 5. That is one category they were put in. The CSE was the Certificate of Secondary Education. This assessment is shown to the child and to understand this brutal realism (this is the consultants speaking) it is necessary to look at the objectives of the school. Brutal realism is what they called they system.

On the question of the sixth form this is what the consultants had to say. This was in 1981. "At this stage, it is sufficient to ask whether the pattern of education and occupation of 18 year leavers, together with Caymanian's requirement for trained qualified manpower is well served by the present sixth form approach?". That question answers itself in the negative.

I pointed out earlier that Brookbank and Isles Report recommended a hall for all primary schools in 1981 and the Third Elected Member did not build one solitary hall. The Northside Primary School got its hall in 1986 and I did not even know about this Report. If I had of known that I would have built it in 1985. The Bodden Town Primary School got its hall in 1986, so did Savannah and George Town got theirs in 1990 and 1991. The one that he had been told was a special case and should have priority attention, I did not now that that recommendation existed.

MADAM SPEAKER: Honourable Member, I think you have well established that point. Could you not refer to it again, please?

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: I think I have demonstrated clearly that the problems with the education sector did not develop in the last seven years. They have existed for a long time.

When we decided to have this review, we did not set out to ask the consultants to give a clean bill of health to the present system. We asked them to come in, look at all aspects of the sector and tell us what could be done to improve it. That is what has happened. So, I have no problem with the findings and recommendations of this Report. This is what we asked them to do.

If you go to the doctor, Madam Speaker, and ask him to look at your finger when it is your neck that is paining, you are not liable to get any results. But that is what happened in 1981, they complained that the consultants had went further than they had been asked to go and they hid it. It was never published.

This Report, which we have, is a detailed and exhaustive report, it goes into every aspect of the system and it is my view, that when this Five Year Plan has been put in to operation that we will then have for the first time in this country, a well organised and workable and cohesive education system. This country deserves nothing less. When it comes to education, nothing is too good for this country. If it costs a couple of dollars more than it now costs to muddle through, it is worth it.

The big complaint by the Backbench seems to be that the Plan did not have sufficient public input, but nothing could be further from the truth.

When the consultants were coming to the country, a social evening was organised for the arrival of the lead consultant, Mr. Porter, and the two local consultants and every Member of this Assembly was invited and they were conspicuous by their absence. None of them showed up.

There was a second reception when the second consultant, Doctor Broomes arrived - the same result. The Third Elected Member for George Town, had a personal invitation to

talk to Mr. Porter and he refused to do so. He told the consultant that if he showed him the Interim Report, he would talk to him after he had read it. But he was not going to talk to him before, and the consultant rightly told him that the Interim Report was not for publication. Now he comes with crocodile tears claiming he wanted to make an input.

The First Elected Member for Bodden Town is a member of the Education Council that accepted this Plan, but he was not to the meeting where it was accepted. Now, they talk about having input.

As I said in the introduction, there was consultation in the first instance with teachers, students, parents, in the case of PTAs, all of the professional associations and this Plan reflects the wishes and suggestions of those people.

It will be recalled that in March or April of this year, there was a motion from the Backbench that I table the Report which I had only got two weeks before and did not have the Plan. I brought it when I was ready and they have had it from June. But they have no intention of supporting any improvement that is initiated by this Government. They believe that that makes them look good in the sight of the Caymanian public but I hope they put a flogging on them for opposing this Education Plan.

Madam Speaker, this Plan is a good Plan. We went to the public with it, we had public meetings but we could not drag the people to the meetings. They were well advertised and my view is that when the public does not show up at these meetings, they trust me and the Government to do a good job with it. That is obvious. In West Bay and Cayman Brac we had good attendance. Elsewhere, the attendance could be described as not so good.

As I said in the introduction, two issues of substance were raised. The first was the abolition of the reception class. When it was pointed out, that that provision was only for half days and that the experts in that area said that it should be moved out of the present primary school but that we would see that children received proper pre-school instruction, even if we had to subsidise it, it was accepted.

One Member in his contribution used the fact that we were moving the reception class from the primary school to pose the question, if you have to segregate those children by age, how can you propose to mix Middle School and High School age children? But, age was not the criteria for that.

The simple fact is, that pre-school education is not intended in anyway to be formal education. It is a system where children learn by play. It develops their social skills and their motor skills. It is the opinion of experts that this is best done on a different site.

One of the reasons for this is that the parents themselves, unknowingly put the pressure on the children and the teachers. When a parent finds out that their little Johnny is not reading after one term in school, even though it is pre-school, the parent gets worried and wants to know why? This put pressure on the teachers to give them formal teaching which they should not be getting. It is well established that children who have been under that pressure suffer from burn-out. That is the reason for taking it out. In the case of the Middle School, nobody set out to dismantle the Middle School system or remove the Middle School from the system. The abolition of this school made itself felt unself-evident when they rest of the system was put together simply because the systems, as I pointed out, operated as three separate systems. The Middle School system was not dove-tailing with the Secondary system and children were expected to make their options after only three months at the school. You remember the 1981 consultant said that that was brutal. Fact is that the Middle School system has really not worked wherever it was put because of this same break.

In the United States the Middle School system is successful because in the United States you have a system where, for each year, you get a number of credits towards your graduation but in the British system your high school flies or falls on the basis of your external examinations. The time allowed for the preparation of those in our system is insufficient.

Coupled to that, when one realises that the proposed system calls for high schools with an enrollment of not more than 500, then the question of duplicating Middle Schools was self-evident. It was too costly to repeat those as well. So it died in the making of the system.

I asked the consultants to have a look at it to make sure that it could not be saved because I realised it would be politically difficult and they told me that it just had no place in the system. That is how I see it with the Plan which they have recommended, and the Plan comes from the teachers, not something the consultants brought from overseas.

Our teachers have been saying that the children were moving from the primary school before they were ready to and the teachers at the high school have been saying that we only have three years to prepare children that come out of the Middle School, ill prepared for the Secondary system, and therefore, that explains your failures.

In 1981, the consultants called attention to the fact that the ills of the high school were the inheritance from the primary schools and that something should be done to correct it. But I guess they too, realised how sacrosanct that Middle School system was to some people. They probably did not know that they would bury the rest of the recommendations, anyway, or they would have recommended what has been recommended now.

For as far as the ICCI is concerned, I have proven that the Brooksbank and Isles Report, in 1981 recommended basically what is recommended now. The problem with ICCI is a simple one. At one time the college was registered with the Education Department as a commercial college when it bought the old Sylvia Gill commercial school, and it was allowed to go on to issue degrees through an American subsidiary. That was the Third Elected Member for George Town that created that problem, not me. Now he comes and wonders why I do not solve it? I am going to solve it because I am going to register the college.

What happens is that probably with prompting from the Third Elected Member for George Town, who did not have guts to do it himself, the college attempts to link registration with recognition. Therein lies the problem. The Government has a policy that it will not grant scholarships to or recognise degrees from an American institution that is not listed, at least competitive, by Barrons or Peterson's Guide to Schools and Colleges and ICCI is not so registered. So we cannot recognise ICCI degrees in the Civil Service or in the teaching service.

That policy has its grounding in the Education Law because our Education Law says: "A school based on the American system registered in the Cayman Islands must meet the requirements of a good school of that category.". Our definition of a good school is one that is listed as competitive.

[Some Members' saying: "Amend the Law."]

Hon. Benson O. Ebanks: So, you hear how they would get over that problem? Amend the Law. Government does not allow our scholarship holders to attend institutions that are not competitive in the Unites States and I do not believe that that standard should be lowered.

ICCI, is not alone in this category. There are thousands of institutions in the United States that fall in that category and we do not recognise them. If a Caymanian on their own goes to one of those schools, Government does not accept the credentials, the degrees. So we are not treating ICCI any different.

When I get out of this Assembly and have some time in the next couple of weeks, I am going to continue to examine the ICCI question and I believe that we will be able to register them in a category. I do not have any need or intention to seek the demise of that institution through not registering it. I believe that the standard of the Community College can stand on its own. We are not afraid of competition, I do not know who is? But we are not. The Community College will stand on its own.

MADAM SPEAKER: Would you take a break at this time, Honourable Member?

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Yes, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The House will be suspended for 15 minutes.

AT 3:43 P.M. THE HOUSE WAS SUSPENDED

HOUSE RESUMED AT 4:30 P.M.

MADAM SPEAKER: Please be seated. It is now 4:30 and if we are to continue, I need someone to move the suspension of Standing Order 10(2).

MOMENT OF INTERRUPTION - 4:30 P.M.
STANDING ORDER 10(2)

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER 10(2)

HON. RICHARD W. GROUND: Madam Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Order 10(2) be suspended to enable the House to continue debate on this motion and to continue to finish the Business on the Order Paper.

MADAM SPEAKER: Thank you, the question before the Honourable House is that Standing Order 10(2) be suspended in order that debate may continue and conclude on Government Motion No. 11/91 and the other Business of the House be concluded. If there is no debate, I shall put the question.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. STANDING ORDER 10(2) SUSPENDED TO ENABLE DEBATE ON GOVERNMENT MOTION NO. 11/91 TO CONTINUE AND FOR THE BUSINESS TO BE CONCLUDED.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Education debating Government Motion No. 11/91.

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. In the interest of time, I do not think I will need more than 20 minutes or so. I dealt with the charge that consultation was missing in the process of presenting this Plan. I think I have proven that that is not so and in fact, I would like to the Cayman Compass article editorial that was referred to here by previous speakers, and just to point out that they failed to mention that part of the editorial which said that one thing Members could not claim or one thing that no one could claim is that they did not have time or an opportunity for an input.

Another criticism of the Plan is that it lacks flexibility. When Members read the Plan, surely that has to fall away because one integral part of the Plan is the requirement that the Plan be reviewed and revised annually and what could be more flexible than that.

It has also been charged, that the Plan lacks comprehensiveness or the direction as to how to implement it. It is just that, a plan. The plan of a house does not

give you or is not the house. The house is built from the plan, so that the system will be produced by implementing the Plan.

In that connection, I would just like to point out that the Plan is not without the details which a lot of Members have charged and I cautioned Members that they should read the entire two booklets because if one starts at page 30, part three of the Report, it will be noted that that consists of the Terms of Reference and recommendations. It is in that section of the Report that the details of the recommendations are given. If you read page 117, the list of recommendations, that is in a much more abbreviated form. Unfortunately, that is what some Members seem to have concentrated on. So the details are there, Madam Speaker.

One of the other concerns expressed revolved around cost. Here the Members seem to believe that we were going in for mega bucks, but if they look at the Plan, it will be seen that page 12 Table I, it will be seen that in 1991 the budget for education was $13.4 million. The Low Immigration Variant for 1996 is only $15.3 million and even the High Immigration Variant is only $16.9 million. The $77 million they talk about is the total over five years but in 1991, the recurrent budget is $13.4 and in 1996 it is estimated to be $16.9 an increase of 2.85 per cent average per annum or 4.75 per cent. Members should not try to set off any alarm bell about that, Madam Speaker. It is a normal increase.

While on the question of costs and spending on education, I think I should point out the fallacy of something that the Third Elected Member for George Town said in his contribution. That is that he tried to use appendix I to the Plan Budget Allocation to Education to say that there had been a reduction in spending in Education since 1983 because at that time the percentage on education was 15.1 per cent of the budget.

The percentage has decreased because the budget has increased so rapidly but in real terms, education has gone from $5 million out of $33 million in 1983, to $13.4 million in 1991 out of $101 million - 13.2 per cent of the budget.

In the terms of capital expenditure, the highest percentage ever spent on education was in 1990 last year when we spent 23.7 per cent of the capital funds on education.

For example, as I said, last year we spent $3.79 million on education, the capital aspect, 1991 $3.14 million. In 1983 we only spent $1.5 million and in 1984, the last year of his administration, we spent $1.2 million. I do not know what the Member is talking about. The trouble is he loses no opportunity to mislead the people of this country about what he did for education. He should have told them the Brooksbank and Isle said he made a mess of it.

Another concern was the recommendation that we have schools with no more than 500 pupils. I believe one Member said that in the United States or world wide, I think he said, the graduating classes in some schools was as large as our High School. But the trend world wide is to smaller schools and I would like to read an excerpt from the *Washington Post* of the 4th of November 1991. This is some of what this article says because I do not want to read the whole of it, just the pertinent parts.

> "In an extraordinary influential 1959 Report, titled the American High School today, former Harvard University President, James B. Konant, convinced the nation that secondary schools should be large and comprehensive. Such schools, he argued, could offer students a sufficiently broad curriculum through economies of scale [just as is being advocated by the Backbench here today, Madam Speaker] and by tending to the educational needs of all students under one roof. They were an important source of the democratic spirit in public education. Three decades of experience now suggest Konant was wrong. By the measure of the tremendous number of students turned off to learning in the nations large comprehensive secondary schools today, the mega schools have been a costly failure.".

Madam Speaker, let us go over to some of the praises that have been sung for the smaller schools that are being organised in the United States.

> "The closer ties between students and teachers in small schools results in a level of genuine caring and mutual obligation that is found far less frequently in comprehensive schools. Those largely intangible qualities are crucial ingredients of successful schooling for when students and teachers feel mutually responsible to one another, they tend to work harder on each others behalf.
>
> Additionally, small schools are less dependent upon bureaucratic governance. For teachers that means fewer rules and regulations defining their roles and relationships. This increased autonomy in turn produces greater collegiality as well as a greater degree of shared responsibility among teachers. It is hard to be a poor teacher on a small team, one Seattle area teacher told me.
>
> There is also strong evidence that attributes of smaller schools creates a healthier academic environment.
>
> A 1987 study of 744 comprehensive schools nation wide found a drop out rate at schools with more than 2,000 students to be twice that of schools with 667 or fewer students. A 1988 study of 357 high schools by University of Chicago researchers Anthony S. Brick and Mary Arena Driscoll revealed higher rates of class cutting, absenteeism and classroom disorders in large schools.".
>
> "Perhaps the most telling indictment of large comprehensive schools is that many school systems

are attempting to combat their drop out problems by assigning truants and borderline students to alternate schools with enrollments of 200 to 300 students. These provide intensive remedial instructions and intensive student teacher contact. Small schools that counter the an anonymity of the traditional comprehensive model. School systems would better serve themselves and their students by making similarly supportive schools environments available to students before they reach the point of dropping out.".

I want to clear up what seems to be a misconception about the small 500 student High School. The First Elected Member for Bodden Town and the Second Member for Cayman Brac and Little Cayman seemed to have had a lot of problems accepting this on the basis that it was going to create segregation.

The First Elected Member for Bodden Town told his own story when he said that on a recent visit to the Savannah and Bodden Town Primary Schools, he was so happy to see the mosaic of children that was there. These are the same schools that will feed the High School in that area and there in lies the secret.

No district in these islands today is made up entirely of people who were born in those districts. There is cross movement all over the Island. People from West Bay are now living in Bodden Town. people from Bodden Town are living in West Bay, East End and vice versa. Cayman Brackers are all through us and you have West Bayers gone to Cayman Brac. So there is mixture and the people who come from abroad no longer reside only in George Town. They are all over the Island, and the proposal is that through sports and academic contact, debating meets, other spelling B championships, all of this type of thing. There will be intermixing, so they should not have that fear.

The good reasons that I gave from that article and hundreds of others that are available for the asking in support of the small school shows that the small school is much more desirable. In addition, the Cayman of yesterdays is no more. When we were growing up, before we came to school in George Town, we probably came to George Town to see the doctor or the dentist once or twice a year. Now the average Caymanian child goes to Miami more often than that. So, the isolation that existed, does not exist today.

The other criticism or concern was the School Boards, but this is what the Report has identified and the Plan calls for, to carry the school into the community and the community into the school. One of the findings has been that schools have become isolated institutions without input from the community and as a result you have children who really do not interact with the community. The idea is to involve influential and prominent people in the community into the organisation and running of the school. The duties have been identified and they are not great. There is no danger that they will meddle with the academics of the school. Those Boards will give a good input to the schools, and as I said, make the school a part of the community. It is going to cut down on the amount of vandalism to the property, it is going to make the districts feel proud of the schools and the schools are going to respond as being part of the district.

I mentioned awhile ago that Members had not read the Plan properly or they could not come here and say that there was not sufficient direction in the Plan. The last speaker quite rightly pointed out that it is a comprehensive Plan. It is well known that the United Nations Development Plan, funded the study; they have received copies of the Report and of the Plan; they have expressed eagerness to help us found the implementation of the Plan from their own resources and from other agencies like UNESCO.

The Portfolio and the Education Department are anxious to get on with the implementation, so is the teaching profession. Teachers have commended this Plan from the page 1 to the final page. They have said this is what we needed for a long time, lets get on with the job and I am ready to move, the Education Portfolio is ready to move, the Department is ready to move, the schools are committed to implementing the Plan, United Nations wants to help us and I am saying the hour is late, let us get on with this Plan and I wonder, even at this late hour, the Opposition cannot find it in their hearts in this Yuletide season to vote, yes, on this motion.

Thank you, very much.

AMENDMENT TO GOVERNMENT MOTION NO. 11/91

MADAM SPEAKER: An amendment has been circulated to this motion which I will ask the mover is he would like to present at this time?

MR. ROY BODDEN: Thank you, very kindly, Madam Speaker.

AMENDMENT TO GOVERNMENT MOTION NO. 11/91
DRAFT FIVE YEAR EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT PLAN 1991-1996

In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 25(1), I, the First Elected Member for Bodden Town, propose the following amendment to Government Motion No. 11/91 as follows:

(1) by deleting the word "**accepts**" in the last line of the Motion and replacing it with the word "**notes**";

(2) by deleting the words "**for implementation**" and replacing them with the words "**and refers it to a Select Committee of Elected Members of this Honourable House to study, recommendation by**

recommendation, hear witnesses and report to this Honourable House".

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: I will Second that, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: There is an amendment before the Honourable House to Government Motion No. 11/91, which has just been read out and the question is open for debate.

MR. ROY BODDEN: Thank you, kindly, Madam Speaker.

Having regard for the long session that we have been involved in and for the patience of Members and the Chair, I take it and thought seriously before moving this amendment because what is going to happen in the Education Plan is going to be nothing short of a revolution in our country.

I believe, just like in other important developments in the recent past, we should allow and afford every available opportunity to those parents, teachers and members of the general public who are interested and who have input into these proposed plans, which, for whatever reason, they have not been able to air or have never had the opportunity of airing, we should afford them this grand opportunity to do so because once we have embarked on this course, it is safe to say that it is well nigh impossible to reverse or alter this course.

This is a great undertaking, in that, it calls into question enormous sums, in that, it changes the educational direction in our country, affects the way our children will be socialised from the infant stage, right up through the Community College and we should, in all fairness, consider this recommendation by recommendation for there are many things which are good in the recommendations but there are also, in those recommendations, many things which are controversial.

I hope that the Government, through the Honourable Member, who is piloting the initial motion, could see fit to accept this amendment in the interest of insuring that everyone had his say into this very important development.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Second Elected Member for Cayman Brac and Little Cayman.

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I rise to briefly say that I support this amendment to the motion before the House, in that, as has been stated so well by the First Elected Member for Bodden Town, it will afford the opportunity of going through this Report, item by item, the fact that it is such a large and revolutionary recommendation and change to the educational system. It can give Members, as a whole, the opportunity of deciding what could practically and realistically be implemented in the country taking all factors into account.

I think, as I said in my debate earlier, that I am aware of no motion that could be so ideally handled in a Select Committee, such as this.

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: Honourable Member for Education.

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Madam Speaker, Government opposes this motion. This is nothing but a cheap attempt to win a political battle that could not be won by persuasion during the long debate on Government Motion No. 11/91.

Members, as I have pointed out, had ample opportunity to make input into this Report. They were invited to do so and indeed, during the course of my debate, I was being rudely interrupted by the First Member for West Bay who was saying that they had spoken to Mr. Porter, privately. I know for a certainty, that the opportunity offered to the Third Member for George Town was not accepted.

Parents have had the opportunity to have an input into this. It might be of interest to know that a parent in Savannah at the public meeting, who had been through the Middle School system, the one that gives them so much concern, that parent said if it was one thing she was glad of, was that that non-entity thing was moving. She said that she was confused the whole time she was there and that is a person who is very successful in our community. She said that when she was put in the Middle School she was told she was too old for primary, she was not old enough for Secondary but that she was a young woman. She did not know what she was.

This is the problem, it leads to confusion. But I am not surprised at that definition because the Third Member for George Town thrives in a system of confusion.

Madam Speaker, I want to remind Members that earlier this year, or the end of last year, when the motion was made to extend school age by one year, the Third Member for George Town moved an amendment to that motion to call for its implementation within three months. I was to agree and tell them how I would accommodate and finance the accommodation for those extra children within three months because he said I had a habit of dragging my feet. Truth is the Member does not want to see anything done and if Members will refer to the Plan, they will see that we are already late in the time table for this implementation. There are proposals here that should have been made by September gone. To delay this further can only mean that the children of this country will suffer further the depravation of a good education system and that in my humble opinion, Madam Speaker, is an acceptable alternative for the Backbench once they believe they are scoring a political point.

Their interests are really not the interest of these children or they would not be following the Third Elected Member who was told from 1981 to get on with the job and did not do it.

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The First Elected Member for West Bay.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Madam Speaker, I have listened long and very attentively to Members debating this important issue. I do not know who the Member for Education is talking about, that does not have the interest of children, because in my short address on the substantive motion, I pointed out that I am a parent that has, right now, a child in the Middle School and one child that went through the Middle School.

His interest is no greater than ours, in fact, the Member for Education, if he had the interest of my children, your children and the next persons children at heart, these matters would not be waiting today to be done.

We have heard a lot of rot here about 1981, and the word 'brutal'. Does that Member forget that he took over this Portfolio in 1984? The Third Elected Member for George Town, left it in 1984. If the Member for Education had the system at heart, he would have done something before now. In fact, he has just admitted that changes should have taken place in September. Why did the Member not move to affect those changes?

MADAM SPEAKER: We are not debating the substantive motion, it is just the amendment to go to Select Committee.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Madam Speaker, I appreciate your cautioning, but I am replying to the Member for Education who got up again and talked about the Member for George Town on his debate on the amendment. He just finished, Madam Speaker. I am replying to him. And it is sometime that somebody here tell him that he should have done something a long time ago! He had the system since 1984 and if the Reports that he pointed out in his substantive debate, if they were so good, why did he not implement them? Why did he not implement them?

Madam Speaker, the Member is incompetent, he is a lazy Member, he would not have moved, if, it had not come from the teachers, if it had not come from the staff in his Portfolio and if it had not come from Members in this Honourable House. That is how this whole thing got started. It was not on his initiative, no, that should be the last Member.

As far as he is talking about people interrupting him, when it is rude to interrupt, Madam Speaker, did you hear me interrupt him?

MADAM SPEAKER: Please talk to the amendment motion, Honourable Member.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Yes, Madam Speaker, it is time that somebody replied to him though. As far as an attempt for cheap political mileage, Madam Speaker, he knows best about that because I understand he was giving out $100 bills over the Christmas. That is cheap political mileage. Not what we were attempting.

Madam Speaker, let me say something. I gave the Member my support in certain instances. But there are recommendations in this Report that need to be looked at and in all sincerity if the Member was not concerned about the cheap political mileage that he would gain, he would sit down and discuss those matters with parents and other concerned people in the country, myself being one of them.

As far as we not going to those cocktail parties, I rarely attend them. I rarely attend them. And what is the use? You go and talk to some of these people and they will tell you, I am hired by the Portfolio. I am going to support this because I believe, in all honesty, that we should sit down sensibly, and discuss some of those recommendations. Some teachers support it, but I would say here, not all teachers support it. That is my position. Some of those Reports and recommendations are what is needed but there is a lot left to be desired. Not only my children's future is at stake, but the future of this country, citizens throughout the country - not just McKeeva's children. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Honourable Member for Health and Social Services.

HON. D. EZZARD MILLER: Madam Speaker, I rise to oppose this amendment to Government Motion No. 11/91 for basically two reasons: The first is that the significant thing in this amendment is that it is being sent to a Select Committee of Elected Members, only. There is a particular reason for that. That is because, as we know and they always remind us, the Backbenchers, that they are the majority of the Elected Members in this House and therefore, they will amend the Plan as they see fit. If they did not have that intention, why was it not moved to a Select Committee of the whole House?

I think it is fair to say that the other reason why I oppose this motion is that it is only going to delay unnecessarily the implementation of this Plan. Which is not going to happen overnight, it is a Five Year Plan, but you have to start implementing sometime.

This planning process has taken over two years. I believe it is fair to say that all of those people, who as this amendment call, could be heard as witnesses have had ample opportunity in various forums to make input into this Plan and there are few people in this country, I believe, who, have not had the opportunity and taken the opportunity if they so desired, to have input into this Plan. I cannot support this delay tactic. Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: If there is no other Member wishing to debate, would the

Honourable Mover of the amendment like to reply?

MR. ROY BODDEN: Thank you, Madam Speaker. In the final analysis what counts is that people be guided by the dictates of their conscience. that is the case with this Member. Certainly, it is the case with my colleagues on this side of the House. For those on the Government side, who conveniently forget this, let me remind them that when I speak on matters relating to education, that I am speaking from the very depths of my soul because I still regard myself as an educator and anyone who cares to examine the records of my service in this country and the other jurisdictions where I worked, would find that my record is not too shabby. I do not play politics with this kind thing because this is the future and the very soul of the nation which will have to go on long, after I have departed these Halls, and indeed, maybe long after I have departed this land. So, it is not out of any expectation to win cheap political mileage that I move this amendment.

Madam Speaker, I would like to remind Honourable Members or introduce them to something which I found profound and it came from non less a personality than Thomas Jefferson, who said, "I know of no safer depository of the ultimate power of the society but the people themselves and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them but to inform their discretion.".

We are denying our people an important opportunity and I have pledged my qualified support to this Education Plan and I still stand by that but I caution the Plan will not work if it is deemed only to be the Plan of the Member, his Portfolio and his Department. It must involve those at every level with whom the Plan will come in contact. I rest my case and one more defeat is not going to break the indomitable spirit of Roy Bodden. Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The question before the Honourable House is that the amendment to Government Motion No. 11/91 be made. I shall put the question.

AYES & NOES

NEGATIVED BY MAJORITY: AMENDMENT TO GOVERNMENT MOTION NO. 11/91 NEGATIVED BY MAJORITY.

MADAM SPEAKER: I shall now put the question on Government Motion No. 11/91. BE IT NOW THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT this Honourable Legislative Assembly accepts the DRAFT EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT PLAN 1991 - 1996 for implementation. I shall put thee question.

AYES & NOES

HON. BENSON O. EBANKS: Madam Speaker, can we have a division, please?

DIVISION NO. 41/91

Ayes: 10	Noes: 2
Hon. Thomas C. Jefferson	Mr. John D. Jefferson, Jr
Hon. Richard Ground	Mr. Gilbert A. McLean
Hon. J. Lemuel Hurlston	
Hon. W. Norman Bodden	
Hon. Benson O. Ebanks	
Hon. D. Ezzard Miller	
Hon. Linford A. Pierson	
*Mr. W. McKeeva Bush	
Capt. Mabry S. Kirkconnell	
**Mr. Roy Bodden	

**(Madam Speaker, my vote is cast with the Ayes. Just as an explanation, I wanted it recommendation by recommendation which could have been done under Standing Orders. Seeing that is not done, I will cast my vote for those parts in the recommendation which I support).*

***(Madam Speaker, I will cast my votes for the recommendations I think are workable. In that case I think I will have to vote with the Ayes.)*

ABSENT
Mr. Truman M. Bodden
Mr. G. Haig Bodden
Mr. John B. McLean

AGREED BY MAJORITY: GOVERNMENT MOTION NO. 11/91 PASSED BY MAJORITY.

MADAM SPEAKER: We will continue now with Private Member's Business Private Member's Motion No. 20/91 Introduction of Police and Criminal Evidence Law with Codes of Practice and Bail Law. The First Elected Member for West Bay.

OTHER BUSINESS

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 20/91 (AS AMENDED) INTRODUCTION OF POLICE AND CRIMINAL EVIDENCE LAW WITH CODES OF PRACTICE AND BAIL LAW

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Madam Speaker, I beg to move Private Member's Motion No. 20 standing in my name which reads:

> WHEREAS there is not now any comprehensive law clearly indicating the rights of the Police vis-a-vis the rights of the individual citizen when matters arise which cause the citizen's freedom to be restricted;
>
> AND WHEREAS the United Kingdom has passed a comprehensive Act known as the Police and the Criminal Evidence Act 1984 with Codes of Practice setting out those said rights;
>
> BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Government introduce a law similar to the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 passed in the United Kingdom along with the Codes of Practice introduced by the Secretary of State for the United Kingdom and currently in force, as part of the said Act;
>
> AND WHEREAS the Cayman Islands has no specific Bail Law setting out the rights of an accused person (although the Criminal Procedure Code in section 27 and 28 make some provisions for bail);
>
> AND WHEREAS the United Kingdom has enforced such an Act;
>
> BE IT THEREFORE FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Government introduce a law similar to the Bail Act 1976 of the United Kingdom which Act sets out the rights of an accused person on bail.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: In addition, to the motion, Madam Speaker, an amendment is circulated which says that the Government should give consideration to introducing such a law:

AMENDMENT TO PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 20/91

> I, the First Elected Member for West Bay, in accordance with the provision of Standing Order 25(2) seek the authorisation of the Speaker to amend, without notice, Private Member's Motion No. 20/91 as follows:
>
> > By deleting the word "**introduce**" as it appears after the word "**Government**" in the first line of the first Resolve of Private Member's Motion No. 20/91, and substituting therefor the words "**give consideration to introducing**".

MR. JOHN D. JEFFERSON, JR.: Madam Speaker, I am pleased to Second the motion.

MADAM SPEAKER: The question before the Honourable House is Private Member's Motion No. 20/91 as has been amended. The Motion is open for debate.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Police and Evidence Act in the United Kingdom sought to strike a balance between the rights and liberties of the individual citizens and the community as a whole. The Act in England was based upon three standards which were thought should be applied to investigative arrangements to ensure public confidence in the police. Those three standards were; is it fair; is it open and is it workable?

In relation to fairness, it was decided that it should be fair to the police officer who should not be required to work within a framework of rules that were unclear to him. In relation to the citizen, he should be made aware of what rights he has upon the commencement of investigative procedures or arrests. In relation to openness, the police while protecting the community as a whole, would also protect the rights of citizen by following clearly laid down procedures. In relation to workability, that the police would be given sufficient room to discharge their duties properly and thus protect the community from criminal elements.

With this framework in mind, certain aspects of police work were examined, namely: 1) the powers to stop and search citizens; 2) road checks; 3) the powers of entry, search and seizure; 4) arrest; 5) detention of citizens; 6) questioning and treatment of persons by the police; 7) obtaining of documentary evidence and criminal proceedings; 8) the production of evidence in court and criminal proceedings; 9) complaints against the police; 10) disciplinary action.

The Act in the United Kingdom sets out in clear terms rights and powers of the police and a citizen in relation to all of those matters. The Secretary of State, pursuant to Section 66 of the Act issued codes of practice dealing with the procedure to be followed by the police when statutory powers under the Act were being exercised in relation to the following matters: 1) the search of a person without first arresting; 2) the search of a vehicle without making an arrest; 3) the detention, treatment, questioning and

identification of persons by police officers; 4) the search of premises by police officers; 5) the seizure of property found by police officers and persons or on premises.

The Code of Practice adopted in the United Kingdom enabled the police to have a clear and concise course of procedure which must be followed and also allow the citizen to have a clear and concise understanding of his rights and the rights and duties of the police.

This lessens the conflict which arises between police and the citizen and also allows the courts to have clear statutory procedures the enforcement of which will protect the community as a whole and the citizen whose civil liberties, particularly, the right to freedom have been removed for one reason or another.

Prior to this act in the United Kingdom, there were as there are in these Islands, a set of judges rules which were not in statutory form and were not as comprehensive or clear cut as the present position in the United Kingdom, after the coming in to effect of the said Act.The establishment of these rules, I believe, will enhance the administration of justice in these Islands.

One problem, and one which I feel should be rectified quite early, is where the, and I will give the House this as an example, the habitual drug user is caught through the commonly used urine test. I have seen cases where a young boy is caught, taken to court, charged a heap of money which he does not have, then he might serve some time in prison. He is released and the whole episode is replayed.

One thing I have to disagree with is with those cases where a young man is charged because of this urine test and sometimes, on release on bail or even after he has been to court several times for the urine test, he is lucky enough to land himself a little job. The police then go on that job, take him away from the job to get a urine test.

I have seen cases where a young person is in his parents home, is in the house, yet the police call him out to do a urine test. This must be wrong. This law, which I am asking for, should stop all of this. I have said time and time again, that that urine test is not serving as a deterrent, that the Member for Education might have hoped for when he put that in the law and saw to it that it was enforced. Today it is being used as a weapon against the habitual user who cannot help himself, nor does he have the money to pay for the large court fines imposed upon him by the Magistrate Court.

As I said, I hope that a law as what I am asking for will be able to direct the police properly in regards to when and how they can charge someone with an offence. Especially those repeat offenders caught under the application of the urine test.

I believe that the passing of such a law will enhance the police capacity and at the same time protect our citizens from any abuse of power. I certainly believe that it will not give any criminal element any advantage over the system of justice, as we have. In fact, as I understand it, in the framing of the act in the United Kingdom, many of the police recommendations were accepted.

So, I would expect that when the draft law is being framed the officers in the force would utilise that time to make a constructive effort to have input according to their experience.

As far as the Bail Law is concerned, the motion asks for the framing of a proper Bail Law. There is now no comprehensive law in these Islands which deals with the right to bail and this is essential in order for the proper administration of justice and in order for the citizen who has been accused to understand what his or her entitlement is to freedom prior to trial and to give clear guidance to the court as to the consideration to be made when bail is applied for.

As an Elected Representative, I am often confronted and I am sure other Members have been as well, by parents, spouses, sometimes common-law wives, in a lot of instances seeking assistance because someone connected to them has been put away for a couple of months without bail.

I have seen persons confined for petty thefts for periods of up to three months without trial and without bail. Surely this is too long a period without trial and it does not or go well for the system of justice as we adhere to. The jurisprudence which this country is known for.

Madam Speaker, both these Acts have solved a number of problems which existed in the United Kingdom, (U.K.) similar to our problems, problems that we face from day to day the passing of which Act enhance that administration of justice in the United Kingdom.

MADAM SPEAKER: Honourable Member it is 5:30. I think we have to get the tape changed otherwise you will not be recorded. Could we just hold for a few minutes? Thank you.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I had just about finished, just to say or to emphasise that in the United Kingdom the passing of the Police and Criminal Evidence Law with Codes of Practice and Bail Law, have enhanced the administration of justice in the U.K. and I have every reason to believe that these laws and some other changes made in the system will solve a great many problems experienced today. I believe that the Government is going to accept the motion and I only await now to hear their terms of conditions.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Second Official Member.

HON. RICHARD W. GROUND: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

It is late and we are drawing towards the end of a long Sitting, so I will not detain the House for long.

If I could deal with the Police and Criminal Evidence Act first. The Member moving the Motion has outlined accurately in broad terms what it does and the considerations that it

addresses.

It is a huge statute, I have a copy here and Members can see how thick the wad of paper is. It runs to some 122 sections, though only 67 of those are directly relevant to police procedures. In addition to those sections there are the Codes of Practice the Member mentioned but there are four of those and though each is not long, they add to the volume of material that has to be considered.

The Act itself, was passed in the U.K. in 1984, but the passing of the Act was the end of a long and at times painful progress. It began with a world commission in 1978, it appeared first of all in a Bill in Parliament in 1982 and the Bill then moved slowly through both Houses of Parliament falling away in 1983 with a dissolution, coming back again in November of 1983 and under going several major debates and policy battles.

That tells us two things. It tells us that the Act does address difficult and complex issues that were not easily resolved in the United Kingdom. It also happily tells us that much of the hard foot work has been done.

Nonetheless, the statute cannot just be brought to Cayman and applied here wholesale. In addressing procedures is predicated on a system that in some ways is different from ours. A larger police force, to give an example requires a constant supervision of the process of arrest and interrogation by officers of certain ranks, after certain periods of hours while a person is in detention. We just cannot lift that up and put that into our system. We do not have enough officers of the ranks that that specifies to do it. We will have to think about that and look it and consider it. I welcome the Member's recognition that the Force is going to have to put some input into this itself.

I also very much welcome the Member's proposed variation of the motion. It originally called for Government to introduce a law similar to the Police and Criminal Evidence Act. His proposed amendment calls upon Government to consider the introduction of such a law. I do not regard that as weakening the motion but rather as recognising that we have to take away these 68 procedural sections and go through them and make them fit to Cayman and make them apply here.

I can assure him that in varying the motion in that way that we will not take advantage of that and that Government will go away now and begin that process. I think that at the end of the day we will come out with something that fits local circumstances and achieves the aims of balancing law enforcement and the rights of the citizen that the Member referred to.

As I say, we will begin at that process. It is not going to be a short one, it is going to be hard work. It is one in which I hope we can involve the Legal profession, the judiciary and other interested parties.

Turning to the Bail Act, that happily is simpler. It is a much shorter and more direct piece of legislation. It enacts some principles that were already there in the common law and which we adhere to here. It created certain new principles. It creates a presumption in favour of bail a statutory presumption that has to be rebutted in court by evidence.

I am happy to say that the larger principles of the Bail Act have been adhered to by the higher courts here and adopted and adumbrated in judgements of the Grand Court and because of that I see no problem in moving forward to enact it here and hope that in doing so uncertainties and fears in the community will be laid to rest.

So with those few words I can tell the Member to put him out of his suspense that Government will support this motion in form as varied as he proposes the variation and as I say I am grateful to him for recognising the practical difficulties in doing that.

MADAM SPEAKER: If there is no further debate would the mover of the motion like to reply?

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I would like to thank the Honourable Attorney General for his reply to the motion. I am pleased to have that very serious undertaking from the Honourable Attorney General, that they will not take advantage of the words which say, "give consideration to introducing". However, the substantive motion was only asking that a law similar to the Pace Act in the U.K. be introduced here, not that that entire law be introduced here to the Island because I know that would be very, very impractical and unworkable.

I am pleased to have his undertaking because in previous times and as the House might know, I am wary of using those words "give consideration to" because if the four Elected Members of Executive Council want to stop it, they can say we gave consideration to it and we are not going to do it. That has happened to me in the past and I am very wary of those words but I trust the Honourable General, while I do not put much trust in the four Elected Members.

On my part, I think it is very important to this country to have some similar statute as to that which exists in the U.K. regarding police work and the rights of the citizen. All I want to see is the streams of justice running free and clear in our system as we know it and have over the years learned to trust it. What must be realised today by those Executive responsible for the justice system and for those of us in this House who make laws that affect the justice system is, today in the Cayman Islands the question is often posed, perhaps too often, is our system of justice working? This is being asked by persons in high places as well as the decent person on the street.

Caymanians are honest law-biding people. While they want to see anyone who breaks the law punished, from the most extreme to the minor infraction, they also want to see fairness applied. They do not want a slipshod justice system and I believe that the law that is being discussed will affect changes for good when those changes are applied and I thank the Honourable Attorney General for this

undertaking to the Honourable House.

MADAM SPEAKER: The question before the Honourable House is Private Member's Motion No. 20/91 as amended.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 20/91 (AS AMENDED) PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 21/91
REVIEW OF THE ROYAL CAYMAN ISLANDS POLICE FORCE

MADAM SPEAKER: Private Member's Motion No. 21/91 Review of the Royal Cayman Islands Police Force, the Second Elected Member for Cayman Brac and Little Cayman.

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move Private Member's Motion No. 21/91, Review of the Royal Cayman Islands Police Force.

WHEREAS there has never been a complete review of the Royal Cayman Islands Police Force;

AND WHEREAS the Police Force, excluding civilians, totalled 230 in number as at 31st December, 1990, comprising approximately 40 per cent of various foreign nationalities, some of whom occupy positions of senior rank;

AND WHEREAS there are increasing and frequent complaints from the public in the media and to Elected Representatives concerning police actions and conduct;

AND WHEREAS the recent case of Regina vs Patrick Campbell has revealed serious Police misconduct;

AND WHEREAS following this incident public concern has escalated with expression that conditions be investigated and remedied;

BE IT NOW THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT this Honourable House requests His Excellency the Governor to consider asking the Foreign and Commonwealth Office to appoint an independent, suitably legally qualified and experienced person or persons to undertake a full review of the Royal Cayman Islands Police Force, and report to this Honourable House thereon.

MR. ROY BODDEN: Madam Speaker, I respectfully beg to Second the Motion.

MADAM SPEAKER: The question before this Honourable House is that Private Member's Motion No. 21/91 be approved. The Motion is open for debate.

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I think that the recitals in this motion have fairly much covered the concerns which has motivated this particular motion. It seems that the motion which was just passed by this House very much compliments this particular situation and I am particularly glad to know that the Government has accepted that motion which would work hand in hand if this one is also accepted.

We have had our police force now for many, many years beginning at the time where was two or three. It has grown now to a tremendous size compared to the relative size of our population. There is indication that there is a official wish to increase it even further and so it is no longer an insignificant number of persons in the Corps or Forces. As these numbers grow so naturally are the problems and difficulties because of the shear size and the complexities of breaches of the law which are now a part of our society.

Many of the police officers in this country are non-Caymanian. This has elicited in many quarters serious criticism. The criminal element certainly a part of, other citizens have commented on it and have raised concerns about it. Certainly there have been representations made to me about the growing number in the police force and the growing number of foreign nationalities. This is something, which too, at this time would seem to deserve some scrutiny and some recommendation if a review is carried out. The position of many of the foreign officers are in the higher ranks and I dare say in the majority this could be found to be the case.

There is a considerable percentage in this society who would like to see that change. I certainly believe, as a representative, that there should be effort made to change that particular condition and perhaps a review could very well look at this situation and come up with some suggestions.

Never before that I can recall have there been so many complaints regarding the police, their action and their conduct. Some might be taken as to be trivial or they may come from persons who simply wish to have a good subject to complain about but there are many others that are genuine and certainly, in my opinion, they need serious looking in to.

Questions of police brutality, that have been questioned and, in some instances, where investigations have been alleged to have been carried out, it has been found that it was

simply the wrong perception of the person making those claims. In others where conduct and actions have come in to play, it has been said to be a rumour. It has really not helped the confidence of the public in the police and all of such matters or at least some of the complaints that have been entered in the Log Book over recent years might well be looked at in a review to determine the nature of these complaints and to determine whether in review, or in retrospect, the conclusions drawn were the most satisfactory.

I have been made to understand that in the United Kingdom, particularly at this time, the High Courts are striking down various cases involving actions taken by the police and there is a strong lobby or a call in the United Kingdom for reviews of the police actions and conduct. In fact, I understand that the very code of conduct that was asked for in the motion prior, is under review, or there has been at least a request to review that in the light of happenings in the United Kingdom in recent times.

Perhaps the thing that has brought the police force into the greatest focus in very recent times has been the case of Regina vs. Patrick Campbell a recent murder case in the court which revealed serious police misconduct. We are made to understand that that is presently being investigated. When that investigation will end, no one really knows and one will wonder, certainly I do, what will be the outcome of that.

What seems to strike me, and many people have expressed similar concerns to me, is that this has happened and no-one has heard if the police officers involved in this particular matter, have been suspended or even if their pay has been cut pending an investigation. In fact, it has been said to me that at least one of the officers who was alleged to have been involved has been sent on a training course at expense of the country.

Certainly the police officer, Mr. Bowden, I think the name was, if he was not a participant in that particular affair, it would only seem right that he has the right to defend himself and the public ought to know if the accusations which were made there were correct or not. To the best of my knowledge he was not called in this particular instance so he did not have an opportunity of answering in court.

I believe this needs to be pursued speedily because it is not really forgotten and it should not be forgotten and this ought to reach a conclusion which will clearly show what happened in this particular case and who were the participants in it. Certainly, the police ought to be pursuing some investigations to find out who did, indeed, kill the victim.

Madam Speaker, more and more there is a growing public concern. More and more there are criticisms of the police force which is unhealthy. I firmly believe that listening to the many complaints, listening to the many stories that I hear about involving police action and police conduct, there ought to be a full review of the Cayman Islands Police Force.

It can only help, I suggest, if such a review is done by persons competent, not necessarily another police officer. It might be found that a judge or someone with a legal background might be more suitable. Whatever or whoever is the most suitable in this case should be the person that I would hope the Governor would request the foreign and commonwealth office to appoint to do a review. This person should be independent of the Cayman Islands Police Force and he should not have any obligations one way or the other. This is very necessary in my opinion.

I think that if a review is carried out it should cover various areas. I shall but site a few. I think a look needs to be taken at the overall training facility in the police to see the content of their training; does it include public relations training and to what extent it includes the knowledge of the law and police science. It needs to be examined and also a look needs to be taken whether it is a long enough period or whether more should go into it. Or, whether before that training is over there needs to be an apprenticeship period, whether certain exams need to be taken and whether training is an on-going effort where police officers are constantly up-dated. I believe this should be done.

I also believe that the whole process of recruitment needs to be reviewed to find out why more Caymanians are not finding an interest in becoming a police officer.

Much has been said here in this Legislative Assembly about that and I do not really feel that the crux of the matter is the many answers that I hear expressed here from time to time. I believe there is a certain doubt in the mind of the people who could become police officers and they do not wish to join into the type of body or group or organisation as they too hear it to be.

In the recruitment, I would hope that the situation of age would be looked at because I believe that it is possible to interest persons other than those 17 years of age for the salaries offered to police officer fall within an average salary that is paid to persons in other areas of work and I think that some older person in this society can be attracted to it.

I would hope the educational requirement would be looked at and certainly I would also trust that persons who are presently attending our Law School and who are getting the diploma or getting a degree might be identified and encouraged to look at joining the Police Force.

I feel that the way police are deployed should also be considered, whether they should be used in the court prosecuting, or whether they should be used as Bailiffs in the court and so on, Court Marshals should be looked at - their whole deployment - be it in drug squad, be it in motor patrol or whatever.

I would hope if a review is accepted that the review would take into account the situation Cayman Brac versus Grand Cayman. I know that way back in 1980 in a discussion with Mr. Stowers, former Commissioner of Police, I suggested to him that there should be a rotational situation set up where certain officers would be taken from Grand Cayman to the Brac to serve and some from the Brac would be brought to Grand Cayman. As I recall, it was around 1980 that such a system was put in place and I think it still largely continues to be that way.

However, what I have noticed and numerous complaints to me

seem to be that once an officer from here goes to Cayman Brac his attitude seems to change. He is under less scrutiny, it is a small community and they really flex their muscles and I get many, many complaints. It is as if they have to prove something when they go there. It is something which I certainly hope that the review would look at and that the reviewers would avail themselves to persons in this community who wish to see them to tell them about instances of attitude or actions of misconduct of police.

I cannot believe that promotions should be purely on ones arrest record or how well he salutes or he cow-tows to his higher officials or officers in the police force. I believe there should be some form of examinations set up and if a proper review was carried out these should be areas that would be looked at. Exams to discover their competency and certainly that would play a part in their promotion.

We do know that there is a number of persons who are in the police force that do not necessarily have all of the educational background that would be desirable when they enter but certainly if a system of promotional exams were in place then they would have opportunity of studying and moving upward.

In any review I think they should look at dismissals. There have been dismissals from the police force but normally, again, it is deathly quiet. Dismissals I believe where a police officer has done something wrong, they should have the same public to face as does any other citizen.

In the question of dismissals and promotions in recruitment and all the rest of it, I believe the time has come for the Cayman Islands to have a Police Commission and I would strongly advocate that.

Staffing, goes hand in hand to some extent with the deployment. I would hope that a review would look at the staffing, both in the Central Police Station and in other district stations in this country. Certainly one of the very important areas because the police are the ones who have the right to go and take other citizens freedom in terms of arresting them, that there should be a balanced situation whereby the public has the right to complain.

Ideally, I think, there should be a complaint unit or section where a civilian person qualified or quasi-qualified with a legal background would take statements and so on, from people, enter it into a log, no loose-leaf book, into a log and they are not intimidated to go in there, in fact they are encouraged to go in there, as was the case many years ago to make complaints where a citizens in their good sense knows that they have been wronged or they have not been treated fairly, or whatever, to have their complaints lodged and with the knowledge that investigations will not take two years to be done and one hears that it was only a rumour or that what appeared to be police brutality really was not.

I believe that a proper review would also look at areas of specialisation, with particular emphasise placed on police officers who deal with the juvenile problems dealt with by the police. I do not think that that is presently the case and in fact, I hear it is not, but I think that is very important considering that it is mostly youth who make up the population of Northward Prison.

If it is accepted and is done, as has been the undertaking earlier, that there is a Code of Practice for police officers, we can expect then that there will be the clear rules to be followed when a person is arrested and that the rights of people will be respected when they are arrested with the right to make a telephone call and all the rest of it and not to be detained indefinitely by the police. Hopefully that will go right on into the courts where before a case is over the judge is saying he believes the police and he does not believe the accused.

I would also hope that a review would take into account how patrols are set up in the country and make certain recommendations on those.

This motion is not a police bashing exercise, it is simply a request for the Government to do a complete review of the Cayman Islands Police Force, make recommendations which would improve that organisation, their function, the way they perform and remove a lot of doubt from the minds of the public as to who they are and who the police are and make it very clear how the two should twain work together.

I recommend this to the House and I trust that it will be accepted. Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Third Official Member.

HON. J. LEMUEL HURLSTON: Madam Speaker, I wish to briefly comment on Private Member's Motion No. 21/91 recommending an independent Review of the Royal Cayman Islands Police and I am happy to say that the Government intends to accept the Motion.

Firstly, as Honourable Members are aware, responsibility for the Royal Cayman Islands Police rests constitutionally as a reserved subject with His Excellency the Governor.

As the Administrative Secretary, I am responsible to His Excellency for certain aspects of the Police Force. It is not accurate to say that there has never been a complete review of the Police Force. A comprehensive review was undertaken by Mr. J. H. Brownlow, Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary in September of 1983. A more recent visit was made by the Assistant Overseas Police Advisor, Mr. Colin Dinsdale in October, 1990.

The Brownlow Review set out the general framework by which the Police Department has subsequently been organised. Its general section of organisation and establishment have been recently outlined in some detail to this Honourable House. The performance of the Force is reported upon in Annual Reports, tabled usually at the first sitting of each year's Parliamentary session. These Annual Reports summarises the accomplishments and challenges met by the Department during the previous 12 months.

The Report also contains matters relating to complaints by citizens against the Department and how these complaints have been disposed of. Dismissals are also published in the Annual Report.

Madam Speaker, I recently answered a Parliamentary question giving complete details of all citizens' complaints received within the last two years by the Department with details of how each substantiated complaint was dealt with.

The most recent Report by Mr. Dinsdale stated that he found the Department efficient, well motivated and well commanded. The alleged incident leading to the recent acquittal of a person accused of murder was indeed regrettable.

May I hasten to add a word of reassurance to Honourable Members that this and similar matters are viewed most seriously by the Government and as was mentioned by the mover of the motion, the matter is currently the subject of a thorough investigation and enquiry.

In following established departmental procedures there was no cause nor reason to suspend any Officer involved in the particular incident. The task of investigating offences such as murder is of course the primary responsibility of the Criminal Investigation Branch of the Department.

The Member correctly identified a number of subject areas that any review of this sort ought to rightly address. The question of organisation, strength, manning, Caymanisation, training, investigation of citizen complaints, etcetera, are all worthwhile subjects to be considered. In the interest of time, therefore, I wish to conclude by reaffirming that Government views seriously its responsibility for policing these Islands. These Islands deserve and rightly expect to have a professionally run Police service. By and large, this is the case here.

There is room, of course, as always, for improvement. Should a complete review be undertaken its Report will be submitted to His Excellency the Governor. May I also add that the Commissioner of Police and his Officers have, themselves, no objection to such a review. The Government is therefore pleased to accept Private Members Motion No. 21/91.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The First Elected Member for Bodden Town.

MR. ROY BODDEN: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I realise that it is getting late but as the seconder of the motion I have one or two ideas that I would wish to add to the introduction so ably put by my colleague the Second Elected Member for Cayman Brac.

I would like to see some measure or medium introduced whereby, especially the young officers, could be given lessons in stress management because the work they are often called upon to do is very stressful and indeed, in other jurisdictions one of the major problems with social control forces is that they suffer from burn-out and in a lot of instances incidents, arise out of people working under stress and therefore, I would ask the Government to give serious consideration to seeking to procure the services of either a sociologist or a social psychologist, even if it is on a periodic basis, so that the officers can have access to some kinds of consultation with a view to learning how to cope.

I would also like to say that the position of Members of the Legislative Assembly as we are, are sometimes made difficult by complaints from citizens for whom we are supposed to be the buffer for complaining against the police. Our position is such that as legislators and as framers of the law, we have to be as sympathetic to the cause of the social control forces as we are of the cause of our citizens whom we have a right to protect and defend. So that our motive for bringing this motion is simply to alleviate any maladjustments and any negativeness and to improve the situation.

I am reminded by a few incidences of my own exposure I education. I saw a film one time called State of Siege which documented how the social control forces in the South American Republic of Uruguay went awry and indeed how they went far beyond their legal authority and one is reminded of what happened in Argentina during the dirty war and the nation is just coming to grips with what happened among its armed forces and members of the police force in their high-handedness regarding the citizens.

I am glad the Government has seen fit to accept this motion and I hope that in the interest of all (certainly in the interest of the citizens who complain so frequently to some of us about these incidents) that they consider an infringement that we can work out an amicable solution for our society cannot exist without the social control forces.

I also think and this is a predilection of mine, which might not hold any worth outside my own person. I also think that a part of the problem has to do with the notion of a police force. I think that very often the problem and the breakdowns caused from the kind of approach that is made and so personally I have problems with talking about a police force. I would rather and would feel more comfortable addressing them as the police or the constabulary because force means just that. It means force and so especially for some of the young officers who are not so accustomed to working under some of these experiences, there is a problem.

I would like to say on a positive note, that I have come across many of these young officers and I am struck by their intelligence, by their dedication and their willingness to learn. Some of them themselves, openly and frankly discuss their problems.

I understand that in jurisdictions like the United States and Canada there is in every precinct a bureau called Internal Affairs whose sole duty is to investigate and police the police, so that it is through this body that complaints from the civilians made against the police are investigated.

I took note of what the Honourable Member replying on

Governments's behalf said concerning the recent case. I would only like to say that I hope the matter is not being investigated by the police themselves because the police is a fraternity and it is quite unlikely that a man will convict his fraternal brother. I would also like to say that I realise that in a jurisdiction like the Cayman Islands, it is difficult because we are a small rather insular society and sometimes we are requested to enforce orders against relatives and friends.

I do not believe that that is an over-riding problem because I think, and from the information I have, the level of efficiency is very high indeed. Our problems lie, however, in the fact that we have not been successful in recruiting more Caymanians and that some of the elements whom we have recruited from over-seas have tried to incorporate in Caymanian police tactics the very bad habits that they brought from their jurisdictions, where, the criminal element or the criminal sub-culture, is of an altogether more sinister, evil and dangerous level than what exists in the Cayman Islands.

Happily for us too, there is a fair amount of cooperation between civilian citizens and the police. I am confident that by the Government accepting this motion and by us as legislators exercising our authorities and our responsibilities we can make our society a better one.

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: First Elected Member for West Bay.

MR. W. McKEEVA BUSH: Madam Speaker, I rise to briefly give my support to the motion.

Some years back, I moved a similar resolution which was not accepted by the Government at that time.

I am one who believes that if light can be shed on matters through an investigation or review then it should be welcome. Certainly, matters have come to light since the discussion of my resolution which should remove any doubt as to the pitfalls and inadequacy of the system of enforcement of justice.

My concern with the motion is the way forward. Who will be doing the investigation, what is the purpose and will it solve our problems. Certainly we have heard from the mover what the purpose is, we can think of other purposes and whether these can solve our problems is another matter.

It is no use having a review done by those which an investigation might effect. The Member moving the resolution said that perhaps the motion just passed, piloted by myself, and this one complements each other.

I strongly believe that it does, that this country would be well served if this resolution, under discussion now, could be taken and properly applied and the resolution the House just accepted is attended to expeditiously.

Once those guidelines are accepted and applied, more intensive training and discipline instilled in certain aspects of the force in order for those guidelines to be carried out, I believe then, the system of justice in this country and police work and matters surrounding the law enforcement officers would be enhanced. Then it should not stop there, as far as I am concerned. Reliance must be placed upon the system of justice to enforce the laws which will cause the police to follow proper investigative procedures or run the risk of having their case dismissed.

The object of police work is to investigate fairly, to protect the rights of the community as a whole and the rights of the accused person. Then the courts must be allowed to make a decision as to guilt or innocence. This is the normal course justice should run.

Perhaps one of the problems surrounding the whole sphere of police and the justice system in this country today is that the jurisdiction of the Magistrate Court which was set up to be and should really function as a Petty Court, has been extended to such an extent that Magistrates are empowered by the Legislature to imprison persons for very long terms. This happens because of how the police do their work. This is perhaps placing severe strain on the entire system and perhaps the time has come for Government to look at that matter. It might be well timed for the appointment of further Grand Court Judges, who would come from the High Court Bench to hear cases with or without juries.

With no disrespect to anyone, Madam Speaker, it must be an obligation of this Honourable House to ensure that the community receives the best judicial system and extensive judicial experience of senior personnel.

I am very happy to hear that Government is accepting this resolution and I thank the Honourable Third Official Member for his input. But if these matters are viewed with the due consideration that is needed, our entire system of justice will be greatly improved. When I say that, that is police work, including sufficient offices and courts, so that the public can be properly served. If this is not done, then no review will be effective.

I support the motion and I trust that two matters now before us, this one and the one just finished, both of them can enhance the administration of justice in this country.

MADAM SPEAKER: If no other Member would like to debate would the Second Elected Member for Cayman Brac and little Cayman like to exercise his right of reply?

MR. GILBERT A. McLEAN: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

It is always very satisfying when one brings a Private Member's Motion, that is, to discover that the Government has accepted it. I in this case am very satisfied that the Government has, indeed, taken such a position. I thank the Third Official Member for his notice to this effect.

I would take note of some points which he made and to say that

it is very encouraging to know the Commissioner of Police and other officers in the police force have no problem at all with a review being done. That, indeed, is very encouraging.

I take note, however, that the motion requests a review to be done and that a report to be made to this Honourable House in due course. I did notice that the Member said if a report is done the report will be made to the Governor. I could only hope that such a report would then be sent on to this House, so that the public would have the benefit of it.

I do not wish, by any means to attempt to supplant the powers of the Governor in respect of the police but one certainly has to be very much aware that if one tries to closet to their heart so many secrets it gives cause for suspicion. I think that has happened in many instances in this country where the police are concerned and where the present Governor has dealt with a particular situation.

It seems that there is no intention, and indeed it was said that there was no reason to suspend any officer in the case where the murder case of Campbell was concerned. I must say that from just about every person I spoke to there was great wonderment as to why that did not occur. I am not here to attempt to discuss the legalities of it but it is such instances and attitudes that this is my reserved right, do not question this, I will let you know what is best for you. Certainly, I hope that if this review is undertaken, it is undertaken is such a manner that no-one will be coming here to be instructed in the carrying out of their duty, that this will be a matter for a qualified person to do in the way they know it should be done and it should cover as may areas as is at all logical and possible.

I know that reports are given on the police which shows dismissals and their performance and all the rest of it. That is not in question. It is those activities or those occurrences which do not seem to glean the same type of approach by being reported here in the House.

The motion asks that a complete review of the Royal Cayman Islands Police Force be carried out. I do not know of ay report by Mr. Dinsdale or by Mr. Brownlow that covered in its entirety most of the areas that I mentioned as areas I thought should have been dealt with in any sort of report. The Brownlow one, as I recall, was a bit of crisis management during the famous days of the Latin cocaine case when Mr. Brownlow came in, did what he was supposed to do, but I do not recall that being tabled or made available to the public nor can I really believe that it went into the depth as I was sort of advocating that it should.

I suppose it is a question of semantics of what is complete and what is complete. I thank the Members who spoke on this motion and I sincerely do hope that the motion will be what it is intended to be.

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The question before this Honourable House is that Private Member's Motion No. 21/91 be approved.

QUESTION PUT: AGREED. PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 21/91 PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION NO. 22/91
SELECT COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE TO STUDY THE REPORT ON THE EDUCATION REVIEW OF THE CAYMAN ISLANDS

MADAM SPEAKER: The other Private Member's Motion No. 22/91 falls away. This is dealt with by an amendment to Government Motion No. 11/91.

That concludes the business of the Honourable House for this meeting. Before we adjourn I would like to thank Members for their diligence and hard work in completing the business of the House before the end of the year. I know everyone feels much relieved and happy and I hope that everyone will have a very prosperous, peaceful and happy 1992.

May I now ask the Honourable First Official Member to move the adjournment of the House.

ADJOURNMENT

HON. THOMAS C. JEFFERSON: Madam Speaker, I move the adjournment of this Honourable House sine die.

MADAM SPEAKER: The question is that this Honourable House do now adjourn sine die. I shall put the question. Those in favour please say Aye...Those against No.

AYES.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Ayes have it. The House is accordingly adjourned sine die.

AT 6:38 P.M. THE HOUSE STOOD ADJOURNED SINE DIE.